

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

Title:	Independent Phase One Planning Forum for HS2	
Date & Time	Thursday 26 th November 2020 13:00 – 15:30 Microsoft Teams Meeting	
Chair	[REDACTED]	Independent Chair
Promoter Attendees:	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] BBVS HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] BBVS CSJV CSJV HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] LM-JV HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] EKFB HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] LM-JV Weston Williamson (BBV) HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] Fusion JV MDJV HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] HS2 Ltd [REDACTED] Department for Transport (DfT) HS2 Ltd [REDACTED]
Local Authority Attendees:	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SADC) Westminster City Council (Westminster CC) Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) Warwick District Council (WDC) South Northamptonshire Council (SNC)

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	[REDACTED]	<p>North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF) Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C) London Borough of Camden (LBC) Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) Solihull Met Borough Council (SMBC) Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC) South Northamptonshire Council (SNC) Lichfield District Council (LDC) Birmingham City Council (Birmingham CC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Staffordshire County Council (SCC)</p>
--	------------	---

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%; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Action</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <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>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> </tbody> </table>	Action	Status	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.	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.	HS2
Action	Status											
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.	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.											

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	Consider opportunities within Noise Barrier CDE to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar.	Updates to Planning Forum Note to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar is being considered.	
	Consider how to progress the suggested additional items (handrails, access steps and fencing) as a separate workstream and present to the Forum at a future meeting.	Ongoing.	
	HS2 to include IDRPs comments in a report incorporating all engagement undertaken on CDEs.	Response to IDRPs sent on 20.11.20.	
	HS2 to circulate CDE Planning Forum Notes three weeks prior to the March Planning Forum, with any proposed amendments highlighted.	Sent on 20.11.20.	
	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.	Sent on 25.11.20.	
	EKFB to review the Buckinghamshire Council issues list and provide response to HS2 client engineering team.	Complete.	
	HS2 to provide geographical breakdown of apprentice recruits and other relevant HS2 information on employment and jobs to WCC.	Complete.	
	HS2 committed to speaking to the relevant project manager regarding future TBM arrivals on site and provision of information to local planning authorities.	Complete.	
	HS2 to raise the matter of LA confidentiality with suppliers.	Suppliers reminded of any confidentiality arrangements.	
	HS2 to circulate decided appeal decisions to Planning Forum members.	Sent 25.09.20 and 20.11.20.	
	Appeals digest and key principles to be circulated in due course.	Sent on 13.11.20.	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>HS2 to feedback on whether appeals are chargeable under the Service Level Agreement.</p>	<p>HS2 to update at meeting.</p>	
<p>CDE Public engagement report to be edited to split out into piers and parapets and noise barriers to reflect the differing timescales.</p>	<p>Sent on 25.11.20.</p>		
<p>Update on the 'issuing' of the piers and parapets CDE PFNs to be provided at the next Planning Forum.</p>	<p>Agenda Item.</p>		
<p>Details regarding slides on OCS for South Northants liaison group to be arranged offline.</p>	<p>SNC to contact HS2. Closed.</p>		
	<p>Action: HS2 to provide geographical breakdown of apprentice recruits and information on employment and jobs to other phase one authorities. Also, to include skills and employment as a future agenda item.</p>		<p>HS2</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>HS2 Project Update</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) introduced himself as the ██████████ for the central EKFB section of the HS2 phase one route.</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) explained that HS2 contractors are continuing to operate with COVID Secure sites and that HS2 is abiding by new regional restrictions. Offices remain open for those who need to undertake activities that can't be done at home; however the default position is home working.</p> <p>HS2 is continuing to liaise through established working groups with the supply chain to maintain pace during November lockdown and prepare the impact of travel restrictions during the Christmas period.</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) provided some highlights on HS2 Phase One progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Across phase one contractors have commenced mobilisation at multiple site compounds in preparation of the 2021 earthwork season, including the establishment of haul roads. • Willesden Euro Terminal: SCS successfully achieved the incentive milestone to be ready for the delivery of excavated material from OOC. • Align TBMs: successful Factory Acceptance Test on second TBM (Cecilia) and the first parts of the TBMs arrived on 22nd Sept. • Long Itchington Wood Tunnel: work has started on the TBM Reception Box • Euston Works continue to progress: work to prepare London Euston for the construction of HS2 has hit an important milestone with the demolition of the station's western ramp and canopy. 		

