

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Independent Phase One Planning Forum for HS2</b>	
<b>Date &amp; Time</b>	Thursday 24th January 2019 13:00 – 16:00  Mary Ward House 5 - 7 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9SN	
<b>Chair</b>	[REDACTED]	Independent Chair
<b>Promoter Attendees:</b>	[REDACTED]	HS2 Ltd (Senior Project Manager, North) HS2 (Architect, Moxon Architects) HS2 Ltd (Acoustic Engineer) HS2 Ltd (Head of Programme Interface, Central) HS2 Ltd (Senior Town Planning Manager, Central) HS2 Ltd (Senior Community Engagement Manager, North) HS2 Ltd (Chief Executive) HS2 Ltd (Lead Architect) HS2 Ltd (Phase 1 Town Planning Lead) HS2 Ltd (Programme Director, North) HS2 (Architect, Weston Williamson) HS2 (Structures Design Co-ordinator, Eface Kier) HS2 Ltd (Head of Town Planning) HS2 Ltd (Interim Head of Public Response) HS2 Ltd (Town Planner, Central) HS2 Ltd (Head of Programme Interface, South)
<b>Local Authority Attendees:</b>	[REDACTED]	Three Rivers DC (TRDC) Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) Cherwell DC (CDC) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) Stratford on Avon District Council (SAC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) Warwick District Council (WDC) South Northants District Council (SNDC) Birmingham City Council (BCC) Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Council (CDC&SBDC)

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

		OPDC Staffordshire County Council (SCC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC)
<b>Guests</b>		Independent Construction Commissioner

Item		Action Owner
1.	<b>Introductions</b>	
2.	<p><b>Review of notes &amp; actions from last meeting</b> The minutes of the November meeting were agreed. <b>Action: HS2 to place minutes on website.</b></p> <p><b>Outstanding actions:</b> The Forum reviewed the action log and noted the following outstanding actions (NB. Full action list included in slide pack; outstanding actions were covered at the end of the meeting):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 Ltd to provide additional information on how the intensification of construction routes are assessed against the ES. <b>Action: HS2 to respond at next Planning Forum.</b></li> <li>• HS2 Ltd to circulate appendix to PFN6 Lorry Routes on conditions. See update under item 7.</li> <li>• HS2 to confirm at a future meeting how E20 requirements are communicated to LPAs and how 'AFARP' principles apply to temporary highways. <b>Action: HS2 to provide response to EH Sub-Group on 6 Feb</b></li> <li>• HS2 to consider how the likely iterative design development could be managed in the Sch17 process. The answer to this was provided in response to a question from DW (SNDC), recorded under item 4 below.</li> <li>• HS2 to circulate a draft Planning Forum Note on operational noise. See update under item 7.</li> <li>• HS2 to update the Forum on route-wide issues arising from appeal decisions (when known). The Building Act appeal is decided. The Sch 17 appeal decision still awaited. <b>Action: HS2 to update Planning Forum on Schedule 17 appeal when decision received.</b></li> <li>• HS2 to consider how the likely iterative design development of noise mitigation could be best managed within the Sch17 process. This</li> </ul>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>question was answered by MD during the meeting in response to a question from SNDC under agenda item 4 below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 to advise on when next tranche of Woodland Fund will be released. This item is reported under AOB.</li> <li>• Presentation from HS2 on how HS2 ensures compliance with route-wide undertakings. <b>Action: HS2 to present at a future Planning Forum.</b></li> <li>• HS2 to arrange next meeting of piers and parapets CCE working group, and to set up noise barrier CDE working group. See update under item 7.</li> <li>• Clarification of potential for overlap between Prolonged Disturbance Scheme and the Construction Complaints process, and whether claims can be made retrospectively once the Prolonged Disturbance Scheme is finalised. ML noted that the scheme had not yet been published by DfT. <b>Action: HS2 to provide an update on both issues to the EH sub-group on 6 February.</b></li> <li>• HS2 to provide update on 'One-stop shop' bus. See update under 5.</li> <li>• HS2 to propose Informatives to summarise obligations on HS2 under the EMRs. See update under item 7.</li> <li>• HS2 to propose draft guidance to contractors on location plans. This item is reported under AOB.</li> <li>• HS2 Third Party Assurance Managers to liaise with LPAs to establish who is using what format of invoicing. This item is reported under AOB.</li> <li>• JF (HCC) asked what HS2's Brexit strategy is given the need to source some plant/material from abroad. <b>Action: HS2 to respond at Ecology Review Group in April.</b></li> </ul>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Phase 1 update</b>  <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">██████████</span> gave an update on the project, including Phases 2a and 2b.</p> <p>MT said that HS2 has a clear ambition to deliver some world class design across the project, but as a publicly funded project also needs deliver value for money for the country. HS2 needs to work together with stakeholders to get the right balance. <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">██████████</span> stated that conversations with LPAs and the consenting programme was key to delivering the HS2 project.</p> <p>MT emphasized the importance of the Planning Forum. It was agreed MT would attend the Planning Forum again in January 2020.</p>	

