

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	[REDACTED]	Birmingham City Council (Birmingham CC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Lichfield District Council (LDC)
--	------------	--

Item		Action Owner																
1.	Introductions – were made.																	
2.	<p>Review of minutes & actions from last meeting The minutes of the July Planning Forum were agreed.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to place minutes on website.</p> <p>Outstanding actions Actions were reviewed.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Action</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Design development of OLE to be presented at a future meeting, for information.</td> <td>Agenda Item 7.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS2 to arrange for the Head of Arts and Culture to attend a future meeting of Forum.</td> <td>Arrange for future meeting.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS2 to circulate a position statement on rural fencing standards.</td> <td>Status update was provided at July meeting. Ongoing</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.</td> <td>Arrange for future meeting.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update to the Planning Forum Note.</td> <td>To be included in next revision of PFN.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consider opportunities within PFN17 (Noise Barrier CDE) to replace ‘where appropriate’ with ‘as agreed’ or similar.</td> <td>Updates to Planning Forum Note 17 to replace ‘where appropriate’ with ‘as agreed’ or similar is being considered.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>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</td> <td>Ongoing. Update provided at July meeting. Update on CDEs under Item 6.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Action	Status	Design development of OLE to be presented at a future meeting, for information.	Agenda Item 7.	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.	Status update was provided at July meeting. Ongoing	HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.	Arrange for future meeting.	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 (Noise Barrier CDE) 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	Ongoing. Update provided at July meeting. Update on CDEs under Item 6.	HS2
Action	Status																	
Design development of OLE to be presented at a future meeting, for information.	Agenda Item 7.																	
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.	Status update was provided at July meeting. Ongoing																	
HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.	Arrange for future meeting.																	
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 (Noise Barrier CDE) 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	Ongoing. Update provided at July meeting. Update on CDEs under Item 6.																	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	meeting.		
	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 to circulate revised drafts of PFN 6 (Appendix A) and PFN 7.	Update under Item 9.	
	Signage strategy for HS2 to be brought to 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.	
	HS2 to provide the community engagement key contacts for Phase One at the next meeting.	Complete - email circulated 18.09.20	
	HS2 to share outcome of legal advice on Sch 17 and U&A compliance with Planning Forum.	Complete - email circulated 18.09.20	
	Buckinghamshire Council to provide list of common design issues from pre-apps to HS2.	Complete	
	EKFB to review the Buckinghamshire Council issues list and provide response to HS2 client engineering team.	Ongoing	
	HS2 to share landscape integration guidance note for balancing ponds and fencing when available.	Complete - email circulated 18.09.20	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>HS2 to update the Planning Forum on the outcome of the common design elements workstream.</p>	<p>Item 6</p>	
	<p>HS2 to provide a link to the updated Sch 17 Statutory Guidance</p>	<p>Complete – email circulated 07.08.20</p>	
	<p>HS2 to add sustainability and climate change to the next Planning Forum agenda</p>	<p>Email circulated 18.09.20</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>HS2 Project Update</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that capacity in HS2 offices has been increased to around 50%, all within COVID Secure Guidelines and that most sites and contractors are continuing progress whilst operating COVID Secure sites. HS2 has established working groups with the supply chain to plan and prepare for both a second wave and what the future of the industry looks like post-COVID.</p> <p>As of 23 September 2020, HS2 is following the government’s advice and reverting to a default position of working from home where possible. However, offices will remain open for those who need to return to undertake activities which can’t be done at home or may be more easily done in the office.</p> <p>■ (HS2) provided some highlights on HS2 Phase One:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 has doubled the numbers graduates recruited this year in order to support young people’s employment prospects. • An Integrated Project Team handbook has been established which sets out a framework for integrated delivery helping to establish a collaborative culture throughout our supply chain. • Work to prepare London Euston for the construction of HS2 has reached an important milestone with the demolition of the station’s western ramp and canopy. • HS2 has revealed the names of the construction firms in the running to build Birmingham Curzon Street station. The firms have been invited into the invitation to tender stage. • The final design for the Chalfont St Peter headhouse has now been revealed as virtual engagement sessions go live for local communities. • Phase 2a House of Lords Select Committee has resumed hearings following delays due to COVID-19. • HS2’s Old Oak Common has reached a new milestone with the handover to construction partner Balfour Beatty Vinci Systra (BBVS) Joint Venture. • HS2’s first permanent structure, a new road bridge over a section of the M42 has been successfully installed. • Washwood Heath in Birmingham has welcomed the first of over 150 trains that will bring up to 235,000 tonnes of aggregate from quarries in the Peak District over the next four months. 		

