

INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM for HS2 Phase One

Title:	Independent Planning Forum for HS2 Phase One	
Date & Time	13:00 – 15:40 Thursday 19th July 2018 HS2 Ltd, Two Snowhill, Queensway, Birmingham B4 6GA	
Chair	Ted Allett	Independent Chair
Promoter Attendees:	Ryan Ward Emma Palmer Paul Gilfedder Mike Lyons James Boag Dominic Moore Nikita Harrison Sarah Goodburn Merida Mathen	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd DfT
Local Authority Attendees:	Sean Coghlan Susan Kitchen Laura Leech Esme Cushing Tony Horton David Jeffery Richard Warren Claire Bishop Julia Sykes Erica Levy Sara Lee Matthew Williams Debbie Prince Doug Lee Will Martin Nik Smith Ifath Nawaz Mandy Lumb Denis Winterbottom Adam Ralton	Lichfield District Council (LDC) Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) Bucks County Council (BucksCC) Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) Stratford Upon Avon District Council (SOADC) Stratford Upon Avon District Council Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Warwickshire County Council Warwick District Council (WDC) Birmingham City Council (BirCC) West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) Chiltern & South Bucks District Council (CDC/SBDC) Chiltern & South Bucks District Council South Northamptonshire & Cherwell District Council (SNC/CDC) South Northamptonshire & Cherwell District Council Three Rivers District Council (TRDC)
Guests	Cathy Elliott	Independent Chair of the CEF and BLEF

INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM for HS2 Phase One

Item		Action Owner
1.	Introductions	
	The Chair gave new attendees the opportunity to introduce themselves.	
2.	<p>Review of notes & actions from last meeting</p> <p>The May minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the previous meeting and are to be published on the gov.uk website. Action.</p> <p>The Chair reviewed the action log and the Forum discussed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the Chair of the Independent Design Panel had written to planning authorities following the March meeting of the Planning Forum. As there was still felt to be some areas that need clarification it was agreed that the authorities will respond to Sadie Morgan. Action. • HS2 Ltd said that it had not received any emails from Forum members on issues relating to non-town planning consents. Should members wish to raise any concerns with such consents they should email HS2. 	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>LAs</p>
3.	<p>Community Environment Fund (CEF) and Business & Local Economy Fund (BLEF) update</p> <p>Cathy Elliott (CE) presented an overview of the CEF & BLEF and regional updates, which highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background into when and why the funds were set-up and what they are to be used for. • How to apply. There are four assessment criteria for applications – Need, Planning, Disruption and Sustainability Legacy. Priority will be for those within 1km of the route. • Groundwork offer mentoring for unsuccessful applicants. • The ineligibility criteria were explained to PF. • The current programme statistics were provided with an explanation of the availability of an interactive map showing successful projects updated every last Friday of the month. CE explained that leaflets and traditional types of marketing are available. These would be distributed to members. Action. <p>It was queried whether any necessary planning permissions were required before award. CE confirmed that they were.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project examples were provided. CE explained that common themes were community activities, training and landscape. • CE explained that updates are provided quarterly to MPs, Local Authorities and businesses. 	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM for HS2 Phase One

	<p>CDC/SBDC said that its parish councils raised concerns on conditions. CE asked for contact details to be provided to pick up discussion. ACTION</p> <p>BirCC raised concerns that BLEF had a poor uptake. CE confirmed that some awards had been made under BLEF but agreed more promotion needs to be done. More applications are in the 'pipe-line' and they have been prioritising businesses since March.</p> <p>The Chair cited examples under the similar mechanism on HS1, where grants were provided to farmers for new hedgerows. CE confirmed that HS2 does not fund projects by individual landowners: groups of farmers would need to come together. The Chair suggested that some good proposals might therefore fall through the gaps. CE explained that the funds are about bringing people together.</p> <p>BirCC questioned whether the criteria for CEF & BLEF needed to be looked at. CE explained that the criteria are based on Information Paper C12.</p> <p>A member questioned how the funds relate to the Green Corridor. CE explained that the CEF & BLEF ensure a link is in place. PG went further to clarify that there is no Green Corridor fund <i>per se</i>. It is about linking up existing funds with funding opportunities. The mechanics are still being worked out.</p> <p>A member referred to the Chair's earlier HS1 example as a good example for what could be carried out as part of the Green Corridor. The Chair suggested that HS2 should look at what is required to enable this.</p> <p>ML explained the Act that the Act does not fix details of design including mitigation and that in developing mitigation design HS2 and its contractors will be engaging with planning authorities</p> <p>BirCC explained that the CEF & BLEF are working well in West Midlands but proving associated disruption from HS2 in order to justify an application is difficult. CE explained that Groundwork look at the route map and Environmental Statement to understand disruption.</p> <p>One Forum member said that the construction method is under constant review and the full effects aren't known. What is Groundwork's plan? CE explained that Groundwork can only assess what is publically available.</p> <p>The Chair recalled that some members of the Forum had previously requested more information be included on the applications as opposed to the awards.</p> <p>CE explained that LAs are eligible to apply and have to balance conflict of interest: she confirmed that there was no 'only one application in six</p>	HS2 Ltd
--	---	----------------

INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM for HS2 Phase One

	<p>months' rule.</p> <p>CE explained that general information about the applications can be shared, but not the specifics due to potential conflicts of interest and data protection. If something is of particular interest CE will discuss with Groundwork and the Panel.</p> <p>CE explained that Groundwork are looking at 'cold spots' – areas where there have been fewer applications, and are working to encourage more applications in these areas.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Common Design Elements</p> <p>ML explained that since the last Planning Forum HS2 had been reviewing progress with design in relation to certain contractual milestones. Part of this review had been focused on common design along the route. HS2 realise the maturity of design is not sufficient to allow progress to Notice to Proceed. The decision is to put more time into the front end design process, which has delayed the Notice to Proceed by three months. Designs are to be looked at not geographically but asset based to improve commonality. ML is leading on surface assets, Mike Hickson (Programme Director, Area Central) leading on subsurface assets and Rob Carr (Programme Director, Area South) everything else. ML explained that there has thus been a slowdown in progressing the CDEs. ML provided an example to illustrate the decision that various contractors had different designs for pier structures. This pause is necessary to get commonality and efficiency in design.</p> <p>The Chair stated that it was a useful update. He recalled the challenging programme that had been set for Planning Forum in January and observed that it is now stalling. It is important to explain the stalling.</p> <p>ML explained that the approach is not one size fits all.</p> <p>SNC/CDC noted that ML mentioned commonality, efficiency and effectiveness, and suggested that another key word was missing – distinctiveness. Structures should respect local distinctiveness. How is this assessment going to be factored in?</p> <p>ML explained that HS2 is designing for place and certain aspects of the design can be modified to take account of people, place and time. This will not be altered by the change in design programme. Schedule 17 is the process through which this can be examined.</p> <p>An authority remarked that the designs are not assessing landscape context.</p> <p>PG explained that if something is a CDE it will still be well designed. Draft</p>	

INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM for HS2 Phase One

	<p>planning forum notes will set the CDEs and LAs are part of the process of settling them. Once the PFNs are agreed, each asset will still require Schedule 17 approval. It is through pre-application discussion that the LA decides whether the CDE is appropriate.</p> <p>ML provided further clarification stating that the approach is likely to be a family of structures, with different materials based on local environment.</p> <p>It was asked whether key design elements have also been delayed three months? ML clarified that it depends on the area.</p> <p>PG explained that the delay will be articulated in the next round of lookaheads. HS2 is working though what the three month delay means for pre-application discussions.</p> <p>AVDC raised concerns that effort and resource has been put in from LAs on CDEs. ML explained that for the avoidance of doubt HS2 is not discarding the work undertaken to date with the Forum.</p> <p>TA enquired when the next CDE presentation, on Noise barriers, would be? ML explained that it also is being pushed back three months.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd said that the intention is that the November 2018 Planning Forum will include a substantive item on CDEs covering noise barriers and bridge piers and parapets.</p> <p>There was a discussion at to when it would be best for the Forum’s working group on bridge piers and parapets to next meet. ACTION. HS2 Ltd to update working group members on the timing of the next meeting.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Planning Forum Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PFN 11 Site Restoration Schemes • PFN 12 Engagement with Statutory Consultees <p>PG explained that PFN 11 has been previously circulated to Planning Forum and comments were received: some were incorporated into the note and an explanation provided when not included.</p> <p>Comments were only received on the revised draft from TRDC and HCC. From an initial review, it seems most comments can be incorporated but this will be confirmed after more consideration.</p> <p>Comments were raised by the Planning Forum about sites being restored ready for development but then that development not proceeding, and how this would be handled. PG explained that the response to this was set out in the response table: while HS2 will agree the restoration scheme with the planning authority there is a risk that subsequent development might then be delayed but that this is equally true in ‘normal’ planning.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM for HS2 Phase One

	<p>PG explained that comments were only received from TRDC and HCC on PFN 12. HS2 will consider these comments and respond to them and circulate updated note. TA identified a typographical error in paragraph 7.</p> <p>ACTION. Town Planning will consider comments, amend the notes and then re-issue.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Community Engagement update – Complaint Statistics</p> <p>SG briefed the Forum that Terry Morgan was now the Chair of HS2.</p> <p>SG provided a strategic update. This included updates on Common Place websites and the Prolonged Disturbance Scheme. SG explained that workshops had been held on the Prolonged Disturbance Scheme with more planned across the route.</p> <p>SG explained the Playing it Safe programme is going well and thanked the LAs for their help to promote the programme. SG can provide more information if requested.</p> <p>SG explained the Bringing History to Life Initiative and will provide more updates on this and hoardings at the September Planning Forum. Action</p> <p>SG provided a specific update on complaints,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now logging local issues • 48% of complaints to do with delivery: others were land and property related • Identifying and managing repeat complaints • Complaints leaflet – comments have been received and it has been updated (wasn't it handed out?) <p>It was asked whether the complaints report is on the website. SG confirmed that the database and the website is linked. (I don't understand this sentence. There is no 'complaints report' yet.)</p> <p>Multiple LAs stated that the Common Place websites and newsletters are not up to date. Examples included road names on road closures being incorrect. HS2 Ltd asked that Forum members notify the HS2 community relations staff member for the area of any such instances.</p> <p>WCC raised comments on the Head of Arts and Culture not being aligned with other areas of HS2. PG explained that the person is new in their role and the planning and other Act powers will be discussed with them.</p> <p>ML commented and said that their role is to try and stretch boundaries.</p> <p>LAs requested that the Arts Coordinator attend Planning Forum to explain</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM for HS2 Phase One

