Title:	Planning Forum for HS2 P	Phase 2b	
Date & Time	Wednesday 12 th January 2022 10:30 – 11:30 Microsoft Teams (Virtual meeting)		
Chair	Independent Chair		
HS2 Ltd			
Attendees:			
Local Authority Attendees:		South Ribble Borough Council (SRBC) Cumbria County Council (CuCC) Cheshire West and Chester Council (CWCC) Cheshire West and Chester Council (CWCC) Cheshire East Council (CEC) Manchester City Council (MCC) Carlisle City Council (CCC) Lancashire County Council () Manchester City Council (MCC) Warrington Borough Council (WBC) Wigan Council (WC) Trafford Council (TC)	
		Trafford Council (TC) Trafford Council (TC)	
Promoter Attendee:		Department for Transport (DfT) Department for Transport (DfT) Transport Scotland Transport Scotland Scottish Government Planning & Architecture	
Apologies:			

INDEPENDENT Phase 2b Planning FORUM FOR HS2

ltem		Action Owner
	Welcome and Introductions	
	Chair opened the meeting.	
1	Review of Minutes from Previous meeting	
	1.1. HS2 Ltd provided commentary on the outstanding actions and all actions were completed, except item 3 & 6 (see below).	
	1.2. HS2 confirmed that the amendment to the minutes (Item 5) requested by MCC was agreed and, with the addition of that change, the minutes were agreed.	
	1.3. Item 3 related to the changes made to the Environmental Minimum requirement (EMRs), HS2 Ltd agreed to review and send this to members prior to the next forum meeting (or shortly after the Hybrid Bill deposit).	
	1.4. Item 6 related to level of detail required for the SLA, HS2 Ltd welcomed further discussions with local authorities as to how aspects could be improved.	
	Action: HS2 Ltd agreed to circulate a Phase 2a Information Paper on the funding of local authority costs (there will be an equivalent version for Phase 2b).	HS2 Ltd
2	Purpose of current meeting	
	2.1 HS2 Ltd explained that previous meetings to date have focussed on information sharing. Members were advised once the Bill and associated documents have been deposited and are published for consultation (specifically the Hybrid Bill, Environmental Statement (ES), Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) - the Planning Forum will have the opportunity to discuss these matters in detail	
3	Integrated Rail Plan	
	3.1 The DfT provided an update on the recently published Integrated Rail Plan (IRP) (please refer to the slide deck).	
	3.2 The Chair sought clarification on the Golborne Link regarding its inclusion within the hybrid Bill for the western leg, following pre- meeting discussions with local authorities. It was explained that	

	 there was uncertainty amongst members regarding the potential implications of the recommendation made in the Union Connectivity Review for a review of alternative options to the Golborne Link to connect HS2 to the West Coast Main Line (WCML) north of Crewe, and how this may impact the Hybrid Bill. 3.3 The DfT informed members that the Government will publish a response to the Union Connectivity Review, which is likely to include guidance on the WCML link. 3.4 HS2 Ltd advised that the hybrid Bill will include the Golborne link and until a decision is made by Ministers on how to proceed with the recommendation regarding a link back on to the WCML, no change to the hybrid Bill will be made. However, if a change is required it could be achieved through an Additional Provision (AP) 	
	 to the hybrid Bill (see item 4 slide pack for further information on APs). 3.5 Further information related to the parliamentary process, including APs, can be found at the following link (Phase 2a examples): https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/understanding-the- 	
4	hybrid-bill-hs2-phase-2a-information-papers Scheme changes during Bill passage	
	 4.1 HS2 Ltd provided an overview of how changes to the scheme and hybrid Bill can be made and the processes involved (please refer to the slide deck). 	
	4.2 It was explained that the method for making a change to the Hybrid Bill differs according to the nature of the change. For minor changes agreed with individual parties, such as an agreement to not acquire land for environmental mitigation. Then a commitment could be provided to the affected party by for HS2 Ltd to not exercise the powers within the Bill. Such agreements are possible where they do not create a significant environmental effect (to the ES) and/or did not require an amendment to the Hybrid Bill.	
	4.3 HS2 Ltd explained that if a major change was proposed, which required additional or different Bill powers or would result in a new or different significant environmental effect would need a different process, and would be delivered by promoting an Additional Provision (AP) or a Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES).	
	4.4 HS2 Ltd advised that there was precedent for major changes being promoted during Bill passage, and explained that during the Phase 1 Bill amendments had been promoted to remove the HS2/HS1	

