

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

Title:	Environmental Health Subgroup (North and South) Meeting #15	
Date & Time	Routewide Meeting Thursday 30 th March 2017 13.00 – 15.30 pm Radisson Blu Edwardian, Grafton, London	
Chair	Peter Carey	Independent Chair
	Ted Allett Gareth Epps	Independent Planning Forum Chair (IPC) Interim Independent Construction Commissioner (ICC)
Promoter Attendees:	Chloe Lewis Michael Shanks Anthony Coumbe Carrie Garlett Paul Gilfedder Robyn Cummings	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd
EHP Attendees:	Alasdair Carlin Rizwan Yunus John Penny Steve Braund Julian Smith Helen Masterson Dean Walters Stephen Whiles Greg Pilley Richard Hiscock Dominic Towey Michael Jenkins Oliver Spratley Barbara Terres Claire Parsons Jack Twomey Olayinka Ekundayo Richard Peers Muhammad Islam	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham / Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham / Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea South Northamptonshire Council Chiltern District Council Wycombe District Council London Borough of Camden North Warwickshire Borough Council North Warwickshire Borough Council Three Rivers District Council Aylesbury Vale District Council Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council Warwick District Council Oxfordshire County Council Westminster City Council Westminster City Council Lichfield District Council London Borough of Brent Staffordshire County Council London Borough of Hillingdon

Item		Action Owner
1.	Welcome and introductions made	

	<p>The Chair welcomed attendees and introductions were made.</p>	
<p>2.</p>	<p>Interim Construction Commissioner Introduction The chair introduced the Interim Independent Construction Commissioner (ICC)</p> <p>The ICC provided a brief introduction on his background and experience to date. He provided clarity that the role of the ICC is to be the point of last resort for complaints that HS2 cannot resolve. The ICC started in July and has attended planning forum meetings</p> <p>The ICC reiterated that HS2 Ltd are in process of setting up Independent Panel as per the update provided in the action log for <u>Action 5a</u>.</p> <p>There is a separate independent website and helpline that has been set up, the link to the website is: https://hs2-cc.org.uk/</p> <p>Meetings to discuss report on HS2 complaints handling process are also being held.</p> <p>The ICC advised that he will be starting to attend community meetings and is open to invites to these going forward.</p> <p>LBH asked for clarification if the ICC will become permanent, as his title currently is interim.</p> <p>The ICC advised that the decision will be made by the independent panel if he is to become permanent.</p> <p>LBH asked if material will be published and will it be available in different languages?</p> <p>The ICC confirmed that a Leaflet text is drafted ready to go once approved by HS2 Ltd process. Open to providing this in different languages, on request, with the aim for information to be accessible for all audiences. He noted that the budget will be set by independent panel.</p> <p>The Chair asked if the ICC could provide any information about independent advice for special cases which are rejected (relating to <u>action 3a</u>);</p> <p>The ICC advised that precise Terms of Reference is to be set up by the Independent Panel, and this will set out the process. Ultimately this will be a case by case basis. The ICC is a non-technical role therefore it is likely that any non-technical complaints will go to the ICC.</p>	

<p>3.</p>	<p>Review of notes and actions from last meeting</p> <p><u>Review of action log</u></p> <p>The following comments were made on outstanding actions:</p> <p><u>Action 5a from September 2017</u></p> <p>Hs2 provided an update on the progress to date via the action log ahead of the March meeting which provided an update on the progress to date, alongside the below discussion within the meeting. This action was agreed as closed.</p> <p>The Independent Planning Forum Chair provided further details: the Local Authorities were requested to make two nominations at the planning forum to make nominations by 31st March. As a result of the planning forum meetings the Authorities proposed to have three local authority representatives, however a response has not been received to date. The IPC met with HS2 Ltd and reiterated the request, and discussions were positive, and therefore hoping it will be agreed for three representatives.</p> <p>HS2 asked if this was to reflect one in each area of the LoR and the IPC confirmed that this was correct. If there were two, it would likely be LBW and LBC to cover north, south, rural and urban. However it was felt that this left a gap, therefore wanted a central representation also.</p> <p>The IPC also commented on the community representative on the panel, and advised that currently the idea is that the panel would be formed without a representative and then the panel would explore how the representative would be identified.</p> <p>The chair noted that there wouldn't be many meetings of the panel, and the IPC agreed, likely to be two meetings a year once established.</p> <p>The Chair noted that CE Framework will be an agenda item at the next meeting.</p> <p><u>Action 3b From January 2017</u></p> <p>The proposed wording for the website to accompany the LEMPs was circulated with the agenda ahead of the meeting and the action was agreed as closed. TRDC commented that the wording suggests that the LEMP would be an all-encompassing document, which in reality the LAs do not feel the LEMPs are, they are more of an overview document. This was discussed between the EHP and HS2 Ltd and it was agreed that it would be very difficult for it to become a document of this nature.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd commented that it will be a combination of documents that would detail specific local information for environmental topics. HS2 Ltd noted the importance of holding engagement on the local impacts and mitigation. This will be led by HS2 Ltd contractors, and focussing on enabling works in the short term.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the concern is the document doesn't give the localised information for</p>
-----------	--

