

Phase One Planning Forum – Highways Subgroup Minutes #20 – 14th December 2016

Date & time:	Wednesday 14th December 2016 Authorities: 12:30 – 13:30 Forum: 13.30 – 16:00 The Office Group, The Stanley Building, 7 Pancras Square, London, N1C 4AG	
Chair:	Ted Allett	Chair
Promoter Attendees:	Peter Tomlin John Woodhouse Richard Adam Hudson Taivo	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd
Guests:	Steve Braund Neil Briggs Trevor Cocks James Hodson	CDC/SBDC Thames Valley Police Thames Valley Police M6 Toll
Highway Authority Attendees:	Basil Jackson Thomas Fitzpatrick Chris Young Keith Davenport Andrew Savage Muthiah Gunarajah David Grindley Julian Richardson Oliver Spratley Lee Palser Paul Hillman Martin Steward Rachel Best Gordon Hamilton Simon Weaver	Buckinghamshire CC Buckinghamshire CC Birmingham City Council Warwickshire CC Warwickshire CC Hertfordshire CC Northamptonshire CC Oxfordshire CC Oxfordshire CC Staffordshire CC Highways England Highways England London Borough of Brent London Borough of Camden Transport for London

Item	Topic	Action Owner
1.	Introductions	
2.	Notes of last meeting and outstanding actions Minutes were agreed, subject to the following amendment: Comments provided by LB of Camden on the Lorry Routes planning forum note at the previous meeting were not included. Action: HS2 Ltd will consider whether these comments can be addressed and responded to. Action: HS2 Ltd to also check if some comments in the table were missing as first referenced is number 21.	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd

	<p>Two actions noted in the previous meeting minutes were not included in the Outstanding Actions list. These were on Item 6;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) why HS2 Ltd are relying on contractors and (ii) Hs2 Ltd to confirm if drawings in LTMPs include lorry movements. <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to action the above two items at the next meeting.</p> <p>Action on Item 4, EToN Noticing: HS2 Ltd confirmed that, while not obliged to use EToN, it has decided to use it for routewide noticing. The procurement is currently being worked out through HS2 Ltd’s Engineering Delivery Partner. Highway Authorities welcomed this development.</p> <p>Action on Item 4, Demarcation Lines. Action: HS2 Ltd will present this at a future Highways Subgroup meeting. See also Agenda Item 7 in these minutes.</p> <p>Action on Item 5, Missing Points on NRSWA note: Hs2 Ltd and WCC have discussed these outside the meeting. HS2 Ltd also considering producing an Information Paper on this, but this might not be possible since the Hybrid Bill process is coming to an end (and thus a guidance note may be required instead).</p> <p>Action on Item 6, Rainbow Maps: Bucks CC asked if the rainbow maps can be provided on GIS. (Rainbow maps show the breakdown of lorry routes shown in different coloured lines depending on the number of movements.) WCC also said that HS2 Ltd should provide this information as it was important to the Highway Authorities. HS2 Ltd said the maps produced in response to petitions are available to the relevant Highway Authorities, but they cannot be uploaded on GIS yet as they are not approved and may change. HS2 Ltd will consider sharing these maps with the HAs who don’t have them already, but the maps <u>will not</u> be uploaded on GIS until the routes have been approved, which will be after Royal Assent. It should be noted that maps were not produced for all area, and in any case, it is the actual routes submitted for approval which are important. New Action: HS2 Ltd to follow this with an update at the next meeting.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd & Chair</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Feedback on Road Safety Audits and Highways Related Departures</p> <p>HS2 Ltd provided feedback to comments on the Guidance Notes for Road Safety Audits and Highways Related Departures from Standard, which were presented at the Highways Subgroup meeting No. 18 in September.</p> <p>On Highway-related Departures; 25 comments were received with 10 comments resulting in some changes to be made to the Guidance Note. There were no fundamental concerns raised. Action: HS2 Ltd to circulate the detailed responses and the revised Guidance Note (once this has been through internal governance).</p> <p>On Road Safety Audits, three key issues were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Stage 4 road safety audits 2) Post-completion alterations 3) Cost / funding questions linked to 1) and 2) <p>These aspects can be discussed further at a future Highways Subgroup meeting, but a revised version will be issued soon in order to pick up certain other issues of more immediate concern to the enabling and main works contracts. Action: HS2 Ltd to circulate the detailed responses and the revised Guidance Note (once this has been through internal governance). Note – The Guidance Note can be revised again at a later date, if required.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>