	<p>the Art Strategy, and provide the same briefing to Heritage Subgroup. Action: HS2 to arrange for the Head of Arts and Culture to attend a future meeting of Forum.</p> <p>SG presented the latest complaints process leaflet. Certain members of the Forum thought the leaflet was negative.</p>	HS2 Ltd
7.	<p>Phase One Programme update - SLA update</p>	
7.1	<p>ML provided a programme-wide update on Phase 1 including an update on future key milestones. ML asked for feedback on the new format of his briefing.</p> <p>WCC commented that HS2 corporate affairs had not made it aware that a Government Minister was visiting its area. ML that there were specific security arrangements for visits of a Minister. The LA said that it was good form and protocol for authorities to be notified in advance. ML explained that he would take it away and discuss with security as he was not best placed to comment.</p> <p>One member commented that information on the Green Corridor went to the Chief Executive instead of the officer. LA members requested that all communications to their CEs should also be copied to themselves. ML noted this.</p>	
7.2	<p>Similarly, another member mentioned that notices from EWC about land and property are being issued to the Chief Exec of the authority instead of the correct contact. This is recurring issue.</p> <p>ML explained that the contractors must learn from that: there had been complications in the mobilizing and there is a learning process. ML explained that through the Contractor Forum, HS2 was committed to this learning process.</p> <p>PG said that the Land and Property Team in HS2 manage the process and not town planning. The Chair agreed that it is a land and property issue rather than planning.</p> <p>ACTION. HS2 to liaise with Interface and Land and Property raise concerns on the process.</p>	HS2 Ltd
7.3	<p>One authority said that property notices being delivered by hand is not efficient. JB explained that it has become necessary to meet the programme for acquiring land but it is not the normal process for giving the 30 days' notice. Looking for a more steady land possessions programme.</p> <p>LAs also suggested that better descriptions of the land involved are required in notices.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM for HS2 Phase One

<p>7.4</p>	<p>It was agreed that the members would produce a consolidated list of issues. SBDC/CDC said that it was content to collate and issue comments to the Chair and HS2. Action</p> <p>Action ML said that he would ask Tim Musgrave (Land & Property) to present at the September Planning Forum.</p> <p>JB and NH provided an update on the SLAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive response received from LAs • Advised LAs to contact Third Party Agreement Managers on further questions. <p>It was questioned where the timesheet templates were at?</p> <p>JB and NH confirmed that they have taken the comments onboard and reissued to LAs.</p> <p>One member said that the requirements were over the top for travel and requested a more realistic level of detail.</p> <p>NH explained that HS2 are looking into it and that LAs can still use the old template up to agreement. A training presentation is being prepared and HS2 can come to LAs to brief them.</p> <p>The Chair observed that the whole process seems too complicated.</p> <p>JB explained that there is to be a review of SLAs to ensure GDPR compliance. JB restated that progress is being made and that HS2 Ltd are engaging with those who haven't yet signed and to speed up payments.</p> <p>Members asked when updates to SLA were to be carried out. JB and TA confirmed it would be better for these to be quarterly to start with.</p>	<p>SBDC/CDC</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>HS2 Updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project updates • Forward plan <p>MM provided a DfT update, including that DfT are preparing guidance on restoration schemes. TA asked whether this was based on the Crossrail template. MM confirmed this to be correct, with a few tweaks.</p> <p>PG confirmed the forward plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDEs presentation removed from September Planning Forum • Hoardings will be discussed and Tim Musgrave to attend September Planning Forum. • November meeting will include PFNs, CDEs and the CEO. 	

INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM for HS2 Phase One

9.	<p>AOB</p> <p>One LA requested an update on the Prolonged Disturbance Scheme guidance.</p> <p>PG and the Chair confirmed that this is ongoing and will clarify the process at the September Planning Forum where an update will be provided on the policy. Action</p> <p>One member asked whether Gareth Epps was still the ICC. ML confirmed that he was still the interim ICC.</p> <p>It was queried whether there was any money in the woodland fund. PG will provide an update at the September Planning Forum. ACTION.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
----	--	-------------------------------

DRAFT