

Phase One Planning Forum – Highways Subgroup Minutes #22 – 29th March 2017

Date & time:	Wednesday 29th March 2017 Authorities: 12:00 – 13:00 Forum: 13.00 – 16:00 Euston Square Hotel, 152-156 North Gower Street, London, NW1 2LU	
Chair:	Ted Allett	Chair
Promoter Attendees:	Peter Tomlin John Woodhouse Richard Adam Hudson Taivo Chris Whitworth Chris Boylan	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd
Guests:	Steve Braund	CDC/SBDC
Highway Authority Attendees:	Chris Young Gez Romano Laura Leech Sarah Davis Julian Richardson Oliver Spratley Lee Palser Nick Hopcraft Martin Steward Adrian Malcolm Timothy Mackay Alan Tilly – part time only David Knowles – part time only	Birmingham City Council Warwickshire CC Buckinghamshire CC Buckinghamshire CC Oxfordshire CC Oxfordshire CC Staffordshire CC Highways England Highways England London Borough of Camden Transport for London London Borough of Hillingdon London Borough of Hillingdon

Item	Topic	Action Owner
1.	Introductions	
2.	<p>Review of notes and actions from last meeting</p> <p>Minutes and actions from previous minutes were reviewed. The following comments were noted:</p> <p><u>From the Minutes</u></p> <p>Dipak Lad from Highways England was NOT at the February 2017 meeting, but Nick Hopcraft was there.</p> <p>Tim Mackay from TfL was also present at the February meeting.</p> <p>Minutes for Meeting No. 20 should have removed reference that the proposal on TROs was “largely welcomed by the HAs”. It was also pointed out that the fact that this change was going to be made should have been mentioned in the Minutes of Meeting No. 21.</p>	

	<p>Action: HS2 Ltd to amend the minutes to incorporate these changes.</p> <p>From the Outstanding Actions</p> <p>Temporary Works Approvals – HAs mentioned that there was no action to discuss the approval for temporary works but this had been discussed in the previous (February 2017) meeting. (This issue was discussed in the meeting at length, please refer to Item No. 5b below).</p> <p>Rainbow Maps – Following from item 6/2 in the Nov-Dec 2016 meeting, a question was asked by one HA on whether Rainbow Maps will be issued in an easily “digestible format”. HS2 Ltd stated that they will be placed on the website with geographically familiar names. However, only the exhibits produced for Select Committee will be provided.</p> <p>As a related issue, clarification was required on what legal process would need to be followed to update definite maps for Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd. to confirm the process required to update definitive maps for HS2-related PRoW network alterations.</p> <p>Winter Service – From Item 5 in the December meeting, a meeting to discuss winter salting routes between HS2 Ltd and NCC, WCC and LBC is still to be held.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to set up the meeting with NCC, WCC and LBC.</p> <p>Adjacent Authorities – It was noted that there was a typographical error in the Outstanding Action Item 5 (from the February 2017 meeting). The entry should have read “HS2 Ltd to confirm whether adjacent authorities that are 2 or more authorities away (from the affected authority) will also be notified on submission”.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd confirmed that, within London, the authorities along the lorry route would also be notified. Elsewhere, it will be authorities adjoining the relevant planning authority, should the routes traverse another authority area before reaching a motorway or trunk road. A change will be made to the planning forum note,</p> <p>Action: Hs2 Ltd to clarify in planning forum note</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
3.	<p>Guidance Notes Update</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented the status of the Guidance Notes that have been shared or are planned to be shared with the HAs. The intention is to have these published on the HS2 website. A tracker will be included to show the status for each Guidance Note or HS2 document. A draft tracker was shown at the meeting, which this will be updated and sent to HSG members.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to issue the tracker to the HSG and also publish it on the HS2 website</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
4a).	<p>Routewide Traffic Management Plan (RTMP)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented a summary of the changes to the RTMP to the last meeting of the sub-Group. These amendments have been approved by Legislative Decisions Board, and were circulated for consultation on 17 March. Responses on the proposed amendments required by 21 April.</p> <p>Action: HAs to provide comments on the proposed amendments to the RTMP. Comments to be provided by Friday 21 April.</p>	<p>HAs</p>
4b).	<p>Local Traffic Management Plan (LTMPs)</p> <p>HS2 Ltd noted that draft Enabling Works Local TMPs have been prepared by their Engineering Delivery Partner, based on the assumptions within the Environmental</p>	