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Common Design Elements</b>          [REDACTED] (NMCG) gave an update of progress on Common Design Elements (CDEs) (see slide pack circulated separately).</p> <p>It was emphasised that the CDEs for viaduct piers, viaduct/ bridge parapets and noise barriers are being considered as a family of elements.</p> <p><u>Viaduct/ Bridge Parapets and Viaduct Piers</u></p> <p>It was noted that a Planning Forum working group had been held on 20 December to consider the viaduct and bridge parapet and viaduct pier CDE proposals shown in the draft Planning Forum Notes (PFNs 14 and 15) issued on 29 November. A number of comments were made at the workshop and subsequently by individual authorities.</p> <p>The principle comment was that it was not apparent how the CDE proposal responded to HS2’s obligation that design should be sympathetic to its local context.</p> <p>It was noted that another CDE working group was in the process of being arranged for late February / early March. It had previously been agreed that the remit of the working group be expanded to include noise barrier CDE. Steve Braund of CDC/SBDC has volunteered to represent the EH Sub-Group’s interest in noise barriers on the working group.</p> <p>It was proposed in relation to viaduct and bridge parapet and viaduct pier CDEs that this working group will discuss HS2 responses to issues raised on draft Planning Forum Notes 14 and 15 and determine further actions.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to respond to issues raised on draft Planning Forum Notes 14 and 15 and issue revisions for consideration before next Working Group.</b></p> <p><u>Noise Barriers</u></p> <p>NMCG presented the work done to date to develop a CDE proposal for noise barriers, comprising an overview of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Railway noise sources;</li> <li>• The different scenarios where noise barriers will be required (for example noise barriers on bridge and viaduct structures, lineside barriers at grade, or on slopes or embankments or within cuttings);</li> <li>• The challenge to achieve a consistent HS2 identity while responding to local scenarios;</li> <li>• The technical challenge to use robust easy to maintain materials that are flexible, durable and easy to construct and provide value for money.</li> <li>• How height changes are being considered.</li> <li>• Consideration being given to metal and concrete options and different</li> </ul>	<p><b>HS2</b></p>
------------------	--	-------------------

