

Phase One Planning Forum – Highways Subgroup

Minutes #28 – 21st March 2018

Date & time:	Wednesday 21st March 2018 Authorities: 12:30 – 13:30 Subgroup: 13.30 – 16:00 Radisson Blu Edwardian, Grafton – 130 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1T 5AY.	
Chair:	Ted Allett	Chair
Promoter Attendees:	Richard Adam (RA) Peter Tomlin (PT) Hudson Taivo (HT) Daniel Turner (DT) Paul Gilfedder (PG) Chris Boylan (CB)	HS2 HS2 HS2 HS2 HS2 HS2
Guests:		
Highway Authority Attendees:	Keith Davenport (KD) Lewis Gunn (LG) Nick Hopcraft (NH) Dpak Lad (DL) Prabhu Vasudevan (PV) Mark O'leary (MO) Christopher Simpson (CS) Jenny Foster (JF) Julian Richardson (JS) Lee Palser (LP) Andrew Savage (AS) Sarah Davis (SD) Rod Black (RB) David Grindley (DG) Adrian Malcom (AM) Ava Gordon (AG)	Warwickshire County Council Transport for London Highways England Highways England Transport for London City of Westminster Hertfordshire County Council Hertfordshire County Council Oxfordshire County Council Staffordshire County Council (LP) Warwickshire County Council Buckinghamshire County Council Buckinghamshire County Council Northamptonshire County Council London Borough of Camden London Borough of Camden

Item	Topic	Action Owner
1	<u>Introductions</u> All attendees introduced themselves and which organisation they represented.	
2	<u>Review of notes and actions from last meeting</u> The chair ran through the previous minutes and action log. The minutes were accepted with no proposed amendments: some actions were updated as follows: Rainbow Maps – PT explained that each highway authority had been sent the maps that fall within their areas, but highway authorities reported that they had not received them. PT is to check and send out a list of who in each authority were sent which maps, the date they were sent, and the file size of the attachments / email. <i>Post meeting note: Information provided on 26/3/18 and highway authorities have reported non-receipt.</i>	
A1	Action: HS2 Ltd to reissue maps individually.	HS2 Ltd

A2	<p>Winter Plan meeting – PT explained that EDP have been tasked with producing a report on matching ES lorry routes with gritting routes: this report will inform the proposed meeting.</p> <p>Action: When the report has been created the meeting will be setup. PT to find out the likely completion date of the report.</p> <p>RSF and VAT - Highway authorities clarified the question surrounding the issue of VAT and the RSF, ie is the RSF inclusive of VAT? PT explained that the highway authorities draw down on their allocation to fund the works they want to use it for, if the contractor charges them for VAT, then that VAT cost has to be found from the allocation. If the highway authority can reclaim VAT then that is for them to arrange. VAT has no bearing on the RSF allocations to the highway authorities.</p> <p>Schedule 26 permits - PT explained that the process in place where there is an existing environmental weight limit is that contractors provide details of the vehicles that would use the route in advance and the police would then not enforce the ban on those vehicles.</p>	HS2 Ltd
A3	<p>Action: Highway authorities agreed to devolve the issue down to Traffic Liaison Groups (TLGs) so that they could sort out the issues locally and individually.</p>	HA's
3	<p><u>New Environmental Effects</u></p> <p>PT and PG presented on what the High Speed Rail (London to West Midlands) Act and ES requirements are, along with those set out within the COCP and the RTMP (see presentation slides for more information).</p> <p>Should traffic flows trend towards being higher than those assessed in the ES, then the contractor is required to assure that no new significant effects arise.</p> <p>Where multiple contractors use the same route, then HS2 may carry out a cumulative review, if considered necessary to do so (ie there is potentially a new significant effect).</p> <p>HS2 transport management team would report to the HS2 construction area teams who would have to collaborate and advise contractors on what to do if new significant effects may arise.</p>	
A4	<p>Action: HS2 Ltd to look into what the assessment year would be for any new assessments, and update at next meeting.</p>	HS2 Ltd
4	<p><u>Draft Guidance on the use of EToN</u></p> <p>PT explained that Franklin Streetworks were appointed by EDP to provide the service. Franklin Streetworks drafted guidance notes on the detail of how this would work, which was reviewed by the chairs of the Joint Authority Group (JAG) and the Highway Authority and Utilities Committee (HAUC), who provided feedback.</p> <p>The intention was to issue the guidance on the 13/03/18 to agree next steps at this meeting. However, Franklin Streetworks have since gone into administration before the feedback from JAG and HAUC could be incorporated into the drafted guidance notes. EDP now need to source a new service provider.</p> <p>A query arose about use of EToN for works which are not streetworks. PT explained that there is no obligation for HS2 or its contractors to notice such works and if there is any obligation it sits with the street authority.</p>	
A5	<p>Action: PT to explain HS2 Ltd's position on EToN notices in writing, referencing the legislation, so that highway authorities can look into it themselves.</p>	HS2 Ltd