 connection included in the Bill on deposit, and, separately, a commitment had been given to not exercise the powers sought in the Bill for passive provision for a connection to Heathrow. 4.5 Members were advised that there had been previous precedence for handling the consequences of major changes to a scheme i.e., the removal of the HS2/HS1 link from the Phase 1 Bill (see slide deck for further information). 4.6 MCC asked who HS2 Ltd gave the commitment on the Heathrow connection to. 4.7 HS2 Ltd replied that in that case the commitment was given to the Select Committee itself. However, HS2 Ltd added that in most cases commitments on changes would be given to the petitioner pursuing the change. 4.8 WC queried whether a change to the HS2 route in the deposited bill, resulting from the Government's response to the Union Connectivity Review, would delay the Hybrid Bill timings. 4.9 HS2 Ltd informed members that an AP could be promoted to extend the scope of the scheme, but it is constrained by the long title of the hybrid Bill and the principle of the scheme as set by Second Reading, and it would depend on the specific extension proposed. 4.10 WC when referring to the Golborne link and the potential for an extension or removal, subject to the Union Connectivity Review, questioned if a change to the scope of those works would delay the passage of the hybrid Bill. 4.11 HS2 Ltd noted that no decision has been made on the Golborne link and Minsters are still in the process of reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the recommendations made in the Union Connectivity Review. However, it was explained that if a decision by Ministers was made to extend/amend or remove the Golborne link and to promote that as a change in the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link ange in the Hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne l			
 for handling the consequences of major changes to a scheme i.e., the removal of the H52/H51 link from the Phase 1 Bill (see slide deck for further information). 4.6 MCC asked who H52 Ltd gave the commitment on the Heathrow connection to. 4.7 H52 Ltd replied that in that case the commitment was given to the Select Committee itself. However, H52 Ltd added that in most cases commitments on changes would be given to the petitioner pursuing the change. 4.8 WC queried whether a change to the H52 route in the deposited bill, resulting from the Government's response to the Union Connectivity Review, would delay the Hybrid Bill timings. 4.9 H52 Ltd informed members that an AP could be promoted to extend the scope of the scheme, but it is constrained by the long title of the hybrid Bill and the principle of the scheme as set by Second Reading, and it would depend on the specific extension proposed. 4.10 WC when referring to the Golborne link and the potential for an extension or removal, subject to the Union Connectivity Review, questioned if a change to the scope of those works would delay the passage of the hybrid Bill. 4.11 H52 Ltd noted that no decision has been made on the Golborne link and Minsters are still in the process of reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the recommendations made in the Union Connectivity Review. However, it was explained that if a decision by Ministers was made to extend/amend or remove the Golborne link and to promote that as a change in the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would be communicated to Ministers deciding on the IRP and Union Connectivity Review. 4.13 H52 Ltd reiterated that no decision to remove the Golborne link has been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation 		commitment had been given to not exercise the powers sought in	
 connection to. 4.7 HS2 Ltd replied that in that case the commitment was given to the Select Committee itself. However, HS2 Ltd added that in most cases commitments on changes would be given to the petitioner pursuing the change. 4.8 WC queried whether a change to the HS2 route in the deposited bill, resulting from the Government's response to the Union Connectivity Review, would delay the Hybrid Bill timings. 4.9 HS2 Ltd informed members that an AP could be promoted to extend the scope of the scheme, but it is constrained by the long title of the hybrid Bill and the principle of the scheme as set by Second Reading, and it would depend on the specific extension proposed. 4.10 WC when referring to the Golborne link and the potential for an extension or removal, subject to the Union Connectivity Review, questioned if a change to the scope of those works would delay the passage of the hybrid Bill. 4.11 HS2 Ltd noted that no decision has been made on the Golborne link and Minsters are still in the process of reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the recommendations made in the Union Connectivity Review. However, it was explained that if a decision by Ministers was made to extend/amend or remove the Golborne link and to promote that as a change in the hybrid Bill that could have implications for the Bill passage programme. 4.12 CWCC questioned how comments submitted in response to the consultation on the ES that would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would be communicated to Ministers deciding on the IRP and Union Connectivity Review. 4.13 HS2 Ltd reiterated that no decision to remove the Golborne link has been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation 	4.5	for handling the consequences of major changes to a scheme i.e., the removal of the HS2/HS1 link from the Phase 1 Bill (see slide deck	
 Select Committee itself. However, HS2 Ltd added that in most cases commitments on changes would be given to the petitioner pursuing the change. 4.8 WC queried whether a change to the HS2 route in the deposited bill, resulting from the Government's response to the Union Connectivity Review, would delay the Hybrid Bill timings. 4.9 HS2 Ltd informed members that an AP could be promoted to extend the scope of the scheme, but it is constrained by the long title of the hybrid Bill and the principle of the scheme as set by Second Reading, and it would depend on the specific extension proposed. 4.10 WC when referring to the Golborne link and the potential for an extension or removal, subject to the Union Connectivity Review, questioned if a change to the scope of those works would delay the passage of the hybrid Bill. 4.11 HS2 Ltd noted that no decision has been made on the Golborne link and Minsters are still in the process of reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the recommendations made in the Union Connectivity Review. However, it was explained that if a decision by Ministers was made to extend/amend or remove the Golborne link and to promote that as a change in the hybrid Bill that could have implications for the Bill passage programme. 4.12 CWCC questioned how comments submitted in response to the consultation on the ES that would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would be communicated to Ministers deciding on the IRP and Union Connectivity Review. 4.13 HS2 Ltd reiterated that no decision to remove the Golborne link has been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation 	4.6	-	
 resulting from the Government's response to the Union Connectivity Review, would delay the Hybrid Bill timings. 4.9 HS2 Ltd informed members that an AP could be promoted to extend the scope of the scheme, but it is constrained by the long title of the hybrid Bill and the principle of the scheme as set by Second Reading, and it would depend on the specific extension proposed. 4.10 WC when referring to the Golborne link and the potential for an extension or removal, subject to the Union Connectivity Review, questioned if a change to the scope of those works would delay the passage of the hybrid Bill. 4.11 HS2 Ltd noted that no decision has been made on the Golborne link and Minsters are still in the process of reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the recommendations made in the Union Connectivity Review. However, it was explained that if a decision by Ministers was made to extend/amend or remove the Golborne link and to promote that as a change in the hybrid Bill that could have implications for the Bill passage programme. 4.12 CWCC questioned how comments submitted in response to the consultation on the ES that would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would be communicated to Ministers deciding on the IRP and Union Connectivity Review. 4.13 HS2 Ltd reiterated that no decision to remove the Golborne link has been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation 	4.7	Select Committee itself. However, HS2 Ltd added that in most cases commitments on changes would be given to the petitioner pursuing	
 the scope of the scheme, but it is constrained by the long title of the hybrid Bill and the principle of the scheme as set by Second Reading, and it would depend on the specific extension proposed. 4.10 WC when referring to the Golborne link and the potential for an extension or removal, subject to the Union Connectivity Review, questioned if a change to the scope of those works would delay the passage of the hybrid Bill. 4.11 HS2 Ltd noted that no decision has been made on the Golborne link and Minsters are still in the process of reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the recommendations made in the Union Connectivity Review. However, it was explained that if a decision by Ministers was made to extend/amend or remove the Golborne link and to promote that as a change in the hybrid Bill that could have implications for the Bill passage programme. 4.12 CWCC questioned how comments submitted in response to the consultation on the ES that would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would be communicated to Ministers deciding on the IRP and Union Connectivity Review. 4.13 HS2 Ltd reiterated that no decision to remove the Golborne link has been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation 	4.8	resulting from the Government's response to the Union	
 extension or removal, subject to the Union Connectivity Review, questioned if a change to the scope of those works would delay the passage of the hybrid Bill. 4.11 HS2 Ltd noted that no decision has been made on the Golborne link and Minsters are still in the process of reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the recommendations made in the Union Connectivity Review. However, it was explained that if a decision by Ministers was made to extend/amend or remove the Golborne link and to promote that as a change in the hybrid Bill that could have implications for the Bill passage programme. 4.12 CWCC questioned how comments submitted in response to the consultation on the ES that would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would be communicated to Ministers deciding on the IRP and Union Connectivity Review. 4.13 HS2 Ltd reiterated that no decision to remove the Golborne link has been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation 	4.9	the scope of the scheme, but it is constrained by the long title of the hybrid Bill and the principle of the scheme as set by Second Reading,	
 and Minsters are still in the process of reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the recommendations made in the Union Connectivity Review. However, it was explained that if a decision by Ministers was made to extend/amend or remove the Golborne link and to promote that as a change in the hybrid Bill that could have implications for the Bill passage programme. 4.12 CWCC questioned how comments submitted in response to the consultation on the ES that would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would be communicated to Ministers deciding on the IRP and Union Connectivity Review. 4.13 HS2 Ltd reiterated that no decision to remove the Golborne link has been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation 	4.10	extension or removal, subject to the Union Connectivity Review, questioned if a change to the scope of those works would delay the	
 consultation on the ES that would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would be communicated to Ministers deciding on the IRP and Union Connectivity Review. 4.13 HS2 Ltd reiterated that no decision to remove the Golborne link has been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation 	4.11	and Minsters are still in the process of reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the recommendations made in the Union Connectivity Review. However, it was explained that if a decision by Ministers was made to extend/amend or remove the Golborne link and to promote that as a change in the hybrid Bill that could have	
been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation	4.12	consultation on the ES that would accompany the hybrid Bill that relate to the Golborne link would be communicated to Ministers	
in the hybrid Bill on deposit.	4.13	been made. Therefore, anyone responding to the ES consultation should submit comments on the Golborne link as it is to be included	