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Missenden: site handed over by Fusion enabling works contractors on 5th October and site establishment earthworks and access works commenced at Little Missenden Shaft site. • EKFB Procurement team has won “Best Initiative to build a diverse supply base” at the Chartered Institute of Procurement & Supply annual awards. <p>■ (HS2) shared some photographs of phase one pre-construction works and other onsite progress.</p> <p>■ (HCC) and ■ (WCC) said that it is currently difficult to undertake site visits and asked whether site photographs could be shared with LPAs on a regular basis. ■ (HS2) acknowledged the current difficulty and agreed to consider how this could be undertaken.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to consider how photographs of site could be shared with LPAs.</p> <p>■ (HS2) presented a forecast of Schedule 17 submissions, which includes the planned submission of consent applications based on local authority six-month lookaheads.</p> <p>■ (HS2) recognised that the accuracy of the lookaheads needs improving. It was noted the inaccuracy has been generally due to delays in the design and the close out of design issues raised at pre-app.</p> <p>Chair raised that from experience on HS1, contractors are often over-optimistic about the design programme, which can lead to inaccurate forecasts of consents.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that HS2 monitors consents and the design programme very closely and noted logistical challenges due to Covid restrictions, for example. ■ (HS2) noted however that the situation was not satisfactory and committed to reviewing the IPT lookaheads to improve accuracy against the HS2 schedule.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to review the lookaheads in detail with project teams.</p> <p>■ (TRDC) & ■ (SNC) asked for reassurance that where the HS2 programme is becoming more pressured, that shorter timescales for determination are not passed onto the LPAs. ■ (HS2) agreed that this would be unreasonable and that it is not the intention to squeeze approval timescales.</p> <p>■ (HS2) noted that EKFB are looking to set out a six-month schedule of all engagement to help plan stakeholder activities, which once shared should help LPAs manage their time.</p> <p>■ (Bucks C) asked if the sequence of Sch 17 submissions could remain the same even if they are delayed. ■ (HS2) suggested that the six-month schedule should be used in discussions with Bucks C to ensure that the sequencing is appropriate.</p> <p>■ (Bucks C) thanked ■ (HS2) for the offer and suggested that pre-apps should also be included so that the right people can be in attendance at meetings.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
--	---	-----------------------

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (Bucks C) also raised the matter of member engagement and emphasised the importance of this taking place prior to submission. ■ (HS2) recognised this and highlighted that the six-month schedule for EKFB would help to plan these sorts of briefings, if required.</p> <p>■ (Bucks C) said that engagement with the community on Sch 17s is also an issue for the Council and that this may lead to negative determinations if not carried out at the appropriate time. ■ (HS2) noted this point and agreed to take the general point back to contractors. ■ (HS2) also explained that EKFB will be providing a schedule of engagement in December.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to feedback the general matter of member and community involvement to contractors.</p> <p>■ (HS2) presented the new organisational structure for the compliance team and provided the points of contact for local authority areas. ■ (TRDC) raised that processing of SLA queries and invoices has been slower under the new structure.</p> <p>■ (HS2) acknowledged this feedback and explained that it is possibly due to staff familiarising themselves with their new roles and processes. ■ (HS2) asked that specific matters be raised with her if required. ■ (SNC) asked for the email addresses for the new contacts.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to provide email addresses for the compliance team.</p> <p>■ (HS2) responded to an action regarding the funding of officer time for planning appeals. ■ (HS2) explained that officer time would be funded if an LPA was successful at an appeal but not if the LPA was unsuccessful and that time spent on an appeal should be claimed via the normal timesheet process. Chair asked LPA's to consider this position at their next LPA pre-meet.</p> <p>■ (HS2) also explained that 'new burden' requests would be shared at Planning Forum in the future to obtain feedback on which local authorities they apply to. Chair welcomed this.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Local Authority Feedback & Issues Arising</p> <p>■ (HCC) requested an update on how HS2 is planning to record bringing into use discussions.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that comments on indicative mitigation schemes would need to be passed onto the relevant designer and highlighted that the Planning Forum Note on decision notices has been updated to help accommodate bringing into use proposals.</p> <p>■ (HCC) expressed concern that records of comments on mitigation schemes could be lost. ■ (HS2) reassured the Forum that both the contractor and HS2</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>separately hold these records.</p> <p>■ (NWBC) asked for clarification and sight of how changes to the route design are assessed by HS2 (against the HS2 Environmental Statement) and asked how cumulative impact is considered. ■ (HS2) explained that a process is followed by HS2 and contractors which assess the environmental impact of works to ensure that they are within the scope of significant impacts reported in the HS2 ES, which includes the cumulative impacts of all the works.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that the evidencing of environmental assessment is not provided with Sch 17 submissions: however if LPAs have concerns they can be raised with contractors or HS2 and designers would be happy to talk through the assessment process. ■ (HS2) suggested that if another presentation on the subject at a future Planning Forum would be beneficial, this could be arranged. This offer was accepted by the Chair.</p> <p>■ (WDC) asked whether any commitments had been made at Planning Forum to submit wider noise assessments with S61s rather than site specific assessments. ■ (HS2) was not aware that this had been discussed and agreed at Planning Forum and suggested the query be emailed to HS2 so it can be passed onto the noise team.</p> <p>■ (WDC) raised a concern about a lack of pre-app and detail included in method statements for Sch 18 heritage submissions for monitoring equipment on listed buildings. ■ (HS2) thanked WDC for the feedback and email setting out the issue and Action: committed to relaying the concern to contractors and responding to the specific comments.</p>	
5.	<p>Statutory Guidance</p> <p>■ (Department for Transport) provided a summary of the main changes to the statutory guidance in light of the Court of Appeal Judgment (Hillingdon). ■ (DfT) asked if feedback could be provided on the draft within two weeks of Planning Forum.</p> <p>Action: Feedback to be provided by LPAs week commencing 7th December 2020.</p> <p>■ (SNC) expressed concern that the draft includes ‘sweeping statements’ and some other new prescriptive wording and suggested that further clarification on the intent of the revised draft text may be needed.</p> <p>■ (Bucks C) raised concerns about the tone of the revised wording in comparison to the original version. Additionally, it was noted that the Council does not agree that there is not a validation process, as this conflicts with paragraph 70 of the Court of Appeal judgement (Hillingdon).</p> <p>■ (DfT) reiterated that DfT do not believe that the Judgment introduces a validation process, due to the specific nature of the case and highlighted the</p>	LPAs

