



LONDON-WEST MIDLANDS HERITAGE SUB-GROUP

NOTES

DATE: 30th September 2014

TIME: 11:00-15:00 pm

VENUE: The Axis, 10 Holliday Street, Birmingham, B1 1TF

| | |
|----------|--|
| 1 | Introduction |
| 2 | HS2 Update |
| | <p>Hybrid Bill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. HS2 Ltd explained that the Select Committee stage of the Bill process is progressing.b. Archaeology & heritage works<ul style="list-style-type: none">Non-intrusive surveys<p>HS2 Ltd advised that some of the sub-group archaeological officers have already been involved in meetings for non-intrusive surveys and that the remaining meetings would be set up in due course.</p><p>HS2 advised that the results of the surveys would be reported in a Supplementary ES in 2015.</p>Update on Generic WSIs for archaeology and built heritage<p>These documents have been written in draft and are now subject to the internal review process prior to being issued to the sub-group.</p> |
| 3 | Heritage undertaking and model agreements |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. HS2 Ltd explained the different types of Heritage Undertakings and Agreements (for Schedule 17 table 1, Schedule 17 table 2 and Schedule 18 to the hybrid Bill) and the interfaces involved with EH and LPAs.b. HS2 Ltd explained it was anticipated that these model documents would require review by the LA and EH legal teams. The documents follow those prepared for Crossrail and the HS-G has already had presentations on that.c. Question raised regarding how the Heritage Agreements (HA) relate to the Generic and location-specific WSIs, and will the HS-G need sight of |

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>the GWSIs to review the HAs?</p> <p>d. HS2 Ltd explained that the review of the model undertakings and agreement could be a parallel process as these were the legal framework.</p> <p>e. Post meeting note: written comments to be returned to HS2 by close of play Friday 5th December 2014.</p> |
| 4 | Draft Heritage Memorandum |
| | <p>a. HS2 Ltd provided a table of all comments received from the HS-G regarding the draft Heritage Memorandum, together with the intended responses from HS2 Ltd and the DfT.</p> <p>b. HS2 Ltd advised that the HM would be finalised by Royal Assent.</p> <p>c. HS2 Ltd advised that the term 'mitigation' would be reconsidered in the HM and other relevant documentation.</p> <p>d. Comment raised by EH that draft CoCP should also be discussed by the HS-G and should be added to agenda of future meetings.</p> <p>e. HS2 Ltd explained that all the EMRs were subject to review and the LPAs colleagues who attend the Planning Forum has been engaged in providing comments. HS-G members were encouraged to liaise with their planning colleagues.</p> <p>f. Question raised whether the HS-G can see the comments on the Environment Memorandum/how do they feed into that?</p> <p>g. HS2 Ltd: comments received on the Env Memorandum are currently being collated as part of the EMR review process. Comments have been requested from National Environment Forum members (which included English Heritage) and from the Planning Forum. Local Authority HS-G members should discuss their comments with their colleagues. The January Planning Forum will discuss the Env Memorandum.</p> <p>h. HS2 Ltd noted that comments received from the HS-G relating to the Env Memorandum, have already fed in - notably those that there was a lack of reference to the historic environment in the Env Memorandum.</p> <p>• Post meeting note: If HS-G members to provide any responses or queries on the Heritage Memorandum table of comments to HS2 Ltd by Friday 5th December.</p> |
| 5 | Viability |
| | <p>a. HS2 Ltd set out its position with regard to long-term viability for historic buildings.</p> <p>b. Question raised whether for listed buildings that HS2 Ltd have</p> |