	4.14 It was explained that the ES consultation serves a particular purpose, namely to inform Parliament of the main themes raised in the consultation. The responses to the consultation are summarised by an independent assessor appointed by Parliament who produce a report that is published prior to Second Reading. The decision-making process on the response to the Union Connectivity Review in general and on the Golborne link in particular was a separate process.	
	4.15 The Chair summarised stating that the scope of the Hybrid Bill appears clear in relation to providing a link back to the WCML north of Crewe, but there may be further changes after Hybrid Bill deposit in relation to the Golborne link, having regard to the Government's response to the Union Connectivity Review.	
5	Community Engagement - details of Bill deposit	
	5.1. HS2 Ltd explained the Bill launch process and activities associated with the Hybrid Bill is deposited. This included the consultation that is triggered once the Hybrid Bill is deposited to parliament and the role of HS2 engagement with stakeholder and the community throughout the parliamentary stage (further information can be found in the slide pack).	
	5.2. HS2 Ltd made the forum aware that like Phase 1 & 2a of HS2, subgroup forums will be created to discuss topic specific matters with relevant local authorities with their area experts.	
	 5.3. HS2 Ltd advised that the four sub-groups would be: Highways Heritage Environmental Health Water & Drainage. 	
	5.4 HS2 confirmed that it would provide more information about the role and purpose of each subgroup and for ease this is set out below (Text in italics to denote it has been added post meeting)	
	5.4.1. The Highway Subgroup of the HS2 Phase 2b Planning Forum will be set up to:	
	• Facilitate engagement between members on route-wide common interest matters related to local highway authority roads and public rights of way.	