	<p>Statement. The intention is that these will be updated later this year by the Enabling Works Contractors, as their scope is confirmed.</p> <p>HSG was therefore asked to consider if they wished these drafts to be circulated for consultation, or await until the Enabling Works Contractor provided an appropriate update. It was noted that the baseline data in the draft would provide the reference point for future impact appraisal. Attendees agreed that they would await the Enabling Works contractor version of the Local TMPs.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd noted that the plans accompanying the draft were of the assumed lorry routes, including extensions to the motorway and trunk road network, not previously shown in the Environmental Statement. It was agreed that HS2 Ltd would engage on these drawings via the Local Traffic Liaison Group meetings, in advance of discussions on the ROMIS plans which were under preparation.</p> <p>LB of Camden queried if lorry routes indicated to be for utilities only could be conditioned as such and not approved for Main Civils Works or Station Civils Works. HS2 Ltd said this would be a matter for discussion during the planning application stage.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to engage on the lorry route drawings and develop the draft Local TMPs with the Enabling Works Contractors.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>5a).</p>	<p>Consents Submission Content</p> <p>A draft checklist for temporary and form (PHW1) for permanent consents submissions were presented. These are still works in progress but will be issued to HAs for comment before they are adopted. However, it was mentioned that some of these forms might be used by the Enabling Works Contractors in advance of the comments being received.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd will send out the draft forms. HAs to suggest any improvements to the forms; e.g. what other information to include on the forms.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: After the meeting HS2 Ltd sent out revised versions for Temporary Interference consents forms and a checklist for temporary interference. Draft permanent highway consents form PHW1 was also sent out. Comments are requested as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Hs2 Ltd, HAs</p>
<p>5b).</p>	<p>Technical Approval of Temporary Works</p> <p>In a related discussion, and as a follow up on an Outstanding Action, HAs wanted clarification on the technical approval process for temporary works. This matter had also been raised in the HAs' pre-meeting. In particular, Highways England were worried that some of the works by the Enabling Works Contractors were due to start work soon but HS2 Ltd had not provided a process on how consents for temporary works will be managed. They pointed out that the only process that has been shared with the authorities is that for permanent works.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd. stated that the process for managing the design for temporary works (highways and structures) will be similar to that for managing permanent works. The technical approval of structures will be done in accordance with BD2 (DMRB Vol 1 Section 1 Part 1 – Technical Approval of Highway Structures), as modified to allow for the Act requirements to be built in to it. A Guidance Note for the Technical Approval of Highway Structures is currently being drafted and will be circulated to the HAs at or before the next Highway Subgroup meeting in May.</p> <p>The process for managing designs for temporary highways will also be similar to the permanent highways process, with the exception that temporary highways will not necessarily be handed over to the relevant highway authority at the end of the works or the project. Therefore it would be inappropriate to remove the word "Permanent" from the current flowchart for managing permanent highways approvals. Instead, a</p>	

