

Phase One Planning Forum – Heritage Sub-Group Meeting Notes – 13th December 2016

Date & time:	13th December 2016 11.00-14.00 Macdonald Burlington Hotel Burlington Arcade, 126 New Street, Birmingham B2 4JQ
Chair:	Helen J Glass

Presentations provided at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-heritage-subgroup>

Item	Topic	Action
1	Welcome and introductions	
2 & 3	<p>Review of 2016 and Update</p> <p>Hybrid Bill, EMRS, technical standards, procedures, ToR and archiving</p> <p>HS-G Terms of Reference</p> <p>HS2 request that further comments on the Terms of reference received by the end of January 2017.</p> <p>Only two responses received to date focusing on the frequency of the meetings.</p> <p>SK suggest keeping the meeting at the existing spacing – every 3 months to enable the implementation of HERDS to be reviewed.</p> <p>PM agreed adding that individual site based work could raise route-wide questions that would warrant discussion</p> <p>JW noted that the LPA members of the HS-G don't really engage with HE and suggested that if that changed then the group might be more</p>	

	<p>effective where there were route wide issues. This might enable more interactive discussion.</p> <p>ACTION HS-G to provide any further comment by the end of January. HS2 to circulate revised ToR prior to next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 emphasised the need for the sub-group to suggest agenda items that they wanted to discuss.</p> <p>Schedule 17 Consents Process CM highlighted her concern as to how conservation officers would be involved with Schedule 17 applications – what was the mechanism?</p> <p>PM raised concern as to whether LPAs would consult archaeologists on Schedule 17 applications or involve them in the pre-application discussions. What was the mechanism to include them?</p> <p>HS-G requested that HS2 consider how the issue of LPA historic environment specialists involvement in Schedule 17 can be ensured.</p> <p>RB also noted that there was a need to improve the understanding of their town planning colleagues. Would a presentation on the historic environment to Planning Forum be beneficial?</p> <p>CM noted that there might be a need for responsive approach to issues, notably the setting of heritage assets.</p> <p>AB highlighted the variability in approach to setting, suggesting that the same approach should be adopted.</p> <p>AB offered to run a setting guidance refresher workshop.</p> <p>ACTION: Discuss with AB the timescales and options for the provision of such training to the HS-G members</p> <p>CW asked for more information regarding the progress of the detailed design.</p> <p>HS2 noted that the historic environment team were involved in elements where there was a heritage related aspects for critical sites and that the contractors would continue this as they came on board.</p> <p>LW suggested that having someone attend the HS-G to explain the inter-relationship of design would be beneficial.</p> <p>HS2 noted that there had been considerable discussion at the Planning Forum, but CM requested further detail be presented to the HS-G.</p>	<p>HS-G</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HE/HS2</p>
--	--	---

	<p>AB noted that as Qualifying Authority they would need to have these processes in place and be able to communicate effectively to keep commitment as a QA, the onus is on them not HS2.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to provide a further information at the next sub-group regarding the Schedule 17 engagement and submission process.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to consider a presentation to the Planning Forum on the historic environment to improve communication.</p> <p>Schedule 18: Heritage Agreements</p> <p>AW: How are the applications going to be submitted?</p> <p>LW: At the moment working on the basis that they will be submitted by email but HS2 speaking to planners about use of planning portal.</p> <p>CM asked for clarification regarding those Listed Buildings named in Table 2 - what will the process be and how far in advance will LPAs be informed?</p> <p>LW: HS2 is revising information paper to make it clear and will discuss the three phase process with the local authorities.</p> <p>CM asked how LPAs would find out if agreements under Sch. 18 are to be submitted, to enable resourcing internally. How does HS2 communicate with LPAs if no Sch 18 table 2 submission is necessary? Does HS2 think that the number of Table 2 will reduce as design develops?</p> <p>LW: As detailed design develops we will have a better idea and will engage sensibly. Yes are anticipating a reduction in numbers as was the case on Crossrail.</p> <p>DE noted that changes to settlement contour can be significant, for example tombs.</p> <p>LW confirmed that the current 10mm contour is the Worse Case Scenario. The IP is being revised.</p> <p>ACTION: As with the Schedule 17 process, HS2 will provide greater clarity on the engagement.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
--	--	----------------------------------

	<p>Archiving</p> <p>SK: How will data we generate key into historic archiving and physical archive and HERs?</p> <p>HJG noted that HS2 had engaged ADS to develop the digital archiving strategy. We have yet to have detailed discussions with HERs.</p> <p>All data will be released in-line with Open Data.Gov policy.</p> <p>SK noted that HERs don't get large numbers of reports and that minimum of processing required.</p> <p>ACTION: workshop on HER submissions.</p>	HS2
4	<p>Historic Environment Research and Delivery Strategy</p> <p>Entire HERDS is available for comment to the HS-G.</p> <p>The document had been amended in light of HE comments.</p> <p>AB: queries how academic engagement would continue.</p> <p>HS2 highlighted that engagement would continue via the Contractors, and the HERDS team.</p> <p>CW asked when the HERDS would be released publically.</p> <p>HJG stated that elements will be publically released – specific objectives, resource assessment, but this aspect had not been a priority given the need to ensure on-boarding of the EWC and ongoing EDP work.</p> <p>HS2 recognise the need to provide outward facing documentation when it goes out externally given that it is a dynamic document.</p> <p>JH outlined digital platform and the on-going work to enable collaboration along the route and the delivery of the HERDS.</p>	
5	<p>Phase 1 Forward Look</p> <p>MC outlined the arrival of the EWC and that their supply chain – the appointment of archaeological contractors - would follow.</p> <p>MC highlighted that the EDP had been commissioned to undertake priority project plans. This work would be handed over to the EWC.</p>	

	<p>Fieldwork could start in the Spring.</p> <p>HJG noted that there will be an overall HER query to LAs to avoid individual queries.</p> <p>LAM: Positive about project plans and HERDS integration, but was concerned about how we will define what is significant? What weight will 'HS2' give to the County Archaeologists' opinion if they have seen project plan and don't agree with it? She highlighted the concern that other developers could use the HS2 approach as a precedent.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to confirm feedback mechanism as to engagement and when and where advice is taken, or not.</p> <p>LAM asked if there be more than DDBAs and how were they decided; can the list be supplied?</p> <p>MC confirmed that DDBAs were not needed at all locations; our engagement with stakeholders will ensure these are discussed.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to share the list of where work is planned.</p> <p>There was a general request as to when members of the HS-G would hear from the EDP about this work?</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to provide further information regarding the programme of EDP work.</p> <p>SK and PM noted that there had been no contact regarding the burial ground DDBAs.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to ask EDP why this has not yet taken place and the respond to the individual LPAs.</p> <p>LAM requested that the Blackgrounds geophysical work be shared with the HE Inspector.</p> <p>POST MEETING NOTE: done.</p> <p>The on-going matter of SharePoint as the place to exchange information was stressed.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 to address.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
6	<p>Communications on HS2</p> <p>Emphasised showing what we find to communities – building on ideas such as Crossrail project.</p>	

	<p>JW: To what extent do we hope to engage the contractors and their staff?</p> <p>ME: Yes, contractors would be an important part of the story.</p> <p>LW queried if there were long-term ambitions of how HS2 is changing the landscape?</p> <p>ME stated that there were wider discussions with production companies about how the building of the railway would be captured. CW noted that the linking of medieval and post-medieval periods were important in the stories of the railways.</p>	
6	<p>AOB</p> <p>Next meeting 16th March 2017 in London.</p>	