

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

Title:	Independent Phase One Planning Forum for HS2	
Date & Time	Thursday 28th July 2022 Microsoft Teams Meeting 13:00 – 15:30	
Chair	[REDACTED]	Independent Chair
Promoter Attendees:	[REDACTED]	<p>HS2 Ltd (Senior Delivery Sponsor) Arup HS2 Ltd (Architect) BBV BBV BBV SCS HS2 Ltd (Town Planning) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning) Department for Transport (DfT) HS2 Ltd BBV EKFB HS2 Ltd (Senior Town Planning Manager) HS2 Ltd (Planning Phase 1 Lead) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) HS2 Ltd (Senior Business Engagement Manager) Weston Williamson HS2 Ltd (Head of Town Planning) Fusion JV Mace HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning) Wardell-Armstrong HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) BBV HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) HS2 Ltd (Senior Public Response Manager) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) EKFB</p>
Local Authority Attendees:	[REDACTED]	<p>Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) Westminster City Council (WCC) Solihull Met Borough Council (SMBC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) West Northamptonshire Council (WNC) North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC)</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	[REDACTED]	<p>Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC) London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham (LBHF) Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C) Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) Solihull Met Borough Council (SMBC) West Northamptonshire Council (WNC) Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) Lichfield District Council (LDC) Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C) Birmingham City Council (BCC)</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>Draft Noise Barrier PFN18 issued to Members for comment 15/07/22 which does reference reverse side of noise barrier</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>Draft Noise Barrier PFN18 issued to Members for comment 15/07/22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jan 22</td> <td>Chair to provide a list of names to DfT for Planning Forum representatives on the Prolonged Scheme Disturbance review panel</td> <td>DJ (DfT) provided an overview noting a review of historical data from Phase One is progressing with particular look into disruption in three case study areas; Camden, Old Oak Common and Calvert. Further engagement with PDS review panel to take place end of August/Early Sept to review data and discuss recommendation with a view to the review concluding in the early Autumn.</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.	Draft Noise Barrier PFN18 issued to Members for comment 15/07/22 which does reference reverse side of noise barrier	Sep 19	Consider opportunities within Noise Barrier CDE to replace ‘where appropriate’ with ‘as agreed’ or similar.	Draft Noise Barrier PFN18 issued to Members for comment 15/07/22	Jan 22	Chair to provide a list of names to DfT for Planning Forum representatives on the Prolonged Scheme Disturbance review panel	DJ (DfT) provided an overview noting a review of historical data from Phase One is progressing with particular look into disruption in three case study areas; Camden, Old Oak Common and Calvert. Further engagement with PDS review panel to take place end of August/Early Sept to review data and discuss recommendation with a view to the review concluding in the early Autumn.	
Date	Action	Status												
Sep 19	Consider referencing the reverse side of the noise barrier in the next update to the Planning Forum Note.	Draft Noise Barrier PFN18 issued to Members for comment 15/07/22 which does reference reverse side of noise barrier												
Sep 19	Consider opportunities within Noise Barrier CDE to replace ‘where appropriate’ with ‘as agreed’ or similar.	Draft Noise Barrier PFN18 issued to Members for comment 15/07/22												
Jan 22	Chair to provide a list of names to DfT for Planning Forum representatives on the Prolonged Scheme Disturbance review panel	DJ (DfT) provided an overview noting a review of historical data from Phase One is progressing with particular look into disruption in three case study areas; Camden, Old Oak Common and Calvert. Further engagement with PDS review panel to take place end of August/Early Sept to review data and discuss recommendation with a view to the review concluding in the early Autumn.												

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	Mar 22	HS2 to issue a programme for the completion of lineside noise barriers PFN & parapets on road overbridges design	Draft PFN16b on parapets for road overbridges and draft Noise Barrier PFN18 issued to Members for comment 15/07/22	
	Mar 22	HS2 to arrange for a future presentation on the fencing design approach	An update is scheduled to be provided at the September Planning Forum	
	Mar 22	HS2 to identify a presenter for a future Planning Forum to discuss SME involvement with HS2	Presentation by [REDACTED] – Senior Business Engagement Manager under Item 8	
	Mar 22	HS2 to arrange a presentation for future Planning Forum on details of frameworks in place for bilateral agreements between HS2 and landowners	Presentation by [REDACTED] – HS2 Senior Delivery Sponsor under Item 9	
	Mar 22	HS2 to arrange a discussion session with LPA's regarding the position on SLA's.	Session to be arranged for October.	
