

**Phase One Planning Forum – Heritage Sub-Group  
Meeting Notes – 17<sup>th</sup> September 2019**

<b>Date &amp; time:</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> September 2019: 10.30-13.30  Mary Ward House 5 - 7 Tavistock Place, London WC1H 9SN
<b>Chair:</b>	<b>HJ Wass</b>
	<b>Presentations attached</b>

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lead</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>	Chair
<b>2</b>	<b>Landscape design, setting and design integration</b>	HS2
	<p><b>Summary</b> DT presented on the landscape design approach and how work is integrated.</p> <p>The overall HS2 Landscape Design Approach can be found at: <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/550791/HS2_Landscape_Design_Approach_July_2016.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/550791/HS2_Landscape_Design_Approach_July_2016.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Seed mixes</b> JF raised concerns about the appropriateness of the seed mixes to be used. Keen to ensure that they were not out of context.</p> <p>DT confirmed that seed mix would be appropriate to the context, soils and geology and the design needs to draw on local character and species. HS2 is working with contractors to consider appropriate design, but also what the industry can learn for this and future projects. Design development will consider variations of seed mixes to see what will deliver local benefit, that is achievable and is best value for the project.</p> <p><b>HS2 Woodland Fund</b></p> <p>AS raised concerns about the Woodland Grant.</p> <p>AS was concerned that the good heritage work being undertaken on HS2 might be undone by large areas of planting under the scheme.</p> <p>DT confirmed that it was a totally independent process with landowners approaching the FC for funds. The FC then allocate those funds.</p> <p>DT – the FC are managing the fund, as part of that they have responsibility for making sure the planting is managed correctly</p>	DT

	<p>HJW added that the FC are following their usual protocols regarding town planning. HJW noted that FC works were beyond the redline so we had no 'jurisdiction'.</p> <p>AS knows that HS2 don't 'approve' works, but sought reassurance about the interaction and information exchange between HS2 and the FC.</p> <p>DT clarified that HS2 and the FC were in contact about the wider context. FC understand the broad strategic goals and will be responsible for managing grant applications on a site-by-site basis. DT confirmed that there was with FC regarding character and species content and local context driven design.</p> <p>HJW added that there is internal communication and that our information is available.</p> <p>TA agreed that this is how this aspect is expected to work.</p> <p><b>Design process and local context</b></p> <p>SK stated that it was a very encouraging presentation, but sought more information about the design process in specific locations? How do HS2 marry design works with all the local strategies and partnerships? He noted that the works in the Colne Valley a complex environment and that the design process included historic landscape character and the archaeological investigations.</p> <p>SK was concerned as to whether HS2 was providing a contextually significant response.</p> <p>DT confirmed that the designers working in each area are responding to all the stakeholder pressures, seeking resolution. It is an iterative design process</p> <p>Earthworks for example was an evolving picture as we do not yet know the volume of material to be generated. There is ongoing dialogue between many stakeholders external and internal.</p> <p>SK asked about (external) stakeholder engagement, noting HE's involvement in the Colne Valley group for example. How do HS2 marry design works with all the local strategies and partnerships?</p> <p>HS2 is not the designer but manages the design process, ensuring that design responds to the ES, commitments under the HS2 Act standards and a sense of place which conforms to the Landscape Design Approach.</p> <p>DT explained that it is part of a staged design process: HS2 ensure designers respond to the context and they also consult the communities and landowners.</p> <p>DT highlighted the internal structured gateways in the design process where contractors present their developing designs and the various factors that have been included. These designs are discussed and then either signed-off or sent back for further development.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>EH noted that SK continued to be involved in the ongoing archaeological works, as an external stakeholder.</p> <p><b>Grim's Ditch</b></p> <p>PM asked about landscape proposals regarding Grim's Ditch: he had been surprised recently by the extent of earthworks proposed near the monument. CW confirmed that he had not seen detailed design regarding landscaping. DT surprised they had not had contact with EK, but noted that the design in that location was developing, as the engineering stage was not yet complete. PM confirmed that he was aware of bridge design and significant earthworks.</p> <p>DT explained that there was a need to resolve earthworks before can fix absolute landscape design, and that HS2 was awaiting Notice to Proceed before next stage, which is detailed design.</p> <p>NS highlighted that the P1 Hist Env team was involved in the IDR process where we can table issues and get responses from designers. We are awaiting more definitive earthwork drawings/ engage with engineers and awaiting next design stage.</p> <p>NS confirmed that the landscape design is included for comment/discussion within Schedule 17 pre-application discussions with the LPA, which are ongoing and will continue.</p> <p>CW stressed the need for HE involvement in the earthworks design for Grim's Ditch.</p> <p>NS confirmed that he continues to be aware of this requirement.</p> <p><b>Hartwell House</b></p> <p>CW also noted Hartwell House and the landscape works required there. DT confirmed that Schedule 17 pre-app discussion with AVDC, notably the landscape officer, was underway and will continue.</p> <p>DT noted that landscape gives the vision to the engineering but until the line is fixed the landscape response cannot be. The Scheme Design stage is anticipated by the end of the year. Detailed design will be developed after Notice To Proceed is issued.</p> <p>PM raised that the NT's archaeologist had not been consulted.</p> <p>NS noted that the NT has separate requirements and so there is regular dialogue.</p> <p><b>ACTION: NS to follow up NT involvement and report back to PM.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative mitigation</b></p> <p>JF offered that the group didn't understand indicative mitigation and Bringing Into Use and explained about final landscape design and BIU discussions that are being had at the Planning Forum.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>TA clarified that indicative mitigation with engineering design was to assist understanding and approvals.</p> <p>TA explained that BIU is a planning consent that says LPAs have seen and approved all expected mitigation at that stage and is compliant with the Act. In the intervening period between engineering approvals and BIU HS2 will have provided detailed landscape mitigation proposals.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> circulate link to relevant Planning Forum Note on indicative mitigation</p> <p><b>Link attached</b>  <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/657207/pfn10_indicative_mitigation.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/657207/pfn10_indicative_mitigation.pdf</a></p>	
3	<p><b>Contractor reporting to LPAs</b></p>	HS2
	<p><b>Availability of reports/SharePoint</b></p> <p>MC reiterated the use of the Heritage Sub-group SharePoint site for the posting of final reports.</p> <p><a href="https://highspeedtwo.sharepoint.com/sites/stakeholders/hsg/SitePages/Home.aspx">https://highspeedtwo.sharepoint.com/sites/stakeholders/hsg/SitePages/Home.aspx</a></p> <p>SB noted that she used to get notifications when reports were uploaded, but doesn't now.</p> <p>MC /CJ confirmed that these had been turned off at the request of Sub-group members who found them annoying.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> CJ to circulate guidance on how to set your own notifications.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> SB to send round an update to HER officers to make them aware of reports</p> <p><b>Programme updates</b></p> <p>PM stated that regular updates would be useful to the LPA officers so that they are aware of works; he suggested that a version of what the supply chain provides to HS2 might work?</p> <p>MC noted that the supply chain reports HS2 receive are contractual and probably don't contain the information being sought but he will look into what can be provided to LPAs.</p> <p>NS confirmed that he would provide information to support LPAs in their non-HS2 planning work.</p> <p>NS noted that there had been considerable programme changes and much of the anticipated investigation works had been reprogrammed. He acknowledged that it would be helpful for the LPAs to be aware of that.</p>	

