

**Phase One Planning Forum – Heritage Sub-Group
Meeting Notes – 16th June 2016**

Date & time:	16th June 2016 10.00-13.00 Two Snow Hill, Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6GA
Chair:	Helen J Glass

Item	Topic	Lead
1	Welcome and introductions	Chair
2	<p>The Community and Environment (CEF) and Business and Local Economy (BLEF) Funds: An introduction</p> <p>(Presentation attached)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd outlined these elements of these two funds. A similar scheme was implemented during High Speed One. It was noted that Local Authorities will already be aware of local groups who have ideas and opportunities that might be applicable.</p>	HS2 Ltd
3	<p>HS2's Planning Regime Schedule 17</p> <p>(Presentation attached)</p> <p>CM asked how can LPAs be assured that there will be enough information for mitigation proposals to be understood?</p> <p>HS2 Ltd: Reminded the HS-G that the Planning Memorandum requires the submission of adequate information and proposed mitigation. LPAs can refuse at Stage 9.</p> <p>CM: What is the design package detail?</p> <p>HS2 Ltd: the same level as stage 3 RIBA.</p> <p>SK: Questions when field evaluations would be undertaken – they should be prior to submission of any Schedule 17 applications.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd: Noted that it is in their interests to do works as much in advance as possible.</p> <p>AS: Asked if LPA can refuse Sch 17 applications because don't have enough information on archaeology.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd Post meeting clarification: <i>The grounds for the determination of certain approvals under Schedule 17 to the Bill include that the works ought to be modified "to preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest or nature conservation value,</i></p>	HS2 Ltd

	<p><i>and is reasonably capable of being so modified...". The nominated undertaker will provide the planning authority with the information reasonably required to determine the request for approval. This information could include archaeological information. It is likely that the large majority of requests for approval will not be accompanied by archaeological information as the scope of the approvals will not materially affect archaeological sites. Also it should be borne in mind that due to the constrained Bill limits, operational and safety requirements and the need to provide appropriate investigation and recording and / or mitigation, there is limited flexibility as to where works can be located.</i></p> <p><i>If a planning authority believes it does not have the necessary information to determine the request for approval then it could opt to not make a decision and the nominated could either provide further information or appeal the non-decision. However, given the commitments on pre-submission discussions in the Planning Memorandum and commitments in the Heritage Memorandum relating to archaeology. HS2 Ltd does not expect this issue to affect the planning process.</i></p> <p><i>In relation to archaeological works, the pre-submission discussions will include specific engagement regarding the project plans and location specific written schemes of investigation pertinent to the Sch 17 application.</i></p> <p><i>It is not the purpose of Schedule 17 planning regime to replicate other controls such as commitments in the Heritage Memorandum and associated documents such as the GWSI: HERDS which have been developed in consultation with the Heritage Sub-group by HS2 Ltd to support delivery of the commitments in the Heritage Memorandum. The Promoter has agreed the controls and approach to the historic environment through this memorandum and other commitments through the Bill process and it is not the purpose of Schedule 17 to revisit them.</i></p> <p>HS2 Ltd noted that LAs would be consulted on the development of Project Plans and Location specific WSIs.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd noted that there would not be an avalanche of Schedule 17 consents as soon as Royal Assent is granted.</p> <p>A key part of the Early Works Contracts is the progression of historic environment works.</p> <p>The EWC would also be submitting some Schedule 17 applications Enabling Works – will input schedule 17 applications.</p> <p>HE: reminded that LAs can still consult HE on those sites that may fall under NPPF para 139 sites of national importance but not scheduled - Sched 17 doesn't require this but could be useful.</p>	
--	--	--

4	<p>Procedure for the unexpected discovery of archaeological remains of national importance (Presentation attached)</p> <p>A key concern from Local Authorities was their staffing numbers and their ability to react if a meeting was called with 24 hours notice.</p> <p>HE: sought clarification about who makes the decision as to what nationally important and how this relates to the Heritage Memorandum.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd is currently reviewing the procedure in light of comments received.</p> <p>HE noted that new guidance on in situ preservation would be available shortly.</p>	
5	<p>Phase 1 update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GWSI: Historic Environment Research and Delivery Strategy • Procurement <p>(Presentation attached)</p>	
6	<p>AOB</p> <p>The next meeting will be on the 15th September 2016; London</p>	