

HIGHWAYS SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

Title:	Phase One Planning Forum, Highways Subgroup (North and South) #15	
Date & Time	North and South Meeting 4 th May 2016 13:30 – 16:00 Warwick Hilton	
Independent Chair:	Ted Allett	
Promoter Attendees:	Richard Adam Peter Tomlin John Woodhouse Adam Ruane Hudson Taivo Yogita Maini	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd
Highway Authority Attendees:	Sarah Mallen Sarah Davis Sarah Widdows Steve Braund Darl Sweetland David Grindley Julian Richardson Oliver Spratley Chris Young Muthiah Gunarajah Adrian Malcom Paul Hillman Martin Steward Andrew Savage Timothy Mackay Simon Weaver Gez Romano Keith Davenport Adrian Matthews James Hudson	Staffordshire County Council Buckinghamshire County Council Buckinghamshire County Council Chiltern District Council Buckinghamshire County Council Northamptonshire County Council Oxfordshire County Council Oxfordshire County Council Birmingham City Council Hertfordshire County Council London Borough Camden Highways England Highways England Warwickshire County Council Transport for London Transport for London Warwickshire County Council Warwickshire County Council Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council M6 Toll
Invited by Bucks CC:	Trevor Cocks	Thames Valley Police

Item		Action Owner
1	Welcome and introductions Introductions were made.	

HIGHWAYS SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

2	<p>Review of notes and actions from last meeting</p> <p>Minutes were agreed subject to a minor typographical correction. Action: HS2 Ltd to correct error in the minutes before publication.</p> <p>The outstanding actions table was gone through by the Chair and the following additional points raised:</p> <p>July 14, 4: HS2 Ltd clarified that Information Paper E13 has been updated and is on the web site, so this action is now complete.</p> <p>March 16, 1: Spoil by rail. HS2 Ltd confirmed that a study is currently underway to look into the viability of moving construction material by rail. Action: HS2 Ltd to update the Subgroup on progress at the next meeting.</p> <p>March 16, 3: EToN noticing and HS2. HS2 Ltd informed the Subgroup that this matter was being dealt with by the Department for Transport and that the outcome would be reported when DfT had considered the issues. All the LAs present confirmed their desire for the EToN to be adopted for HS2 use. It was understood that DfT were engaging with the EToN developers' groups and JAG.</p> <p>March 16, 7: RTMP. HS2 Ltd explained that the amendments are currently going through HS2 governance and would be shared with the Subgroup in due course.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
3	<p>Complaints/Construction Commissioner & Enforcement</p> <p>Chair informed the Subgroup of recent correspondence between HS2 Ltd and Buckinghamshire County Council in respect of the Construction Commissioner.</p> <p>BCC explained that a query had arisen relating to the role of the Commissioner and their ability to intervene on planning related matters where Local Authorities had planning enforcement powers, specifically regarding lorry routes approvals. BCC explained that HS2 Ltd had confirmed the Commissioner would not have a role in this area, and that the Job Description for the role was correct. HS2 Ltd confirmed that for lorry route approvals the relevant (approving) authority would be the county or unitary authority in the role as planning authority (which incidentally is also the highway authority) and therefore could exercise enforcement powers.</p> <p>Chair confirmed that Local Authorities would be involved in the interviewing of the shortlisted Commissioner candidates and that the Commissioner will be monitored by an independent body.</p> <p>There was some discussion relating to the differentiation between what is enforceable by LAs and what could be escalated via the HS2 complaints process to the Construction Commissioner. BCC added that planning enforcement has its own statutory process.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to provide clarity on enforceable matters and the complaints procedure in respect of lorry routes at the next meeting.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

HIGHWAYS SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

<p>4</p>	<p>Draft Maintenance Agreement – update</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented an update on the Highways Maintenance Agreement. HS2 Ltd explained that version 16 had been recently circulated by Warwickshire to the working group and that pending some minor changes to two clauses, the agreement could be shared with the Subgroup.</p> <p>Action: It was agreed that v16 (16.1) could be shared with authorities following the meeting.</p> <p>Action: Authorities are to provide comments to Warwickshire County Council who in turn will send any comments in to Hs2.</p>	<p>WCC / HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HAs</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Traffic Management Updates</p> <p>HS2 Ltd explained that consultation would be carried out on Enabling Works LTMPs in the summer.</p> <p>Highways Condition Survey Methodology. HS2 Ltd updated the Subgroup on progress, stating that tender award of the contract was awaiting internal approval. Action: HS2 Ltd to update the Subgroup on progress at the next meeting.</p> <p>Lorry route accessibility surveys. HS2 Ltd informed the Subgroup that stage one surveys were complete and that stage two work would report in Autumn 2016, through early preparation of the ROMIS plans, prior to planning approvals being sought.</p> <p>Signal works discussions. HS2 Ltd explained that the agreements would be issued for consultation once HS2 governance is complete. It was raised by the Subgroup members that a common agreement might be considered by the Subgroup.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Traffic Liaison Group Meetings</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented an indicative proposal for TLG areas for comment. It was explained that the TLG draft Terms of Reference was included as an appendix to the draft RTMP, and that final comments were also being sought on this.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd highlighted that some assurances would dictate the need for a TLG on certain sections of the route, but that other areas would be established following comment from the Subgroup.</p> <p>Maps of potential TLG areas were presented and a general justification made for these areas based on the clustering of HS2 works. See slides for details.</p> <p>Hs2 Ltd expressed that the first TLG meetings could take place in Autumn 2016 to establish the groups, with the intention of further meetings as required.</p>	

HIGHWAYS SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p>Action: It was agreed that comments on the ToR and on the proposed TLG areas would be coordinated via LBC and fed back to HS2 Ltd before the next meeting.</p> <p>Action: Highways England agreed to coordinate comments on the Birmingham Box TLG TOR.</p>	<p>HAs /LBC</p> <p>HE</p>
7	<p>Technical Standards Bridges – feedback</p> <p>HS2 Ltd explained that no comments had been received.</p> <p>Action: WCC agreed to collate comments on the technical standard for 19th May</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to inform the Subgroup if a bridge engineer would be attending the next Subgroup, which would be dependent on the type of comments received.</p>	<p>WCC</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
8	<p>Departures</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented information on departures, including the definition of departures, approval bodies and the basis and timing for departures.</p> <p>Each highway authority will need to consider how it will process HS2 departure requests since decisions will have to align with the hybrid Bill regime rather than its normal internal procedures.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to provide a departures template for discussion later in the year.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
9	<p>Forward Plan, Tracker and Programme</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented the forward plan, tracker and programme to the Subgroup. It was confirmed that the next meeting would take place on the 15th June in Euston.</p>	
10	<p>AOB</p> <p>Query was raised on how submissions to highway authorities would be made and how documentation would be managed. HS2 Ltd explained that this matter was currently being considered by HS2 Ltd and the Planning Forum, and further details would be provided at a later date.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd raised that the Errant Vehicle Protection Technical Standard had been removed from the website as it could have security implications. NCC raised whether a closed website could be considered for sharing potentially sensitive documents with authorities.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd agreed to look into this.</p> <p>Action: LBC requested that the slides from the meeting be circulated immediately following the meeting.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>