

HIGHWAYS SUB-GROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

Title:	Phase One Planning Forum, Highways Sub-Group (North and South) #6	
Date & Time	<p>North and South Meeting</p> <p>Monday 11th May 2015</p> <p>2:00 – 5:00 pm: Highways Subgroup Meeting</p> <p>The Euston Office Oneustonsq 40 Melton Street London NW1 2FD</p>	
Chair	Ted Allett	Independent Chair
Promoter Attendees:	<p>Richard Adam</p> <p>John Woodhouse</p> <p>Peter Tomlin</p> <p>Adam Ruane</p> <p>Mike Kelly</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
Highway Authority Attendees:	<p>Paul Richards</p> <p>Muthiah Gunarajah</p> <p>Martin Steward</p> <p>Andrew Savage</p> <p>Lee Palser</p> <p>Robert Slaney</p> <p>Kevin Hicks</p> <p>Gez Romano</p> <p>Keith Davenport</p> <p>Kayley Smith</p> <p>Nick Boule</p> <p>Simon Weaver</p>	<p>London Borough of Bent</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council</p> <p>Highways England</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council</p> <p>Staffordshire County Council</p> <p>London Borough Camden</p> <p>Birmingham City Council</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council</p> <p>London Borough Hammersmith and Fulham</p> <p>London Borough Hammersmith and Fulham</p> <p>Transport for London</p>
<i>Planning Forum Highways Sub-Group distribution list appended to minutes.</i>		

Item		Action Owner
1	Welcome and introductions Introductions were made.	
2	Review of notes and actions from last meeting Chair noted that on the draft minutes from previous meeting, items 3 and 4 had been recorded in the incorrect order; otherwise authorities confirmed they were happy with the draft minutes. Minutes were agreed with no changes subject to items 3 and 4 being reordered.	

HIGHWAYS SUB-GROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p>The outstanding actions table was gone through by the Chair and the following additional points raised:</p> <p>March 15, Item 2: Chair asked whether CoCP will be circulated to members prior to the meeting. Action: HS2 Ltd confirmed that the CoCP should be circulated prior to meeting #8 in July.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd further explained that Chapter 14 (Traffic and Transport) is currently being revised following comments from authorities. HS2 proposes that the chapter is also restructured to reflect the proposed development of a Route-wide Transport Management Plan and Local Traffic Management Plans.</p> <p>March 15, Item 4: HS2 Ltd informed the Subgroup that Information Paper E14 has been revised but not published due to Purdah. It was confirmed that the IP will be shared once it has been uploaded to the website, in line with the HS2 Ltd action under Feb 15 Item 6.</p> <p>March 15, Item 4: Chair requested that HS2 Ltd's responses to the authorities' comments on Information Paper E28 should be shared with the Subgroup before the next meeting to ensure a productive meeting. Action: HS2 Ltd noted this request and agreed that the comments should be shared before the next meeting (#7).</p> <p>Chair asked when the summer recess for Government will commence. HS2 Ltd indicated that this usually starts around the 25th July, but this is yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>March 15, Item 4: Warwickshire CC explained that authorities' comments had been collated and circulated. This was acknowledged by the Subgroup.</p> <p>Warwickshire CC requested that a schedule of highways assets should be updated as soon as possible to inform discussions around the highways maintenance agreement.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd noted this request and explained that it was always the intention to collect data, but via a representative sample of authorities in the first instance. Action: In the absence of a DfT representative HS2 Ltd would seek to provide an update at the next meeting.</p> <p>March 15, Item 3.1: HS2 Ltd explained that legal advice has been sought on the matter of "approvals" and liabilities. The advice confirmed that the general position in law is that planning (or highway) authorities are not under a duty of care rendering them liable to pay compensation in respect of damage or loss arising from the approval of a scheme. There is a small, but important caveat to that principle. It has been held that a claim against a planning authority can proceed where the planning</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
--	---	--

