



## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

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

Item		Action Owner												
1.	<b>Introductions</b> – were made.													
2.	<p><b>Review of minutes &amp; actions from last meeting</b>  The minutes of the November Planning Forum were agreed.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> HS2 to place minutes on website.</p> <p><b>Outstanding actions</b>  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>HS2 to arrange for the Head of Arts and Culture to attend a future meeting of Forum.</td> <td>Agenda item for March.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS2 to circulate a position statement on rural fencing standards.</td> <td>Agreed that the action has been completed following the circulation of guidance on landscape integration for balancing ponds in September 2020. Closed.</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 Noise Barrier CDE to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar.</td> <td>Updates to Planning Forum Note to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar is being considered.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Action	Status	HS2 to arrange for the Head of Arts and Culture to attend a future meeting of Forum.	Agenda item for March.	HS2 to circulate a position statement on rural fencing standards.	Agreed that the action has been completed following the circulation of guidance on landscape integration for balancing ponds in September 2020. Closed.	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 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.	<b>HS2</b>
Action	Status													
HS2 to arrange for the Head of Arts and Culture to attend a future meeting of Forum.	Agenda item for March.													
HS2 to circulate a position statement on rural fencing standards.	Agreed that the action has been completed following the circulation of guidance on landscape integration for balancing ponds in September 2020. Closed.													
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 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.													

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	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.	
	Signage strategy for HS2 to brought Planning Forum at a later date.	For later Planning Forum.	
	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.	Information requested and skills and employment to be on March agenda.	
	HS2 to consider how photographs of site could be shared with LPAs.	See <b>action</b> below.	
	HS2 to review the lookaheads in detail with project teams.	Submission dates have been reviewed and latest forward plans circulated to some authorities.	
	HS2 to feedback the general matter of member and community involvement to contractors.	General matter passed onto the community engagement team and IPT client directors. Closed	
	HS2 to provide email addresses for the compliance team.	Details have been provided by compliance team. Closed	
	HS2 committed to relaying the concern regarding Sch 18 heritage submissions to contractors and responding to the specific comments.	HS2 and WDC are engaging bilaterally and general concerns regarding Sch 18's have been relayed to contractors. Closed.	
	LPAs to meet to discuss the statutory guidance within two weeks of Planning Forum and feedback on Statutory Guidance by week commencing 7th December 2020.	LPA's have provided feedback on statutory guidance. Item 6 on agenda.  Closed	
	LPAs to meet within two weeks of Planning Forum to approve the PFNs.	LPAs have met on Pier and Parapets CDE Planning Forum Notes and they have been approved. Closed	
	Common approach to fencing (some high-level outputs) to be on the next Planning Forum agenda.	The procurement of the design workstream has commenced. Ongoing.	

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

<p>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 engage with HS2 in light of Covid-19.</p>	<p>There are no current plans to update the HS2 Engagement Strategy. Dedicated Coronavirus webpage : <a href="https://www.hs2.org.uk/coronavirus-covid-19/">https://www.hs2.org.uk/coronavirus-covid-19/</a></p> <p>Closed.</p>	
<p>HS2 to regularly share chart for determination periods.</p>	<p>Ongoing. Charts under agenda item 3</p>	
<p>CAAD. 1) Query if the duty to notify the acquiring authority is placed on the applicant or the LPA? 2) Query whether the LPA should be providing HS2 with the application or certificate? HS2 to clarify these points with the property team.</p>	<p>Property Team Response: 1) Duty to notify placed on the applicant as under s232 Localism Act an application "must be accompanied by a statement specifying date on which a copy of the application has been, or will be served on the other party directly concerned."  2) s232 also states LPA must not, without the agreement of the other party directly concerned, issue a certificate to the applicant before the end of 22 days beginning with the date specified in the statement referred to in point 1.</p> <p>Closed</p>	
<p>Regarding Chair contract extension, Planning Forum members to contact HS2 by 30th November if they have any objections.</p>	<p>No emails received.</p> <p>Closed.</p>	
<p><b>Additional discussion regarding actions:</b></p> <p><u>Site Photographs</u></p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that HS2 is setting up a route-wide system for managing imagery. ■ (HS2) explained that there is a lot of imagery, which in the first instance would need to be managed and disseminated at a local level to ensure it is relevant.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> LPAs to discuss site photographs at regular bilateral meetings and HS2 to make contractors aware of the site photographs discussion at Planning Forum.</p>		