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first two HS2 Tunnel Boring Machines (TBM) have been completed in Germany. • ■■■ (HS2) shared some photographs of main civils works across the route. <p>■■■ (WCC) asked whether a geographical breakdown of apprentice recruits could be provided. ■■■ (HS2) stated that this was done for the previous cohort and should be available. Action: HS2 to provide geographical breakdown of apprentice recruits and other relevant HS2 information on employment and jobs.</p> <p>■■■ (HC) said that the Council would like to be informed of the arrival of TBMs and expressed interest in attending the site. ■■■ (HS2) confirmed that just the first cutting head had arrived and Action: committed to speaking to the relevant project manager regarding future arrivals on site and provision of information to local planning authorities.</p> <p>■■■■■■■■■■ (HS2) presented a forecast of Schedule 17s, which includes the planned submission of consent applications based on local authority six-month lookaheads.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Local Authority Feedback & Issues Arising</p> <p>■■■ (Bucks C) expressed concern that IPTs had informed Bucks Council members about Sch 17 matters discussed at formal pre-app and directed members to officers.</p> <p>■■■ (Bucks C) queried whether some statements made by HS2 at engagement events about officers' opinions on emerging designs are consistent with confidentiality agreements in place with local authorities.</p> <p>■■■ (Bucks C) provided an example whereby an IPT had informed the public (at a Webinar) that Bucks C and the AONB review group were broadly supportive of a design. ■■■ (Bucks C) was concerned that comments at pre-app should have been confidential.</p> <p>■■■ (HS2) acknowledged that confidentiality arrangements are very important and that this matter would be raised with the relevant teams. It was requested that specific examples be provided so that they can be followed up. Action: HS2 to raise the matter of LA confidentiality with suppliers.</p> <p>■■■ (Bucks C) raised the matter of IPT discussions with landowners about the hand-back of land. It was requested that IPTs refrain from making promises to landowners before the Schedule 17 process (i.e. Site Restoration) is undertaken with the local planning authority.</p> <p>■■■ (SNC) reiterated the above point, stating that landscape and planting mitigation design is evolving at this current stage. It was highlighted that third-party landowner involvement in these discussions seems to be a grey area but is critical to the future management of the land.</p>	<p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (HS2) explained that under Schedule 17, restoration schemes are agreed with the landowner and the Local Planning Authority. This means that the landowner must be engaged in the design. The matter will be raised with the land and property team and the supply chain.</p> <p>■ (Bucks C) raised the importance of community engagement on designs to provide context on the design journey. This has been especially effective at community forums attended by IPTs. It was requested that the frequency of these types of meetings could be improved.</p> <p>■ and ■ (HS2) acknowledged the importance of getting the above right and asked LPAs to relay local concerns to the relevant town planning or community engagement lead to ensure that HS2 continues to meet its commitments.</p>	
5.	<p>Appeals Update</p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) provided an overview of the Court of Appeal judgment in relation to the Colne Valley wetlands site in Hillingdon.</p> <p>■ (HS2) said that the HS2 planning regime is essentially the same as that employed on the Channel Tunnel Rail Link and Crossrail projects. This regime allows local planning authorities to make decisions on Schedule 17 planning submissions in the absence of some information such as archaeology surveys, because there is already a legal protection in place though the EMRs.</p> <p>The Court of Appeal judgment appeal decision makes it clear that local planning authorities may request that survey information is made available at the point of decision, rather than relying on the EMRs where they reasonably require that information to perform their statutory duty under Schedule 17. The practical reality of how this will work is still being considered.</p> <p>■ (HS2) drew attention to paragraph 11 of the judgement, which highlights that the HS2 planning regime is a streamlined planning process which requires collaboration between parties. As such there is more continuity than change as a result of the appeal.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that the next steps will be for the Department for Transport to update the Schedule 17 Statutory Guidance. It is hoped that this will address any ambiguities and provide a clear position on the practicalities of the outcome. As a result, some Planning Forum Notes may need to be updated in collaboration with the Planning Forum.</p> <p>In the interim ■ (HS2) explained that the planning regime will continue to operate in line with the currently agreed Planning Forum Notes: however if local planning authorities feel that further information is needed, this should be flagged at the earliest opportunity. The need and relevance of the information will need to be discussed on a case by case basis.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (HS2) clarified that the obligations in the Planning Memorandum still stand and emphasized the need for collaborative working to deliver the planning regime in the way intended by parliament. It was made clear that no decision has yet been made by HS2 Ltd on whether to challenge the judgement: however in order to meet the Court’s procedural timescales a request for permission to appeal has been made.