

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████</p>	<p>Solihull Met Borough Council (SMBC) South Northamptonshire Council (SNC) Lichfield District Council (LDC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Stratford District Council (SDC)</p>
--	---	---

Item		Action Owner
1.	Introductions – were made.	
2.	<p>HS2 Project Update</p> <p>Mark Thurston (HS2 Ltd) introduced himself and thanked the local planning authorities and the HS2 supply chain for their efforts to date, especially during the Covid-19 crisis. He said that he intends to attend Planning Forum more frequently and will most likely be back early next year.</p> <p>MT (HS2) presented some slides on highlights over the past few months: the Oakervee review concluded at the end of last year and this was followed by the backing of the Prime Minister at the start of 2020, which in turn was followed by the formal notice to proceed on 15th April 2020. Notice to proceed took place following the conclusion of Stage One of the Main Works Civils Contracts which are now mobilising.</p> <p>Stations construction partners are now in place for Old Oak Common and Euston and tender documents will be shortly issued for Curzon Street and Interchange stations. Stations designs have received Schedule 17 approval at Curzon Street and Old Oak Common and it is hoped that this will be the case at Interchange soon. At Euston, the new Euston Partnership has been set up in conjunction with DfT and Network Rail, and the first meeting will take place on Monday 27th July.</p> <p>Rolling stock procurement is progressing. Tenders are being assessed and HS2 hope to be in the position to make a recommendation before the end of the year. Pre-qualification work is taking place on the Rail Systems procurement and statements have recently been made on track and OCS design. Systems integration, learning from Crossrail, is an important element of these contracts.</p> <p>Engagement has attracted the attention of the new HS2 Minister Andrew Stephenson. A lot has been going on to ensure that communities and stakeholders are engaged on HS2 works and that any complaints are appropriately dealt with.</p> <p>93% of HS2 sites are operational and suppliers have worked to ensure that work is progressing safely.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>The Community and Environment Fund (CEF) and the Business and Local Economy Fund (BLEF) has awarded £7.14 million to date to help deliver benefits along the route, and further work is on-going in respect of jobs creation.</p> <p>The Phase 2a Select Committee is recommencing and will sit w/c 27th July. Some enabling works packages are in place on this phase to cover the likes of ecology and land and property matters.</p> <p>Phase 2b has received confirmation that the Bill can be prepared for the western leg, with Bill deposit due around the end of 2021. The eastern leg forms part of the integrated rail plan which is being led by the National Infrastructure Commission (NIC). The report on this is due towards the end of the year.</p> <p>The effects of Covid-19 on employment in the UK is recognised by HS2 and there is work going on to look at opportunities to create work and support businesses.</p> <p>MT (HS2) finished his presentation by setting out the strategic case for HS2 in terms of rail capacity, connectivity between conurbations and reduction in carbon emissions.</p> <p><i>Questions were taken:</i></p> <p>■ (SNC) asked about the recent restructure at HS2. MT (HS2) explained that for NTP organisational capability and maturity was required. Project Evolve was established to ensure a new 'asset / contract-based' structure was ready for NTP.</p> <p>■ (WDC) expressed concern that the council were expecting a significant number of pre-application meetings and submissions in six weeks' time, without the resources to deal with them. ■ and ■ (HS2) reassured WDC that the HS2 supply chain will work bilaterally and through the Planning Forum to ensure that local planning authorities are not overwhelmed.</p> <p>■ (NWBC) asked whether there are any charts to accompany the Evolve process so that the local authority would have sight of key contacts. MT (HS2) replied that a list of key contacts can be provided but there has been a lag with charts, however they will be shared with the Planning Forum where relevant. ■ (HS2) reminded the Forum that as shown at the March Planning Forum the contacts for Town Planning have not changed following Evolve. Action: It was agreed to provide the community engagement key contacts for Phase One at the next meeting.</p> <p>■ (BCL) expressed concern about workload and the approach to packaging and phasing of consents in Buckinghamshire. They also expressed concern about coordination between HS2 suppliers. MT (HS2) acknowledge the concerns and agreed that coordination is required to make sure that workload is manageable.</p> <p>Chair raised that internal governance within HS2 may be delaying documents and</p>	<p>HS2</p>
--	---	------------

