

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Independent Phase One Planning Forum for HS2</b>	
<b>Date &amp; Time</b>	<p>Thursday 21st March 2019 13:00 – 16:00</p> <p>Two Snow Hill Queensway Birmingham B4 6GA</p>	
<b>Chair</b>	[REDACTED]	Independent Chair
<b>Promoter Attendees:</b>	[REDACTED]	<p>HS2 Ltd (Senior Project Manager, North)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd (Head of Programme Interface, Central)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd (Senior Town Planning Manager, Central)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd (Lead Architect)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd (Phase 1 Town Planning Lead)</p> <p>HS2 (Architect, Weston Williamson)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd (Programme Director, Central)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd (Head of Town Planning)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Advisor)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd (Head of Public Response)</p>
<b>Local Authority Attendees:</b>	[REDACTED]	<p>Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC)</p> <p>Warwick District Council (WDC)</p> <p>South Northants District Council (SNDC)</p> <p>Northamptonshire County Council (NCC)</p> <p>Chiltern District Council &amp; South Bucks District Council (CDC&amp;SBDC)</p> <p>Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council (HCC)</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council (OCC)</p> <p>Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC)</p> <p>South Northants District Council (SNDC)</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council (WCC)</p> <p>Birmingham City Council (BCC)</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council (WCC)</p> <p>Lichfield District Council</p>
<b>Guests</b>	[REDACTED]	<p>Network Rail (NR)</p> <p>Network Rail</p> <p>Network Rail</p> <p>Network Rail</p> <p>Department for Transport</p> <p>Weston Williamson</p> <p>Weston Williamson</p>

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

Item		Action Owner
1.	<b>Introductions</b>	
2.	<p><b>Review of notes &amp; actions from last meeting</b>            EC (NCC) noted that there was a missing action from the minutes of the last meeting: HS2 Ltd were to provide additional information regarding how the intensification of construction routes are assessed against the ES.</p> <p>The minutes of the January meeting were agreed subject to the above action being added to the actions list.  <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):</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 (missing action noted above).  <b>Action: HS2 to respond at next Planning Forum.</b></li> <li>• EH Subgroup engagement on relevant CDEs ongoing.</li> <li>• The process for managing noise arising from temporary highways to be communicated to the next EH Subgroup.  <b>Action: HS2 to advise process at next EH Subgroup (4 April).</b></li> <li>• HS2 to update the Forum on route-wide issues arising from appeal decisions (when known). An update on the Sch 17 appeal decision was given under AOB.</li> <li>• HS2 to advise if claims can be made retrospectively once the Prolonged Disturbance Scheme is finalised and clarify how potential overlap between the Prolonged Disturbance Scheme and the Construction Complaint process is to be addressed. PG confirmed DfT are still finalising the scheme.  <b>Action: HS2 to advise at next EH Subgroup (4 April).</b></li> <li>• HS2 Ltd to give presentation at future meeting on process for ensuring compliance with route wide undertakings.  <b>Action: Proposed agenda item for May Forum.</b></li> <li>• <b>Action: HS2 to arrange for Local Authorities to view the VR facility at the July Forum at Snow Hill.</b></li> </ul>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 to respond to issues raised on draft Planning Forum Notes 14 and 15 and issue revisions for consideration before next CDE Working Group. See update on Planning Forum Notes under Item 7.</li> <li>• HS2 to progress work on noise barrier CDE and present progress at next Working Group, for discussion. <b>Action: HS2 to update on progress at next Working Group on 25 April.</b></li> <li>• <b>Action: HS2 to issue draft Planning Forum Note on Noise Barrier CDE after the next Working Group.</b></li> <li>• HS2 to respond to comments on draft Appendix A to PFN 6 (lorry routes) in order for the response to be considered in time for the next Planning Forum. LAs to provide any comments on draft PFN 16 (Operational Noise) by 18 February.</li> <li>• LAs to provide any comments on draft Appendix A to PFN 9 (Informatives) by 18 February. See update on Planning Forum Notes under Item 7.</li> <li>• LAs to provide any comments on draft PFN 16 (Operational Noise) by 18 February. See update on Planning Forum Notes under Item 7.</li> <li>• HS2 to present on BIU process at future Planning Forum. <b>Action: Proposed agenda item for May Forum.</b></li> </ul>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Phase 1 update</b></p> <p>██████████ (Programme Director, Central Area) reiterated points made by ██████████ at the last meeting regarding the cost and schedule challenges that HS2 Ltd is working through with Main Works Civils contractors. Gateway 5 submissions were submitted at the end of February, which HS2 Ltd are currently reviewing.</p> <p>PB confirmed that HS2 Ltd will be flexible in accommodating how authorities would like to receive submissions (e.g. preferences for larger or smaller packages) as far as possible. HS2 Ltd wants to ensure it works in a way that is consistent and helpful with regards to each local authority's processes. HS2 is encouraging contractors to engage with local authorities and local authorities are encouraged to do likewise.</p> <p>DW (SNDC) noted press reports about one of Fusion's sub-contractors potentially going into administration and asked what impact this will have on works such as Chipping Warden Relief Road. PB confirmed that HS2 Ltd is in dialogue with the contractor in question and does not currently expect a material impact on the project.</p> <p>SNDC requested the planning forum be kept up-to-date regarding the matter of</p>	

