

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Independent Phase One Planning Forum for HS2</b>	
<b>Date &amp; Time</b>	Thursday 18 <sup>th</sup> July 2019 13:00 – 16:00 2 Snowhill Queensway Birmingham B4 6GA	
<b>Chair</b>	[REDACTED]	Independent Chair
<b>Promoter Attendees:</b>	[REDACTED]	HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager, South) HS2 Ltd (Head of Programme Interface, North) HS2 Ltd (Traffic Manager) HS2 Ltd (Head of Programme Interface, Central) HS2 Ltd (Senior Town Planning Manager, Central) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager, South) HS2 Ltd (Lead Architect) HS2 Ltd (Programme Director, North Area) HS2 Ltd (Phase 1 Town Planning Lead) HS2 Ltd (Head of Town Planning) HS2 Ltd (Senior Town Planning Manager, South) HS2 Ltd (Head of Public Response) HS2 Ltd (Town Planning Manager, North)
<b>Local Authority Attendees:</b>	[REDACTED]	Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) South Northants Council (SNC) Birmingham City Council (BCC) North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) Northamptonshire County Council (SNC) Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) Birmingham City Council (BCC) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) Lichfield District Council (LDC) South Northants Council (SNC) Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Council (CDC & SBDC) Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) Stratford District Council (SDC)
<b>Guests</b>	[REDACTED]	Network Rail (NR)

Item		Action Owner
1.	<b>Introductions</b> – were made.	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

2.	<p><b>Review of minutes &amp; actions from last meeting</b>  The minutes of the May Planning Forum were agreed.  <b>Action: HS2 to place minutes on website.</b></p> <p><b>Outstanding actions</b>  The Forum noted the following outstanding actions. (NB. A full action list is included in the slide pack):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overhead line equipment will be reviewed again at a future Planning Forum.</li> <li>• HS2 stand-alone website.  <b>Action: HS2 to report back at next meeting on progress in establish a Planning Forum section on the new website.</b></li> <li>• The EHO sub-group engagement on Common Design Elements is ongoing.</li> <li>• Prolonged Disturbance Scheme. Concern about the scheme not having been issued yet has been relayed.  <b>Action: HS2 to update at next meeting.</b></li> <li>• The HS2 virtual reality display was made available for Planning Forum members to view prior to the meeting.</li> <li>• A meeting has been arranged with Staffordshire BC regarding flood risk.</li> <li>• There has been liaison with Warwickshire CC regarding advanced notifications for ground investigations.</li> <li>• HS2 Ltd to provide clarification on the circumstances where a derogation of the relevant rural fencing standard could be allowed.  <b>Action: HS2 to circulate a position statement on rural fencing standards.</b></li> <li>• Construction camps. It was noted that HS2 had issued a note on the consenting requirements under paragraph 4 of Schedule 17 (email to Planning Forum members dated 14 June 2019). Following a discussion, TA suggested the Forum review the position again if any consenting problems arise in specific instances.</li> <li>• HS2 to circulate protocol regarding protester management. JB said there is no formal HS2 policy but there is a paper which can be circulated.  <b>Action: HS2 to circulate the position paper.</b></li> <li>• ‘Common Design Elements’ (CDEs).  <b>Action: HS2 to consider an alternative clearer term to use as part of public engagement on CDEs.</b></li> <li>• An update on progress on Common Design Elements was covered under item 7 on the agenda.</li> <li>• An update on Planning Forum Notes was covered under item 10 on the agenda.</li> <li>• HS2 input into minerals policy plans is being dealt with on a bilateral basis.</li> <li>• Calvert Box and East-West Rail.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: Network Rail to provide update to Bucks CC on the status of Calvert Box and East-West Rail.</b></p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>NR</p>
----	---	--

<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Phase 1 Construction Update</b></p> <p>██████████ (Programme Director, North Area) gave an update on Phase 1-wide milestones and progress.</p> <p>Work progresses on numerous ecological mitigation sites across Phase 1, many of which are now starting to mature.</p> <p>Approximately 9000 people are working on HS2 throughout the country, on 250 work sites employed by approximately 2,000 companies, two thirds of which are small and medium-sized enterprises.</p> <p>At the end of May a community roadshow commenced on both Phase One and Phase Two using the new ‘pop-up’ vehicle, which was well attended.</p> <p>██████████ has published the 9<sup>th</sup> Construction Commissioner’s report, which HS2 has responded to. The report refers to noise insulation in LB Camden and asks HS2 to learn lessons on engagement with communities on this issue.</p> <p>The government has published its response to the Phase 2a Select Committee’s report. There was a significant majority in favour at third reading of the Phase 2a Bill in the House of Commons.</p> <p>The HS2 EDI team has achieved some important external recognition with a double win at the Employers Network for Equality &amp; Inclusion annual awards.</p> <p>Progress with enabling works on the ground is accelerating. Investment authority for substantial further enabling works has been given by the HS2 and DfT Boards and is now with Treasury for a final decision. This will enable the scale of enabling works to increase during the second half of 2019 including a significant programme of vegetation clearance over the winter 2019/2020. This will require close liaison between LA officers and HS2 Interface as it will be a very visible activity in some locations. Further significant highway works will also be undertaken (for example to support Birmingham Interchange) in preparation for commencement of main works in 2020.</p> <p>Investment authority is also being sought to allow substantial main works investment decisions, for example the procurement of concrete batching plants, tunnel boring machines and other major orders. HS2 is still expecting Notice to Proceed for the main works contracts in December 2019, with mobilization early in 2020.</p> <p>An industry day is planned for Curzon Street on 19 July to support a review of the procurement strategy for Curzon Street Station.</p> <p>At Old Oak Common there is an on-going legal challenge to the award of the station construction partner contract. The design of the station is progressing through the station development contract.</p>	
-----------	---	--