	<p><b>ACTION:</b> MC to develop an LPA report.</p> <p><b>Survival of the archaeological resource</b></p> <p>SK asked how the survival of the archaeological resource, within the redline was being captured. This would allow the resource to be managed in the future and how we know what has been looked at and what not excavated.</p> <p>CJ explained that our data schemas will record archaeological work. HS2’s asset information management system (AIMS) has an asset class to record preserved archaeological sites, to link with the future operator.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> MC to add this item to discussions with SB about HER needs.</p> <p><b>Schedule 17</b></p> <p>CW highlighted that in recent Schedule 17s there had been little reference to historic environment works beyond a reference to the work undertaken for the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>SB noted that the information coming forward in the Schedule 17 applications was improving.</p> <p>MC acknowledged that there needed to be appropriate references to assist decision-making.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> HS2 to remind town planners and supply chain again, to ensure that work planned, ongoing or complete is included in the applications.</p>	
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>ADS scoping exercise</b></p>	<p>HS2</p>
	<p>Been instructing Contractors on how to fill in OASIS forms. Digital archiving - ADS are entering an SLA with HS2. Also updating the Digital Archive Procedure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ LAM: can our standards be provided to feed into county level standards.</li> </ul> <p>CJ provided an update on the work that ADS is undertaking regarding digital data.</p> <p>AS asked if reports were to be embargoed before it goes into the public domain.</p> <p>MC confirmed that in the majority of cases no embargo would be required, but there may need to be exceptions and where these were considered appropriate then this would be discussed with the relevant LPA.</p> <p>SB noted that there was still some confusion in the supply chain about how they should upload HS2 works to OASIS. She will send through the list (there are not many).</p>	

