

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

Title:	Independent Phase One Planning Forum for HS2	
Date & Time	Thursday 17th March 2022 13:00 – 15:30 Microsoft Teams Meeting	
Chair	[REDACTED]	Independent Chair
Promoter Attendees:	[REDACTED]	<p>HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) Arup HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) Constain SCS HS2 Ltd (Town Planning) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) HS2 Ltd (Town Planner) HS2 Ltd (Project Director – Civils) HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd (Town Planner) HS2 Ltd (Senior Town Planning Manager) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) LM JV Department for Transport (DfT) HS2 Ltd (Town Planner) HS2 Ltd (Lead Architect) Weston Williams HS2 Ltd (Town Planner) HS2 Ltd (Head of Town Planning) Fusion JV HS2 Ltd (Town Planning) HS2 Ltd Head of Public Response Wardell-Armstrong HS2 Ltd (Town Planning) Department for Transport (DfT) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager)</p>
Local Authority Attendees:	[REDACTED]	<p>Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Solihull MBC London Borough of Camden (LBC) West Northamptonshire Council (WNC) North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF) Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C) Hertfordshire County Council (HCC)</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

		<p>London Borough of Camden (LBC) Solihull Met Borough Council (SMBC) London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (LBHF) Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC) West Northamptonshire Council (WNC) Warwick District Council (WDC) Lichfield District Council (LDC) Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Birmingham City Council (BBC)</p>
--	--	--

Item		Action Owner																					
1.	Introductions – were made.																						
2.	<p>Review of minutes of the January meeting and outstanding actions.</p> <p>Outstanding actions were reviewed:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">Date</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Action</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sep 19</td> <td>Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update to the Planning Forum Note.</td> <td>Update under Item 6 but to be confirmed when the PFN is finalized.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sep 19</td> <td>Consider opportunities within Noise Barrier CDE to replace ‘where appropriate’ with ‘as agreed’ or similar.</td> <td>Update under Item 6 but to be confirmed when the PFN is finalized.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sep 19</td> <td>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.</td> <td>Confirmed that hand rails and access steps are not to be taken forward however contractors are to be encouraged to ensure high quality in the design of these aspects.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>May 21</td> <td>Signage strategy for HS2 to be brought Planning Forum.</td> <td>For later Planning Forum.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jul 21/ Sep 21</td> <td>HS2 and LPAs to reconsider proposed change to PFN 6 (requirement for lorry route approval for local suppliers) and feedback at next PF.</td> <td>Closed. PFN6 updated and uploaded to .gov website</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jul 21</td> <td>HS2 and LPAs to consider the proposed change to PFN 6 to introduce requirement for direction of travel arrows on plans.</td> <td>Closed. PFN6 updated and uploaded to .gov website</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date	Action	Status	Sep 19	Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update to the Planning Forum Note.	Update under Item 6 but to be confirmed when the PFN is finalized.	Sep 19	Consider opportunities within Noise Barrier CDE to replace ‘where appropriate’ with ‘as agreed’ or similar.	Update under Item 6 but to be confirmed when the PFN is finalized.	Sep 19	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.	Confirmed that hand rails and access steps are not to be taken forward however contractors are to be encouraged to ensure high quality in the design of these aspects.	May 21	Signage strategy for HS2 to be brought Planning Forum.	For later Planning Forum.	Jul 21/ Sep 21	HS2 and LPAs to reconsider proposed change to PFN 6 (requirement for lorry route approval for local suppliers) and feedback at next PF.	Closed. PFN6 updated and uploaded to .gov website	Jul 21	HS2 and LPAs to consider the proposed change to PFN 6 to introduce requirement for direction of travel arrows on plans.	Closed. PFN6 updated and uploaded to .gov website	
Date	Action	Status																					
Sep 19	Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update to the Planning Forum Note.	Update under Item 6 but to be confirmed when the PFN is finalized.																					
Sep 19	Consider opportunities within Noise Barrier CDE to replace ‘where appropriate’ with ‘as agreed’ or similar.	Update under Item 6 but to be confirmed when the PFN is finalized.																					
Sep 19	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.	Confirmed that hand rails and access steps are not to be taken forward however contractors are to be encouraged to ensure high quality in the design of these aspects.																					
May 21	Signage strategy for HS2 to be brought Planning Forum.	For later Planning Forum.																					
Jul 21/ Sep 21	HS2 and LPAs to reconsider proposed change to PFN 6 (requirement for lorry route approval for local suppliers) and feedback at next PF.	Closed. PFN6 updated and uploaded to .gov website																					
Jul 21	HS2 and LPAs to consider the proposed change to PFN 6 to introduce requirement for direction of travel arrows on plans.	Closed. PFN6 updated and uploaded to .gov website																					