<p>5</p> <p>A6</p>	<p><u>HS2 Phase 1 Route-wide Traffic Management Plan - Operational Review</u></p> <p>PT presented on the changes and clarifications that will be made within the RTMP and proposed the next steps.</p> <p>Amendment – The RTMP will be amended to comply with the following regarding the Maintenance of temporary traffic management: <i>“Contractors who fail to attend site within 2 hours shall reimburse the reasonable costs of the highway authority to attend and make good a work site as necessary”.</i></p> <p>Clarifications include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The different meaning of a construction site and worksite. - Update the TLG TORs as some TLGs have agreed action logs rather than formal minutes. - Include a process for alterations to temporary traffic management (Temporary Schedule 4 submissions) - Include requirement for temporary work to be built to a permanent standard. - Designer responsibilities for the design of temporary traffic management and other designs of work within this. - Remove section on vehicle heights from ground level and rely on N3 specification. - Include that safety checks on vehicles required by the RTMP may be done in lorry holding areas. - Area traffic manager responsibilities to be reviewed. <p>Action: Highway authorities are to identify any other areas within the RTMP that they feel require amending, and are to update HS2 on this by the end of Friday the 04/05/2018 via email.</p>	<p>HA's</p>
<p>6</p>	<p><u>Consents and Approvals Procedure – Update (including lessons learnt)</u></p> <p>HT and PT presented on the procedural changes from revision P01, and recapped the key design stages and action (see presentation slides for more information).</p> <p>The lessons learnt so far are as follows:</p> <p>From Permanent schedule 4 submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A change of mind set is required from HS2 Ltd, contractors, and highway authorities, to understand the Act. Highway Authorities no longer have to review and approve all submissions. - Sharing of information is essential. - Understanding the design basis and status of HS2 Technical Standards is particularly important where several highway authorities in a single work package fall under different categories. - HS2 Ltd is not expecting rigorous design checks from highway authorities because the nominated undertaker is accountable for the design of works to be constructed under Act powers. The Service Level Agreements would also not cover a duplication of work already carried out by others. However, it is up to each highway authority to decide how it wishes to review consent / approval submissions. <p>From Temporary Schedule 4 submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a high level of co-operation in the processing of Streetworks submissions and other highway submissions. - There is good working relationships with contractors to develop best approach to works and co-ordination with others. 	

