

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>CC regarding traffic management issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Forum Notes PFN 7 (Bringing Into Use) and 10 (Indicative Mitigation). Comments received from Herts CC regarding PFN 7 but no other comments were received. • Planning Forum Notes 15 and 16 (Pier and Parapet CDEs) were circulated on 16 July 2019. • HS2 Ltd to provide clarification on the circumstances where a derogation of the relevant rural fencing standard could be allowed. This is an ongoing action until position is clarified internally. <p>Action: HS2 to update at next Planning Forum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A list of HS2 Interface Managers was circulated 17 September 2019. • ■ (Chair) updated the Forum on meeting with Mark Thurston (HS2 CEO) that included discussion of Service Level Agreements. • ■ (HS2) confirmed that Local Authority costs for attending the Independent Design Panel will be paid when the meeting relates to work requiring Schedule 17 approval and thus is part of the pre-application process. • Comments received regarding the proposed complaints reporting dashboard are to be discussed under item 7 on the agenda. 	<p>HS2</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Phase 1 Construction Update</p> <p>■, HS2 ■ gave an update on Phase 1-wide milestones and progress.</p> <p>Designs for the automated people mover (ATM) at Birmingham Interchange have been unveiled. The ATM will connect the HS2 Interchange Station with Birmingham Airport, Birmingham International Station and the NEC.</p> <p>The Government has announced the Oakervee review.</p> <p>The Main Works Civils contracts now have the authority to proceed with advanced critical works, detailed design and the procurement of long-lead items.</p> <p>Birmingham Curzon Street Station procurement has been paused while there is a review of approach. However, Old Oak Common is now out of legal challenge and is moving forward following the contract being awarded to Balfour Beatty Vinci Systra (BBVS).</p> <p>■ (HS2) gave an overview of works in progress in the three Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Area South, work surrounding Euston station continues. Utilities works are due to commence in October on the west side of the station. Work continues on Euston Station design review and feedback has been received that is being used to inform the design process. • In Area Central, the procurement of the TBM power supply is ongoing. The haul road is under construction at Great Missenden. Work on 	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>Chipping Norton relief road had been paused but has now been picked up by the contractor, Buckingham Group, who have mobilized on site. Excavation works continue on the Boddington heave trial cutting to determine ground conditions and validate computer models. A video was played to the Forum showing work in progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Area North, highways works to the A452 and A4438 associated with Birmingham Interchange Station are due for completion in early August 2019. Early works have commenced on the M42 and A446 and the construction of HS2 trace bridges is planned to start early in 2020. At Curzon Street Station Laing Murphy have completed archaeological excavations at Park Street. 	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Urban Integration</p> <p>██████████ HS2 ██████████ and ██████████ HS2 ██████████ introduced themselves. ██████████ (HS2) gave a presentation describing how HS2 and its physical effect on urban areas can present opportunities for place making, regeneration and as a positive way to meet the challenges of the future. ██████████ (HS2) went on to describe the principles that the team will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HS2 plans positive change through what it delivers but also what the design of the railway can do to enable opportunities and be a catalyst for growth. The design process is informed by the integration of surface transport in urban areas as far as possible within the scope of the project and the powers in the HS2 Act ██████████ (HS2) presented Manchester and the London Olympics as examples of where change or disruption can present opportunities to regenerate and reconnect parts of cities and of how design can be a catalyst for growth. Application of urban design principles is key to connecting HS2 with the surrounding urban form. Engagement between HS2 and local authorities through the plan-making process was encouraged. <p>██████████ (CDC & SBDC) asked if urban design statements are submitted as part of the Schedule 17 process.</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) confirmed Design and Access Statements will include an appropriate level of design analysis. ██████████ (HS2) said that Planning Forum Note 3 specifies that Schedule 17 applications for stations and Key Design Elements are to be accompanied by Design and Access Statements. For other submissions the Schedule 17 Written Statement will include a design statement.</p> <p>██████████ (CDC & SBDC) questioned whether structures in CDC and SBDC will be considered as part of urban integration. ██████████ (HS2) replied that the focus is on urban corridors and urban edges. If members of the Forum had areas in mind</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>where the urban integration approach might be appropriate, this would be considered.</p> <p>■ (HS2) said that an example of the how the approach to urban integration works is Old Oak Common Station where the design has been informed by opportunities that exist in the area surrounding the station, from major development around the station to small interventions that are particularly meaningful to local communities.</p> <p>Action: HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Local Authority Feedback</p> <p>■ (HCC) said that a Schedule 17 submission was approved for a bund that subsequently has been found to require relocation to accommodate utilities, thus necessitating a revised submission. This duplication is unfortunate.