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>Procurement of railway systems contracts is progressing with track and overhead line and tunnel ventilation contract documentation in preparation. Tenders for the rolling stock contract are due to be returned soon.</p> <p>Phase 1 and Phase 2 final cost estimates and schedule are being pulled together for central government review.</p> <p>TA asked if Birmingham Interchange station is in the same position as Curzon Street contractually. ML said that Interchange procurement strategy is still being developed and therefore not as advanced as the other three stations. An initial design for the people mover has been launched.</p> <p>TA asked about the challenge at Old Oak Common by Car Giant. PG confirmed that this does not affect HS2.</p> <p>JB gave an overview of works in progress in the three Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Area South, work is progressing on the design of Euston Station with public engagement planned for the autumn. Enabling works are progressing at Euston, with ongoing demolitions, utility diversions and archaeological investigations. At Old Oak Common the Schedule 17 submission for the station is planned for later this year.</li> <li>• In Area Central, works to establish the TBM power supply for the Chiltern tunnel and a number of ecological and environmental enabling works are ongoing. Works have commenced on the Boddington heave trial cutting, to determine ground conditions and validate computer models.</li> <li>• In Area North, highways works to the A452 and A4438 associated with Birmingham Interchange Station are due for completion in early August 2019. Topsoil stripping is ongoing at the M42 West and HS2 trace roundabouts, with vegetation clearance at the Birmingham Interchange Station area. The Schedule 17 submission for Curzon Street Station is expected in the autumn. Archaeological investigations at the Curzon Street station site have revealed a very early engine roundhouse.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Local Authority Feedback</b></p> <p>JF (HCC) raised an issue regarding quality of a Schedule 17 pre-application submission by Align JV and the information provided. MD noted that Align JV had recognised and apologized to HCC for some mistakes and omissions in the submission referred to, which they were correcting. An extension of time has been agreed as a result.</p> <p>JW (BCC) said there had been poor co-ordination between contractors working on adjacent sites near Lawley Middleway. LM submitted details of the roundabout but the design of the adjacent road within BBV's scope of works was not available. LM were not able to delay their submission and consequently WCC were therefore unable to see a full picture of the area. Another submission had been made without a site plan.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>SM (CDC &amp; SBDC) asked that Schedule 17 submissions contain a clear drawing showing how the proposals relate to local authority boundaries.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to remind project teams of the need for integration and co-ordination between contracts in the same geographical area, and to provide clear drawings showing local authority boundaries.</b></p> <p>DW (SNC) said that pre-application engagement on schemes crossing administrative boundaries should be coordinated to include all relevant authorities at the same time so that relevant views can be reconciled more efficiently.</p> <p>DW (SNC) said that a number of meetings have taken place with main works contractors but an HS2 presence might have been helpful to address wider issues at the time which has subsequently wasted time.</p> <p>JF (HCC) noted that it is important that contractor and HS2 staff with a long history and knowledge of the project and local authority issues continue to be available.</p> <p>SK (AVDC) said that as HS2 works increase there are more communities affected and an increasing number of residents are contacting local authorities. The public expect both a role in decisions on Schedule 17 applications and that local authorities will advise and help them. JB (HS2) responded that residents should be directed to the HS2 Helpdesk. The HS2 community engagement then could then contact the person and answer questions.</p> <p>SK (AVDC) replied that residents are often unsatisfied with the response they receive from the Helpdesk and expect the LPA to intervene; they expect local authorities to represent their interests not to direct them to the HS2 Helpdesk. A very high degree of liaison between the district and county officers is having to take place in order to provide accurate answers to questions from the public and elected members. This will obviously become more acute as main works commence.</p> <p>DW (NCC) said that the local liaison group set up by the local authorities in Northamptonshire is a valuable forum for parish council members and other interested parties to bring concerns to local authorities, and is an opportunity for HS2 to present its proposals and answer questions. DW said this model works, and HS2 appear to agree there is value in it and suggested HS2 consider it elsewhere.</p> <p>SK (AVDC) said similar local liaison groups have been set up in the AVDC area. EL (NWDC) said the special management zone in North Warwickshire is a similar forum, but the local authorities are not able to re-claim costs despite it being an assurance. DB (HS2) said that the assurance required HS2 to set up the forum as a means of engaging with local communities. Local authority attendance is optional and hence costs for doing so are not recoverable.</p>	
--	---	--

