

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Independent Phase One Planning Forum for HS2 - #67</b>	
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	Thursday 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2023  Microsoft Teams Meeting 13:00 – 15:30	
<b>Chair:</b>	[REDACTED]	Independent Chair
<b>Promoter Attendees:</b>	[REDACTED]	HS2 Ltd (Planning Phase 1 Lead) HS2 Ltd (Head of Highways and Drainage Engineering) BBV DFT Arup HS2 Ltd (Head of Landscape) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning) BBV HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) BBV HS2 Ltd (Project Director Civils) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) BBV HS2 Ltd (Head of Town Planning) HS2 Ltd (Head of Public Response) HS2 Ltd DFT DFT HS2 (Urban Design) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) HS2 (Urban Design) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) SCS HS2 Ltd (Urban Design) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) LM JV SCS HS2 Ltd (Head of Urban Design) HS2 Ltd (Lead Architect) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) HS2 Ltd (Senior Environment Manager) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager) SCS BBV
<b>Research Observer:</b>	[REDACTED]	University College London (UCL)

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<b>Local Authority Attendees:</b>		<p>Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC)  Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC)  Birmingham City Council (BCC)  Warwickshire County Council (WCC)  Hertfordshire County Council (HCC)  Lichfield District Council (LDC)  North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC)  Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C)  Buckinghamshire Council (Bucks C)  North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC)  West Northamptonshire Council (WNC)  London Borough of Camden (LBC)  Staffordshire County Council (SCC)  Three Rivers District Council (TRDC)  London Borough of Camden (LBC)  London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham (LBHF)  Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC)  Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC)  Westminster City Council (WestCC)  London Borough of Camden (LBC)  Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC) and  Warwick District Council  Old Oak &amp; Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC)  Lichfield District Council (LDC)  West Northamptonshire Council (WNC)</p>
-----------------------------------	--	--

Item		Action Owner						
<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Introductions</b> – were made.</p> <p>SA (HS2) announced as new Planning Phase 1 lead. CG (BBV) announced as new BBV Consents Director.</p>							
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Review of minutes of the November meeting and outstanding actions.</b></p> <p>Additions to minutes of the November Planning Forum were presented and their inclusion into the minutes was agreed. Minutes were agreed.</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 style="text-align: center;">Jan 22</td> <td>Prolonged Disturbance Scheme review being undertaken with Feedback to be provided by DfT</td> <td>HS2 have collated noise traffic and complaints data. HS2 Independent Commissioner’s comments on 20/10/22 and Planning Forum members’ on 25/11/22 to garner feedback and insight. Suggestion the</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date	Action	Status	Jan 22	Prolonged Disturbance Scheme review being undertaken with Feedback to be provided by DfT	HS2 have collated noise traffic and complaints data. HS2 Independent Commissioner’s comments on 20/10/22 and Planning Forum members’ on 25/11/22 to garner feedback and insight. Suggestion the	
Date	Action	Status						
Jan 22	Prolonged Disturbance Scheme review being undertaken with Feedback to be provided by DfT	HS2 have collated noise traffic and complaints data. HS2 Independent Commissioner’s comments on 20/10/22 and Planning Forum members’ on 25/11/22 to garner feedback and insight. Suggestion the						