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>acquired that are likely to have diminished in value as a result of the scheme - will HS2 Ltd make sure that these are in good enough order when they are sold on that they do not have a conservation deficit that would mean future owners that acquire the property at a reduced price are burdened with expensive conservation and repair works that could require public funding in the future? EH (Birmingham) gave East Lodge (to Stoneleigh Abbey) as an example.</p> <p>c. A suggestion made was that HS2 Ltd determine what the conservation deficit will be when selling - due diligence.</p> <p>d. HS2 Ltd requested examples of specific properties where HS-G members had particularly concerns for long term sustainability and examples of where this issue was demonstrated on other projects. These examples can they be raised with the property team.</p> <p>e. Question raised as to whether HS2 will carry out market appraisals, for example, to ensure that the most viable use of the blighted listed building is found, rather than passing the property on to the next owner in a form that is likely to fail long term?</p> <p>f. HS2 Ltd to discuss the issues raised above with the Land & Property team, and at a future HS-G meeting could be attended by an HS2 property team representative to answer detailed questions.</p> <p>g. It was noted that properties purchased by HS2 Ltd are intended to all be sold eventually, however they will always be protected under HS2 requirements/commitments, or when sold, under the normal legislation.</p> |
| | |
| 6 | Community Engagement |
| | <p>a. Discussion that community engagement in relation to heritage revealed by HS2 works should build on existing best practice and EH guidance on community engagement. Questions to be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is HS2 Ltd's overall approach? - How does Cultural Heritage fit into the HS2 strategy? - What sort of audiences will be targeted (e.g. local communities and special interest groups)? - What is the role of the H-SG? - How will community engagement link into the WSIs and the overall research objectives? <p>b. HS2 Ltd explained that wider outreach opportunities are being developed, e.g. educational engagement and developing an overall approach which will consider how the project tells the story of the</p> |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| | <p>work and how the information will be articulated, e.g. through social media, lectures and so forth to inform a wider audience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. HS2 Ltd requested HS-G to provide examples of previous schemes involving unusual/inclusive engagement and/or academic opportunities. d. HS-G would encourage HS2 Ltd to seek active engagement on site. It was advised that this would need to be incorporated into early planning of works. HS-G stressed that this is a public good and that HS2 Ltd should be identifying instances along the line of route and developing a bespoke method to make it possible once specialist contractors are appointed – i.e. writing it into the overall contract documentation. e. HS2 Ltd should consider student/ undergraduate involvement in small, discrete activities. Suggested that HS2 identify communities particularly affected and use this as a way to mitigate the impact long term; schools intervention identified as a major positive. f. HS-G: Research objectives and community engagement strategy are two sides of the same coin. g. HS2 Ltd: As the project develops, the overall strategies for engagement will evolve and the project is aware of the opportunities that archaeology/heritage presents. |
| | |
| <p>7</p> | <p>Monitoring</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Discussion regarding the role of Local Authority archaeologists in the monitoring of works. Concern that the archaeological works would not be implemented professionally. b. HS2 Ltd explained how archaeological monitoring on other infrastructure projects worked, e.g. Crossrail and CTRL and reiterated the wording set out in the Heritage Memorandum and Information Paper E8 Archaeology. c. There are a range of processes in place to ensure the works are carried out to the proper standards, such as the EMRs, generic WSIs, location-specific WSIs and the LEMPs (which ensure that the construction contractor is cognisant of the environmental requirements on a given worksite). <p>Post meeting clarification: Section 8.3 of the draft Code of Construction Practice states that the nominated undertaker will require its contractors to implement appropriate monitoring of the consequences of construction work on all cultural heritage assets (designated and non-designated) to ensure the effectiveness of management measures and compliance with agreed approaches to</p> |

| | |
|----------|---|
| | <p>construction activities and cultural heritage assets. As with other nationally important infrastructure projects (e.g. the Channel Tunnel Rail Link and Crossrail), there will be a series of processes established which will put in place the necessary monitoring and auditing, by experienced technical specialists to ensure delivery of all commitments and requirements in the Proposed Scheme. There is therefore no requirement for local authorities to monitor the archaeological/heritage works.</p> |
| | |
| 8 | The Risk Based Approach |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Andrew Croft (C253) presented the work being carried out to prepare the 'risk model' for external issue. Presentation attached. b. HS-G (AS): Is a review required? c. HS2: No review required, issued for information only as it the work will not be 'new', merely a re-presentation exercise. d. HS-G (TA): If issues are identified by the HS-G perhaps they can be fed back to be considered when the LS-WSIs are prepared. e. HS-G (LAM): As fieldwork is carried out the sub-zones could multiply. f. HS2 (AC): If the model stays live then it could become an evolving tool. g. HS-G (RT): First time this methodology used on a scheme of this magnitude. A GIS deliverable would be useful. h. HS2 to review what can be released. |
| | |
| 9 | Summary & Close |
| | <p>Next meeting: 13th January 2015 London</p> <p>Proposed agenda items to date: CoCP Property Draft Heritage Memorandum Model Heritage Agreements & undertakings</p> |
| | |

Doc Ref: LWM-HS2-EV-MRC-000-000063