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>other matters being considered by the Planning Forum. MT (HS2) said that it was not the intention of the project to slow things down and would support understanding and resolving any issues. ■ (HS2) clarified that some governance was still bedding in and that HS2 are seeking to resolve the issues.</p> <p>MT (HS2) closed his agenda item and expressed his desire to come back to the Planning Forum soon. The Chair thanked MT (HS2).</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>Local Authority Feedback and Issues Arising</p> <p>■ (BCL) raised the matter of coordination of repeat comments on design packages and the inefficiency of raising the same points on different packages of work. Specifically, the issue of overengineered designs in the rural context was highlighted.</p> <p>■ (SDC) raised the issue of Schedule 17's conflicting with U&A's and suggested that these matters should be considered before the planning stage. ■ and ■ (HS2) explained that legal advice had been sought and that this would be brought to the Planning Forum. ■ (HS2) made the point that in principle Schedule 17's should not be brought forward that conflict with a U&A, as these should be picked up as part of design assurance.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to share outcome of legal advice with Planning Forum.</p> <p>■ (SNC) noted that the LA support minimising the time spent discussing designs in a request for approval by being more efficient at the pre-app stage, for example allowing more delegation on matters such as security fencing. ■ (SNC) also suggested that rural standards might help to resolve some common design issues.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that the local planning authorities could come forward with common design issues initially. ■ (BCL) explained that a list of issues in Buckinghamshire had already been circulated between local authorities and this could be shared as a starting point. ■ (HS2) agreed that this was a sensible approach. Action: ■ (BCL) to provide issues list to HS2.</p> <p>■ (EKFB) explained that the above issues had been discussed with Buckinghamshire Council and the intention was to respond to them. It was explained that designs are often constrained by HS2 standards and that the derogation process is not as agile as it could be. Action: EKFB to review the above list and provide to HS2 client engineering team.</p> <p>■ (HS2) highlighted that a landscape integration guidance note for balancing ponds and fencing has been provided to the engineers, which does provide some flexibility on standards. Action: Guidance note to be circulated to Planning Forum.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>BCL</p> <p>EKFB</p> <p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>Consents Chart</p> <p>■ (HS2) introduced the consents chart showing the actual submissions in May and June 2020 and the forthcoming MWCC planned Schedule 17 submissions.</p> <p>■ (WDC) and ■ (BCL) expressed that the number of pre-apps was currently a concern. ■ (HS2) acknowledged this, explained that this feedback would be passed on to IPT's and invited local authorities to speak bilaterally with HS2 where there are concerns regarding forthcoming submissions and pre-apps.</p>																			
<p>4.</p>	<p>Review of minutes & actions from last meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the January Planning Forum were agreed, subject to a minor change received from WCC via email.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to place minutes on website, as amended.</p> <p>Outstanding actions were reviewed:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="347 800 1312 1837"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="347 800 837 842">Action</th> <th data-bbox="837 800 1312 842">Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 842 837 951">Design development of OLE to be presented at a future meeting, for information.</td> <td data-bbox="837 842 1312 951">Last presentation Nov-18. Arrange for future meeting – potentially September.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 951 837 1060">HS2 to arrange for the Head of Arts and Culture to attend a future meeting of Forum.</td> <td data-bbox="837 951 1312 1060">Arrange for future meeting.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1060 837 1131">HS2 to circulate a position statement on rural fencing standards.</td> <td data-bbox="837 1060 1312 1131">Update to be provided under item 6.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1131 837 1241">HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.</td> <td data-bbox="837 1131 1312 1241">Urban integration to be presented at a future Planning Forum. Ongoing.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1241 837 1388">Amend PFN9 to include a note to LPAs to add references to indicative mitigation responses as Informatives to Schedule 17 decision notices.</td> <td data-bbox="837 1241 1312 1388">Complete.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1388 837 1514">Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update to the Planning Forum Note.</td> <td data-bbox="837 1388 1312 1514">To be included in next revision of PFN.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1514 837 1661">Consider opportunities within PFN17 to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar.</td> <td data-bbox="837 1514 1312 1661">Updates to Planning Forum Note 17 to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar is being considered.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1661 837 1837">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.</td> <td data-bbox="837 1661 1312 1837">Ongoing. Update to be provided under item 6.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Action	Status	Design development of OLE to be presented at a future meeting, for information.	Last presentation Nov-18. Arrange for future meeting – potentially September.	HS2 to arrange for the Head of Arts and Culture to attend a future meeting of Forum.	Arrange for future meeting.	HS2 to circulate a position statement on rural fencing standards.	Update to be provided under item 6.	HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.	Urban integration to be presented at a future Planning Forum. Ongoing.	Amend PFN9 to include a note to LPAs to add references to indicative mitigation responses as Informatives to Schedule 17 decision notices.	Complete.	Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update to the Planning Forum Note.	To be included in next revision of PFN.	Consider opportunities within PFN17 to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar.	Updates to Planning Forum Note 17 to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar is being considered.	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.	Ongoing. Update to be provided under item 6.	<p>HS2</p>
Action	Status																			
Design development of OLE to be presented at a future meeting, for information.	Last presentation Nov-18. Arrange for future meeting – potentially September.																			
HS2 to arrange for the Head of Arts and Culture to attend a future meeting of Forum.	Arrange for future meeting.																			
HS2 to circulate a position statement on rural fencing standards.	Update to be provided under item 6.																			
HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.	Urban integration to be presented at a future Planning Forum. Ongoing.																			
Amend PFN9 to include a note to LPAs to add references to indicative mitigation responses as Informatives to Schedule 17 decision notices.	Complete.																			
Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update to the Planning Forum Note.	To be included in next revision of PFN.																			
Consider opportunities within PFN17 to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar.	Updates to Planning Forum Note 17 to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar is being considered.																			
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.	Ongoing. Update to be provided under item 6.																			