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>Fusion’s sub-contractor and asked what the process is for doing so. PB said that a communications strategy is being drawn up and will be actioned in the next few days.  <b>Action: HS2 to issue communication on this issue.</b>  <b>(Post meeting note: a communication to MPs and Local Authorities was issued on 22 March).</b></p> <p>WCC said there was a lack of information regarding ground investigation works locally. <b>Action: HS2 Ltd to circulate information regarding ground investigations.</b></p> <p>JB gave a short presentation outlining the works that are underway in areas South, Central and North. In area south, contracts have been signed to deliver the Euston terminus and St James’ Gardens archaeological works are ongoing. There has been a successful tender for Old Oak Common now awaiting formal sign off. Engagement on Old Oak Common station design is underway.</p>	<p><b>HS2</b></p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Network Rail works - powers and community relations</b>  A presentation was given by three representatives of Network Rail.</p> <p>MB described the general scope of works NR is delivering for, and associated with the HS2 project, and provided an update on works at Euston.</p> <p>JB outlined general planning issues (including confirming that Network Rail is subject to the EMRs when undertaking works under the HS2 Act).</p> <p>HM discussed community relations and the interaction of HS2 and Network Rail community relationship/engagement processes.</p> <p>TA requested NR/HS2 Ltd circulate guidance regarding the approach to the application of permitted development rights and the powers granted by the HS2 Act. <b>Action: NR/ HS2 to arrange briefing on permitted development rights and identifying the appropriate consenting regime for works at future Planning Forum.</b></p> <p>It was agreed that Network Rail’s community engagement and planning team should attend future Planning Forum meetings.</p> <p>SL (WCC) requested HS2 Ltd clarify the position with regards to HS2 construction vehicle identification and said there had been instances of non-compliances. PG referred to the vehicle identification requirements in 4.8.2 – 4.8.6 of the Route-wide Traffic Management Plan, which apply to EWC as well as MWCC, and asked for specific examples of non-compliance. <b>Action: SL (WCC) to provide details of non-compliances to HS2 for investigation.</b></p> <p>IN (CDC&amp;SBDC) requested more detail of complaints received and for detailed reports to be shared with local authorities. SG confirmed that the Local Authority Report will include further details regarding complaints at a later stage.</p>	<p><b>NR/HS2</b></p> <p><b>SL (WCC)</b></p>

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Community engagement and helpdesk update</b>            SG gave a Community Engagement and Helpdesk update.</p> <p>Old Oak Common station design events: there have been five events with approximately 350 people in attendance, 50% of whom had not attended an HS2 event before. A younger demographic attended (particularly younger parents) compared with previous events.</p> <p>Community and Environment Fund and Business and Local Economy Fund - £3.2 million awarded to 55 projects to date.</p> <p>A Phase 2a newsletter is being circulated to households during March.</p> <p>SG provided key stats from community engagement and complaints reporting (see slide pack for more details).</p> <p>IN (CDC&amp;SBDC) queried whether the strategy to mitigate complaints is reactive rather than proactive. SG said that this was not the only way that Community Engagement are working: learning from complaints is one example.</p> <p>JB said that HS2 has embedded one of its community engagement senior management into a contractor’s team to assist in avoiding complaints.</p> <p>SL (WCC) requested that HS2 corporate affairs provide the protocol/public statement for protestor management.  <b>Action: HS2 to provide its public statement and/or protocol regarding protests [Post meeting note. An email outlining the protocol was sent to WCC on 17 April: to be circulated separately to the Planning Forum]</b></p> <p>BN (AVDC) said that a notification of works in Calvert had raised greater public concern than might otherwise have happened, due to the description of works not being accurate. This led to residents inferring a greater scale of works was to take place than was planned.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Common Design Elements (with focus on design in the local context)</b>            [REDACTED] (NMCG) gave a presentation on Common Design Elements (CDEs) and local context (see slide pack circulated separately). The presentation focussed on the design process in relation to Cole Valley Viaduct, to show how Common Design Elements are integrated into the overall design of a structure.</p> <p>NMcG presented an example of a structure he has been involved with and a contextual approach to shaping CDE.</p> <p>Clarification was sought on the extent to which Schedule 17 applications will include an explanation of the process and design justification in terms of context.</p> <p>MD said that while Design and Access Statements only accompany Schedule 17</p>	