	<p>department had required the construction of a footpath in a dangerous situation. It was the planning authority's intervention which had caused the harm.</p> <p>March 15, Item 3.1: HS2 Ltd provided their position in relation to pre-application discussions, explaining that the Route-wide Transport Management Plan is likely to include the intention to consult with authorities, and that the Plan will be subject to consultation with authorities. Chair expressed that he did not understand how this could be considered a commitment. Action: HS2 Ltd noted this and will further look into the matter for the next meeting (#7).</p> <p>March 15, Item 3.1: HS2 Ltd explained that the Party Wall Act is disapplied 'in part'. An explanation of the disapplications can be found in Information Paper B2. The explanatory notes to the Bill also explain each clause of the Bill.</p> <p>March 15, Item 5: Chair informed the Subgroup that the Crossrail Lessons Learnt document had been circulated by LB Camden prior to the meeting.</p> <p>March 15, Item 5: HS2 Ltd stated the position of the project in relation to ATMS and highlighted that Select Committee did not see the matter as a route wide issue for discussion at the Subgroup. It was, however, noted that ATMS may be a sub-regional matter and that discussions could be progressed through other meetings. Authorities acknowledged this approach and agreed that any route-wide outcomes should be reported to the Subgroup.</p>	HS2 Ltd
3	<p>Traffic Management</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented information relating to proposed Local Traffic Management Plans (LTMP's), covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed hierarchy of Traffic Management Plans • Indicative content of LTMPs • Possible geographical areas for LTMPs • Suggested timescale for the production of LTMP's and initial consultation with highway authorities <p>It was explained by HS2 Ltd that the draft traffic management plans would be completed by contractors, particularly in relation to lorry routes and flows.</p> <p>TfL asked whether the LTMP is only relevant post-royal assent. HS2 Ltd confirmed that the LTMP relates to post-royal assent work, and that any pre-royal assent work will have its own TMP (as provided by HS2 Ltd for the ongoing Ground Investigation works).</p>	

	<p>Action: HS2 Ltd to circulate the draft LTMP contents before the next meeting.</p> <p>Warwickshire CC requested that lorry route / haul route plans should be updated, as this will aide communities to understand the impact of HS2 related transport in their area. HS2 Ltd expressed that lorry routes / haul routes are a matter for petitioning and therefore may be subject to amendment through the Select Committee process, which HS2 Ltd will account for if required.</p>	HS2 Ltd
4	<p>Temporary works consultation, consent and notifications</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented aspects of Schedule 2 and 4 of the Bill relating to temporary highway works, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trial holes (Schedule 2 part 1) ▪ Temporary accesses (Schedule 4 part 1) ▪ Temporary interference (Schedule 4 part 2) <p>HS2 Ltd presented further information regarding the proposed approach to submissions for temporary works, and how the process equivalently aligns with NRSWA notices through the provision of advanced works programmes, works notifications (for consultation or consent) and commencement notifications.</p> <p>It was explained that notifications may potentially be split into three tiers ('minor', 'standard' and 'major'). The intention of this approach would be to streamline the process of notifying authorities of works.</p> <p>A handout showing the process for standard notifications for other projects was provided.</p> <p>A handout showing the advanced works programme for the highway works schemes for the 2012 London Olympic Games was provided, as an example programme.</p> <p>LB Brent enquired as to whether HS2 Ltd is planning to use the EToN system for notifications. HS2 Ltd explained that there is no plan to use the system. LB Camden asked whether the same level of information would be provided as that listed on the EToN system (i.e. coordinates). HS2 Ltd indicated that the same level of information will be provided.</p> <p>Birmingham CC asked whether NRSWA is disapplied. HS2 Ltd explained that the matter had been covered in meeting #5 and that more information can be found in the forthcoming Information Paper E14, due to be published online following Purdah.</p>	

HIGHWAYS SUB-GROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p>Birmingham CC enquired as to why the majority of consents for the London Olympics (example included in hand out) were not explicitly approved by the determining authorities within the 28 day time period. HS2 Ltd explained that the system worked and was trusted to allow this to happen, i.e. pre-application discussions took place and authorities were fully aware of the proposals. Chair clarified that by allowing the 28 days to lapse, authorities were giving 'deemed approval' and those that did provide consent were doing so earlier than the 28 day 'deemed consent' or were likely applying agreed conditions.</p>	
5	<p>Highways Conditions Surveys</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented information relating to the proposed approach to highways conditions surveys, including possible timing of surveys before and after main construction, and which routes may be surveyed.</p> <p>Highways England enquired as to how the approach would be implemented. HS2 Ltd explained that consideration was being given to appointing an "independent assessor" to evaluate the net change in wear and tear, when lorry routes were compared to non-lorry routes.</p> <p>It was noted that HS2 were aware that consideration may need to be given to early works to ensure that rural roads are capable of carrying the anticipated weight of construction traffic.</p> <p>Warwickshire CC asked whether the full highway, i.e. including verges, will be included in conditions surveys. HS2 Ltd explained that the full highway would be surveyed on lorry routes. Warwickshire CC asked that condition surveys be carried out on a more regular 'interim' basis. Chair enquired as to the purpose of more regular pre-use surveys. Warwickshire CC noted that regular surveys would be required for rural roads which are more likely to degrade. HS2 Ltd expressed that the protective provisions in the Bill do not specify timescales in relation to surveys but do contain a commitment to 'make good the highway'.</p> <p>Highways England asked whether the results of the surveys would be shared with relevant authorities. HS2 Ltd confirmed that this would be the case.</p> <p>TfL enquired as to the process for authorities if they wish to implement other additional temporary traffic management on HS2 lorry routes, including diversions. HS2 Ltd explained that authorities can implement measures as they wish and HS2 traffic would have to comply with what is put in place. Any such changes would have to be taken as agreed variations to the approved lorry routes.</p> <p>LB Brent asked for clarification on emergency situations, such as road closures and diversions. HS2 Ltd explained that it would be impossible</p>	