	<p>Highway Authorities said it would be preferable if HS2 Ltd shared their responses before the meetings rather than after. This will give the Authorities a better understanding of the issues and enable them to ask better follow up questions. Hs2 Ltd explained that time constraints unfortunately meant that this was not possible on this occasion. However, for the next meeting there will be an opportunity for Highway Authorities to follow up on the responses to the two Guidance Notes. Action: HS2 Ltd to allow time for follow up at the next Highways Subgroup meeting.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd & Chair</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Feedback on Permanent Highways Approvals Process</p> <p>HS2 Ltd provided feedback to comments on the flowchart for Consents and Approvals Procedure – Permanent Highways, which was presented at the Highways Subgroup meeting number 17 in August.</p> <p>23 comments were received, 3 of which will result in changes to the flowchart and procedure. Other comments were used to improve overall clarity of the flowchart. One suggested comment made to include the payment mechanism for the Highway Authorities was not included in the flowchart as it was felt the issue of payments should be discussed separately: the purpose of the flowchart was to show when key design inputs were required by all key parties to allow consents and approvals to be granted within the 28-day period stated in the Hybrid Bill. Action: HS2 Ltd to circulate the detailed responses and Version Po2 of the Flowchart. Action: As above, HS2 Ltd to provide time in the next meeting Agenda for follow up questions.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd & Chair</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Winter Maintenance</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented their proposed approach to Winter Maintenance (including gritting and snow ploughing) that HS2 Ltd’s contractors will be required to follow during construction. HS2 Ltd said there was a likelihood of routes between strategic routes and worksites not being prioritised by the HAs, therefore HS2 Ltd’s contractors needed to develop snow and ice response plans accordingly. Highway Authorities do not grit all routes within their areas, and some of these routes may be required by HS2 Ltd’s contractors. Some HAs said they can grit extra routes at HS2 Ltd’s request provided they were paid for this but there was no common approach to such a procurement approach at the moment.</p> <p>Action: A meeting will be set up between HS2 Ltd and three volunteering HAs, Warwickshire, Northamptonshire and LB of Camden, to discuss the best way to approach this. The meeting to be held before the next Highway Subgroup meeting.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd, NCC, WCC and LBC.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Planning Forum Note – Lorry Routes</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented the Lorry Route Planning Forum Note No. 6 which had been circulated to the HAs prior to the meeting.</p> <p>Highway Authorities suggested that the phrase in paragraph 2 under “Approach” in the Forum Note was still ambiguous, i.e. “Once more than 24 LGV movements in a day <u>to or from</u> a site ...” as it wasn’t very clear whether the 24 movements were in one direction or combined for both directions. HS2 Ltd explained that 24 was the total number of movements irrespective of direction (e.g. 12 one way, and 12 the other way). It was suggested that the wording in the Hybrid Bill be used to avoid confusion. Action: HS2 Ltd to consider revising the phrase using the wording used in the Hybrid Bill.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