<p>A7</p> <p>A8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current nature of EWC packages makes long – term planning and co-ordination difficult. This should improve with MWCCs. - The HS2 Act is a replacement of powers and processes, and not an additional layer of process to be adopted: individual authorities are “interpreting” the provisions. E.g. it is not necessary for submissions for roads not listed in table 3 of schedule 4 to run for 28 days and be “deemed approval”: in some cases HS2 Ltd may regard this as unreasonable because highway authorities could provide consent within a quicker timeframe for works with lesser impact. <p>Highway Authorities fed back that the quality of information and plans provided within submissions are often not good enough and often appear as if a review / rigorous check has not taken place.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Ltd are considering the representations made by several highway authority about the wording of consent / approval forms, update to be provided at next meeting.</p> <p>Action: Highway authorities are to send comments on the procedural changes to HS2.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HA's</p>
<p>7</p>	<p><u>Temporary versus Permanent highway schemes (Implications on maintenance responsibilities and costs)</u></p> <p>RA presented on this issue. Works undertaken under “temporary interference” are by definition temporary, and therefore they must be removed unless other powers exist and are used to make them permanent.</p> <p>However, a methodology was created during the hybrid bill process whereby the highway authority can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Adopt” them using its Highways Act 1980 powers, - Obtain any consents or approvals that may be required, - Accept they are constructed to temporary standards, or - Fund the “extra over” cost of using permanent standards. <p>Works that occur outside of Act limits can only be undertaken under “temporary powers”. Any agreements to make these permanent as per above ideally need to be made before the works commence (and must be if an upgrade to permanent standards is being sought).</p> <p>HAs queried why HS2 Ltd was not considering the costs of removal of the temporary works since they could outweigh the cost of installing the permanent scheme from the start. HS2 Ltd explained that each case will be assessed individually, but the starting position was that HAs had to either pay the “extra over” for permanent design or accept works as temporary.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p><u>Land Ownership Under the Highway</u></p> <p>RA presented on the position under the Phase 1 Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If it’s an alteration to an existing road (i.e. not a scheduled work) there is no change to existing ownership (adjacent landowners to mid-point or highway authority). - If it’s a new road, the land is acquired compulsory by the Secretary of State of Transport, and it could be transferred to the highway authority at a later date. The draft maintenance agreement provides for both eventualities. - If it’s a new or altered PRoW, then land ownership is as per normal regime (i.e. land ownership is not affected by highway status). 	

<p>9</p> <p>A9</p>	<p><u>Technical Standards / Guidance Notes / Forms (including version control, tracked changes and HS2 website)</u></p> <p>RA updated on what had been circulated, updated, and sent out for comment and showed what version control was in place (see presentation slides for more information).</p> <p>Version control is through the “PXX” numbers, and tracked changed versions of updated documents will now be circulated.</p> <p>Work on the new HS2 website is ongoing, and should make it easier to update documents than on GOV.UK: however the timing currently remains uncertain.</p> <p>In the discussions, HAs suggested that the HS2 Ltd documents could benefit from paragraph numbering so that they can be easier to navigate and make references to. HS2 Ltd explained that while they try to number the paragraphs, they had to abide by the corporate style guidelines.</p> <p>HAs also asked if the technical standards could be available via the website. HS2 Ltd explained that currently the Technical Standards are only available to organisations or individuals who had signed a confidentiality agreement.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note – The new HS2 Ltd website is now available, albeit in beta (test) version. The website is on https://www.hs2.org.uk/. However, currently Technical Standards and other documents are not available on the website.</p> <p>Action: HS2 will distribute an updated document tracker.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>10</p> <p>A10</p> <p>A11</p>	<p><u>Schedule 17 Application Lorry movements and numbers</u></p> <p>PT and PG discussed with attendees that the principle contractor is responsible for providing flow forecasts and actual flows for each site. HS2 Ltd will check these for any trends towards an exceedance of ES assessment flows which may flag up mitigation requirements.</p> <p>This information can be shared at TLGs upon request (summaries only). HS2 will not provide information that they do not regularly collect.</p> <p>There are timeframes and dates within contractor contracts that contractors need to hit for submissions, approvals, and plans.</p> <p>Action: PT to add these dates to the presentation slides for circulation.</p> <p>Action: PG to distribute his lorry movement slides from the Planning Forum.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>11</p>	<p><u>Feedback from Local TLG meetings</u></p> <p>Highway Authorities provided updated feedback on ongoing TLG meetings. The main points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advanced sharing of information is very useful and can this please be done as much as possible. - Can agenda's please reflect what is actually covered within TLG meetings as it has been noted that there seems to be quite a bit of last minute deviation. 	

	<p>- It was noted that emergency service representatives don't always attend, and that there is some HS2 representation that don't attend when required.</p> <p>There has been a great improvement with the agenda, meeting minutes, and presentation slides preparation and sharing within area central.</p>	
<p>12</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>HAs asked if they could use funds from the Community and Environment Fund (CEF) and the RSF together. Some HAs were of the understanding that this was not possible. HS2 Ltd explained that there were some restrictions on the CEF, but not on the RSF. It was agreed that further clarification was required.</p>	
<p>A12</p>	<p>Action: HS2 Ltd to clarify whether it was possible to match the CEF with the RSF.</p> <p>The next meeting will be organised for Wednesday the 13/06/2018 at HS2 Ltd's offices in Snow Hill, Birmingham.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

DRAFT