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>materials, and how these can respond to different local circumstances.</p> <p>NMcG emphasised that the overall design vision is a holistic contextual approach to considering what is appropriate in the local setting, rather than focusing on changing the individual CDE components. CDEs are high quality design responses which embody HS2 Design Vision and give HS2 a route-wide identity. The Key Design Elements may utilise CDE designs unless the setting requires that the CDEs are adapted or changed, in consultation with the local authority.</p> <p>SM (SCC) queried the reference to landscaping as a means of noise attenuation as planting provides no noise attenuation benefit. NMcG clarified that the reference was to the use landscape earthworks wherever possible to mitigate noise as a preference to noise barriers, not planting.</p> <p>DL (BCC) asked if the passenger experience is being considered in the noise barrier design. NMcG confirmed that this was very much one of the criteria in the design principles being followed.</p> <p>MT noted that the virtual reality simulator run by Arup might be of interest to the local authorities.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to arrange for local authorities to view this facility.</b></p> <p>MS said that there is a potential issue with flicker affecting passengers if a transparent noise barrier is adopted on the Colne Valley Viaduct, which is currently being investigated.</p> <p>JF (HCC) expressed a concern that the Colne Valley Viaduct (CVV) design will set a precedent for future designs and that there is limited scope for change. NMcG said that CDEs are linked to Key Design Elements (KDEs) in that KDEs can take the CDE or adapt them or move away from them as necessary and appropriate to that KDE. However, CDEs do drive the KDE design.</p> <p>MS noted that the programme is such that the KDE designs are generally somewhat ahead of the route-wide CDE designs. If there are elements of the KDE designs that could be applied on a route wide basis in the CDEs then that will be looked at.</p> <p>PG noted that a KDE being approved does not set a precedent for CDEs. CDEs still need to be agreed by the Planning Forum. If there are concerns about the noise barrier design for CVV, this can be raised by the planning authorities during the pre-application process.</p> <p>NS (CDC/ SBDC) said that there was currently still uncertainty as to the appearance of the noise barriers on the Colne Valley Viaduct.</p> <p>JR (OCC) questioned how structures will look in 50 years or so and asked who will maintain them. MD confirmed that the railway operator will be responsible for maintenance.</p>	<p><b>HS2</b></p>
--	---	-------------------