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	Jan 22	Chair to provide response to DfT letter to Local Authorities, regarding findings of Planning Forum Sch 17 performance review.	Closed. Chair's letter issued 3 March. Further update under Item 4
	Jan 22	Chair to provide list of names to DfT for Planning Forum representatives on Prolonged Scheme Disturbance review panel	Closed. Initial meeting held between DfT/HS2/LA representatives. DR (LBC) and JF (HCC) provided initial feedback regarding concern with noise being used as a proxy. Further meeting to be arranged. Any further attendees from Planning Forum welcomed.
	Jan 22	HS2 to provide links to EHO sub-group meeting minutes	Closed. Updated meeting minutes issued 15/03/2022
	Jan 22	Concern re. Progress on CDEs. HS2 to consider how Planning Forum can assist with the delivery of CDE's	PF Design Group met on 4 March. Update under Item 6
	Jan 22	HS2 to update on how issues of sub-soil and land acquisition powers in general are being communicated with residents by the land and property team/community engagement team	Update under Item 7
	Jan 22	HS2 to update appeals digest with Solihull appeal decision.	HS2 to circulate in due course
	Jan 22	HS2 to update on availability of Construction Commissioner and HS2 CEO for presentation at a future Planning Forum	Mark Thurston (HS2 CEO) to attend May Planning Forum. HS2 to update on Construction Commissioner.
3.	HS2 Project Update		
	<p>The Phase 1 Project update was provided by DE (HS2), showing progress on enabling works, main works & stations contracts.</p> <p>TA (Chair) had read media comments regarding the tunnels to/from Old Oak Common. DE (HS2) confirmed that they are on the critical path but that progress is moving forward. PG (HS2) noted that most important consents are in place for the TBM launches at Hillingdon.</p>		

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>4.</p>	<p>Planning Consents Performance</p> <p>PG (HS2) presented charts showing the time taken to determine main works Schedule 17 applications in the last six months. PG noted performance is broadly similar to previous months with approximately one third of submissions determined in 8 weeks or less, one third between 8-16 week and one third over 16 weeks.</p> <p>PG (HS2) also presented charts showing Schedule 17 applications currently awaiting determination. These show a slight improvement of the position since the January Planning Forum but still with over half of applications at 16 weeks or over.</p> <p>PG (HS2) also shared a chart showing actual number of Schedule 17 submissions vs. planned submissions shown in quarterly forward plans. PG (HS2) noted there was a slight under-performance in January and February in terms of targeted submissions and also noted that a large number of submissions are targeted for April albeit with no one authority due to receive more than 6 applications.</p> <p>PG (HS2) presented an update on the status of appeals. Noted that the Bromford East appeal (HS2/APP/18) is the only live appeal.</p> <p>TA (Chair) raised his letter sent in response to that issued by DfT to the heads of Qualifying Local Planning Authorities (LPAs). TA (Chair) queried whether there is a correlation between lorry route applications and long determination times PG (HS2) confirmed that HS2 can look at the statistics to test that possibility.</p> <p>TH (DfT) welcomed the letter from TA but queried the plan for continuing the work in addressing the issues. TA noted that some actions needed to be agreed such as LPAs preparing a specific Sch 17 determination process to track applications against. TH (DfT) noted it was surprising that more LPAs didn't already have such processes in place. JF (HCC) noted the process at HCC helped to structure workload although even with a process in place, it has not been possible to determine all applications within 8 weeks.</p> <p>GK (Bucks C) noted that resource availability and slow contractor responses are factors leading to delays – it isn't just the LPAs. PG (HS2) noted that the same contractor was achieving timely decisions in another LPA area and doesn't believe this is a driving factor in delays.</p> <p>TA (Chair) noted that he intends on approaching LPAs to understand better the impact of resourcing constraints on determination times. TA (Chair) raised the issue about SLA funding and lack of response from HS2. PG (HS2) noted there had been personnel changes within HS2 although HS2 remain open to engaging in discussions.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>Chair</p>
------------------	---	---