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	HS2 to include IDRPs comments in a report incorporating all engagement undertaken on CDEs.	Ongoing. Update on CDEs under Item 6.	
	HS2 to circulate CDE Planning Forum Notes three weeks prior to the March Planning Forum, with any proposed amendments highlighted.	Ongoing. Update on CDEs under Item 6.	
	HS2 agreed to set up a separate meeting on the SLA and procedures so the matter is dealt with outside of Planning Forum.	Ongoing.	
	HS2 to circulate revised drafts of PFN 6 (Appendix A) and PFN 7.	Ongoing. Item 8.	
	Bucks C noted a recent lack of community engagement. It was explained that this may be due to Covid-19, but information should still be flowing from contractors. HS2 to take the matter away.	Matter raised with community engagement and relevant IPT.	
	Forecast of Schedule 17's. It was agreed to include the previous month's actual figures on the chart.	Agenda item 3.	
	Query raised by Chair on GPDO Part 4 Note and assurance in respect of EMR and U&A compliance and enforcement through the contracts. Note to be updated to cover this.	Note updated and circulated 17th July 2020.	
	NWBC sought clarity on the number of Part 4 sites in North Warwickshire and also cumulative effects and the trigger for EIA. HS2 to raise the matter with BBV IPT and consider the EIA point further.	GPDO note updated (see above) and matter raised with relevant IPT.	
	SNC and HCC raised a point about spoil balance and suitability of fill material. To be covered by HS2 at the next meeting.	Agenda item 5.	
	Signage strategy for HS2 to be brought Planning Forum at a later date.	For later Planning Forum.	
	HS2 to share tabulated Common Design Elements public engagement report prior to the July Planning Forum meeting.	Update on CDEs under item 6.	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>HS2 to circulate a draft PFN paragraph on Common Design Elements public engagement prior to the July Planning Forum.</p>	<p>Circulated on 11th June 2020.</p>	
	<p>HCC to review the PFN 9 wording on indicative mitigation and feedback to HS2 following the meeting.</p>	<p>Complete.</p>	
	<p>Suggestion that additional meetings could take place on alternative months to cover other items on the agenda, such as community engagement. HS2 take the matter away and feedback.</p>	<p>Meeting cycle to remain unchanged.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Spoil Balance</p> <p>█ (EKFB) presented slides on mass haul in the EKFB IPT geographical area. It was explained that the key drivers are to ensure that the railway can be delivered efficiently, sustainably and in line with the EMRs. It was also explained that mass haul has a role in integrating the railway into the landscape.</p> <p>█ (EKFB) set out the different classes of material, their uses and explained that this material must be balanced and used appropriately. Examples of mass haul plans and associated programmes and design stages were set out by █ (EKFB).</p> <p>█ (EKFB) highlighted that there is an interaction between mass haul and Schedule 17 and that the design process should ensure that there is alignment between approved Sch 17 designs and delivery of earthworks. It was explained that in circumstances where there is change there might be a need to modify or seek new planning consents.</p> <p>█ (SNC) raised the issue of landscape mitigation and future maintenance of this on third party land, more specifically where planting is being used. █ (EKFB) explained that long term mitigation is something that would form part of the agreements with landowners.</p> <p>The Chair asked if borrow pits will be used. █ (EKFB) confirmed that a planning application has been submitted to Oxfordshire County Council and another is likely forthcoming in South Northamptonshire.</p> <p>█ (HS2) reiterated the importance of landscape earthworks and explained that their function is critical to the EMRs. █ also explained that the Nominated Undertaker is obligated to ensure that commitments within the EMRs and U&As are met after the land is handed back to third parties.</p> <p>█ (HCC) said that the council is concerned about the suitability of fill material in their area to ensure EMRs can be met. █ (EKFB) confirmed that this is an important consideration and the right balance needs to be found to ensure</p>		

