

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	[REDACTED]	<p>Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C) London Borough of Camden (LBC) Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C) 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) Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C) 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 January Planning Forum were agreed. Action: HS2 to place minutes on website.</p> <p>Outstanding 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.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.</td> <td>Agenda item in May.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update</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 PFN to replace 'where appropriate' with 'as agreed' or similar is being considered.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consider how to progress the suggested additional items (handrails, access steps and fencing) as a separate workstream and present to a future PF meeting. Common approach to fencing (some high-level outputs) to be on the next PF agenda.</td> <td>The procurement of the design workstream has commenced. Ongoing.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Signage strategy for HS2 to be brought to PF at a later date.</td> <td>For later Planning Forum.</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.	HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.	Agenda item in May.	Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update	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 PFN 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 a future PF meeting. Common approach to fencing (some high-level outputs) to be on the next PF agenda.	The procurement of the design workstream has commenced. Ongoing.	Signage strategy for HS2 to be brought to PF at a later date.	For later Planning Forum.	HS2
Action	Status															
HS2 to arrange for the Head of Arts and Culture to attend a future meeting of Forum.	Agenda item.															
HS2 Urban Integration to present again in 6-9 months with more focus on Phase 1.	Agenda item in May.															
Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update	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 PFN 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 a future PF meeting. Common approach to fencing (some high-level outputs) to be on the next PF agenda.	The procurement of the design workstream has commenced. Ongoing.															
Signage strategy for HS2 to be brought to PF at a later date.	For later Planning Forum.															

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>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>Agenda item.</p>	
<p>LPAs to discuss site photographs at regular bilateral meetings and HS2 to make contractors aware of the site photographs discussion at PF.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>	
<p>GSM-R Masts. HS2 to provide a route-based plan of masts for each authority.</p>	<p>HS2 has provided some plans: others will be provided in due course. Ongoing.</p>	
<p>LPAs to provide feedback / experience on their back-of-house systems for processing split decisions at the next PF.</p>	<p>Feedback under item 4.</p>	
<p>Statutory Guidance. LPAs to provide comments on what to include in Planning Forum Note via track changes on draft Guidance document by the 5th February.</p>	<p>Complete. Update under item 7.</p>	
<p>HS2 to provide a clean Word version of the draft revised Statutory Guidance to ensure that the LPAs' tracked changes can be captured.</p>	<p>Complete.</p>	
<p>The Chair to meet with HS2 prior to the next PF to review the statistics and identify common issues regarding extended determination periods.</p>	<p>Meeting held on 24th February. Agenda item.</p>	
<p><u>Common Design Elements / Common Design Approaches</u> [REDACTED] (HS2) provided a brief update on Common Design Elements (CDE), noting that the Piers and Parapets CDE's have been approved whilst the Noise Barrier CDE is still under development.</p> <p>For road overbridge parapets, it was highlighted that a design standard has changed due to the withdrawal of a British Standard and the adoption of a Highways England requirement, which may affect the design profile of parapets going forward. This design profile has not been picked up in the approved Parapet CDE and as such HS2 were looking into the implications of the change on parapet design. Action: An update will be provided at the next PF.</p> <p>For noise barriers, [REDACTED] (HS2) explained that work is ongoing and a design working group between EKFB and BBV was being arranged to help address remaining design issues and undertake any required testing. It was noted that the design may have changed slightly since it was shared previously. Action: An update will be provided at the next PF.</p> <p>Regarding the fencing common approach, [REDACTED] (HS2) explained that the</p>		<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>procurement of a design consultant for the work is underway and it is hoped that more progress will be made by the next PF.</p> <p>█ (Bucks CC) was concerned that the ongoing design work and testing work for noise barriers would affect live consent applications for noise barriers. █ (SNC) was concerned that this may also be an issue in Northamptonshire for emerging designs. █ (HS2) noted these concerns. █ (HS2) clarified that noise barriers, in the absence of a CDE, should be considered on their own merits by local planning authorities.