**HS2**

	<p>■ (WDC) said that there are no regular bilateral meetings in their area. ■ (HS2) noted this and offered a regular meeting to WDC.</p> <p><u>Fencing – Common Approach</u></p> <p>■ (SNC) said that fencing forms part of Sch 17 submissions and in some cases HS2 standards are already being mentioned by contractors when justifying design matters, such as colour.</p> <p>■ (HS2) acknowledged this and explained that the common approach to fencing workstream will be on the Planning Forum agenda soon, which will help develop appropriate common design guidance.</p> <p>■ (SMBC) asked for clarification on the types of fencing covered by the workstream. ■ (HS2) explained that all types of HS2 fencing will be covered.</p> <p>■ (Bucks C) said that at a pre-application meeting, HS2 had told the Council that some fencing details would not be shared for security reasons.</p> <p>■ (HS2) and ■ (HS2) explained that there are security considerations in the depiction of fencing details on Sch 17 drawings. ■ (HS2) clarified that fence heights can be shown on Sch 17 drawings where essential and that this point would be relayed back to the team.</p> <p>■ (HS2) noted that fence foundation details / depths may have security implications: however the Chair highlighted that these details would not generally be relevant for Sch 17 consent application drawings anyway.</p>	
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>HS2 Project Update</b></p> <p>■ (HS2) provided apologies from ■ (HS2) and introduced himself as the HS2 ■ for the central EKFB section of the HS2 phase one route.</p> <p>■ (HS2) presented some highlights on HS2 Phase One progress:</p> <p>Ecological mitigation works continue whilst noise insulation, utility works and small-scale demolitions are underway. For main works, the current key activities are site establishments, piling, noise insulation, ongoing ecological works and detailed design.</p> <p>■ noted that the EKFB contract has approximately 38,000 design deliverables (documents, drawings, reports, etc), which is a significant detailed design challenge for HS2. It was explained that three of the four main works Integrated Project Teams (IPTs) are at about 10% design completion with Align IPT at about 50% completion.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (HS2) presented detailed slides for each main works IPT, setting out progress and a broad lookahead. Some photographs were shared of phase one construction works and other onsite progress.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted a press release by HS2 regarding a significant archaeology discovery at Coleshill, in the form of a buried Elizabethan garden. ■ (HS2) and ■ (HS2) confirmed the find and noted that it is an important discovery.</p> <p>The Chair asked for more details on the ‘<i>HS2 Sheriffs</i>’ recently reported in the press. ■ (HS2) clarified that the term ‘sheriff’ is not being used by HS2 and that the roles reported in the press derive from the recent Transport Select Committee. At the committee the HS2 CEO confirmed the creation of ‘delivery units’. The delivery units will be 16 sub-divisions of the HS2 phase one IPTs, which will have assigned senior project managers responsible for the works in the unit area.</p> <p>■ (HCC) asked how the delivery units align with local community engagement teams. ■ (HS2) clarified that the current community engagement teams will continue to carry out their role whereas the new ‘units’ are accountable for construction delivery.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>GSM-R Masts</b></p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) introduced the HS2 railway radio systems requirements, explaining that the mains works civils contracts will be space-proofing for radio systems in their emerging designs.</p> <p>■ (HS2) said that HS2 will be reliant on radio systems to operate the train service as they are part of the signalling system, and that Technical Specifications mandate the use of GSM-R for ‘track to train data’ and voice communications.</p> <p>It was noted that the initial assumptions were that LTE technology (successor to GSM-R) would be operating by 2025, however it is delayed and as such HS2 is adopting GSM-R technology. Early design development has been taking place to establish a radio plan on operation performance of masts, an assessment of the HS2 civil infrastructure design, environmental and engineering considerations and other infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>It was highlighted that there could be wider community opportunities from the GSM-R technology. Noting that, a commercial contract could be established to allow 3rd parties to access the infrastructure, subject to any necessary separate planning approvals.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that cross-topic environmental workshops had taken place to review each provisional location against the current design. It was highlighted that site refinement work had taken place to consider environmental constraints and reduce impacts of masts on the landscape.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (HS2) said that once the mast locations and specifications are confirmed, all sites will be reviewed for compliance with the EMRs.</p> <p>■ (HS2) and ■ (HS2) explained that GSM-R masts and associated equipment buildings will be space-proofed in MWCCs designs coming forward for Sch 17 approval and that the rail systems contractor will ultimately apply for Sch 17 plans and specifications approval for the precise location and design.</p> <p>■ (HS2) proposed that GSM-R masts could be a common design element (CDE) to be taken forward by the rail systems contractor in collaboration with the Planning Forum.</p> <p>The Chair asked whether the locations for masts will be indicated on MWCC plans and specifications submitted for approval (i.e. for compounds or earthworks etc.). ■ (HS2) confirmed that MWCCs would be able to show the presence of mast within compounds they are responsible for designing.</p> <p>■ (Birmingham CC) expressed concern that there might be a different solution needed in urban and rural settings and that there might be too many different combinations of design to allow for a CDE to be agreed. ■ (HS2) explained the CDE would be an option. Other designs could be pursued, assuming they are appropriate for operational needs.</p> <p>■ (SNC) asked for clarification on the number and frequency of masts. ■ (HS2) said that the frequency of masts is dictated by topography and the height of the masts (up to approx. 15m), to ensure line of sight is maintained. <b>Post meeting note:</b> estimated number of masts: 81.</p> <p>■ (Bucks CC) expressed that a route-based plan of masts for each authority would be helpful. ■ (HS2) confirmed that the location of masts will appear on MWCC plans and specifications drawings. <b>Action:</b> HS2 to provide a route-based plan of masts for each authority.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Local Authority Feedback and Issues Arising</b></p> <p>■ (Bucks C) raised that bilateral discussions had been taking place with Align IPT regarding permitted development and the use of a car park. It was explained that Bucks Council had sought legal advice on the matter, as had Align / HS2. HS2 had initially agreed to pay for external legal advice sought by the council, but HS2 had since changed its position on payment. ■ (HS2) and ■ (HS2) acknowledged the issue and took the matter away for bilateral resolution.</p> <p>■ (SNC) suggested that applying for a lawful development certificate is often the simplest and formal way of establishing whether development is permitted or not, explaining that legal opinions are not always the best way of reaching this conclusion.</p>	