	<p>Highway Authorities also said Paragraph 3 was unclear in relation to who exactly was the relevant qualifying authority. HS2 Ltd explained that the application is determined by the qualifying authority where the route starts or ends at an HS2 site. Even if it passes through an adjacent authority, that authority does not determine the route. If the authority who receives the application wishes to consult adjacent Authorities they may do so. However, there is no requirement in the Act to do so. HS2 Ltd will send a copy of submissions to all qualifying Authorities through which the route passes in accordance with the Planning Memorandum. Authorities asked how they can legally approve part of a route that runs through another authority. HS2 Ltd stated that is what the Bill allows, but given the HAs' uncertainty, HS2 Ltd agreed that HAs could ask the question and HS2 Ltd would have it answered.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to update the Note to make it clear who was the "relevant qualifying authority".</p> <p>Action: Authorities to pose legality question (as above) and HS2 Ltd to seek a fuller answer from agents. [Post meeting note – question has been received]</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Ongoing Points</p> <p>Demarcation Points / Land Ownership</p> <p>Work is still progressing and details will be provided at a future Highways Subgroup meeting. HS2 Ltd explained that the "demarcation lines" referred to bridge maintenance demarcation lines which will show who owned what part of typical structures. Land Ownership will also be discussed in future, although HS2 Ltd had presented a draft approach at the Subgroup meeting in December 2015.</p> <p>Action: HS2. Ltd to put these two items in the future agenda for discussion.</p> <p>Highway Maintenance Agreement</p> <p>Version 17 of the draft Maintenance agreement has now been sent to all HAs HS2 Ltd explained that the agreement will only kick off after highways have been constructed and at the end of the 12 months maintenance period, so there was no urgent need to have this agreed now. HS2 Ltd also explained that it was appropriate to have the same standard maintenance agreement with all Authorities since the underlying Bill requirements are the same. Such a standard contract is working perfectly well on HS1 and HS2 Ltd did not see the need for variations across the different Authorities (apart from the specific detail in the schedules).</p> <p>Highway Authorities asked if they can engage lawyers to review the maintenance agreement, and whether HS2 Ltd would pay for such legal services. HS2 Ltd explained that there was no need to involve lawyers at this stage and therefore HS2 Ltd did not believe it should pay the HAs' legal fees (for now). This will be reviewed closer to when the agreements are due to be signed off, which will be well after Royal Assent. Action: HS2 Ltd will consider final comments received and report back on a final version 18 where the matter will hopefully be closed for now. If HAs choose not to take it forward, the provisions in the Bill and Information Paper E29 will be relied upon following the 12 month 'maintenance period'.</p> <p>NRSWA Note</p> <p>Note is agreed, but considering whether to update the IP or whether HSG can have it as a formal note. Action: HS2 Ltd to provide update on this.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd & Chair</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>

8.	<p>Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) / Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTRO)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd advised HAs that DfT were considering amending the Hybrid Bill to provide for the Secretary of State to ask Highway Authorities to make the TROs or TTROs specified by the NU to implement approvals by the HAs. The reason for this proposal would be to allow TRO/TTRO to be made at the same time as the linked Schedule 4/32 Part 1 approvals. The amendment could also take the burden from the Authorities of having to approve HS2-related TRO/TTRO.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to provide an update on the status of the amendment at the next Subgroup meeting which is expected to be immediately after Royal Assent.</p>	HS2 Ltd
9.	<p>AOB.</p> <p>Thames Valley Police Future Attendance</p> <p>Thames Valley Police said this was going to be their last meeting at the routewide Highways Subgroup meetings as most of the issues discussed now were not generally relevant to their work. TVP will now mainly attend the local Traffic Liaison Group meetings as these were more relevant to their area. TVP said the issue of mapping of the worksites was very important, and that this needed to be addressed urgently. TVP were worried that if they were not provided with GIS mapping of HS2 worksites, they would have to be entered manually into their systems so that their response would be acceptable in emergency cases.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to provide update on this at the next subgroup meeting and TLGs.</p> <p>Safety at Junctions</p> <p>Bucks CC wanted clarification as to whether the assessment of safety issues on lorry route junctions, would be provided before approval of routes was sought. (Bucks CC had received a related assurance on this point.) Action: A meeting will be set up between HS2 Ltd and Bucks CC and Camden (representing the London Boroughs) to discuss lorry routes and associated safety issues at junctions. These are specific issues that are not relevant to the HSG.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd, BCC, & LBC</p>
10.	<p>Forward Plan etc.</p> <p>The March Highways Subgroup meeting, which should be after Royal Assent, will discuss the business of the Subgroup meetings going forward.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the next meeting would take place on the 8th of February 2015 in Warwickshire.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>All to note</p>