</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>HS2 Project Update</p> <p>█ (HS2) provided apologies from █ (HS2) and introduced himself as the HS2 █ for the █ section of the phase one route. █ (HS2) presented some highlights on Phase One progress:</p> <p>Ecological mitigation works continue whilst noise insulation, archaeology and 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. █ (HS2) explained that a transition is taking place in 2021 to conclude enabling works and pass on enabling works to the main works contractors.</p> <p>█ (HS2) presented slides for each main works IPT, setting out progress and a broad lookahead. Photographs were shared of phase one construction works and other onsite progress.</p> <p>The Chair raised that some local authorities were not familiar with the equivalent client directors for other IPT areas. Action: HS2 to provide a list of HS2 client directors after the meeting.</p> <p>█ (HS2) highlighted that five appeals had been made for Schedule 17 lorry route applications in the Buckinghamshire Council area. The Chair noted this and highlighted that they had been in the press recently. He also drew attention to landscaping works near the southern portal, using chalk from the tunneling works, which had also featured in the press.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Planning Consents Performance</p> <p>█ (HS2) presented a chart showing the time taken to determine Schedule 17 applications in the last six months. It was noted that around 20% of applications had been determined within eight weeks: 13% had gone beyond 24 weeks.</p> <p>█ (HS2) also presented a chart showing Schedule 17 applications awaiting determination. Half of the live applications are currently under the eight-week threshold and 21% are beyond 24 week; however it was noted that four of the 24+ week applications have now been appealed.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>■ (HS2) said the statistics show that improvement is needed and that it can hopefully be achieved through collaboration between HS2 and LPAs. ■ (HS2) noted that effective pre-application discussions are important and drew attention to PFN 13 which provides guidance on the matter. It was also noted that the forward looks and the quality of submissions also plays a part.</p> <p>■ (HS2) highlighted that delays are often due to requests for additional information and that these requests could be better dealt with if they are made as early as possible prior to submission. The early involvement of consultees was also suggested to ensure that comments are considered prior to submission. In addition, it was noted that decision making processes within local planning authorities are a factor in timescales for decision making.</p> <p>■ (HS2) also shared a Schedule 17 submissions chart, which indicates that HS2 was on target for January, but some applications planned for February had slipped to March. In some cases, this was due to requests for additional information, and partly due to delays in completing and signing off documentation. ■ (HS2) added that in his contract area (EKFB), member briefings prior to Schedule 17 submissions have been well received.</p> <p>The Chair explained that following the last Planning Form meeting, he had met with HS2 and local planning authorities to discuss consents performance and had carried out some analysis based on a 13-week threshold. He detailed variability in performance, highlighting that for half of the authorities only 10% of applications have exceeded 13 weeks, but in contrast three authorities have seen 50% of applications exceeded 13 weeks.</p> <p>The Chair listed quality of submissions, missing information, the size of drawings and significant changes in design (from that assumed in the HS2 Environmental Statement) as reasons provided by local authorities for delays. However, it was noted that feedback varied along the route.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that the issue might best be tackled at a separate meeting with a sub-set of local planning authorities. ■ (HS2) agreed to the meeting and suggested that specific real-life applications (which have experienced delays) could be used draw out the reasons and improve performance.</p> <p>■ (HS2) supported the approach and asked local planning authorities to provide specific examples to ensure they can be addressed by HS2. It was also flagged that the same HS2 contracts cover multiple local authority areas and in some cases determination periods vary widely. As such, the discussion around performance does need to focus why this may be the case.</p> <p>■ (SNC) raised some concerns about the scale of Schedule 17 packages and the appropriateness of an 8-week determination period, owing to 'major' applications normally being 13-16 weeks. The Chair and ■ (HS2) reminded the Forum that the HS2 Act refers to 8 weeks and that it is usual practice to submit packages of works. ■ (HS2) acknowledged this but also raised concerns about</p>	
---	--

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	resourcing. Action: Chair to set up a separate meeting to discuss planning consents performance.	Chair