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>DJ (SADC) asked if noise barriers can also be used as the security fence. NMCG confirmed that wherever possible the noise barrier will be used as the lineside security barrier.</p> <p>EC (NCC) asked how the public will be able to engage and comment upon CDEs. Jon Lord said that an engagement plan was being developed as outlined at the November Planning Forum. MD said that the aim was to progress with the public engagement on CDEs as soon as the Planning Forum was content with the CDE design principles.</p> <p>DW (SNDC) highlighted that there was still some uncertainty around noise and sought clarification as to what the process was for progressing the design without understanding the noise impacts. If the assessment necessitated a design change would this need to be secured through a new application. MD said that the scheme design and thus Schedule 17 applications are being progressed on the current 'worse-case scenario' noise source term assumptions. If lower noise barriers can be demonstrated to be achievable as a result of the detailed design of the track and rolling stock, then revised applications under Schedule 17 or non-material amendment applications would be made as necessary, to reflect the revised noise barrier heights.</p> <p>MD noted that [REDACTED] of Arup (technical adviser to HS2) is to provide an update to the EH Sub-Group on 6 February on improvements to the noise source terms that are being incorporated in the scheme design as a result of the conclusions of technical studies.</p> <p>DW suggested the 'big-picture' of how the overall design is responding to local circumstances should be made explicit in the CDE Planning Forum Notes.</p> <p>At the next CDE working group referred to above, HS2 will present a further update on noise barriers CDE design for discussion and questions, and agree further actions.</p> <p>At the March Planning Forum there is proposed to be a further update on the CDE proposals. NMCG said that it is hoped that agreement can be reached at the March Planning Forum that the CDE proposals are sufficiently mature to enable HS2 to take forward public engagement.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to progress work on noise barrier CDE and present progress at next working group, for discussion.</b></p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to issue draft Planning Forum Note on Noise Barrier CDE after the next working group.</b></p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
5.	<p><b>Community engagement and helpdesk update</b> [REDACTED] gave a Community Engagement and Helpdesk Update (see slide pack).</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>DR (LBC) sought clarification as to the mechanism for analysing and dealing with complaints and highlighted that complaints often make their way to LBC resulting in the need for both LBC and HS2 to respond.</p> <p>It was explained that discussions regarding individual complaints should form a separate discussion with individual Local Authorities and the Public Response/Local Engagement Team outside the Planning Forum as required. It was agreed that going forward, the community engagement presentation will include overall complaint numbers.</p> <p>JF (HCC) sought clarification regarding the presentation of district and county figures and whether these are double counted?</p> <p>It was explained that the County Council data is a consolidation of the total number of contacts received by the HS2 Helpdesk from across the whole country, which includes data from the individual District Councils listed within the report but could include others.</p> <p>DP (WDC) provided positive feedback on how the enabling contractors were engaging with Parish Councils.</p> <p>In relation to the 'One-stop shop' bus, it was explained that in 2019, HS2 Ltd will be running a programme of engagement activities using a mobile trailer that can appear in locations that are not usually used for engagement events. The locations and timing are being scoped out and further details will be shared when confirmed.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>LA comments on Schedule 17 process</b></p> <p>The local authorities highlighted the following issues with Schedule 17 applications received to date:</p> <p>SM (Staffs CC) said that she had no visibility of forthcoming Sch 4 highways consents applications and highlighted that without an accurate forward plan it was not possible to properly plan their resourcing requirements. This point was also made by a number of other authorities.</p> <p>JF (HCC) said that the highways consents programme received by HCC was useful. In relation to Schedule 17 consents, the regular meetings with contractors were useful in providing updates on that consent programme.</p> <p>JC (BCC) raised a concern that some pre-application discussions on Sch 4 highways consent applications have been poor quality. Forward plans were identifying previous meeting dates and referencing these as formal pre-application discussions, whereas these meetings were often simply to introduce the concept of a scheme and did not represent a pre-application discussion in which the LPA had expressed a view or shared feedback on a specific proposal.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>PG said that the comments raised about Schedule 4 highways approval will be raised with the HS2 highways team.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to action the comments made regarding highways consents process</b></p> <p>DR (LBC) queried if a fee was payable for Sch. 17 submissions where the SLA had been signed. PG confirmed that the HS2 Fee Regulations provide that a fee is not payable where an alternative arrangement is in place.</p> <p>SM (SCC) said there was lack of clarity on the consent requirements relating to flood risk. PG offered to arrange for a briefing by the HS2 water team.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to arrange a briefing for SCC on flood risk and Schedule 33 process.</b></p> <p>NS (SBDC/ CDC) said that Fusion had struggled to provide plans of sufficient quality on time. MD said that this had been raised with Fusion and that HS2 has asked Fusion to delay meeting until clear plans were available.</p> <p>JM (WCC) said that Central and North have different ways of working and requested that HS2 identifies best practice and applies it on a route-wide basis. MD said that HS2 should and does share examples of good practice on a route-wide basis. Examples of good (and poor) practice should continue to be highlighted so that the process can be improved and refined.</p> <p>JM (WCC) said that there was sometimes lack of clarity at TLG meetings as to which Sch 4 highways consents related to which Schedule 17 submissions (if there was one required) and suggested a planner attends TLGs in order to help overcome this problem.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to review attendance at TLGs and consider how to improve reporting of Sch 4 applications against relevant Sch 17 submissions.</b></p> <p>DJ (SADC) highlighted that one MWC package is proposed to cover a large geographical area. A submission of a single application for a package of this scale differs from the original expectation which was predicated on the basis that they would receive c100 submissions. DJ noted that a single proposal for works at Pasture Lane (access widening) had taken an enormous amount of time in pre-app. The prospect of a single large scale submission caused him significant concern.</p> <p>BD (CDC) in contrast shared his experience of problems caused by the large numbers of small applications submitted by Network Rail for the East-West rail scheme.</p> <p>DP (WDC) said that it was likely to be difficult to deal with Schedule 17 submissions within an 8 week cycle.</p> <p>JM (WCC) sought clarification as to what the process was for contractors taking forward alternative lorry routes which were not identified in the ES. EC (NCC) highlighted proposals for more intensive use of HGV routes and sought reassurance that these routes had been fully assessed. MD said that routes not</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
--	---	----------------------------------