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>■ (HS2) clarified that payment for legal advice is a bilateral matter and that the HS2 position on the principles of permitted development remains the same as that set out in the legal note circulated in July 2020.</p> <p>■ (LBC) raised the matter of pre-application meetings and explained that delays can be avoided if pre-apps are timely and meaningful from the outset, citing a recent Network Rail example in Camden. It was noted that a split decision has now been requested for the example in question, which could have been avoided.</p> <p>■ (Bucks C) reiterated the point raised by LBC in respect of enabling works in Buckinghamshire, which can lead to delays during the approval process. ■ (WDC) also raised the point in respect for a recent Sch 17 and deficient drainage information / extensions of time. ■ (HS2) asked ■ (WDC) for a discussion on the specific matter offline.</p> <p>■ (HS2) acknowledged these concerns and asked that they are initially raised as early as possible with the relevant local contacts, and if any further issues arise, for these to be flagged to the HS2 Project Client. ■ (HS2) reiterated this point but asked for LPAs to contact the town planning team first with issues as early as possible and not wait for the next Planning Forum.</p> <p>The Chair asked for clarification on how split decisions might be processed by LPAs. ■ (HS2) and ■ (HS2) explained the HS2 Act and Planning Memorandum allows for local planning authorities to make a decision on part of a Schedule 17 consent application, which may allow for more time on other aspects of the application (i.e. if additional information is needed etc). ■ (HS2) acknowledged that the back of house systems at local authorities might not be compatible given split decisions are not part of the 'normal' planning process.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that LPAs could share their knowledge on back of house systems and experiences processing split decisions for an agenda item at the next Planning Forum.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> LPAs to provide feedback / experience on their back of house systems for processing split decisions at the next Planning Forum</p> <p>■ (HCC) said that a Schedule 4 application was submitted just before Christmas last year and this meant that time was lost on processing the application. It was requested that more thought be put into submissions around holidays.</p> <p>■ (HS2) acknowledged that application timescales need to be discussed and agreed with authorities around holidays to ensure that they can be processed and not unnecessarily impact the HS2 programme.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Statutory Guidance</b></p> <p>■ (DfT) provided an update on the proposed update to the statutory</p>	