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

			findings are discussed with the Environmental Health sub group ( [REDACTED] (HS2)). Intention is for HS2 to put evidence to their delivery partner through a report used for a basis for further discussion and policy position. DfT will have to agree position which then needs to be approved by Ministers. [REDACTED] has begun conversations within HS2 about a more flexible approach to mitigation with respect to noise from construction.	<b>DfT</b>  <b>HS2</b>
Mar 22	HS2 to arrange for a future presentation on the fencing design approach	Deferred from PF#65. Item to be discussed under Item 7		
Mar 22	HS2 to arrange a discussion session with LPAs regarding the position on SLAs and on timesheet scrutiny.	Action Complete. Third session held 30/11/22. HS2 gave an update: See slide about SLA		
Jul 22	TA (Chair) asked all Phase 1 LPAs (email 7 June) to provide confirmation that they have processes for ensuring timely Schedule 17 decisions.	TA (Chair) issued a chasing email on 23/11/22 requesting updates from LPAs on the request for a Sch17 process. Not all LPAs have replied and they are urged to do so. TH (DfT) noted there was senior attention on this point and reiterated the request for LPAs to respond. Chair to update under Item 4.		<b>Chair</b> <b>HS2</b>
Jul 22	HS2 to look at providing a presentation updating on early stage mitigation works.	To facilitate at a 2023 Planning Forum		
Sep 22	Overbridge Parapets PFN 16a and 16b to finalised and circulated to PF for agreement.	Update under Item 6		
Sep 22	Lineside Noise Barrier PFN18 to be agreed by PF.	Update under Item 7. [PFN 18 agreed and final version to be formally uploaded]		
Sep 22	Content of Schedule 17 Performance slides to be discussed.	To keep under review but to maintain the current level of reporting in the interim.		

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	Nov 22	Access to the progress/ location of all tunnel boring machines. HS2 to investigate.	Action Complete. Live location of TBM is available via HS2 interactive map: <a href="https://www.hs2.org.uk/in-your-area/in-your-area-map/#8/52.7030/-1.1096/filter=hs2-stations,hs2-network,tbm">https://www.hs2.org.uk/in-your-area/in-your-area-map/#8/52.7030/-1.1096/filter=hs2-stations,hs2-network,tbm</a>	
	Nov 22	Request for PFN7 para 20 to refer to PFN14 instead of PFN16 when mentioning noise.	Action ongoing	
	Nov 22	PFN2 Draft has been circulated of proposed changes to other LAs with a view of agreeing comments and issuing to HS2 by mid December.	Note on PFN2 sent to HS2 on 30/1/23. To be discussed at next PF 68	
	Nov 22	Amendments made to PFN18 noise barriers reissued as draft on 3rd November 2022. PFN18 has been agreed. HS2 to formally upload PFN18.	Action Complete	
	Nov 22	HS2 to update PFN16a & 16b to show positioning of security fencing under bridges to minimize the extent of higher parapets with a view to agreeing it at the next PF.	Update at Item 6	
	Nov 22	DW (WNH) questioned the process for determining whether a 1.8m parapet is required in the case that a bridge is used as a bridal way and how this can be reflected through the PFN. HS2 to review and respond on this point as part of any further update to PFN16a and 16b.	Update at Item 6	
	Nov 22	New PF Dates proposed for 2023.	Update at Item 9	
<b>3.</b>	<b>HS2 Project Update</b>			
	The Phase 1 Project update was provided by JR (HS2), showing progress on enabling works, main works & station contracts.			
<b>4.</b>	<b>Planning Consents Performance</b>			
	SA (HS2) presented charts showing the time taken to determine Schedule 17 applications in the last six months. SA noted performance is broadly similar to previous months. SA (HS2) highlighted that reporting slides had been amended			