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p>the public. Rather it is an overview and could use the text to signpost that more localised information can be found in xx documents.</p> <p>LBH queried whether all the LEMPs will be uploaded onto the website, if so, make this clear in the wording. LBH also requested that continued engagement with the local authorities is added to the website text.</p> <p>HS2 confirmed that Each of the LEMPs will be uploaded.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Hs2 to review the proposed wording to accompany the LEMPs on the website to set out the context of the document more clearly, provide clarity that all LEMPs will be uploaded and that HS2 Ltd will continue to engage with the local authorities.</p> <p>LBC noted that for the Camden LEMP the wording may need to be tweaked a bit due to an assurance given, and that LBC have some comments on its LEMP that need rectifying, which they will share with HS2 Ltd.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> HS2 Ltd community engagement and LBC comms to discuss wording to accompany LBC LEMP, as it is impacted by a U&A.</p> <p>CDC requested clarification to the wording explaining what is meant by 'new environmental baseline information' for the public.</p> <p>HS2 advised this is referring to identification of new environmental receptors, or human receptors in light of information gathered at community events for example.</p> <p>WCC requested that dates for community engagement were published on the website. The Chair noted that the value of the LA knowing the upcoming engagement dates and ensuring this is communicated to the community</p> <p><u>Action:</u> HS2 ltd to discuss with its engagement team the possibility of publishing the dates of the planned community engagement events on the website.</p> <p><u>Action 3d – from January 2017</u> HS2 provided an update within the action log ahead of the March meeting and advised that the EWC contractors will need to confirm and implement the file transfer sites.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the site needs to be readily accessible for all Local Authorities so this should be kept in mind. This action is to remain open.</p> <p><u>Action 5a from January 2017</u> This action was agreed as closed, it was also noted that the latest version of the data sharing strategy was circulated by HS2 on the 30/03/2017.</p> <p><u>Action 8a and 8b from January 2017</u> The Action was agreed as closed.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd /LBC</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
--	---	---