INDEPENDENT Phase 2b Planning FORUM FOR HS2

•	Seek agreement on a common approach to route-wide principles,
•	
	standards, practices and processes associated with highway
	consents and approvals.
•	Present recommendations on highway-related planning consents
	and approvals to the Planning Forum as appropriate.
٠	Identify and discuss areas of common interest and concern to local
	highways authorities along the whole line of route; and
٠	Progress matters as raised and directed by the relevant Select
	Committee during the passage of the HS2 Phase 2b Bill through
	Parliament.
5.4.2.	The Heritage Subgroup of the HS2 Phase 2b Planning Forum will be set
up to:	
٠	Enable engagement between the HS2 Archaeology and Heritage
	Manager and its consultants with Historic England and Local
	Planning Authority archaeological and heritage officers.
٠	Discuss principles and practices that could be applied at the Project
	level to enable a successful outcome
٠	To facilitate the integration of heritage matters into other aspects of
	the design process.
5.4.3.	The Environmental Health Subgroup of the HS2 Phase 2b Planning
Forum	will be set up to:
•	Enable engagement between members of the sub group on matters
	related to environmental health;
•	Seek agreement and discuss route wide principles, standards,
	practices, and processes associated with environmental health
	matters.
٠	Report progress, actions and issues as required to the HS2 Phase 2b
	Planning Forum; and
•	Present recommendations on agreements to the Planning Forum
5.4.4 1	The Water & Drainage Subgroup of the HS2 Phase 2b Planning Forum
will be	e set up to:
٠	Enable engagement between members of the sub group on matters
	related to water, drainage and flood risk;
•	Seek agreement and discuss route wide principles, standards,
	practices, and processes associated with water, drainage and flood
	risk matters.
•	Report progress, actions and issues as required to the HS2 Phase 2b
	Planning Forum; and
	Present recommendations on agreements to the Planning Forum
ב ב ווי	2 ltd explained that the nature of matters to be addressed by all the
	2 Ltd explained that the nature of matters to be addressed by all the
-	oups may evolve as the project develops. It is not the purpose of the oups to discuss location specific issues and mitigation, which will