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

<p>to include acknowledgement that determination timescales were driven by a number of factors.</p> <p>SA (HS2) also presented charts showing Schedule 17 applications currently awaiting determination. These show a worsening with a higher proportion of applications in the 17+ weeks determination period. HS2 has identified three potential reasons why: modifications, request for further information and lack of feedback within the 8 weeks.</p> <p>TA (Chair) highlighted that there has been a deterioration in determined apps with more going beyond 17 weeks. PG (HS2) confirms that after 8 weeks HS2 would need to agree to an extension and that in some instances comments have been received up to 19 weeks.</p> <p>JF (HCC) reminds member authorities of the memorandum signed and to reply within 8 weeks but asks if HS2 can expand info on those beyond 17 weeks. DW (BCC) highlights LPA resourcing and external consultee response times as potential issues but not shown in the statistics. TA (Chair) minds LPAs to update HS2 when nearing 8 weeks. PG (HS2) HS2 has offered extra funding/ resourcing but delays by external consultees is ultimately for LPAs to manage.</p> <p>AR (TRDC) noted performance not really changing and what can be done to speed them up. HS2 or Contractors to tell LAs what they are trying to do or put in place, to make more realistic forward planning. SA (HS2) understands there are issues and noted that most of the shortfall is due to one contractor which have a significant volume of schedule 17 packages which makes them harder to manage. TA (Chair) highlighted incomplete data for the next month suggesting one contractor is not providing their data? SA (HS2) notes the differences in terms of forecasting between contractors rather than not having all the available data and it's not provided to HS2 for the purpose of this report in the same format: HS2 is looking to fix that for the next forum.</p> <p>TA (Chair) revisited special arrangements by LAs for determining Sch 17. Non-responding LAs requested to do so. PG (HS2) notes LAs need to think about what to do next about their processes as they aren't delivering timely consents in practice. A future discussion is needed about this. TA (chair) suggests workshops with contractors, LAs and chaired by an independent.</p> <p>CG (BBV) acknowledges issues and wishes to engage proactively with LAs. EL (NWBC) welcomes idea for a workshop but would prefer collectively with LAs rather than individually. VC (BCC) welcomes workshop, pragmatic SLA resource wise about what is coming forward. CG (BBV) agrees to this.</p> <p>A collective understanding about baseline level of information and revision to PFN 2 would assist timely determinations. HS2 to review LPAs' proposed changes to PFN2 and respond at the next PF.</p> <p><b>Appeals and Judicial Reviews Update</b></p>	<p><b>HS2</b></p> <p><b>BBV &amp; LPAs</b></p> <p><b>HS2</b></p>
---	--

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>SA (HS2) updated on the five live planning appeals currently awaiting determination.</p> <p>Bromford Tunnel East Portal appeal (APP/HS2/18) is now the longest HS2 appeal. This appeal has been recovered for final decision by the SoS. The Waste Lane #2 appeal (APP/HS2/19) is also to be recovered for determination by the SoS; appeal decision awaited. The two currently live Borrow Pit appeals (APP/HS2/20 WCC Borrow Pit No.2 and APP/HS2/21 WCC Borrow Pit No.1) are awaiting determination. A fifth appeal was submitted in September (APP/HS2/22 – Bowood Lane Bridge) and is with PINS for determination. Statements of case have been exchanged.</p> <p>There are no currently live judicial reviews.</p> <p>Details of all appeals and JR decisions are available on the Planning Forum gov.uk website and the appeals digest will be updated to reflect any decisions. The last update was issued on 16/11/22.</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-planning-appeal-decisions">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-planning-appeal-decisions</a></p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Local Authority Feedback and Issues Arising</b></p> <p>Responding to proposals on PFN2 by the LKPAs, PG (HS2) noted that it was written in 2016 and we all now have more experience with the Sch 17 process. It remains correct insofar as what it says around conditions and requirements however, it is recognized some aspects in it are light. JS (SMBC) gave an update on progress and agreement with contractor discussions on the information required prior to determination – a positive outcome which will feed into PFN 2 discussions. HS2 will review the PFN2 proposals.</p> <p>TA (Chair) notes the PFN on conditions need to be clearer on the difference between conditions and requests for further details, because they are distinct. PG (HS2) agreed and will instigate a review.</p> <p>DW (WNC) asked if there could be a PF wide discussion or workshop regarding the strategy for BiU applications. PG (HS2) noted that any changes to the process for BiU would be informed by PFN7 and any proposed changes should be promoted as a change to this PFN. HS2 need to reach a position where mitigation proposals are agreed well in advance of BiU submissions in order to avoid programme delays. PG (HS2) noted DfT comments made at the Phase 2a Forum about BiU amendments. DfT is proposing some amendments to the Sch 17 statutory guidance for further clarification, and would welcome discussion at a future PF. JF (HCC) offers input from LAs who have had previous BiU experience.</p> <p>TA (Chair) reminded PF of an OCS update given in 2020, when [REDACTED]</p>	<p><b>HS2</b></p> <p><b>HS2 DfT LAs</b></p>