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>need for collaboration between parties. ■ (DfT) welcomed comments on the matter.</p> <p>Chair suggested that a meeting be set up following Planning Forum to discuss and collate comments on the draft Statutory Guidance. Action: LPAs to meet to discuss the statutory guidance within two weeks of Planning Forum.</p>	<p>LPAs</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Common Design Elements Update</p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) provided a recap on the Common Design Element (CDE) workstream. It was explained that Planning Forum Notes 15 (Piers) and 16 (Parapets) have been taken through HS2 internal governance. Both PFNs were provided to Planning Forum members on the 20th November 2020 and the response to the public engagement was posted on the HS2 webpage on 25th November 2020</p> <p>■ (HS2) also advised that an email and Commonplace news alert will be sent to the stakeholders who responded directly to the original engagement, alongside local authorities and MPs.</p> <p>■ (HS2) noted that the content of PFNs 15 and 16 has been discussed extensively and has remained unchanged for some time and asked if the Forum would be able to approve them at the meeting.</p> <p>■ (SMBC) and ■ (SNC) asked if LPAs could have longer to consider the PFNs following the publication of the HS2 response to public engagement. Chair agreed that this was a sensible approach. Action: LPAs to meet within two weeks of Planning Forum to approve the PFNs.</p> <p>In respect of the lineside noise barriers CDE, ■ (HS2) said that a surface working group has been established by EKFB and BBV to promote collaboration and that the detailed engineering design has begun. It was explained that the main challenge is to develop a robust, cost effective barrier solution with an acceptable appearance which provides effective noise mitigation and can cope with significant fatigue loading.</p> <p>■ (HS2) said that EKFB and BBV have confirmed their commitment to developing a lineside noise barrier common design element and are sharing their progress. ■ (HS2) noted that they have been in consultation with their respective LPAs on the noise barrier proposals.</p> <p>Additionally, ■ (HS2) explained that HS2 are investigating alternative and/or supplementary noise mitigation solutions.</p> <p>The HS2 fencing technical standard has been updated in response to contractor and stakeholder feedback and HS2 are expecting a quote from suppliers to consolidate the work done to date on a common approach to fencing.</p>	<p>LPAs</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■■■ (SNC) and ■■■ (Bucks C) asked whether the common approach to fencing will include the urban and rural context. ■■■ (HS2) confirmed that this is the case and confirmed that fence selection should be responding to the local context. Chair asked if some output from the common approach could be shared in the new year. Action: Common approach to fencing (some high-level outputs) to be on the next Planning Forum agenda.</p> <p>■■■ (HCC) suggested that HS2 could look at the work Align JV are doing on fencing in Hertfordshire, which has been praised by the Council.</p> <p>■■■ (SNC) asked if the work on fencing will include colour. ■■■ (HS2) noted that colour could be a consideration in the common approach to fencing. ■■■ (HS2) noted that from a landscape perspective black was the preferred colour for fencing in the landscape. ■■■ (HS2) explained that position is also important, particularly in relation to landform crest where it may form a visible horizon.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Community Engagement & Helpdesk Update</p> <p>■■■■■■■■■■ (HS2 ■■■■■■■■■■) provided an update on the helpdesk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October has been the busy month for the helpdesk, receiving 5873 enquiries, mainly due to the launch of the Phase 2b design refinement consultation. • Community engagement is being conducted through digital formats, which includes design exhibitions and community drop-ins etc. • The Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman has decided that they have the power to look at construction related complaints after they have been reviewed by the construction commissioner. The construction complaints process now follows the service complaints route, which can be found on the HS2 website. • October complaints total 213, with the majority (92%) relating to phase one construction. Traffic and transport and site operations are the largest category of complaint. Noise and vibration complaints have reduced. • 93% of complaints were resolved in 20 working days. 1316 construction complaints have been received with none referred to the construction commissioner. 