	<p>guidance note will be prepared to explain the process for temporary works and highlighting the (slight) differences with the permanent works process.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd also explained that HAs should not confuse between the process for obtaining consents for traffic management or temporary highways with the process for both temporary and permanent highway works approvals.</p> <p>Further clarification on some scenarios will be provided at the next meeting, as to when Para 6 and Para 11 of Schedule 4 will apply.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to produce two guidance notes for circulation at or before the next Highway Subgroup meeting. These are (i) 'Guidance Note – Technical Approval of Highway Structures' and (ii) 'Guidance Note – Temporary Works'.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to present at the May meeting the scenarios which will apply for temporary interference and permanent works.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note – With regards to issues raised by Highways England; the three bridges (not five as reported) that will be built by the Enabling Works Contractors will be permanent structures not temporary structures. Therefore the process for managing this will be as for permanent works. Any temporary works required to facilitate the construction of the permanent works will be assessed or approved as part of the permanent works submissions.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
6a)	<p>Demarcation Lines and Sample Sketches</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented excerpts from the draft Guidance Note on Bridge Maintenance Demarcation Lines. The demarcation lines show the maintenance responsibilities for the bridges structures carrying highways crossing under or above the High Speed Railway line. The responsibilities depend on whether the structure is above or below the HS2 line, as well as the span configurations. Sketches are included in the Guidance Note and the presentation slides. These are typical scenarios only; there could be local deviations from the general approach at some locations. Comparisons with Network Rail approach were also provided.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to circulate the draft Guidance Note. Some updates to the sketches will be made following suggestions to make the sketches clearer. HAs to provide comments once the Guidance Note is issued.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd, HAs</p>
6b)	<p>Guidance Note – Highway Boundary Considerations</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented excerpts from the pre-circulated Guidance Note on Highway Boundary Considerations. The Guidance Note provides possible boundary configurations between HS2 assets and HAs', private landowners' or other third parties' assets. Sketches provided show the pros and cons for each proposed location. The Guidance Note also provides possible locations for the location of mitigation planting and the pros and cons of each location.</p> <p>Action: HAs to provide feedback to HS2 Ltd. It was felt that it would make sense to comment on both 6a and 6b together, so comments will not be collated until the Guidance Note on Demarcation Lines has been circulated.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd, HAs</p>
7	<p>Forward Plan</p> <p>The forward plan was discussed. Next meeting will be on the 24th of May, and the one after that will be on the 19th of July.</p>	
8	<p>Knights Architects Bridge Parapets presentation (This was an additional item added to the agenda).</p> <p>A presentation on the approach to common designs for bridge parapets, previously given to the HS2 Design Panel and the Planning Forum, was given. The presentation</p>	

	<p>gave various ideas for bridge parapets that could be applied on the HS2 across the whole route. Some Has commented that there didn't appear to be a focus on the safety performance of these parapets, but rather their appearance. It was explained that the materials chosen would ensure that safety performance was not compromised. This is still work in progress, and HS2 Ltd plan to discuss the ideas with Highways England's specialists.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to circulate the presentation to the HSG.HSG members to provided comments using the HS2 Planning Forum email address.</p>	HS2 Ltd, HAs
	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>Review the Highways Subgroup Terms of Reference – The chairperson said the HSG ToR should be reviewed.</p> <p>Road Safety Pot – More information is required on the Undertaking concerning the £30 million road funding along the HS2 phase 1 route – DfT to be invited to confirm arrangements.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd to invite DfT to a future HSG meeting.</p> <p>Schedule 25 TRO – HS2 Ltd noted that the undertakings were being issued to all the HAs. HS2 Ltd are aware that DfT are producing the Statutory Guidance. .</p> <p>Use of alternative lorry routes – A number of HAs along the HS2 phase 1 route recently met at Silverstone and discussed with the data provider Elgin, a proposed app to enable identification of forward planned street works and assumed HS2 lorry routes. The aim of the app is to identify options for HS2 traffic to be diverted off the approved lorry routes, to assist the local HA fulfil its network management duty. Should this be pursued, HS2 Ltd would ask HAs to confirm if they expect HS2 to: (a) seek lorry route approvals, (b) assess the impacts of the diverted lorries (c) sign the diversion routes for HS2 lorries.</p> <p>The HAs noted that a further meeting on this proposed app was to be hosted by Warwickshire County Council on the 27th of April.</p> <p>Action: HAs to consider the points put by HS2 Ltd.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HAs</p>
	<p>Meeting Ended at 16.00 Hrs</p> <p>Next Meeting on: 24th of May in Warwickshire</p>	