5.	<p>Local Authority Feedback and Issues Arising</p> <p>■ (HCC) said that SLA claims are taking longer than usual to process. ■ (HS2) thanked HCC for the feedback, acknowledged that there have been delays and confirmed that HS2 is looking to resolve the issue.</p> <p>■ (Bucks Council) said that planning consents for works crossing contractor boundaries should be coordinated and that separate submissions may lead to delays in determining applications. ■ (HS2) explained that the project is aware of the issue and the discussion should remain bilateral unless it becomes a route wide issue. ■ (HS2) expressed the desire for HS2 to coordinate, however it was explained that different contracts have their own schedules. ■ (HS2) asked Bucks Council to relay issues to the contractors concerned.</p> <p>■ (HCC) raised the matter of split planning decisions. The Chair noted that LB Camden had provided a note on their experience and suggested that a smaller meeting could be held to discuss prior to the next PF. ■ (HS2) informed the Forum that a local planning authority had recently issued a split decision and that it would be useful to get their input. Chair agreed to invite them.</p> <p>Action: Chair to set up a meeting on split decisions and feedback at the next PF.</p> <p>■ (SNC) said that discussions had been held with the local community regarding an additional provision / assurance and asked whether the local planning authority should have also been informed. ■ (HS2) explained that discussions regarding assurances are usually with the beneficiary and as such others may not be involved. However, ■ (HS2) invited SNC to contact the team for more information if required.</p>	Chair
6.	<p>Skills and Employment</p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) introduced the HS2 skills and employment agenda, highlighting that HS2 will be a catalyst for growth, providing new opportunities in skills and employment.</p> <p>■ (HS2) set out the skills challenge for HS2 and the need to train and recruit a more diverse workforce in the context of an evolving economic situation and labour market following the coronavirus pandemic. It was highlighted that the project requires 30,000 people to design and build the railway and is seeking to recruit 2,000 apprentices.</p> <p>■ (HS2) set out the strategic goals for HS2, one of which is skills and employment with the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure HS2 has the skills to deliver the HS2 programme and leave a skills legacy for the transport sector and the wider UK economy. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create sustainable skills, employment and education opportunities in HS2 Ltd’s supply chain through the use of procurement levers. • Stimulate interest in Science, Engineering and Maths (STEM) subjects to encourage more young people into transport infrastructure related careers. • Work in partnership with stakeholders and industry as they maximise the economic and regeneration benefits of the HS2 programme locally along the line of route and across the UK. <p>■ (HS2) provided some statistics for apprentice starts within phase one local authority areas and shared details of the job brokerage scheme and other major achievements on the project to date. ■ (HS2) drew attention to recent work he has undertaken with Oxfordshire County Council to connect young and unemployed people with opportunities and jobs at HS2.</p> <p>■ (LBC) asked whether lessons could be learnt from Birmingham given the number of apprenticeship starts in the city. ■ (HS2) explained that there had also been a number of starts in London, but the figures there had been broken down by borough. She noted that the approach has been the same in both locations but that opportunities may be coming forward at different rates.</p> <p>■ (HS2) also asked whether there are contract targets for recruiting locally. ■ (HS2) explained that the stations contracts have a target but it isn’t mandated.</p> <p>Chair queried whether all HS2 apprentices are included in the local authority chart. ■ (HS2) clarified that the chart only shows apprenticeship starts in phase one local authority areas, therefore it excludes apprenticeship starts in other areas. ■ (HS2) confirmed that apprenticeship opportunities will become more widespread and ‘local’ as HS2 works advance.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>Arts Strategy</p> <p>■ (HS2 ■) introduced the HS2 Arts Strategy, which is part of its Design Vision. It was explained that HS2 contractors have a requirement to develop a strategy for their local area, supported by the Arts and Culture team.</p> <p>■ (HS2) explained that contactors are encouraged to work locally and provided some examples of where this is already underway. It was also explained that the work of the team and contractors is monitored by the independent Design Panel.</p> <p>■ (HS2) also highlighted the arts and culture programmes undertaken by the project, working closely with key stakeholders to help deliver a positive cultural legacy. It was noted that opportunities regarding the green corridor strategy, local tourism initiatives and ‘land art’ are being explored. ■ (HS2) set out that public art is being considered for the stations, which has involved setting up steering groups with local stakeholders to identify options.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>■ (LBC) asked whether a specific budget is set per contract and whether lessons have been learnt from other projects on the implementation of arts strategies. ■ (HS2) said that arts and culture is embedded in HS2 contracts and work is being done with local organisations as opposed to larger commercial consultancies, which is a lesson learnt from other projects.</p> <p>The Chair drew attention to other arts projects on Crossrail and Thames Tideway. ■ (HS2) noted that these were good examples and explained that HS2 didn't want to 'bolt-on' art afterwards and is seeking an integrated approach.</p> <p>■ (HS2) asked whether there is an intention to establish new arts groups in areas outside of urban areas where arts organisations are less common. ■ (HS2) acknowledged this and provided an example of work being done with the Canal and Rivers Trust on Phase 2a. It was also highlighted that even some urban areas don't have an arts infrastructure.