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	commitments will be met.	
6.	<p>Common Design Elements</p> <p><i>Engagement</i></p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that consultation took place earlier this year with the public and statutory bodies and comments have been summarised in a report. Publication of this report is pending the decision on how to proceed with the designs going forward.</p> <p><i>Design Development</i></p> <p>■ (HS2) clarified that contractual arrangements with IPTs will require HS2 to consider the best delivery approach for common design elements. It was suggested that piers and parapets may proceed separately from noise barriers. It was explained that this may be the best approach to allow noise barriers to be more responsive to their local context. Noise barriers are also the most technically difficult elements to design and assure.</p> <p>In an alternative scenario ■ (HS2) suggested that the CDEs may not formally progress, albeit designs will continue to be informed by the CDE work done to date. It is hoped that a decision will be made on this by the next Planning Forum. Action: HS2 to update at the next Planning Forum.</p> <p><i>Independent Design Panel</i></p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that a meeting took place in November 2019 and a report was issued in early 2020. It was noted however that the report was not as supportive as feedback given at the meeting. It was suggested that another panel meeting may be needed depending on how HS2 decide to proceed with CDEs.</p> <p><i>Status of Planning Forum Notes</i></p> <p>■ (HS2) clarified that the CDE drafts remain largely unchanged. The content of the notes has been informing designs to date and will likely continue to do so.</p> <p><i>Further CDEs</i></p> <p>■ (HS2) suggested that further CDEs are unlikely to come forward mainly due to contractual arrangements and difficulties in collaborative procurement. However, fencing guidance will be shared with the Planning Forum when available and there is potential for footbridges to become a design family but not a formal CDE.</p> <p>■ (HCC) expressed concern that designs discussed to date cannot be progressed and that a coherence and design legacy might be lost. The Chair explained that designs approved under Schedule 17 must be built unless another is submitted</p>	HS2

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>for approval and that enforcement powers can be used if this is not the case.</p> <p>■ (HS2) clarified that if designs are not formally agreed CDEs then there is no change to the Schedule 17 process because the ‘presumption in favor of approval’ will not apply.</p> <p>The Chair expressed that there would be disappointment if the work on piers and parapets was not carried through to a formal CDE. This point was recognised by HS2 given the work to date.</p> <p>■ (Align) highlighted that the Align JV has already sought to adopt much of the commonality set out in the CDE Planning Forum Notes regardless of their status.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>Community Engagement and Helpdesk Update</p> <p>■ (HS2) presented slides on the help desk activity and on complaints. It was explained that the help desk team are working from home and are adopting new ways of working. The number of complaints was set out and it was highlighted that the number has risen mainly due to an increase in works along the route but also due to concerns over sites operating during the Covid-19 situation.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that despite the rise in complaints HS2 has maintained its commitment to handle them, with 97% of complaints responded to within 20 working days. ■ (HS2) set out the complaints by month and category, noting that complaints route-wide have been more generally focused on site operations and traffic and transport.</p> <p>■ (HS2) introduced a new HS2 policy: <i>Unreasonable, Disproportionate and Persistent Complaints Policy</i> which can be found here.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Planning Forum Notes and Appeals Update</p> <p>In respect of PFN 6 Appendix A Conditions on lorry routes and PFN 7 Bringing into Use, ■ (HS2) explained that the proposed revisions are awaiting HS2 governance as a post-NTP change before seeking agreement from the Planning Forum. PFN 6 Appendix A wording will need to be revisited in light of ongoing appeals.</p> <p>■ (HS2) clarified that HS2 intend to re-issue the parapet CDE, pier CDE and line-side noise barrier CDE following the assimilation of CDE engagement responses.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that the Appeals Digest and ‘Key Principles’ document had been reissued to Planning Forum on 17 July and that it will be updated as new decisions are issued.</p> <p>■ (HS2) summarised the current live appeals, noting that there are currently five live appeals, two in LB Camden and three in LB Hillingdon.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

8.	<p>Forward Plan/ AOB</p> <p>Future meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 24th September 2020• 26th November 2020 <p>Meetings will be conducted via Microsoft Teams and kept under review.</p> <p>AOB</p> <p>■ (HS2) raised that the Statutory Guidance had been updated to reflect the new unitary West Northamptonshire Council, as highlighted by SNC. Action: HS2 to provide a link to the guidance.</p> <p>■ (HCC) raised that the council had declared a climate emergency and is drafting sustainability plans. It was questioned how HS2 might fit into this and how the project is responding to the declaration of climate emergencies by local authorities. ■ (HS2) offered a presentation by the HS2 sustainability team at a future meeting. Action: to add to future Planning Forum agenda.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
-----------	---	-------------------------------------