

**Phase One Planning Forum – Heritage Sub-Group
Meeting Notes – 15th June 2021**

Date & time:	15 th June 2021: 14.00-16.00 Virtually: MS Teams
Chair:	HS2
eB ref	PH1-HS2-EV-MRC-000-000113

Item	Topic	Lead
1	Welcome and introductions	HS2
2	Values moment	HS2
3	<p>Planning Forum Update</p> <p>HS2 Senior Town Planning Manger provided summary of what was discussed at the recent Planning Forum (27.05.2021):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Forum Notes - following the publication of the revised Statutory Guidance by DfT in May 2021, HS2 had reviewed the phase one Planning Forum Notes to identify any required changes. It was noted that PFN 3 (Written Statements and Design and Access Statements) was one of seven Planning Forum Notes be updated to include specific text around the content of submissions including the need for an Archaeological Summary Statement (contained within the Written Statement) where a Schedule 17 request for approval relates to a designated archaeological site. • Schedule 17 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Charts showing the time taken to determine main works Schedule 17 applications in the last six months were presented. It was noted that around 14% of applications had been determined within eight weeks: 18% had gone beyond 24 weeks, which is similar to the performance shown on the chart at the previous Planning Forum in March. ○ Charts were also presented showing Schedule 17 applications awaiting determination. It was highlighted that performance had worsened since the previous Planning Forum in March. Notably, 28% of the live applications are currently under the eight-week threshold and 56% are between 8-16 weeks. Delays in determination don't necessarily mean that construction 	HS2

	<p>works are delayed and often there are valid reasons for requests for extended determination periods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Design Elements - it was noted that a change is required to PFN 16 in respect of road overbridge parapets. This is due to a change in the vehicle impact requirements and the need to change the inner profile of the parapet for use on road overbridges. • Urban design and integration studies - the urban integration workstream explores what HS2 can deliver and the benefits it can bring to the immediate context, within the limitations of HS2 funding and powers. It also looks at what HS2 can enable and where other partners could help to realise wider benefits or plan for future investment in associated infrastructure, buildings, public realm or economic development. <p>The Planning Forum Chair added some additional points of interest that were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LPA feedback regarding resources/difficulty of recruiting staff • Increased politicisation of Schedule 17 in some LPAs • Resolution of track drainage water determination – this rests with the LPAs not the Environment Agency. • SLA issues – to be an agenda item at the next Planning Forum. LPAs to submit their views and concerns • External communications, for example the Western Slopes where it was not made clear that the design was being submitted and was not an approved scheme. Better clarity sought for such external communications. <p>Questions BucksCC: Requested that archaeological documents were attached to Sch 17 submissions. There had been instances where the information was missing and BucksCC had to seek them out.</p> <p>ACTION HS2 to provide clarification to BucksCC.</p>	
4	<p>Schedule 18</p> <p>HS2 Historic Environment Manager for Area North provided an update on the progress of Sch 18 submissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested that LPA conservation officers engaged with HS2 early in the determination period to enable prompt discussions of concerns and to find solutions, thus avoiding delays. 	HS2

	<p>Stare Bridge: thanks to Warwick DC Principal Conservation Officer for prompt response and assistance regarding the vandalism of monitoring equipment on Stare Bridge.</p> <p>Old Curzon Street Station (OCSS): HS2 recently visited with Birmingham's Principal Conservation Officer to view the restoration works following the incorrect installation on monitoring equipment. Specialist contractors are undertaking the works. HS2 also highlighted the unexpected discovery of 1830s cellars which appear to be associated with the original Hardwick design but not shown on historic plans.</p> <p>Historic England thanked the HS2 Historic Environment Manager for Area North and the team for the resolution of the OCSS incident in terms that all can sign up to.</p>	
5	<p>Post excavation</p> <p>HS2 Historic Environment Lead outlined the works being undertaken to procure the Phase One post excavation analysis.</p> <p>Questions</p> <p>GLAAS: GLAAS had received the Market Engagement it as they are a ClfA Registered Archaeological Organisation. Will HS2 be consulting the curators too?</p> <p>HS2: no, we will not be consulting curators as this is to engage the contracting organisations regarding their appetite for such procurement and to understand their queries and any concerns. HS2 continues to discuss the procurement with Historic England. HS2 highlighted that para 4.6.5 of the Heritage Memorandum and that approaches (e.g. project designs) will be developed with HE and the LPA specialists. This would be the key stage for curatorial input.</p> <p>BucksCC raised concerns regarding whether a single contractor could undertake all the post excavations works.</p> <p>HS2 explained that there could be a single lead specialist contractor, but they would need an extensive supply chain. For existing fieldwork there are a number of consortia and those may express interest in the post excavation. Any offer would be strengthened by the retention of knowledge from the fieldwork stage but this cannot be guaranteed. Consistency is important, for example with regards to landscape approach.</p>	

	<p>WarksCC asked when reporting and information would become publicly available and what those timescales would be. HS2 highlighted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OASIS records are/would be available • HER information was been provided on a six-monthly cycle • Post excavation assessment reports and/or fieldwork reports would be provided on SharePoint, to the relevant LPAs, following HS2 review and approval. <p>HS2 clarify that following HS2 review and approval, documents are provided to the LPAs on SharePoint. Fieldwork reports go to OASIS</p> <p>HertsCC queried what they could/should include in their response to the Sch 17 submission for the Western Slopes</p> <p>ACTION HertsCC to provide details of queries to HS2 and follow-up</p>	
6	<p>Archives</p> <p>HS2 provided an update on archives.</p> <p>BucksCC raised the concern from Bucks Museum regarding the use of accession numbers and artefact marking which is a requirement of the museum and whether this had commenced and may need rework – there is a cost implication.</p> <p>HS2 highlighted that meetings were in the process of being set up to discuss in detail the specific concerns of museum colleagues. ACTION HS2</p> <p>HertsCC raised concerns about where sites crossed administrative boundaries HS2 said site archives would be kept together and that there would need to be a discussion where investigation works straddled boundaries.</p> <p>Historic England sought clarity over the built heritage setting records and whether such records are to be included in the archive.</p> <p>HS2 clarified that such digital material would be held by the ADS and that discussions were underway regarding how such new technologies are curated.</p> <p>StaffsCC, GLAAS and WarksCC raised concerns about the provision of funding for museums given the volume of material anticipated and</p>	

	<p>whether there would be funds for upfront investment, in for example shelving.</p> <p>HS2 confirmed that box fees would be paid as Business as Usual and that HS2 would shortly be holding conversations with the museums with regard to volumes and programme. It is hoped that the museums would articulate their specific concerns when they have more detail.</p>	
7	<p>Burial Grounds</p> <p>HS2 summarised the ongoing investigations into human remains, highlighting some of the discoveries and community engagement, notably St Mary's, Stoke Mandeville.</p> <p>BucksCC asked about the reburial of material found with individuals and gravestones and architectural elements</p> <p>HS2 clarified that artefacts were reburied with the individual.</p> <p>Regarding gravestones, these were usually not wanted by museums, neither often do burial grounds want them. Where they are unwanted and no other use can be found (for example within a landscape scheme or as part of the reburial as is being considered at Brookwood Cemetery in Surrey for the markers from St James's Burial Ground, then we have a duty to destroy/deface them: the HS2 Act follows existing Church Law.</p> <p>Regarding the architectural elements (such as railings, paving) that HS2 is considering the use of architectural elements in the landscape design for the reburial ground for the St Mary's population. If not possible, these will also be destroyed or materials recycled as appropriate.</p>	
8	AOB	
	<p>Next meeting: September 2021</p> <p>Please forward agenda items</p>	