

## HIGHWAYS SUB-GROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Phase One Planning Forum, Highways Sub-Group (North and South) #9</b>	
<b>Date &amp; Time</b>	North and South Meeting 8 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2015 14:00 – 17:00  Warwick Hilton Stratford Rd Warwick CV34 6RE	
<b>Chair</b>	Ted Allett	Independent Chair
<b>Promoter Attendees:</b>	Richard Adam Peter Tomlin James Fearnley John Woodhouse Adam Ruane Mike Kelly	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd
<b>Highway Authority Attendees:</b>	Don Murchie Paul Fermer Muthiah Gunarajah Darl Sweetland Gez Romano Keith Davenport David Grindley Adrian Matthews Sarah Mallen Lee Palser Andrew Savage Martin Steward Paul Hillman Adrian Malcom Kevin Hicks James Hodson	Westminster City Council Oxfordshire County Council Hertfordshire County Council Buckinghamshire County Council Warwickshire County Council Warwickshire County Council Northamptonshire County Council Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council Staffordshire County Council Staffordshire County Council Warwickshire County Council Highways England Highways England London Borough Camden Birmingham City Council Midland Expressway Ltd
<i>Planning Forum Highways Sub-Group distribution list appended to minutes.</i>		

Item		Action Owner
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and introductions</b> Introductions were made.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Review of notes and actions from last meeting</b>  Minutes required some changes. Highways England noted that the matter of	

## HIGHWAYS SUB-GROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p>warranties and guarantees was not minuted under AOB. HS2 Ltd explained that this would be addressed under item 5. Chair suggested that the matter should be added to meeting #8 minutes. <b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd to make edit before uploading the final version to the website.</p> <p>Highways England highlighted that the meeting #8 minutes included direction signing for emergency vehicles as an agenda item at meeting #9. <b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd agreed to include this topic as on the agenda at meeting #10 and any comments on this related to the draft Route-wide TMP could be provided by the end of October 2015.</p> <p>The outstanding actions table was gone through by the Chair and the following additional points raised:</p> <p>July 13 Item 3 (Complaints, monitoring and reporting): It was agreed that this is a generic route wide matter and more appropriate for discussion in the Planning Forum. <b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd to include as a topic for discussion at a future Planning Forum meeting.</p> <p>July 15 Item 3 (CoCP comments): <b>Action:</b> London Borough of Camden requested that highways authorities should provide any further comments on the CoCP by the end of September.</p> <p>July 14 Item 4 (Permitting guidance): <b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd to circulate the DfT document and provide a summary of why the guidance is not applicable to the project.</p> <p>July 14 Item 4 (Route Wide Traffic Management Plan / E14 update): HS2 Ltd indicated that updating Information Paper E13 would be more appropriate than E14. <b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd to update meeting #8 minutes to reflect this change and update Information Paper E13 as appropriate.</p> <p>July 15 Item 7 (CDM): HS2 Ltd explained that it is likely HS2 Phase One Infrastructure Directorate will act as principle designer under CDM, with HS2 Ltd (or other NU) as client.</p> <p><b>Action</b> concerning signals works agreements: HS2 Ltd will write to the relevant highway authorities to arrange meetings.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>Authorities</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
3	<p><b>Technical Standards</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented a summary of four HS2 technical standards to the Subgroup:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way</li> <li>• Errant Vehicle Protection</li> <li>• Highway Access and Drainage</li> </ul>	