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p><u>Action 8c from January 2017</u> HS2 provided an update in the action log that was shared ahead of the March meeting. An update of the CE.Framework will be included on the agenda item for the next meeting.</p> <p><u>12a from January 2017</u> Action was agreed as closed.</p> <p><u>12b from January 2017</u> Action was agreed as closed.</p> <p><u>Review of meeting minutes</u></p> <p>The draft minutes of the November subgroup were reviewed page by page.</p> <p>HS2 noted that the noise template is still to be circulated, and will be ASAP.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Noise template to be circulated to Subgroup</p> <p>CDC advised that there is one correction on item 12, should be MOU/SLA in first paragraph.</p> <p>AOB – class approvals, noted that the Chair was not personally consulted, though acknowledged that it was an open consultation.</p> <p>There were no other queries or comments on the minutes and therefore the draft minutes were accepted.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Terms of Reference Review</p> <p>The group was split into four groups to review and suggest revisions to the ToR. A slide was presented detailing the current ToR.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the TOR of this group need to reflect the TOR of the planning forum (which are currently under review). The aim of this session is to record ideas to be take away for review and to draft new ToR. The session should ensure that the ToR are fit for purpose, and explore what everyone wants to get out of the group.</p> <p>The summary of discussions from each group will be circulated with the meeting minutes.</p> <p>The next steps were discussed, and it was confirmed that the Planning forum TOR is to be set first and then the subgroup can be set. The IPC advised that the redraft of the planning forum ToR wasn't able to be shared at last planning forum meeting. The IPC had reviewed the planning forums ToR and whilst he felt the original words were robust, there was still work to be undertaken to ensure they reflected that HS2 Ltd has now got Royal Assent. HS2 Ltd advised that the ToR for the planning forum will hopefully be agreed at the next planning forum meeting.</p> <p>SCC asked if this group will still remain as a sub group to Planning Forum?</p> <p>HS2 Ltd confirmed that it will remain as a subgroup as this is what is referenced in the</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p>Planning Memorandum.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> At the next sub group meeting HS2 Ltd to provide feedback on the ToR review for the planning forum. Once the ToR reviews have happened, a meeting between the independent chairs of the group and HS2 to review the revised ToRs should be arranged.</p> <p>Action: The summary of discussions from each group will be circulated with the meeting minutes</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd / The Chair</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>EWC update</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented slides and provided a general update on the key activities the EWC have progressed and will continue to work through over the next few months, within area north, central and south.</p> <p>GI was discussed and LBHF & KC asked if it included contaminated land assessments and whether the reports would be shared with the Councils. This topic was further discussed and it was concluded that a contaminated land update should be included on the agenda for the next meeting.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> HS2 Ltd to provide an update on the contaminated land process at the next meeting.</p> <p>LBC asked for clarification on land access and the formal notification process for private / council owned land.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd confirmed that the Schedule 2 Notice is a notice from HS2 Ltd, which lasts for 3 months, and HS2 Ltd will need to re issue every three months. Then the contractor will serve a more detailed Letter of Notification identifying the works intended to be carried out.</p> <p>LBC provided feedback that there is some issues with the joining up between the HS2 Ltd and the contractor letters, ensuring it gets directed to the right person in the Council, and also noted that the first letter is very generic and therefore hard for the Council to ensure the right people are informed. LBC also noted that it felt the 7 days is too short for the LA to get it to the right person within the Council. It was also raised that the mapping provided for the GI letters could be clearer.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> HS2 Ltd to pass on Land access process feedback to the relevant teams internally and provide an update.</p> <p>LBHF & KC enquired if HS2 Ltd were liaising with OPDC? HS2 Ltd confirmed that they are with regards to planning but others will go through the Councils themselves.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>