91 service complaints have been resolved at step one and 6 have been referred to step two and 1 directly referred to Independent Complaints Assessors (ICA). <p>■■■ (HCC) queried whether the HS2 engagement strategy would be updated in light of Covid-19 and new practices around community engagement. ■■■ (HS2) clarified that there are no plans to update the strategy at the moment but HS2 will continue to innovate to deliver engagement virtually.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to inform Planning Forum of any planned updates to the HS2 engagement strategy. HS2 to check if the website provides detail on how to</p>	<p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>engage with HS2 in light of Covid-19.</p> <p>■ (HS2) informed members that ■ is on maternity leave and ■ will be covering as interim Community Engagement Director.</p>	
8.	<p>Planning Forum Notes and Appeals Update</p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) provided an update on recent appeals: Colne Valley Viaduct, Hillingdon (APP/HS2/7) and West Ruislip Portal, Hillingdon (APP/HS2/8), both decided on 18-Nov-20.</p> <p>■ (HS2) noted that the decision letters had been circulated on 20th November and that the Appeals Digest would be updated to include these recent decisions. Appeal decisions will also be added to a new page on GOV.UK.</p> <p>■ (HS2) highlighted that some Planning Forum Notes would likely need updating in the new year following the update to the Statutory Guidance, possibly to include a generic statement relating to the provision of information necessary to make a decision and identification of information during pre-application discussions.</p> <p>■ (HS2) clarified that two Planning Forum Notes (3 and 6) may need additional changes. PFN 3 Written Statements and Design and Access Statements will likely require updates to Table 1 to refer to inclusion of specific types of information where applicable. PFN 6 Lorry Route Approvals will likely require an amendment to Section 7 (content of Written Statements for lorry route applications) to provide more detail where applicable.</p> <p>■ (HS2) emphasised that the proposed changes are assumptions based on the current draft Statutory Guidance and will depend on the outcome of the update and will be subject to future consultation and agreement with Planning Forum.</p>	
9.	<p>Forward Plan / AOB</p> <p>It was agreed that Planning Forum will take place on the following dates in 2021, with March and July meetings taking place a week earlier to avoid the election period and school summer holidays:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 28th January• 18th March• 27th May• 22nd July• 30th September• 25th November <p>Meetings will be conducted via Microsoft Teams and kept under review.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>AOB</p> <p>■ (HS2) presented a slide to show the determination periods for Schedule 17 submissions, which indicates that roughly half of all submissions are determined within an eight-week period.</p> <p>It was emphasised that there might be a multitude of reasons behind this statistic, however there had been some issues with a lack of information from LPA about timescales for decision making. Secondly, ■ (HS2) asked that LPAs exercise planning judgement prior to forwarding consultation responses to HS2 to make sure they are relevant to the matter for approval and that it is clear what action is needed from HS2.</p> <p>■ (Birmingham CC) asked for clarification on whether extensions had been agreed for determination periods over eight weeks. Chair and ■ (HS2) clarified that in almost all cases an extension is agreed to ensure that HS2 retains its right to appeal.</p> <p>Chair suggested that the chart for determination periods is shared regularly. Action: ■ (HS2) agreed to this.</p> <p>■ (HS2) presented some slides on Certificates of Appropriate Alternative Development (CAAD) and explained what they are, the contents of an application and how these can be submitted to HS2.</p> <p>■ (SNC) queried if the duty to notify the acquiring authority is placed on the applicant or the LPA? ■ (NWBC) asked whether the LPA should be providing HS2 with the application or certificate? Action: HS2 to clarify these points with the property team. ■ (WDC) offered to provide advice / forms to LPAs if they require some guidance on the process.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that the Chair’s two-year contract is up for renewal and asked the Planning Forum to agree a year’s extension. Action: Planning Forum members to contact HS2 by 30th November if they have any objections.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
	<p>End</p>	