	<p><b>ACTION: SB to send list</b></p> <p>CJ confirmed that ADS had also trawled the system to identify duplications or incorrect uploads and that work to resolve this was in hand.</p> <p>LAM concern that the ADS was not sufficiently focused on the contractors' needs, that the ADS was too academic in focus and the way it supported engagement/interaction with contractors.</p> <p>LAM said that HS2 should be considering how HS2 can move forward digital archiving in the industry. Uniformity of standards between counties and the ADS would be a good outcome.</p> <p>LAM noted Contractors concerns at cost of uploading to ADS. Feels that ADS need revisit their guidance and be clear as to what is required for upload – being more selective.</p> <p>LAM noted the forthcoming Dig Ventures work on the data management. <a href="https://digventures.com/projects/digital-archives/">https://digventures.com/projects/digital-archives/</a></p> <p>JW noted that data management plans were an element of the Dig Ventures work with contractors identifying what is significant about data and follow it through the process through the Data Management Plans.</p> <p><b>ACTION: HS2 to discuss with HE to be more informed about the Dig Ventures work. What is the test run that Northants and Albion are doing? What can HS2 learn?</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: HS2 to meet with LAM to discuss ADS, county standards and lessons learned.</b></p> <p>HJW noted that as part of their work, the ADS is/will be talking to contractors and can talk to stakeholders.</p>	
5	<b>Investigating archaeological incidents</b>	HS2
	<p>NS provided a detailed overview of the incident reporting system, using the Northants incident as an example.</p> <p>JF asked if HS2 accepted all of the recommendations?</p> <p>NS confirmed that HS2 has worked with Fusion and accepts their results. NS noted that the procedure is ok, it was just not followed. There needs to be an increased emphasis on the assurance process from HS2. HS2 needs to see the evidence of its application.</p> <p>LAM would have liked to have known about the 'investigation' work earlier and considered that curators were more used to dealing with these issues. Had HS2, for example, reviewed the earthwork drawings? LAM would have requested that. Although noted that the works were a county scheme and she had not been consulted by her county colleagues.</p>	

<p>LAM considered that another pair of more experienced eyes would have prevented this occurrence.</p> <p>NS accepted that LAM should have been involved earlier, in the reporting of the Level 4 incident. Something that needs to be considered by the HS2 team in terms of how engagement can be added.</p> <p>NS confirmed that communication across all parties was being looked at.</p> <p>TA noted that the procedures are Fusions. He asked if those procedures would be cascaded to other EWCs and the MWCC.</p> <p>NS confirmed that this is so.</p> <p>TA highlighted the 3<sup>rd</sup> party contractor going into administration and the risk assessment of that failure should go up a step in the management chain. If HS2 knows that a supplier has gone then there should be an audit.</p> <p>TA suggested that this sort of contractor administration issue should prompt an assessment of environmental procedures.</p> <p>TA asked if the lessons learned will be cascaded to other EWC contractors and the MW contractors.</p> <p>NS confirmed that this is automatically provided to the other contractors through HORACE.</p> <p>JF noted that there should be regular credit checks third party contractors.</p> <p>NS noted that this was Fusion responsibilities.</p> <p>JF suggested that HS2 can take back and discuss with commercial team and feed back to the group.</p> <p>This view was noted.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> this is beyond the remit of the HS-G.</p> <p><b>Decision Record Notices</b></p> <p>SK raised the involvement of LPAs in the HS2 'decision record notice', so that they can be consulted on what is in and out of scope. SK considered that there should be earlier engagement</p> <p>NS noted that as works were progressing the DRN process was being refined and improved.</p> <p>AH noted that the Area North team had started to involve stakeholders in the DRN process. AS said that recent meetings had highlighted where mitigation work should occur. This is being cascaded to the other Area teams.</p> <p>JH highlighted that as works progressed to investigation/ recording (mitigation), that a more formal process for discussion on DRNs had developed.</p>	
--	--

	<p>CW asked if there was an overall plan of where all historic environment works were proposed?</p> <p>MC noted that the digital platform, once populated, would help, although the receipt and processing of data to put onto Gviewer has been slow.</p> <p><b>LEMPS</b></p> <p>AS asked if LPAs saw the LEMPS.</p> <p>HJW noted that they were relatively high-level documents.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> HS2 to update the group regarding LEMPS.</p> <p>Post meeting note: the link to published LEMPs is:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-environmental-management-plans-for-hs2-phase-one">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-environmental-management-plans-for-hs2-phase-one</a></p> <p>The CoCP sets out the purpose of the LEMPs, notably section 4.2.  <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/593592/Code_of_Construction_Practice.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/593592/Code_of_Construction_Practice.pdf</a></p>	
6	<p><b>Archive Strategy</b></p> <p>HJW explained that the draft Strategy would be uploaded to SharePoint for Heritage Sub-group review and comments shortly.</p>	HS2
7	<p><b>Recent discoveries</b></p> <p>Areas North, Central and South presented on recent works.</p>	
	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>Next meeting: December Birmingham,  HS2 Snow Hill offices, 12<sup>th</sup> December</p> <p><b>Proposed focus: Contractor roundup</b></p>	