	be considered through bilateral meetings.	
	5.6 HS2 Ltd also advised that they hold an extensive list of technical contacts for each local authority and following Hybrid Bill deposit will contact the forum members to ensure that their lists are correct, and the appropriate contacts are invited to the specific sub group forum.	
6	Planning authority feedback and matters	
	6.1. The Chair reported that a pre-meeting with local authorities had been undertaken on 6 th December 2021 to discuss the IRP, specifically the Golborne link in relation to the Union Connectivity Review and the Hybrid Bill.	
	6.2. All pre-meetings have been booked for 2022 and the next pre- meeting is scheduled for 9 th February.	
	6.3. The Chair welcomed the DfT's presentation on the IRP and addressing the many of the concerns raised by local authorities.	
	6.4. The Chair volunteered to meet with local authorities along the route to obtain a greater level of understanding of the areas of change in each authority. The Chair will contact local planning authorities separately to arrange site visits.	
	Action: The Chair to contact local planning authorities to arrange site visits.	The Chair
7	Arrangements for the next meeting	
	7. The next meeting will be held via MS Teams on 9 th March.	
8	AOB	
	Ground Investigations (GI)	
	 8.1 HS2 Ltd explained that they are beginning the process of ground investigations for the Western Leg of HS2, which will involve the award of a GI contract in late 2022. The GI works will require a central facility and a site selection process is currently ongoing to secure a site for the facility by summer 2022. HS2 Ltd advised that they will be contact with local authorities to determine who should they contact to discuss possible compound locations in their area, specifically sites that meet the following criteria: 	

INDEPENDENT Phase 2b Planning FORUM FOR HS2

• 2 – 3 acres in size	
Temporary use up to 5 years	
 Sites with existing permission for GI/storage 	
8.1.1 The Chair sought clarification as to the nature of activities that that will be undertaken at the Ground Investigation Facility.	
8.1.2 HS2 Ltd advised that the main use would be for storage of equipment & vehicles, offices, welfare facilities and lay down areas.	
8.2 HS2 Ltd suggested that the GI programme should be revisited in more detail in future meetings to provide an update, advise of the programme and the overarching consenting procedures used on Phase 1 and 2a.	
8.3 The Chair welcomed this clarification and recommended that the GI programme and requests should be brought to the Planning Forum for discussion/information purposes.	
A non-technical summary of what the ground investigation process consists of can be accessed here: <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-ground-investigations-a-non-technical-guide</u>	
8.4 The Chair invited local authorities to raise any other business.	
8.5 MCC queried how the Planning Forum would be used once the Hybrid Bill is live and would the forum become a place to discuss issues and ask questions about the Hybrid Bill.	
8.6 HS2 Ltd advised that the Planning Forum does not discuss site specific matters and these should be undertaken bi-laterally with the Bill team at HS2 Ltd.	
8.8 HS2 Ltd advised that whilst the Hybrid Bill is live, the planning forum would consider the suite of documents associated with the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) to collectively agree a final version.	
8.8 MCC sought clarity on ES consultation period.	
8.9 HS2 Ltd noted that the minimum requirement is 56 days, however HS2 Ltd took an action to confirm.	
 Action: HS2 Ltd to confirm the ES consultation period.	HS2 Ltd
END	