	<p>TRDC raised some concerns regarding the engagement received from Highways England contractors (Jackson) on the upcoming M25 works. HS2 Ltd advised it would investigate.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Section 61 - update</p> <p>The chair asked how many S61 applications gone in to which LBC confirmed it had received approximately 35 to date, and a few had been received by WCC. LBC and WCC advised that quality of the submissions were not always up to scratch.</p> <p>CDC advised that there had been good engagement on upcoming GI works regarding S61 risk assessments, though aS61 was not deemed required. LBC agreed on the engagement.</p> <p>The Chair asked if applications were being reviewed before going to the LA.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd advised that it will be following a risk based assurance process, so not every document would be reviewed, with those deemed high risk being reviewed. Third parties do not have a requirement to submit their applications to HS2 Ltd, however we are engaging with them before and throughout the works.</p> <p>LBC noted that with the risk based assurance all early S61 should be checked to which HS2 Ltd agreed, and advised would feed this back internally.</p> <p>The chair asked if the LAs were aware of when to expect consent applications?</p> <p>HS2 Ltd advised that we have started the conversation as part of the SLA and provided 6/12 month look ahead, however noted it is difficult to provide further information at this stage.</p> <p>LBC advised that the levels HS2 put forward and the Councils estimate was very different, and that this may transpire to be the same for other Councils.</p> <p>The chair asked if LAs are happy with the information that has come through. SBC advised that no information had been provided to date. HS2 Ltd advised that all Councils would have been provided information as part of the higher level SLA discussions, however agreed that there needs to be further information and discussions with the EHPs and the contractors.</p> <p>WCC noted that it was not happy with the risk based approach regarding S61s, and considered that the role of HS2 should be an overview of all applications, especially with the cumulative effect of all applications.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd advised that for the cumulative effects, the EWC will be monitoring this and each CMO is responsible for monitoring the cumulative effects in their area.</p> <p>LBC advised that noise models do tend to vary between contractors, and therefore quality control on this would be welcomed. HS2 Ltd to take this back internally.</p> <p>LBC asked if HS2 can clarify who each LA can contact regarding the consents. HS2 Ltd advised that is likely to be the CMO that will be the contact, but HS2 to clarify this.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> HS2 to confirm the SPOC for each Local Authority to contact regarding S61</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p>consents.</p> <p>The Chair asked about model / template conditions which has been discussed previously, and if the EHPs had decided if this was going to be taken forward. LBC advised that to date all conditions vary on the S61, therefore all are bespoke. Therefore it would likely be a difficult task to come up with conditions that apply across the board.</p> <p>The IPC advised on the Crossrail learning legacy, S61 work: workshop with the contractors and local authorities was undertaken. Once written up this could be presented at the EHO sub group. CDC advised that the lessons learnt have been fed into the S61 guidance document.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd then presented a slide with a general S61 update.</p> <p>Further discussion was also undertaken regarding noise surveys taken along the line of route – results of which will help inform future design of the systems.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Planning Forum Feedback</p> <p>HS2 Ltd gave a summary of the agenda items that were covered at the Planning Forum meeting on the 23rd March.</p> <p>Presentation of standard design of overbridge parapets was given, with the comments provided to the Planning Forum to be feed into the next stage of design. Ultimately it is intended the Planning Forum will settle standard designs for both noise barriers and overbridge parapets will be, T this process will continue until the MWCC are on board.</p> <p>Guidance on the Schedule 17 appeals regulations that SoS put in place in March: HS2 Ltd are in the process of drafting user friendly guidance on the appeals process. Which will be issued before the next planning forum. Guidance for decision notices were also discussed in the planning forum to ensure a consistent approach is taken.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Planning Forum Note 10: Indicative mitigation to be circulated to the EHO sub group, and to be discussed at the next EHO subgroup meeting.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd provided an update on the progress of Class Approvals. The SoS consultation is now closed with 16 responses received. The responses have been analysed and a response to the consultation was published on the 23rd March and can be found at this link: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/601541/hs2-government-response-to-consultation-on-draft-class-approval-web-version.pdf</p> <p>In summary there were four changes made and six conditions added as a result of the consultation responses received. The Class Approval was made on Friday 24th March, and sent to all SPOC on the Planning Forum and Chief Execs of the local authorities.</p> <p>The IPC advised that SLA was also discussed as the Memorandum runs out at the end of March (and is not being extended) and SLA have not yet been signed. The SLA is not a negotiation it is a matter of agreeing the LA costs, which will be refunded if they fall under agreed Schedule 1 headings and the rates are transparent and acceptable.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p>If the Memorandum runs out there is an agreement that the local authorities should log the times and costs under the headings of Schedule 1 until the SLA is signed. Any questions should go to the interface managers (Susanne Crouch Area South, James Gasson-Hargreaves Area Central and Donovan Bailey Area North).</p>	
8.	<p>Ongoing Construction Experience</p> <p>The Chair asked for LA to share any construction experience (issues and positives).</p> <p>LBC advised under the traffic liaison groups they have a best practice photo sharing session at the end of the meeting and an accessible best practice / lessons learned log for this, is there a way of doing this route wide for HS2?</p> <p>It was discussed how presenting shared learning within the sub group meeting is a good idea, but that there also needs to be a platform for sharing this for all to access. The chair noted examples such as 'knowledge hub', a government based one.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> HS2 Ltd to look into creating a portal to facilitate sharing information such as Best Practise and lessons learned with all the local authorities.</p> <p>The Chair requested that this is to be kept as a standard agenda item.</p>	HS2 Ltd
9.	<p>HS2 Update</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented slides for this agenda item, further information was provided on the below points:</p> <p>MWCC tender evaluations: Now completed, and the contractors should be on board in summer, to begin the 12 -15 month design stage.</p> <p>Station and rail systems: SDSC is going to PQQ in April.</p> <p>The HS2 Community and Engagement Fund (CEF) and the HS2 Business and Local Economy Fund (BLEF) are now live, with £40 million available in total. Groundworks are the administration for this, and applications will go to an independent chair for consideration. The link for the two funds are available here: http://www.groundwork.org.uk/Sites/hs2funds</p> <p>The IPC advised that the independent chair of the above is coming to the next planning forum.</p>	
10.	<p>Forward Plan</p> <p>Agenda Items for the next meeting:</p> <p>Contaminated land update (HS2 Ltd)</p> <p>Engagement update (HS2 Ltd)</p>	

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUBGROUP of the HS2 PLANNING FORUM

	<p><u>Ideas for future meetings</u></p> <p>Presentation on acoustic aspects of the noise barrier presentation given to the planning forum, and how the design was developed</p> <p>Air quality – review / discussion of progress</p>	
11.	<p>AOB</p> <p>The date for next meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 23rd of May, and the revised timings of the meeting was agreed to be taken forward.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note: date moved to July due to Purdah restrictions.</i></p> <p>The new venue location and room layout was discussed and it was agreed that HS2 Ltd should explore another alternative that was more suitable for the meeting such as Friends House, and that the former layout should be implemented.</p>	