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>5.</p>	<p>Local Authority Feedback and Issues Arising</p> <p>JF (HCC) express a desire to work together to drive down determination times but also raised concerns on SLAs, particularly regarding the level of scrutiny that is applied to LPA timesheets. PG (HS2) noted that the issue had been taken on board and was being reviewed internally. Feedback can be provided at a future Planning Forum.</p> <p>GK (Bucks C) queried the quality of pre-app engagement at times. PG (HS2) confirmed that this is an area of improvement that continues to be worked on. DW (WNC) reiterated that this is an issue seen in WNC also.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Common Design Elements and Design Approaches Update</p> <p>MS (HS2) provided a summary of progress to date, noting that PFN 15 (Piers) and PFN 16 (Parapets) are still available for use. A paper is being developed to review lessons learnt on the design of low viaducts through the English countryside.</p> <p>MS (HS2) indicated that the Design Group met on 4th March 2022 to discuss the draft PFN for Lineside Noise Barriers. Some points needing further discussion were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The PFN falls short of describing a common design. b) The CDE must streamline the consents process. c) Arguments around visibility decreasing with distance not convincing. d) Planting as mitigation <p>MS (HS2) to issue a programme for completion of the PFN and to present a draft PFN at the May Planning Forum.</p> <p>MS (HS2) confirmed that contractors are now ready to engage on parapets for road overbridges and he will also issue a programme with the intention of having a decision on how to move it forward at the May Planning Forum.</p> <p>MS (HS2) confirmed that a signage strategy has been developed for wayfinding at stations and public facing signage at HS2 compounds. A short presentation can be prepared for a future Planning Forum.</p> <p>MS (HS2) noted that a fencing design approach has completed HS2 governance and will be instructed imminently. A summary presentation can be provided for a future Planning Forum on the complete document.</p> <p>MS (HS2) noted that there is a lack of desire to develop any further formal CDEs for any other elements such as handrails or access steps. TA (Chair) confirmed that it isn't possible to have these elements as a formal CDE as they are not subject to LPA approval. However, contractors should be encouraged to ensure these elements are delivered to a high quality. MS (HS2) to feed back to contractors.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>GK (Bucks C) queried the status of the fencing CDE. MS (HS2) confirmed that the fencing design approach would not be enshrined in a PFN as their design is not for LPA approval, only their locations.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>Community Engagement</p> <p>SG (HS2) advised that early 2022 helpdesk contacts were increasing again following the December dip. Around 62% of enquiries are resolved by the helpdesk at first point of contact. 38% require referral to technical specialists or the supply chain. Of those around 69% are resolved within 2 working days.</p> <p>The new KPI relating to urgent construction enquiries and complaints has now been reported on. Between October 2021 and February 2022, 93% of urgent enquiries and complaints were responded to within 2 working days.</p> <p>In February 2022, 106 complaints were received, making a total of 1515 in 2021/2022 so far. 94% relate to Phase 1. The level of complaints in February 2022 is down from January 2022. Complaints are again primarily construction related.</p> <p>Escalations in complaints to the Construction Commissioner are still low with no complaints being referred in 2022 to either the Commissioner or the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman.</p> <p>DS (HS2) confirmed that an email was circulated 15/03/2022 from the Planning Forum email address providing a response from the Land and Property regarding the process of engagement regarding sub-soil ownership. JF (HCC) requested that HS2 provide advanced notice of any further notices to be issued to residents on this matter to assist in dealing with residents' queries.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Appeals and Judicial Reviews Update</p> <p>PG (HS2) noted a hearing for the Bromford Tunnel East Portal appeal (APP/HS2/18) was to be held on 27/04/22.</p> <p>There are three live Judicial Reviews (APP/HS2/14 A422 Brackley Road, APP/HS2/16 Wendover Green Lorry Route, APP/HS2/10-13 A413 Lorry Routes). The applications have been rolled into a single JR hearing to be held on 8-9th June 2022.</p> <p>Details of all appeals and JR decisions are available on the Planning Forum gov.uk website which has been updated with the HS2/APP/17 decision:</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-planning-appeal-decisions</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>9.</p>	<p>Forward Plan / AOB</p> <p>Dates for future 2022 Planning Forums were proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26th May • 28th July • 29th September • 24th November <p>JF (HCC) requested an update from the business team on the number of SMEs involved with HS2, their geographic locations and what economic benefits this has had. PG (HS2) to raise query with the HS2 business team to identify a presenter for Planning Forum.</p> <p>JF (HCC) also suggested that future Planning Forums could have case study presentations on challenging Sch17 consents such as the western valley slopes consent to disseminate lessons learnt.</p> <p>CB (HS2) noted the importance of PFN10 regarding indicative restoration and requested to LPAs that where contractors ask for feedback on indicative mitigation proposals, that feedback is given to allow it to be incorporated into the final plans. GK (Bucks C) suggested that the detail that is provided often requires further discussion and where early works are to be carried out, specific landscape related pre-application meetings are arranged. CB (HS2) indicated that even this level of feedback, that further detail is needed or what elements of a plan may be causing concern would assist. JF (HCC) noted that some response will be caveated that further dialogue may be needed between when feedback is given and when it is to be brought into use.</p> <p>PG (HS2) noted that while some LPAs may provide some responses to indicative mitigation through pre-app discussions, it would be helpful if feedback is provided through the indicative mitigation pro-forma as detailed in PFN10, which HS2 will recirculate.</p> <p>DW (WNC) questioned detail of third-party agreements that would be in place for maintenance and management of landscaping and how these would operate. PG (HS2) noted that a presentation could be provided at a future meeting to detail the frameworks that are in place regarding bilateral agreements between HS2 and landowners.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>End</p>		