</p> <p>■ (DfT) reiterated the above points and confirmed that in their view the judgement does not introduce a validation process. ■ (DfT) also highlighted that the Secretary of State retains the mechanism to determine Schedule 17 applications should a dispute arise.</p> <p>■ (Bucks C) stated that the Council have their own interpretation of the judgment and does not agree that the judgement does not introduce a validation process. ■ (Bucks C) said that in the absence of an agreed position with HS2, the Council will apply this interpretation in their decision making.</p> <p>■ (HS2) summarised the most recent decided appeals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCS lorry routes, Camden. (APP/HS2/4) (25-Aug-20) - Appeal against non-determination (deemed refusal). Conditional approval of alternative route (agreed by HS2) following informal hearing. • SCS lorry routes, Hillingdon (APP/HS2/5) (28-Jul-20) - Appeal against refusal (conditions not accepted by HS2). Appeal upheld. • Euston throat retained cut, Camden (APP/HS2/6) (27-Jul-20) - Appeal against refusal (design of parapet wall). Appeal upheld. <p>Chair highlighted that authorities should use the above appeal decisions as a steer for interpreting the planning regime and applying conditions</p> <p>Action: HS2 to circulate the above appeal decisions to Planning Forum members.</p> <p>■ (HS2) summarised the two live appeals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colne Valley Viaduct (Hillingdon) (APP/HS2/7) - Appeal against non-determination (deemed refusal) • West Ruislip Portal (Hillingdon) (APP/HS2/8) - Appeal against conditions <p>Action: Appeals digest and key principles to be circulated in due course.</p> <p>■ (NWBC) asked whether appeals were chargeable under the HS2 Service Level agreement. ■ (HS2) explained that this issue would need to be clarified by the third-party agreements team to check if it would be considered a ‘new burden’.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to feedback on whether appeals are chargeable under the Service Level Agreement.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
--	--	----------------------------------

<p>6.</p>	<p>Common Design Elements Update</p> <p>██████████ (HS2 ██████████) explained that an internal meeting had been held to take stock of the potential benefits of CDEs, consider the challenges and evaluate whether the CDEs ought to be progressed.</p> <p>It has been decided to continue with all three CDEs, recognising that the noise barrier CDE may take longer to mature.</p> <p>This is in line with HS2’s previous intent as discussed with the Planning Forum and recognises the benefits in helping to give HS2 a route-wide identity and reducing design, testing and maintenance costs.</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) set out the intention to finalise the Piers and Parapets CDE PFNs as soon as practical. The key remaining actions are to issue HS2’s response to the comments received from the public engagement process, and complete HS2’s change control process. The noise barrier CDE will take longer to mature as a number of technical assurance issues remain to be resolved.</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) explained that the HS2 response to the public engagement exercise carried out in early 2020 will be finalised and made public, with specific reports also issued to each authority. Design Development for noise barriers is likely to be led by the individual MWCCs, with the emphasis being in EKFB and BBV areas given the geographical distribution of noise barrier implementation.</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) said that a fencing ‘common design approach’ will continue to come forward and will be shared with Planning Forum when appropriate. The Chair noted that handrails have also been previously discussed. ██████████ (HS2) stated that these will not be Common Design Elements but there are potential commonalities in designs coming forward which may be shared, such as recent work underway on footbridges.</p> <p>██████████ (HCC) expressed concern about coordination of noise barrier designs if they are to be taken forward by individual MWCCs.</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) explained that SCS have developed noise barrier designs and submitted a design for Schedule 17 approval which is in line with the draft noise barrier CDE. SCS have overcome a key engineering challenge regarding vibration in these designs, which has been easier given the short length of barrier in the SCS contract area. ██████████ (HS2) set out that the same issue will require a different approach in other areas (EKFB and BBV) where the barrier length and conditions are different.</p> <p>██████████ (Weston Williamson) explained that the remaining technical noise barrier issues will continue to be worked on by the more advanced MWCCs so they can pass this knowledge onto the other MWCCs as they are resolved. The designs will continue to be developed in the spirit of the CDE.</p>	
-----------	--	--