**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>guidance, noting that DfT received the feedback collated by the Chair on behalf of Planning Forum members before Christmas as well as well as a small number of individual responses.</p> <p>Based on the feedback, ■ (DfT) proposed that a new Planning Forum Note be produced for agreement by the Forum, containing the Annex as well as some sections of the draft Statutory Guidance. ■ (DfT) invited members to specify the text from the Guidance they would like to see in the new Planning Forum Note rather than the revised Statutory Guidance.</p> <p>■ (DfT) set out the timescales for the publication of the new Guidance and PFN in time for the next PF meeting in March (18<sup>th</sup>).</p> <p>■ (HS2) reiterated the importance of having the guidance and note in place prior to the main bulk of planning submissions for main works in 2021. ■ (HS2) agreed and noted that previous comments on the guidance were generally less about accuracy and more about whether Statutory Guidance was the appropriate location for the new proposed content. The Chair acknowledged this and asked for the LPAs to focus on the detail, such as the Annex and provide comments to this effect by the 5<sup>th</sup> February.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> LPAs to provide comments on what to include in Planning Forum Note via track changes of draft Guidance document by the 5<sup>th</sup> February.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> HS2 to provide a clean Word version of the draft revised Statuary Guidance to ensure that the LPAs’ tracked changes can be captured.</p>	<p>LPAs</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Community Engagement &amp; Helpdesk Update</b></p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) provided an update on the helpdesk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1/3 of enquires received in December 2020 related to HS2 Phase One with the remaining being predominantly land and property related.</li> <li>• In 2020 94% of complains received were construction related.</li> <li>• 92% of all Phase One complaints were responded to within 20 working days and 92% of Phase One construction complaints responded to within 20 working days</li> <li>• The majority of construction complaints relate to traffic and transport, site operations and noise and vibration.</li> <li>• One construction complaint has been referred to the construction commissioner. Eight service complaints are at the ‘step two review’ stage and one was with the Independent Complaints Assessor (ICA).</li> <li>• A new digital contact form is due to launch soon, which will provide a new way of contacting the helpdesk.</li> </ul> <p>■ (WCC) asked what happens if a complaint goes directly to the Construction Commissioner. ■ (HS2) explained that when complaints are prematurely</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>escalated, the Commissioner will seek to ensure the formal HS2 process is followed first by passing the complaint to HS2.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Planning Forum Notes and Appeals Update</b></p> <p>██████████ (HS2 ██████████), provided an update on Planning Forum Notes, explaining that PFNs 15 (Piers Common Design Elements) and 16 (Parapet Common Design Elements) will shortly be uploaded to the Planning Forum website.</p> <p>It was explained that there are currently no live appeals, however three Judicial Reviews are taking place or proposed, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colne Valley Wetland APP/HS2/1 (LB Hillingdon)</li> <li>• SCS Lorry Routes APP/HS2/5 (LB Hillingdon)</li> <li>• Colne Valley Viaduct APP/HS2/7 (LB Hillingdon)</li> </ul> <p>██████████ (HS2) highlighted that appeal and judicial review decisions have been uploaded here:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-planning-appeal-decision">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-planning-appeal-decision</a></p> <p>The Chair noted that Judicial Reviews should relate to whether decisions are taken lawfully, and process, rather than outcome. ██████████ (HS2) agreed.</p>	
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Forward Plan / AOB</b></p> <p>The Chair noted that Planning Forum will take place on the following dates in 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18th March</li> <li>• 27th May</li> <li>• 22nd July</li> <li>• 30th September</li> <li>• 25th November</li> </ul> <p>In respect of the spring elections period (purdah) and Schedule 17 submissions, ██████████ (HS2) confirmed that HS2's position at present is that HS2's general Schedule 17 submission programme will be unaffected by purdah restrictions.</p> <p>██████████ (WCC) highlighted that during previous election periods the Council had been asked by DfT to pause broader engagement (such as Planning Forum). The Chair noted that the indicated election dates avoid a clash with Planning Forum. ██████████ (WCC) also noted that dates for elections had yet to be confirmed and that they might move to October 2021.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>■ (HS2) presented charts to show the planned and actual submissions made by IPTs and determination periods for Sch 17 submissions. It was explained that revised January 2021 lookaheads had been issued to most LPAs and additional scrutiny had been given to proposed submission dates.</p> <p>A number of live Sch 17 submissions show a significant delay beyond the 8-week period. In respect of determination periods, ■ (HS2) asked that LPAs are as open as possible about issues in determining Sch 17s and ensuring that communication on delays and other issues are flagged so that they can be resolved.</p> <p>The Chair asked for a meeting to discuss the issues behind long determination periods. ■ (HS2) agreed. <b>Action:</b> The Chair to meet with HS2 prior to the next Planning Forum to review the statistics and identify common issues regarding extended determination periods.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that the Charts should be shared at each meeting and if a trend is emerging, discussion should take place at Planning Forum.</p> <p>■ (HS2) drew attention to long determination periods, which he noted may cause issues in the future for HS2 if the delays are replicated across the full programme.</p> <p>■ (LBC) suggested that the determination period statistics highlight the need for effective pre-app to resolve issues prior to submission. ■ (HS2) acknowledged this point.</p>	<p><b>Chair / HS2</b></p>
	<p><b>End</b></p>	