Phase One Planning Forum – Heritage Sub-Group Meeting Notes – 15th September 2020

Date & time:	15 th September 2020: 14.00-16.00
	MS Teams: Virtually
eB ref	PH1-HS2-HS2-EV-MRC-000-000002
Chair:	HS2
	Presentations provided

ltem	Торіс	Lead
1	Welcome and introductions Values moment	Chair
2	Schedule 17	
	 HS2 updated the group on the Court of Appeal LB Hillingdon judgement, providing an overview, noting the following: There was more continuity than change and doesn't change the fundamentals. The judgement alters the way the law operates and HS2 will be following that. 	
	ACTION: HS2 to send link to the judgement, notably para 11.	
	HS2 is awaiting the DfT's revision of the Statutory Guidance The Planning Forum Notes will be updated in due course.	
	For any applications that are live or in pre-application, then the onus is on the LPA to flag whether they need further information to make a decision, what that comprises and why it is needed. HS2 will then come back with questions – not to be difficult but to understand requirements collaboratively.	
	The EMRs still apply, it is the planning regime that is altered.	
	PG asked that any questions on this matter be referred to the HS2 Town Planning team or the Contractors Town Planning teams.	
	Questions and discussion JF: Is there a time limit on challenge to decision?	
	PG: Yes. HS2 has lodged application to challenge at Supreme Court (so we don't time out). As yet there is no decision to challenge yet.	
	CW highlighted that there are live applications, and at pre- application discussion. Wording still at pre-appeal court. What kind of response at this stage do you think would be appropriate.	

	PG considered that it would be on a case by case, for example a recent request for ecology information and subsequent conversations between parties.	
	PG agreed to have a detailed discussion with CW.	
	CW noted that the LPAs needed to consult their own specialist advisors.	
	JF stated that this entire issue had been discussed at Planning Forum.	
3	Community Engagement	
	IA outlined the ongoing community engagement approach during the pandemic	
	Questions and discussion AS: What is HS2 position in light of site visits after Covid 19, e.g. at Coleshill Hall, where there is considerable interest? Are 'events' like open days still being planned?	
	Is there a framework in place for what can happen if we can get back out on site?	
	IA: we are actively considering how we get back to face-to-face engagement. We have to think about best sites for visitors. Coleshill would be one of those.	
	JC: noted that physical visits could start to be planned. There are lessons to be learnt from the museum sector. But such visits can only be in place with the right restrictions.	
	ET: highlighted that the medieval landscape at Ruislip would, post- lockdown, be a good opportunity for guided tours, walk through for communities.	
	NM & ML: Asked about the use of video diaries and online/virtual site tours.	
	JC & HW answered that that is a good idea, noting that some of the webinars on HS2 YouTube included site footage.	
	JW: Amazing to hear how many have engaged digitally, and probably more than with site visits. Recognising the importance of a site visit, but celebrating success of webinar numbers is important. Lesson learned moving forward in the industry, new good practice for engagement on big and small projects alike.	
	IA: highlighted the success of video content / recording webinars and putting them on YouTube, e.g. Coleshill had several thousand	

	views. Increasing video content with experts shot on site was	
	something HS2 and its supply chain can increase.	
	MC highlighted the BBC2 documentary.	
	Old Curzon Street Station	
	JM outlined the incident at OCSS regarding the incorrect installation of monitoring equipment and the subsequent damage to the building.	
	HS2 and LM are committed to making it as right as we can.	
	JM confirmed that an investigation is underway and HS2 apologised.	
	JM outlined the initial findings of the investigation and the involvement of HE and BCC.	
	Questions and discussion NM emphasised how bad the damage is. Cosmetically it can be sorted, but it is very disappointing. Acknowledged the efforts that JM had gone to for trying to sort it.	
	CP stated that is was a complete failure of the process with catastrophic result. Another issue with LM, after the failure at Fox and Grapes and raised serious concerns that this was a pattern in the way they managed heritage and their attitude to it.	
	HJW: We all feel the same. Being dealt with at the highest level in HS2 and LM to bottom out the issue.	
	JM confirmed that like HS2, LM have taken it very seriously. LM are currently talking with the conservation specialists to understand the right way to affect the repairs.	
	HJW: investigation covering all of the points raised be HE and BCC.	
	CP said that he would be taking a closer interest in activities, such as weekly site meetings, all we can do is stand over them.	
	JM agreed that there would be closer monitoring and outsight.	
BREAK		
4	Data Management	
	FA presented the data management of the heritage works.	
	Questions and discussion JC asked about nullable fields and a need for discussion/instruction from HS2 to rectify this.	

	Proposed agenda items: 1. Yearly highlights and forward look to 2021
	Next meeting: December
6	AOB
6	Area updates were provided on works by LM, Fusion and CSjv.
5	Area Updates
	MC and SK to meeting to discuss SK's ideas.
	MC said that no other areas beyond HS2 works would be included, but that post excavation work would use relevant wider HER data where necessary.
	SK asked is the data will include excavation area outlines from HS2 and also from non-HS2 projects. Could HER data be included to assist the urban context digitisation?
	SB acknowledged that FA is working hard on getting the data ready to send out.
	AS noted the importance of the data in setting standards and its importance for analysis and in the future.