</p> <p>■ (HS2) said that coordination between contractors and across administrative boundaries of large applications has been taken on board and HS2 is taking up this issue with contractors. ■ (HS2) added that there will be situations where design will be changed following Sch 17 approval. However, every effort is taken to avoid having to do so.</p> <p>■ (HCC) questioned how HS2 plans to track information from local authorities on indicative mitigation between contractors? ■ (HS2) replied stating that communication between contracts is an ongoing important issue for HS2. LPAs can assist the process by referring to their responses to consultation on indicative mitigation in Informatives attached to Schedule 17 decision notices.</p> <p>■ (HS2) suggested that PFN9 be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to amend PFN9 to include a note to LPAs to add references to indicative mitigation responses as Informatives to Schedule 17 decision notices.</p> <p>■ (Chair) raised the issue of pre-application meetings needing to involve all authorities in respect to Schedule 17 approvals which cross administrative boundaries. ■ (HS2) confirmed that he has raised this with all contractors.</p> <p>■ (SNC) questioned whether HS2 communication had been addressed following archaeological mitigation having not been completed in respect of road development at Chipping Warden. ■ (Chair) confirmed that a presentation was given at the Heritage Sub-group meeting during which communication was discussed and there has been a report detailing ways to avoid the issue occurring again. ■ (Chair) suggested that an environmental audit be undertaken in circumstances where a contractor has gone into administration.</p> <p>■ (WCC) said that there had been a failure to properly co-ordinate the distribution of information to the two local authorities relating to Sch 4 submissions at Burton Green, on the administrative boundary between Solihull</p>	<p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>and Warwickshire. ■ (HS2) said he would raise with highways colleagues.</p> <p>■ (WCC) also said that phasing and sequencing of works has led to concerns regarding lorry routes, where one contract required the closure of a route required by another HS2 contractor. ■ (HS2) requested details and said that this issue would be raised with highways colleagues.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to raise co-ordination of highways notifications and sequencing of works within highways team.</p> <p>■ (CDC & SBDC) said that some plans received have been too technical and an application has been accompanied by engineering drawings that are difficult for residents to interpret. Another submission had a section plan missing.</p> <p>■ (CDC & SBDC) said that Align’s engagement with residents in particular the ‘you said we did’ approach was to be commended and should be followed by other contractors.</p> <p>■ (NWDC) said that there had been a number of compounds with high material stockpiles that are going to be in situ for in excess of 12 months. In such circumstances the Class Approval requires that the LPA be engaged and reasonable regard had to their comments. ■ (NWDC) said the Contractor had suggested that the engagement had not happened as an NDA had not been signed. Furthermore, the scale of the stockpiles is in excess of what had been expected.</p> <p>■ (HS2) confirmed that the Council should have been engaged on temporary spoil stockpiles in accordance with the Class Approval and requested that further details be provided so that it can be followed up. If references to the NDA had been made in the context of engagement under the Class Approval, this was not correct.</p> <p>Action: ■ (HS2) to raise the need for engagement under the Class Approval with all contractors.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Common Design Elements Update</p> <p>■ (BBV) presented an overview of the line-side noise barrier Common Design Element proposal as set out in the draft Planning Forum Note circulated to the Planning Forum for comment on 13 September.</p> <p>■ (Chair) invited ■ (AVDC) to comment on the proposals. ■ (AVDC) raised the issue of the reverse side of noise barriers being visible in some locations and therefore the design of the inside face being relevant. ■ (AVDC) also said that ‘where appropriate’ will be subject of considerable discussion.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update to the Planning Forum Note.</p>	<p>HS2</p>

	<p>The Forum noted that positive progress had been made with the lineside noise barrier CDE proposal. HS2 was asked to consider whether points at which ‘where appropriate’ is stated within PFN17 could be replaced with ‘as agreed’ or similar.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to consider opportunities within PFN17 to replace ‘where appropriate’ with ‘as agreed’ or similar.</p> <p>██████████, HS2 ██████████ presented the strategy and material that HS2 proposes to use in order to engage communities on Common Design Elements (as required by Information Paper D1).</p> <p>█ (HS2) presented example drawings of CDEs that are to be included within the engagement material, and described the CDE engagement objectives, engagement methodology (booklets, website content, links to common place sites, and tailoring presentations to audiences) and optional elements of CDEs (e.g. in the case of parapets on over-bridges a pattern maybe specified on the inside face).</p> <p>█ (HS2) said that the CDE engagement approach will recognise that people may have different priorities depending on their location (e.g. in urban transport corridors or in rural settings). Responses can be provided via mail, paper forms at events and by completing an online survey.</p> <p>█ (HS2) said that the next steps are to finalise the engagement material and begin a four-week engagement period.