## HIGHWAYS SUB-GROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p>It was explained that the standards are aimed at designers and are based on the DASs (Deliverable Approach Statements / Design Approach Statements) which will be superseded by the above four standards. The standards will include both guidance and requirements. Technical Standard – Roads outlines several design bases, including 'As Existing', 'DMRB', 'HS2 Urban Street Design Criteria' (which is aligned with Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2) and 'HS2 Rural Road Design Criteria' (which is based on the rural road design criteria previously shared with authorities), with flexibility allowances for local requirements.</p> <p>Northamptonshire County Council asked where the technical standard for bridges will be derived from. HS2 Ltd clarified that DMRB standard BD 2 'Technical Approval of Highway Structures' will apply for all highway structures.</p> <p>Birmingham City Council asked whether authorities are being asked to sign off something as a 'standard' when it is treated as guidance elsewhere. HS2 Ltd clarified that the HS2 technical standards are not changing the status of existing guidance and that authorities should review the documents and feedback any concerns. The guidance is provided by HS2 Ltd to its contractors delivering the design, it is not 'replacing' the guidance and standards that authorities review and sign off highways consents against.</p> <p>Northamptonshire County Council enquired about abnormal road routes. HS2 Ltd clarified that this was matter was submitted by the highway authorities when comments were sought on the Rural Road Design Guide, and that this has now been addressed in Technical Standard – Roads.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd to circulate the four technical standards documents following the meeting.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Authorities to provide comments on the standards for collation by the following Authorities by the end of October.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads – Bucks CC</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way – Staffordshire CC</li> <li>• Errant Vehicle Protection – Northamptonshire CC</li> <li>• Highway and Access Drainage – Solihull MBC</li> </ul>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>Authorities</p>
4	<p><b>Route-wide Traffic Management Plan</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd introduced two topics from the Route Wide Traffic Management Plan which had not previously been presented to the Highways Sub Group:</p> <p><b>Vehicle flow management</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd introduced the purpose of vehicle flow management and its relationship with the Bill, ES, CoCP and undertakings and assurances. It was explained that vehicle flow management would be implemented via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing a vehicle booking system</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring compliance</li> <li>• Setting vehicle identification requirements</li> <li>• Comprehensive recording</li> <li>• Linking to driver and vehicle safety management systems</li> <li>• Deployment of a route (and safety) compliance team</li> </ul> <p>It was further explained that there would be exclusions to the booking management requirements, such as welfare deliveries and non-HS2 construction related vehicles. Furthermore, abnormal roads would use the existing EDSL system.</p> <p>Warwickshire, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire CC expressed that HS2 identification signage should be fitted to the back of HS2 construction vehicles. HS2 Ltd indicated that this would not be workable due the difficulty in enforcing signage. HS2 Ltd explained that an alternative cab signage requirement is proposed with a colour coding system. Chair provided some experience from Crossrail whereby a similar system was used in an attempt to avoid false alarms.</p> <p><b>Vehicle and driver safety</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented the measures that HS2 Ltd plans to put in place to ensure safety for vulnerable road users, vehicles and drivers. HS2 Ltd set out standards in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality plans</li> <li>• Driver safety</li> <li>• Road safety</li> <li>• Vehicle safety</li> <li>• Planning for safety</li> <li>• Operational safety</li> <li>• Vehicle flow management</li> <li>• Compliance and assurance</li> </ul> <p>London Borough of Camden raised that HS2 should adopt CLOCs and FORS as a standard route-wide. Buckinghamshire CC reiterated that these standards could be used as minimum.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd noted that in place of FORS, there was also the option of adopting ISO39001, which is the European standard, which contractors may have already adopted. Chair enquired as to whether those attending were familiar with ISO39001. HS2 Ltd clarified that this is the international standard for road traffic safety management and is a recognised ISO standard.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd explained that that CLOCS standards have been used to inform the proposed driver and vehicle standards set out in the draft RTMP but not all of the standards were currently adoptable by the project and that the presentation would highlight these issues and how HS2 Ltd was working to resolve them. Authorities were invited to provide their comments on safety</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>standards as part of the RTMP consultation.</p> <p>Northamptonshire CC asked how the road safety data (Stats 19) shown on the slides for vulnerable road users was compiled, as records were not available for vehicles classified over 3.5t HS2 Ltd explained that the data was provided from DfT. <b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd to seek clarity on the range of goods vehicles data recorded for Stats 19.</p> <p>London Borough of Camden asked whether there would be issues with compliance if different standards are adopted. HS2 Ltd considered that this would not be an issue and that HS2 Ltd would only require a single HS2 standard route-wide.</p> <p>Highways England asked whether the standards would include HGVs with side guards as a requirement. HS2 Ltd noted this and explained that this was assumed to be a requirement, but needed to ensure that all sites could accommodate side guards.</p> <p>It was noted that compliance with Undertakings and Assurances would likely be undertaken by matching the booking management information with ANPR records. Warwickshire County Council expressed that real time CCTV should be implemented in respect of traffic management. HS2 Ltd indicated that this was not necessary for compliance monitoring or flow management. Chair reminded the Subgroup that CCTV and active traffic management had previously been agreed to be sub-regional issues and therefore pursued via bilateral petition meetings.</p>	HS2 Ltd
5	<b>Highways Maintenance Update</b>	
5.1	<p><b>Update on draft Information Paper E29</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd informed the Subgroup that Information Paper E28 will be numbered E29 and would be circulated once published online.</p>	
5.2	<p><b>Update on maintenance data / cost analysis</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd provided an update on the initial exercise undertaken with three sample authorities to understand the potential maintenance burden arising from HS2. Meetings have taken place with Warwickshire and Buckinghamshire County Council to discuss the outcome and a future meeting is planned with LB Camden.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd to circulate the minutes of the meeting between DfT, HS2 Ltd, WCC and BCC after the meeting.</p> <p>It was further explained that a full data collection exercise will be undertaken once the construction programme is clear and a final 'new burdens' assessment report will be prepared for consideration by DfT and DCLG.</p>	HS2 Ltd

## HIGHWAYS SUB-GROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

5.3	<p><b>Highways Maintenance Agreement update</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd informed the Subgroup that a clause by clause review of WCC's proposed draft agreement (V8) has been undertaken to establish matters of common ground, points of clarification and proposals not consistent with the Bill.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd's initial draft version showing proposed amendments is currently under review by Parliamentary Agents. <b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd to circulate the review once finalised.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd reiterated that it is still the intention that DfT/HS2 Ltd would send a paper to Select Committee updating them on discussions and current position before end of year.</p> <p>Buckinghamshire CC queried whether a Select Committee update would be provided before BCC appear in October. <b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd noted this and in the absence of DfT, committed to pass the communication on to DfT.</p> <p>Highways England raised matter of warranties and latent defects. HS2 Ltd explained that updated text has been introduced to Information paper E29 to address this and a draft of the text (as it awaited final sign off) was provided at the meeting.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
6	<p><b>Forward Plan</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd displayed the HS2 indicative programme for Planning Forum and a separate tracker for the Highways Subgroup</p> <p>It was agreed that the next Subgroup meetings should be held on the 14<sup>th</sup> October and 11<sup>th</sup> November.</p>	
7	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p><b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd informed the Subgroup that the Enabling Works Traffic Management Plan will be circulated following the meeting and that comments are requested by the end of October.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd to include the HS2 high level programme on the circulated slides.</p> <p>Highways England asked whether the LIDAR system could be included as a future discussion item. <b>Action:</b> HS2 Ltd agreed this.</p> <p>Westminster CC asked when AP3 is due to be deposited. HS2 Ltd informed the Subgroup that this is likely to be 17<sup>th</sup> September.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd / Authorities</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>