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>preseted slides on proposed engagement. There was supposed to be a contract awarded by now, but HS2 conformed that the rail systems (OCS) contract hasn't yet been awarded. A number of briefings with LAs are proposed, but only one so far: there will be others in the upcoming weeks and they're very high level. To be discussed at a later PF.</p>	<p><b>HS2</b></p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Update on CDEs &amp; Updated PFN16a and16</b></p> <p>MS (HS2) updated on the amendments made to PFN16 (Parapets) which has been re-drafted as 16a &amp; 16b. The new PFNs are largely agreed but have been held up by four technical issues - green verges, optimisation of the security arrangements to minimise the extent of higher parapet, crash testing and bridleways.</p> <p>EKFB have been in liaison with Bucks Council and WNC and have now agreed the principles of a technical solution which have been captured in a redraft of PFN 16b which was circulated to EKFB and BBV on 30.01.23, and then to the Planning Forum Design Group. DW (WNH) raised that this has not been agreed but discussions have been had. TJ (Bucks C) pleased to see designs are coming through for applications: basically the words are nearly there but agreed should go back to the PF design group due to a few bits and pieces of wording.</p> <p>WNH have asked whether an intermediate height parapet can be provided for bridleways, to avoid the full height parapet where security requirements are reduced. A proposal was made by EKFB to WNC in November, recommending that the current draft CDE, with two not three alternative heights, is progressed. Awaiting WNH review.</p> <p>DW (WNH) questioned the process for determining whether a 1.8m or higher parapet is required in the case that a bridge that is used as a bridal way and how this can be reflected through the PFN. Questions where heights increase around testing for green overbridges ifit will accommodate for a bridleway. MS (HS2) clarifies the unit is higher but the height is within the buildup HS2 to review and respond on this point as part of any further update to PFN16a and 16b. HS2 to update this PFN accordingly and circulate it to members with a view to agreeing it at the next Planning Forum.</p>	<p><b>HS2 Design Group</b></p> <p><b>WNH</b></p> <p><b>HS2 LAs</b></p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Fencing Design Update</b></p> <p>CB (HS2) presented why a coherent approach to fencing design is needed highlighting HS2 Fencing Design Approach (FDA) which explains the design aspiration and how it can be achieved aimed as a guidance document for the HS2 supply chain. Different fencing types were described.</p> <p>JF (HCC) appreciates the input. EL (NWBC) asked about the use of colour. CB (HS2) reiterated colour of fence would be about context as well as standardization.</p>	

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	DW (WNH) asks about types. RA (HS2) highlights the use of primarily mesh fencing, with types 2, 3 & 4 for security.	
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Helpdesk Update</b></p> <p>SG (HS2) noted a drop in Helpdesk calls in December. 48 complaints were received during December, primarily on Phase 1. Traffic and Transport remains the most common reason to complain. No escalations to the ICC or to the Step Two internal review process were recorded during December.</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Forward Plan/ AOB</b></p> <p>Proposal that Phase One Planning Forum reverts to 'the third/ fourth' Thursday of every other month. Dates for future 2023 Planning Forums were proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• March 15th</li> <li>• May 25th</li> <li>• July 20th</li> <li>• September 21st</li> <li>• November 23rd</li> </ul> <p>JF (HCC) can HS2 please send out placeholders for the proposed dates.</p> <p>JF (HCC) in the interest of transparency, was it possibly up to five years ago that PF agreed to retain the current chair. TA (Chair) and PG (HS2) note its being tracked every other year, and will confirm status at appropriate time.</p>	<p><b>HS2</b></p> <p><b>HS2</b></p>
	<b>End</b>	