</p> <p>The Chair asked if some specific examples can be provided for land art. ■ (HS2) explained that a business case was being put together and early-stage feasibility work undertaken.</p> <p>■ (HS2) drew attention to the new EKFB induction process which is supported by 40 professional actors. The Chair noted that a similar induction was used at Tideway, which was an impressive experience.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Statutory Guidance and Planning Forum Note 17 Update</p> <p>■ (HS2) provided an update on proposed PFN 17 (Information for Decision Making). ■ reminded the Forum that the PFN contains the text on information for determining planning submissions that Forum members had previously requested be included in a PFN rather than in the revised Statutory Guidance.</p> <p>■ (HS2) reminded the Forum of the timetable for agreeing this PFN and that a draft of the PFN was circulated to members on 22nd February for comment, together with a redraft revised Statutory Guidance. The deadline for comments was 1st March.</p> <p>■ (HS2) said that one set of minor comments on the PFN was received and had been adopted. On 8th March a final version of the PFN was circulated for agreement by email and no objections were received. PFN 17 is therefore taken to be agreed (15th March). This was agreed by the Forum.</p> <p>■ (DfT) provided an update on the Statutory Guidance and explained that DfT are seeking ministerial clearance on the revised draft. The intention is to publish the revised Statutory Guidance as soon as ministerial clearance is obtained (estimated to be mid/late April).</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

9.	<p>Community Engagement & Helpdesk Update</p> <p>██████████ (HS2 ██████████) provided an update on the helpdesk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• February was a busy month for HS2 due to the protest activity in Euston Square Gardens, which increased the number of complaints in total.• Over half of phase one construction complaints received in February 2021 related to the Euston protests with the remaining being predominantly traffic and transport or noise related.• 98% of all phase one complaints were resolved within 20 working days and 100% of complaints were resolved at the first step of the complaints process.	
10.	<p>Appeals and Judicial Reviews Update</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) provided an update on appeals and judicial reviews. It was explained that there are five live appeals, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>APP/HS2/9 SCS lorry route (LB Hillingdon)</i> - Appeal submitted 13 February – non determination.• <i>APP/HS2/10-14 (Bucks Council)</i> - Appeals submitted 15 March for four lorry routes (Align and EKFB) – non determination / refused. <p>For Judicial Reviews, the following update was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>JR1: Colne Valley Wetland APP/HS2/1 (LB Hillingdon)</i> - Supreme Court has refused HS2's application for permission to appeal the Court of Appeal decision of 31 July 2020• <i>JR2: SCS Lorry Routes APP/HS2/5 (LB Hillingdon)</i> - Sch 17 consent granted on appeal 28 July 2020. Hearing at High Court 10 February; awaiting decision.• <i>JR3: Colne Valley Viaduct APP/HS2/7 (LB Hillingdon)</i> - Sch 17 consent granted on appeal 18 November 2020. LB Hillingdon's application for judicial review of the appeal decision has been refused on the papers. LBH have until 19 March to request an oral hearing. <p>██████████ (HS2) highlighted that appeal and judicial review decisions have been uploaded here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-planning-appeal-decision</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) observed that the majority of appeals seems to be regarding lorry routes and questioned whether Sch 17 is an appropriate mechanism for approving these matters. The Chair noted that the majority of live submissions are currently lorry routes.</p> <p>██████████ (HS2) acknowledged these points and noted that Paragraph 6 has been problematic from a technical perspective and has led to some confusion. However, PFN 17 provides some additional guidance and clarity.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>11.</p>	<p>Forward Plan / AOB</p> <p>The Chair noted that Planning Forum will take place on the following dates in 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27th May • 22nd July • 30th September • 25th November <p>■ (HS2) said that Urban Integration, the Noise Barrier CDE workstream and updates to PFNs should feature on the next Planning Forum agenda.</p> <p>AOB</p> <p>■ (HCC) asked if updates from the Planning Forum sub-groups could be provided at a future Planning Forum. The Chair suggested that short presentations could be made at future meetings.</p> <p>■ (HS2) reminded the Forum of a recent email circulated on 11th March to members regarding changes from BREEAM to CEEQUAL. Action: HS2 to re-circulate the email and local planning authorities to provide comments before 8th April. ■ (HS2) reminded the Forum that the EMR General Principles state that HS2 will consult Planning Forum, not seek agreement (Ref 3.1.12).</p> <p>■ (HS2) clarified that during the pre-election period, HS2 will continue to make Schedule 17 submissions as normal. However it was acknowledged that local planning authorities may have restrictions on their own working arrangements and asked for these to be raised.</p> <p>■ (HCC) requested a response from HS2 on the accessible document formats. ■ (HS2) explained that contractors should be in the position to publish accessible documents. Action: ■ (HS2) agreed to send out a position statement on the matter.</p>	<p>HS2 / LPA's</p> <p>HS2</p>
	<p>End</p>	