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>applications for Key Design Elements and Stations, Written Statements for all Schedule 17 submissions contain a section on ‘Design Criteria and Rationale’ which includes a description of the design options analysed, including an explanation to support the design option(s) chosen and an explanation of the constraints on the design.</p> <p>MD confirmed that this section should include reference to how the design has responded to local context.</p> <p>DW (SNDC) said that local context should be discussed at the pre-app phase to understand local context according to local people.</p> <p>JF (HCC) said that language is important during engagement with the public – it was implied that the word ‘common’ could be perceived as having a negative connotation, which was not the case. <b>Action: HS2 to consider a possible alternative to the term ‘Common Design Element’.</b></p> <p>IN said that the principles of how planting was to be maintained and who would be responsible were not established. MD replied that the principles are clear. They are set out in Information Paper 16: landscape planting will be maintained by the owner via an agreement and if not it will be maintained by the railway operator. IN said this was helpful clarification. <b>Action: HS2 to re-issue Information Paper E16</b></p> <p>It was agreed that at engagement and application stage it is important that the images used to illustrate final designs are accurate.</p> <p>DW (SNDC) queried whether there are any significant elements that are yet to be finalised that might then impact CDEs.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<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) a second was issued on 1 March with wording altered to reflect comments received. MD asked if the Forum now agreed Appendix A. <b>Action: EC (NCC) to discuss with Camden and review the revised note and respond to HS2 with comments in order for the response to be considered in time for the next Planning Forum.</b></li> <li>• Draft Planning Forum Note 9 (Appendix A: Informatives on Sch 17 decision notices). DW (SNDC) suggested text be inserted at the beginning of the document to explain that the advice of the informative is optional to the decision maker. <b>Action: Planning Forum Note 9 agreed subject to the text above being inserted; to be uploaded to the website.</b></li> <li>• Draft Planning Forum Note 13 (Pre-application engagement). A second draft was issued on 21 January and a response sheet was issued. The PFN</li> </ul>	<p>NCC</p> <p>HS2</p>

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>note was agreed by the Forum.  <b>Action: Planning Forum Note 13 agreed; to be uploaded to website.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second drafts of PFNs on Parapets (PFN 14) and Piers (PFN 15) Common Design Elements were issued on 5 March, and comments requested by 26 March. It was agreed that the final wording be reviewed when the noise barrier CDE proposal has been finalised.  <b>Action: LAs to provide comments by 26 March.</b></li> <li>• Draft Planning Forum Note 16 (operational noise) a number of comments have been received and will be responded to before the next Planning Forum.  <b>Action: HS2 to respond to comments before next Planning Forum</b></li> </ul> <p>██████████ (NR) requested guidance on the schedule 17 submission process.  <b>Action: HS2 to brief NR.</b></p>	<p><b>HS2</b></p> <p><b>LAs</b></p> <p><b>HS2</b></p> <p><b>HS2</b></p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Packaging of Schedule 17 Applications</b>  The LAs welcomed HS2’s statement that flexibility will be applied to the packaging of Schedule 17 applications, wherever possible.</p> <p>DP (NWDC) said that while packaging multiple applications together is thought to have some benefits the size of them might be difficult to deal with. There is a potential issue concerning whether the Planning Portal is able to process a certain size of application, and document file size might be too big for people to be able to open and view via the Council’s website.</p> <p>MD said that HS2 teams will, wherever possible, endeavour to break the packages of submissions down to whatever scale local authorities prefer. This needs to be discussed on a bilateral basis.</p> <p>PG asked if local authorities could describe the issues surrounding the submission of Schedule 17 applications. Is the problem mechanics for uploading documents the problem or is it simply that at a certain scale of submissions become unmanageable.</p> <p>An LPA commented that the scale of a package could also increase the chance of there being one detail within a larger submission that has implications for the determination of the other applications that make up the submissions which are less contentious.</p> <p>SL (WCC) raised concerns regarding the quality of submissions that have been received. SL said that mostly these were highways submissions. PG asked for specific details to be provided of which Schedule 17 submissions were of poor quality.  <b>Action: SL (WCC) to provide examples of poor quality Schedule 17 submissions.</b></p> <p>IN (CDC&amp;SBDC) said that submissions do not contain the information required to</p>	<p><b>WCC</b></p>