</p> <p>There were the following comments and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was requested that images show fencing and landscaping. • Images could illustrate what the railway will look like at ground level. • Design of handrails, access steps was raised. • Consider expanding selection of images (e.g. over-bridge in a cutting) • Consider giving the opportunity for respondents to rank on a scale of 1-5 the importance of a statement or question relating to the CDEs. • There was a request for at least one week’s notice to LAs before issue of engagement material. <p>█ (HS2) said that having heard HS2’s proposed engagement strategy, HS2 would like to ask the Forum if it is content that public engagement on the three Common Design Elements (line-side noise barriers, viaduct piers and bridge and viaduct parapets) can proceed.</p> <p>█ (Chair) questioned whether there is a need for another CDE Working Group given the general agreement expressed during the meeting and asked if there was consensus that the proposals had reached a sufficient stage for HS2 to proceed towards public engagement.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
--	--	------------

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>It was agreed that it would be beneficial if HS2 could circulate all the draft Planning Forum Notes dealing with CDEs again.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to re-circulate latest versions of all three draft CDE Planning Forum Notes (NB. These were originally circulated to the Planning Forum for comment on 13/09/2019 (PFN17) and 16/07/2019 (PFN 15 & 16))</p> <p>Action: LPAs to respond with any final comments within 2 weeks.</p> <p>■ (Chair) suggested that any outstanding comments on the draft Planning Forum Notes could be addressed in parallel with the CDE public engagement consultation stage. ■ (Chair) said that if there are any major issues raised by LPAs, there was an opportunity for HS2 to discuss with the Forum.</p> <p>It was agreed by the Forum that the engagement on CDE proposals can progress.</p> <p>It was agreed that it would be beneficial to explore developing Common Design Elements for handrails, lineside access steps and fencing (noting that the design of fencing is not a matter for approval under Schedule 17).</p> <p>■ (HS2) summarised the next steps: HS2 will progress with public engagement and feed back the results to the Forum together with any proposed amendments to the CDE proposals arising from the engagement responses. Following that, HS2 will seek the Forum’s approval to the finalised Common Design Elements.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to proceed with the public engagement on the basis of the designs as they are set out in the draft PFNs.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to consider how to progress the suggested additional CDEs (handrails, access steps and fencing) as a separate workstream and present to the Forum at a future meeting.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>LPAs</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Community Engagement and Helpdesk Update</p> <p>■, HS2 ■ gave a Community Engagement and Helpdesk Update.</p> <p>The number of helpdesk contacts increased to August (24,000 contacts to August compared with 27,000 for 2018). There have been 400 complaints received in the year to the end of August (Phases 1 and 2), 94% of which relate to Phase 1. 96% of complaints were responded to within 20 working days.</p> <p>■ (HS2) cited works at Breakspear Road as an example of where HS2 had sought to respond to complaints from the local community by postponing further scheduled road closures.</p> <p>■ (HS2) thanked the Forum for comments received on the Draft Local Authority Report.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (TRDC) said that there had been insufficient notification on Common Place of works at the Chiltern Tunnel South portal construction site. ■ (HS2) agreed to contact the relevant local team to discuss notifications and Common Place.</p> <p>Action: HS2 ■ to review notifications on Common Place.</p> <p>The Forum requested that the next update be specific to Phase 1.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Planning Forum Notes Update</p> <p>■ (HS2) summarised the status of draft Planning Forum Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 issued a proposed amendment to Planning Forum Note 4 (Consultation on Requests for Approval) on 24 September, for comments by 15 October. • Planning Forum Note 6 (Appendix A: conditions on lorry route approvals). There is now an appeal being determined at which the appropriateness of conditions to a lorry route approval is the point at issue. HS2 would therefore prefer not to take this document forward until the appeal is determined: it might be that the current draft of Appendix A requires alteration to reflect the outcome of the appeal. The Forum agreed that the note should not be progressed for the time being. • Planning Forum Note 7 (Bringing Into Use). HS2 has accommodated HCC comments and the proposed revisions were being reviewed by main works contractors. Further comments were requested by 4 October. • Forum Notes 15, 16 and 17 (Parapets, Piers and Noise Barrier Common Design Elements) final comments are required by 10/10/2019 (as noted under item 6 on the agenda). 	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Forward Plan/ AOB</p> <p>The following agenda items were agreed for November Planning Forum:</p> <p>November 21st (Snow Hill)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Design Elements. • Local Authority feedback. • Update on project from Infrastructure Director. • Landscape strategy. • Activities at Sub-groups update. <p>■ (Chair) said that a question had been raised at Highways Sub-group as to whether highways works under construction would be completed, or the works reinstated, in the event that the project was cancelled following the Oakervee review, which ■ (Chair) intended to raise with Douglas Oakervee.</p> <p>Action: ■ (Chair) to write to Douglas Oakervee seeking clarification regarding highways projects that are underway.</p>	<p>Chair</p>