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>assumed in the ES can be proposed provided that proposals are assessed for compliance with the ES.</p> <p>EC (NCC) requested a list of all of the Planning Forum Notes. PG referred to all the agreed Planning Forum Notes located on the HS2.gov.uk website. Post Meeting Note: PFNs are located at:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-notes-for-local-authorities">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-notes-for-local-authorities</a></p> <p>JF (HCC) asked how HS2 is ensuring that comments made by LAs on mitigation planting schemes are taken forward and actioned by follow-on contractors. MD confirmed that HS2 is aware of the need to record comments and actions.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Planning Forum Notes Update</b>  MD summarised the status of draft Planning Forum Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft PFN 6 (Appendix A: conditions on lorry route approvals) was issued for comment on 3 December 2018. Comments had been received from three authorities.  <b>Action: HS2 to respond to comments in order for the response to be considered in time for the next Planning Forum.</b></li> <li>• Draft PFNs on Parapets (PFN 14) and Piers (PFN 15) Common Design Elements.  <b>Action as reported under item 4 above.</b></li> <li>• Draft Planning Forum Note 9 (Appendix A: Informatives on Sch 17 decision notices) was issued on 21 January, with comments requested by 18 February. (NB. The Informatives are proposed as an appendix to PFN 9, not PFN 5 as suggested at the November Planning Forum).  <b>Action: LAs to provide any comments by 18 February.</b></li> <li>• Draft Planning Forum Note 13 (Pre-application engagement). A response to comments received from the local authorities and a second draft was issued on 21 January. It was suggested that if the Forum was content with HS2's response, PFN 13 could be agreed at the March Forum.</li> <li>• Draft Planning Forum Note 16 (operational noise) was issued on 21 January, with comments requested by 18 February.  <b>Action: LAs to provide any comments by 18 February.</b></li> </ul>	<p>HS2</p> <p>LAs</p> <p>LAs</p>
8.	<p><b>Introduction to Construction Commissioner</b>  ██████████ (Construction Commissioner) introduced himself to the Forum.</p> <p>RR (OPDC) said that a number of complaints about HS2 in fact arise from</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	statutory undertakers' works.	
9.	<p><b>Forward Plan/ AOB</b></p> <p>The following agenda items were agreed for the March and May Planning Forums:</p> <p>March 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Network Rail works – powers and community relations</li> <li>• Planning Forum Notes - update</li> <li>• Common Design Elements - update</li> </ul> <p>May 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Briefing on compliance with route-wide undertakings</li> <li>• Common Design Elements - update</li> </ul> <p>The following items were covered under AOB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to concerns raised at the November Planning Forum regarding the quality of some site location plans, MD confirmed that he has notified HS2's contractors of the concerns, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Select an appropriate scale to the scale of the works and the context;</li> <li>- Location plans to be based on OS mapping;</li> <li>- Label local road names and other features, to aid identification of the site;</li> <li>- Include an outline of the HS2 trace.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In response to a concern raised at the November Planning Forum by CDC/SBDC regarding a lack of response to a letter regarding HeX assurances, MD confirmed that a response from [REDACTED] (Central Area Programme Director) had been sent on 28 November.</li> <li>• In response to questions and concerns raised at the November Planning Forum regarding invoicing format, [REDACTED] gave an update to the PF in terms of which LAs are using the SLA invoice format provided by HS2 Ltd. The usage varies across the Areas and is broken down as follows: Area South 5 of the 8 LAs, Area Central 9 of the 12 LAs and in Area North 2 of the 7 LAs are using the invoice format as presented to the PF in 2018.</li> <li>• In response to a query regarding when the next tranche of Woodland Fund will be released, PG said that HS2 is finalising agreement with the Forestry Commission to deliver the next tranche of funding, which is likely to re-open in Spring 2019.</li> <li>• JF (HCC) asked if greater clarity could be given on the Bringing Into Use process and how mitigation schemes are provided and consented. It was</li> </ul>	

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>agreed this should be subject to a presentation at a future meeting. <b>Action: HS2 to present at future Planning Forum.</b></p> <p>The next meeting is on the 21st March 2019 at 2 Snow Hill, Birmingham.</p>	<p><b>HS2</b></p>
--	---	-------------------