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (Bucks C) was supportive of the approach and noted that the work to date has not been wasted given the progress they are having with EKFB. It was questioned whether conditions could be applied to noise barriers, for texturing etc. ■ (HS2) confirmed that conditions could be applied on texturing given its relevance to design and advised that Statutory Guidance provides guidance on applying conditions.</p> <p>■ (HCC) and ■ (NWBC) highlighted that the devil is in the detail on design matters and BN (Bucks C) explained that many ‘common design’ issues have been discussed on a recurring basis and are on their list circulated after the July Planning Forum. ■ (HS2) noted these points and agreed that detail is important.</p> <p>Action: Public engagement report to be edited to split out piers and parapets and noise barriers to reflect the differing timescales.</p> <p>■ noted the lengthy delay in progressing the CDEs and hoped the Planning Forum Notes for Piers and Parapets could now be expedited.</p> <p>Action: Update on the ‘issuing’ of the piers and parapets CDE PFNs to be provided at the next Planning Forum</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Overhead Catenary System</p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) showed slides illustrating the V360 (SNCF) overhead catenary system and set out the contents of the contract works information and procurement timescales.</p> <p>■ (HS2) set out the benefits of the V360 OCS system and shared diagrams and photographs to display the appearance of the system; such as masts, portal frames and options for the position of the negative feeder conductor. It was explained that the selected SNCF design is much less intrusive than the standard Network Rail designs.</p> <p>■ (HS2) provided a summary of the aesthetic design considerations in the OCS works information and highlighted the importance HS2 is placing on design and engagement particularly where the railway will have more impact.</p> <p>It was explained that the standard OCS designs may need more attention in areas where a bespoke approach is more appropriate. The Colne Valley Viaduct was provided as a recent example.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that in the works information these areas are the 27 key design elements (set out in Information Paper D1) supplemented with four additional sites called Environmentally Sensitive Worksites: Colne Valley, Chilterns AONB, Bernwood Forest, Radstone and Helmdon disused railway.</p> <p>In addition, the works information includes the Chiltern AONB Panel Detailed Design Principles and it expected that the contractor will follow this guidance.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (HS2) set out the engagement process for the three stages of design and highlighted that engagement will take place with the Design Panel and the Planning Forum.</p> <p>■ (HS2) set out the procurement timeline as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-Qualification – Started • ITT Issue – Q1 2021 • Evaluation period – Q4 2021 – Q1 2022 • Contract Award – Q2 2022 <p>■ (NCC) asked whether there are plans to engage with residents. ■ (HS2) explained that exchanges have been had with the South Northants HS2 Alliance but there are no further plans.</p> <p>■ (HCC) expressed that some areas of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link are unsightly and have been affected by the weather. ■ (HS2) noted these comments and explained that span lengths and heights are improved with the current SNCF design, to reduce arcing etc. ■ (HCC) asked about noise impacts. ■ (HS2) explained that line tension and train pantograph performance are two areas which can lead to noise impacts. HS2 is seeking to reduce impacts through good design in these areas.</p> <p>■ (NWBC) asked about how Environmentally Sensitive Worksites were identified. ■ (HS2) explained that these sites that are identified in the Environmental Memorandum, were selected due to their landscape sensitivity. Chair confirmed that the Planning Forum were consulted on the document at the Bill stage.</p> <p>■ (SNDC) asked whether the slides could be shared with a local liaison group. ■ (HS2) agreed with the principle but that the content might need to be adjusted for the audience. Action: Details regarding slides for South Northants liaison group to be arranged offline.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Helpdesk Update</p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) provided an update on the helpdesk. It was explained that there has been a steady increase in contacts since May. In August 56% of enquires were about Phase One; approximately one third of these relating to land and property issues and 15% were construction related. It was also noted that there has been an increase in enquires about apprenticeships and archaeology following recent broadcast of the HS2 archaeology documentary.</p> <p>It was highlighted that complaints have risen in August and September mainly due to a road closure in Burton Green. A virtual public meeting is scheduled at the end of September.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (HS2) presented a breakdown of construction complaints which are predominantly site operations and traffic and transport related. A summary of construction and service complaints was also provided.</p> <p>■ (HCC) asked if the Residents Commissioner has a role in complaints. ■ (HS2) explained that the Residents Commissioner does not get involved in specific cases because this is the role of the Construction Commissioner. However, the Residents Commissioner is made aware of complaints and generally oversees land & property and community engagement activities to ensure HS2 is meeting its commitments.</p>	
9.	<p>Planning Forum Notes Update</p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) provided an update on Planning Forum Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PFN 6 Appendix A Conditions on lorry route approvals – more work needed due to court of appeal judgement • PFN 7 Bringing into Use - Final version issued 22-09-20. It was agreed by the Planning Forum that this revision to Planning Forum Note 7 is approved if there are no further comments from LA members by 8 October. • Parapet CDE, Pier CDE. Steps required: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HS2 Technical Panel approval 2. Public Engagement response 3. HS2 to re-issue for Planning Forum approval • Line-side Noise Barrier CDE to follow piers and parapets 	
10.	<p>Forward Plan / AOB</p> <p>Next meeting: 26th November 2020.</p> <p>2021 meetings to be confirmed. Meetings will be conducted via Microsoft Teams and kept under review.</p>	
	<p>End</p>	