	<p>to assess all situations relating to emergency road closures and diversions, and if a situation did arise HS2 traffic would follow directions (of the police, emergency services etc.) and comply with road signage (such as width or height restrictions) in the same way as any other road traffic on the affected routes.</p> <p>Forward Plan</p> <p>Warwickshire CC asked whether the agenda item on green bridges could be moved forward. Chair asked whether the discussion around green bridges would be a matter for offline discussion as green bridge design is generally for a bespoke purpose, i.e. ecology. HS2 Ltd reiterated this point and highlighted that Information Paper E15 provides further information on green bridges including a schedule of proposed green bridges (as at hybrid Bill submission, but this may need to be updated during the Parliamentary process to account for any changes). It was agreed that bilateral discussion was probably the best method for discussion around individual green bridges, but that the item should remain on the agenda for a general information session at the September meeting.</p> <p>In order to allow for sufficient time for highways maintenance to be considered by the Subgroup before the summer, it was agreed that meeting #7 should be brought forward by a week to Friday 12th June. It was also agreed that meeting #8 should take place on Wednesday 22nd July, as per the original forward programme. September meeting date will remain TBC.</p>	
6	<p>AOB</p> <p>Warwickshire CC asked whether an updated project programme could be provided. Action: HS2 Ltd to provide updated project programme at next meeting (#7).</p> <p>Birmingham CC asked how local authority costs were being considered. HS2 Ltd referred the Subgroup to new Information Paper C13 which explains the relationship between funding and the New Burdens Doctrine.</p> <p>Warwickshire CC asked whether SLA is also applicable to time spent in relation to Additional Provisions. HS2 Ltd explained that matters related to petitioning were excluded. However there are aspects that could be related to the Additional Provisions that Information Paper C13 sets out that funding will be provided for.</p> <p>A question was also asked about whether review of documents through the Subgroup – at the request of HS2 Ltd (e.g. traffic management</p>	HS2 Ltd

	<p>plans) would be covered. HS2 Ltd stated it would confirm in the written minutes.</p> <p>****POST MEETING NOTE****</p> <p>Information Paper C13 sets out in Table 1 HS2-related activities for which additional funding will be provided to local authorities. This includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Early discussion on preliminary route design and technical input into the Environmental Statement, or any update to it, for the HS2 Bill, at the request of HS2 Ltd or DfT.</i> 2. <i>Provision of technical and spatial data (e.g. GIS data) for environmental assessment purposes, at the request of HS2 Ltd or DfT.</i> 3. <i>Reviewing and providing technical input into the production of technical documents produced by HS2 Ltd pre-construction, at the request of HS2 Ltd or DfT.</i> <p>In addition HS2 Ltd iterated that attendance at the Forum was already funded by HS2 Ltd and Information Paper C13 also includes in Table 1 items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. <i>Attendance of Phase One Route Wide Planning Forum and Sub Groups on Highways, Environmental Health and Heritage</i> 5. <i>Early discussions on design of HS2 works, including buildings, structures, road layout and design, heritage and archaeology, traffic management activity, flood risk management, noise and vibration monitoring of construction activity at the request of HS2 Ltd or the nominated undertaker</i> <p>and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. <i>Technical engagement of local highways authorities in the preparation and development of Traffic Management Plans, at the request of HS2 Ltd or DfT</i> <p>Action: Information Paper C13 will be distributed with the minutes.</p> <p>The Chair Asked whether the existing service level agreement in place with Local Authorities were compliant with the provisions of the Information Paper.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd stated that it believed there were existing MOUs/SLAs in place regarding the provision of data to HS2 Ltd and also attendance at the Planning Forum and its Sub-groups and these do remain in place. But would report back verbally at the next meeting on this.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
--	---	-------------------------------

HIGHWAYS SUB-GROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	Action: HS2 Ltd to report back on status of existing MOU/SLA at the next meeting.	
--	--	--