3.	HS2 Project Update			
	<p>The Phase 1 Project update was provided by PG (HS2), showing progress on enabling works, main works & station contracts.</p> <p>EL (NWBC) mentioned the movement of a conveyor at Water Orton and re-iterated the need for pre-application engagement to ensure the LPAs are made aware of any significant construction updates. PG (HS2) noted that the respective HS2 planning manager will liaise with EL on this matter.</p>			HS2
4.	Planning Consents Performance			
	<p>MD (HS2) presented charts showing the time taken to determine the main works Schedule 17 applications in the last six months. MD noted performance is broadly similar to previous months.</p>			

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>MD (HS2) also presented charts showing Schedule 17 applications currently awaiting determination. These show a higher proportion of applications in the 8-16 week determination period however the statistics weren't raising major concerns at this present time.</p> <p>MD (HS2) also shared a chart showing actual numbers of Schedule 17 submissions vs. planned submissions shown in quarterly forward plans. MD (HS2) noted that HS2 are seeking to issue forward plans more regularly that every 3 months to give greater clarity on the planned numbers of submissions.</p> <p>MD (HS2) presented an update on the status of appeals, with 4 live appeals.</p> <p>TA (Chair) requested feedback via email from LPA's that the request for a Sch17 workflow process was being acted upon.</p>	<p>LPAs</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Local Authority Feedback and Issues Arising</p> <p>DW (WNC) noted that LPAs appreciate the time constraints contractors are under however indicated that in some instances, key information is being provided to planning officers late in the process. MD (HS2) noted that the HS2 planning team will be considering the concerns raised by DW.</p> <p>JS (SMBC) reiterated the same concerns that at times there are delays in information coming back to planning officers were requested following an initial pre-application discussion.</p> <p>GK (Bucks C) highlighted that transparency on the schedule for submissions would assist LPA's so that pre-application engagement can be best practice driven as well as being schedule driven.</p> <p>TA (Chair) raised a suggestion for HS2 contractors to prepare a list of questions to be provided to LPA's which could provide feedback on the perceived strengths and weaknesses of contractors with a view of identifying areas of potential improvement. PG (HS2) questioned whether TA could facilitate an exercise for both sides to provide feedback on performance. HS2 to canvas opinion on the approach from contractors.</p> <p>VC (BCC) raised the need for written statements with pre-application submission and Sch17 submissions. Currently the statements are missing a description of what the LPA is being asked to assess against Sch17 of the Act and how HS2 have assessed the submission against the relevant parts of the Act. VC queried whether PFN3 may need amending. MD (HS2) appreciated the suggestion and would look into what guidance could be provided to contractors. DW (WNC) further queried how EIA regulations are covered in the written statement and requested that further information is required to demonstrate that Sch17 applications respond to the EIA regulations or identify what further information is required to demonstrate that EIA regulations are</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	being complied with.	
6.	<p>Common Design Elements and Design Approaches Update</p> <p>WM (HS2) provided an update on CDE’s noting that draft Planning Forum Note (PFN) 16a, 16b and 18 have been circulated.</p> <p>WM described the content of draft PFN 18 regarding lineside noise barriers with a concealed post barrier and exposed post barrier. WM reiterated that a CDE has not been pursued for lineside noise barriers.</p> <p>TJ (Bucks C) noted their presumption in favour of the concealed post option. JF (HCC) queried who would be erecting the noise barriers. WM (HS2) confirmed the main works contractors would be responsible for constructing noise barriers.</p> <p>DW (WNC) questioned the approach to inserting a crank on an exposed post barrier. WM (HS2) noted that generally a crank on exposed post barrier is not being considered given that the locations for exposed post barriers are more rural and should not require a crank. However, should it be required, it would be designed in a similar way to the concealed post. Any gaps between the cranked elements would be very narrow and not affect the performance on noise mitigation unless the receptor is immediately adjacent to the barrier. In such instances, gaps could be filled if required following acoustic testing. MD (HS2) noted that this can be clarified in the draft PFN18.</p> <p>WM (HS2) confirmed that the noise barriers will transition in height where appropriate. The heights of the barriers will range from 2m to 6m from ground level. HS2 to add a diagram to the PFN to demonstrate the heights from ground level and top of rail.</p> <p>Para 2.1.2 of draft PFN 16a requires amending. HS2 to action. DW (WNC) queries the clarity of this paragraph referring to occasions where road overbridged may use the CDE described in PFN16a rather than the amended road overbridge parapet described in PFN 16b. WM (HS2) noted that this section can be revisited and wording possibly withdrawn. HS2 to provide an update to the PFN.</p> <p>WM presented the changes to road overbridge parapets as a result of the additional safety measures to be designed for. WM mentioned that a session has been set up to discuss the approach to green verges. Noted that the principle of the PFN’s does not go into detailed dimensions of green verges which can be discussed separately.</p> <p>TJ (Bucks C) raised a request to explore to development of a cross section for green verges to support future applications.