Draft Statutory Guidance Planning Forum consolidated comments (May 2014)

1 1-3 North: No comment 2 1-2 South: No comment 3 3-2 South: Should be explicit in stating that it is not a planning application. 4 South: Include text of CIL and sac6. 5 ILPAs consider that text should be explicit about what is not covered by the planning regime, e.g., plant and machinery, temporary structures, not looking at the environmental effects again as these have already been considered. Also include what is deemed to be reasonable givings ome rural examples, as Crossrail examples are all urban, e.g. will LAS be able insist on stone or dressed stone finishing for some bridges in local areas? 6 4 The Chair observed that the first bullet repeats what is in the Planning Memorandum Section 5, H52 Ltd agreed that where there is text repeated between the Planning Memorandum and the Statutory Guidance, if the text is necessary in both, it should be the same. 7 5-3 LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed. 8 5-3 South: LBC queried whether internal design applies to permeability of the station site. LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed. 9 5-3 North: LPAs want clarification on what is considered to be an enhancement. 10 LPAs want to understand what is considered to be an enhancement. 10 LPAs want to understand what is considered to be an enhancement. 11 ELPAS want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. 11 6 South: Clarify whether the 8 week timeframe applies once a request for additional information is made. H52 Ltd confirmed that it would not be appropriate to have text on pre-application discussion in the Guidance as it is specific to actual Requests under Sch. 16 of the Bill. 12 6.1 North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology. 13 7.2 South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. 14 7.4 As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition wher	No.	Paragraph (April 2014)	Issue
3 3.2 South: Should be explicit in stating that it is not a planning application. 4 South: Include text of CIL and sao6. 5 LPAs consider that text should be explicit about what is not covered by the planning regime, e.g. plant and machinery, temporary structures, not looking at the environmental effects again as these have already been considered. Also include what is deemed to be reasonable giving some rural examples, as Crossrall examples are all urban, e.g. will LAs be able insist on stone or dressed stone finishing for some bridges in local areas? 6 The Chair observed that the first bullet repeats what is in the Planning Memorandum Section 5. HS2 Ltd agreed that where there is text repeated between the Planning Memorandum and the Statutory Guidance, if the text is necessary in both, it should be the same. 7 LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed. 8 South: LBC queried whether internal design applies to permeability of the station site. LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed. 9 South: LPAs want clarification on what is considered to be an enhancement. 10 LPAs want to understand what is considered to be an enhancement. 10 LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. 11 EPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. 12 South: Clarify whether the 8 week timeframe applies once a request for additional information is made. HS2 Ltd confirmed that it would not be appropriate to have text on pre-application discussion in the Guidance as it is specific to actual Requests under Sch. 16 of the Bill. 14 North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology. 15 South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. 16 As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wordin	1	1-3	North: No comment
4	2	1-2	South: No comment
LPAs consider that text should be explicit about what is not covered by the planning regime, e.g. plant and machinery, temporary structures, not looking at the environmental effects again as these have already been considered. Also include what is deemed to be reasonable giving some rural examples, as Crossrail examples are all urban, e.g. will LAs be able insist on stone or dressed stone finishing for some bridges in local areas? The Chair observed that the first bullet repeats what is in the Planning Memorandum Section 5. HS2 Ltd agreed that where there is text repeated between the Planning Memorandum and the Statutory Guidance, if the text is necessary in both, it should be the same. LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed. South: LBC queried whether internal design applies to permeability of the station site. LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed. North: LPAs want clarification on what is considered to be an enhancement. LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. South: Clarify whether the 8 week timeframe applies once a request for additional information is made. HS2 Ltd confirmed that it would not be appropriate to have text on pre-application discussion in the Guidance as it is specific to actual Requests under Sch. 16 of the Bill. North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology. South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same.	3	3.2	South: Should be explicit in stating that it is not a planning application.
at the environmental effects again as these have already been considered. Also include what is deemed to be reasonable giving some rural examples, as Crossrail examples are all urban, e.g. will LAs be able insist on stone or dressed stone finishing for some bridges in local areas? The Chair observed that the first bullet repeats what is in the Planning Memorandum Section 5. HS2 Ltd agreed that where there is text repeated between the Planning Memorandum and the Statutory Guidance, if the text is necessary in both, it should be the same. LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed. South: LBC queried whether internal design applies to permeability of the station site. LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed. North: LPAs want clarification on what is considered to be an enhancement. LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. South: Clarify whether the 8 week timeframe applies once a request for additional information is made. HS2 Ltd confirmed that it would not be appropriate to have text on pre-application discussion in the Guidance as it is specific to actual Requests under Sch. 16 of the Bill. North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology. South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same. LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.	4	4	South: Include text of CIL and s106.
Planning Memorandum and the Statutory Guidance, if the text is necessary in both, it should be the same. 1	5	4	at the environmental effects again as these have already been considered. Also include what is deemed to be reasonable giving some rural examples, as
South: LBC queried whether internal design applies to permeability of the station site. LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed. North: LPAs want clarification on what is considered to be an enhancement. LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. South: Clarify whether the 8 week timeframe applies once a request for additional information is made. HS2 Ltd confirmed that it would not be appropriate to have text on pre-application discussion in the Guidance as it is specific to actual Requests under Sch. 16 of the Bill. North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology. South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same. LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.	6	4	The Chair observed that the first bullet repeats what is in the Planning Memorandum Section 5. HS2 Ltd agreed that where there is text repeated between the Planning Memorandum and the Statutory Guidance, if the text is necessary in both, it should be the same.
addressed. North: LPAs want clarification on what is considered to be an enhancement. LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. South: Clarify whether the 8 week timeframe applies once a request for additional information is made. HS2 Ltd confirmed that it would not be appropriate to have text on pre-application discussion in the Guidance as it is specific to actual Requests under Sch. 16 of the Bill. North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology. South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same. LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.	7	5.3	LPAs want more detail on how internal design of listed buildings is addressed.
LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included. South: Clarify whether the 8 week timeframe applies once a request for additional information is made. HS2 Ltd confirmed that it would not be appropriate to have text on pre-application discussion in the Guidance as it is specific to actual Requests under Sch. 16 of the Bill. North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology. South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same. LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.	8	5.3	
South: Clarify whether the 8 week timeframe applies once a request for additional information is made. HS2 Ltd confirmed that it would not be appropriate to have text on pre-application discussion in the Guidance as it is specific to actual Requests under Sch. 16 of the Bill. North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology. South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same. LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.	9	5.3	North: LPAs want clarification on what is considered to be an enhancement.
appropriate to have text on pre-application discussion in the Guidance as it is specific to actual Requests under Sch. 16 of the Bill. North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology. South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same. LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.	10	5.4	LPAs want to understand what is considered to be 'maintenance and operation': for example, are balancing ponds, car parks etc included.
7.2 South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements. 7.4 As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same. 8 LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.	11	6	
14 7.4 As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same. 15 8 LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.	12	6.1	North: LPAs consider 'more important' is not appropriate terminology.
15 8 LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.	13	7.2	South: Discussion on scale of vent shaft, the size of which would have to be justified based on operational requirements.
	14	7.4	As at section 4 Chair noted Planning Memorandum repetition where wording should be the same.
16 9 Discussion on validation process and role of Planning Forum papers to set out content of submissions etc.	15	8	LPAs consider that list of standard/model conditions should be included in the Guidance.
	16	9	Discussion on validation process and role of Planning Forum papers to set out content of submissions etc.

⁻ Where both North and South made the same comment a distinction is not made between where the issue was raised.