</p> <p>TA (Chair) summarized that there were no challenges to the two types of noise</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>barrier and that testing of the barriers could commence. Clarifications to the draft PFN's as noted above are to be addressed by HS2 and re-issued to Planning Forum with a view to be signed off at the September Planning Forum. TA (Chair) noted that with regard to the parapets PFN, the green verge issue required further discussion to be taken up as part of the Design sub-group. HS2 to confirm a date for further discussion on the point.</p> <p>An update on the fencing design approach is to be provided at the September Planning Forum. TA (Chair) noted that the fencing design is a voluntary discussion between HS2 and LPAs and the design of fences is not an item for approval through a Sch 17 application, only the position of fences is for determination.</p> <p>DS (HS2) noted that an update on the signage strategy is to be provided at the September Planning Forum.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Community Engagement</p> <p>VB (HS2) noted that approximately 10,500 enquiries have been received route wide in the year to June to date with 92% of those enquiries acknowledged within 2 working days. Around 62% of enquiries are resolved by the helpdesk at the first point of contact. 38% require referral to technical specialists or the supply chain. Of those around 72% are resolved within 2 working days.</p> <p>In terms of the new KPI relating to urgent construction enquiries and complaints, since the start of reporting the new KPI from October 2021, 94% of urgent enquiries and complaints were responded to within 2 working days. For April to June in 2022, this figure is at 100%.</p> <p>In June 2022, 80 complaints were received. 98% relate to Phase 1. JF (HCC) requested that the 'other' category of complaints is clarified as to what is included. HS2 to action.</p> <p>None of the 80 complaints in June 22 was escalated to the Construction Commissioner. In the last financial year, HS2 received over 1,600 complaints, which was a decrease from the previous year by 13%.</p> <p>JF (HCC) noted that residents in Hertfordshire have raised concerns that complaints to the help desk have not made it through to the main works contractors and no response has been provided. VB (HS2) noted that the complaints help desk is widely publicized. Help desk complaints are all logged and stakeholders are advised accordingly on next steps. VB requested that any instances of complaints not being responded to are forwarded directly to [REDACTED]. VB to investigate the issue with Align separately.</p> <p>DW (WNC) raised a concern that the HS2 complaints website does not clarify the difference between a construction complaint and a service complaint. VB (HS2) noted that all complainants would receive a close out email to explain</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>the process and next steps if necessary. HS2 to review the website content and VB to circulate a sample close out email that goes to complaints.</p> <p>TA (Chair) to raise a concern with ICC regarding comments that have not been responded to.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>Chair</p>
8.	<p>Small and Medium Enterprises</p> <p>MH (HS2) provided an update on the involvement of SME's with the HS2 project highlighting some key involvements and the main contacts available for LPA's to promote SME involvement with HS2.</p> <p>MH (HS2) suggested that any LPA's wishing to get in contact do so by contacting [REDACTED]</p>	
9.	<p>Landowner Agreements</p> <p>AR (HS2) provided an update on the context for the need for landowner agreements and the process for facilitating landowner agreements.</p> <p>DW (WNC) noted some pre-application discussions reference landscape mitigation which would be secured through landowner agreements however the role of LPA's regarding long term management is unclear. AR (HS2) noted that the responsibility for landscape maintenance sits with HS2 therefore responsibility for maintenance can only be passed over to landowners where there is confidence that maintenance will be upkept through the use of covenants over land. PG (HS2) noted that the starting point for LPA involvement is to approve the detail of the landscaping scheme at the outset which then must be implemented as approved by HS2. Any perceived breach of landscaping maintenance could then be raised through the complaints procedure and responded to accordingly.</p>	
10.	<p>Appeals and Judicial Reviews Update</p> <p>MD (HS2) noted a hearing for the Bromford Tunnel East Portal appeal (APP/HS2/18) was held on 27/04/22. HS2 will provide some additional drawings and the PINS will determine the appeal. The Waste Lane appeal (APP/HS2/19 Balsall Common (Waste Lane) Lorry Route is to be recover for determination by the SoS. There are two other appeals currently live (APP/HS2/20 WCC Borrow Pit No.2, APP/HS2/21 WCC Borrow Pit No.1) with third party representations being responded to.</p> <p>A decision on the three Judicial Reviews (APP/HS2/14 A422 Brackley Road, APP/HS2/16 Wendover Green Lorry Route, APP/HS2/10-13 A413 Lorry Routes) has been handed down by the High Court on 21/07/22 dismissing the Judicial Reviews.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>Details of all appeals and JR decisions are available on the Planning Forum gov.uk website and the appeals digest is to be updated to reflect the latest decisions.</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-planning-appeal-decisions</p>	HS2
9.	<p>Forward Plan / AOB</p> <p>Dates for future 2022 Planning Forums were proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29th September – presentation on signage strategy and fencing strategy. Carbon update presentation • 24th November - Update from Construction Commissioner <p>JF (HCC) requested a presentation on the early construction sites and the mitigation measures that have been implemented to date. HS2 to facilitate A presentation detailing the progress and effectiveness of the advance planting mitigation with specifics about planting success rates, whether the planting carried out had been maintained to meet the condition and survival rate set and whether there had been any problems.v</p>	HS2
	End	