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>SK (AVDC) said that the public expect local authorities to attend these kinds of local forums to represent their interests, and costs should therefore be reimbursed. DW (SNC) added that the value to HS2 of local authority involvement in such forums is that they can act as an intermediary between the public and HS2 and help to build trust. This is a benefit to HS2 which should be recognized in the payment of attendance costs.</p> <p>PG (HS2) said that the policy regarding reimbursement of local authorities for community engagement activity was debated extensively during the Bill process. While not opposed to a modification of the policy in the light of experience of how the policy is operating, authority to do so lies with DfT.</p> <p>TA suggested that local authorities could consider making a collective case for reimbursement of costs to undertake public engagement activity but a case would need to be made as to why the policy settled during the Bill process should be altered.</p> <p>DB (HS2) suggested rather than adjusting the existing process the focus should be on improving the HS2 Helpdesk and community engagement processes.</p> <p>JF (HCC) said that engagement is not seen as effective as communities feel they are unable to input. JB (HS2) noted that the HS2 Act does not require the public to be consulted on detailed design proposals.</p> <p>DW again pointed to the benefits to HS2 of such local authority forums as the Northamptonshire local liaison groups.</p> <p>TA concluded by asking if HS2 might review whether it is tenable for local authorities not to be present at such meetings and whether the current policy is working. The issue is likely to be returned to at future Planning Forums.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Compliance With Route-wide Undertakings &amp; Assurances</b></p> <p>JB gave a presentation summarizing how HS2 manages compliance with undertakings and assurances (U&amp;As).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are several categories of U&amp;As: specific undertakings to individuals or organisations, route-wide, and multi area.</li> <li>• Route-wide U&amp;As fall under four groups and are several hundred in number (for example the Environmental Minimum Requirements, Code of Construction Practice, elements of HS2 Information Papers and commitments to individuals which replicate an aspect of the EMRs).</li> <li>• Each U&amp;A has a commitment compliance plan and a named 'owner' within HS2. The plan details how HS2 and its contractors will comply with the U&amp;A.</li> <li>• All contractors are contractually bound to comply with the U&amp;As in the Phase One Register and are responsible for supplying evidence of how</li> </ul>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>compliance is being achieved, which is stored on a central database. HS2 reviews and assures this evidence. The evidence provides assurance to DfT that U&amp;As are being complied with.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific queries or concerns will be looked at: however, there are too many to report progress on compliance with each one at the Planning Forum.</li> </ul> <p>In response to a question from DW (SNC), PG (HS2) confirmed that the U&amp;A register on the gov.uk website is the final register encapsulating all the U&amp;As entered into during the Bill stages.</p> <p>TA agreed that it is not practical for HS2 to report progress on compliance with all U&amp;As at the Planning Forum.</p> <p>DW (SNC) said that where a query arises on compliance with a particular U&amp;A, local authorities need to know who to contact within HS2. JB (HS2) replied that any specific queries regarding U&amp;As should be directed to the relevant HS2 Interface Manager.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to circulate list of Interface Managers for each local authority area.</b></p> <p>JF (HCC) suggested a half-day U&amp;A update meeting. PG (HS2) said that while updates to the Forum can be given, it is not the purpose of Planning Forum to review progress on U&amp;A. Any U&amp;A that is discussed at future Planning Forum meetings should align with the remit of the Planning Forum ie. it should have a planning or environment aspect.</p> <p>TA agreed and said that if an issue with a route-wide U&amp;A arises and it is of interest to more than one authority it can be discussed at Planning Forum, otherwise it should be dealt with bilaterally.</p> <p>PG (HS2) summarised the position: if the local authorities at their pre-meet identify route-wide U&amp;As that are relevant to planning and environmental matters they can be asked to be put on to the Planning Forum agenda for discussion, but it is not the purpose of the group in general to monitor U&amp;A progress or compliance.</p> <p>Any concern about compliance with a specific U&amp;A should be directed in the first instance to the relevant HS2 Interface Manager for the local authority area.</p> <p>EL (NWDC) asked what a member of the public should do if they have a concern about compliance with a U&amp;A. JB (HS2) confirmed that they should contact the HS2 Helpdesk.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Intensification of lorry routes and EMR compliance</b></p> <p>GM (HS2) presented an overview of how construction traffic is managed by contractors to ensure compliance with the EMR general principles, how HS2 Ltd ensures that the works are compliant, and how the Local Traffic Management Plans (LTMPs) fit in to this process:</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The HS2 Environmental Statement (ES) reported likely significant environmental effects of the project, based on assumed construction traffic volumes. The EMR general principles require that there be no new significant environmental effects unless arising from circumstances which could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time of the ES. The definition of significance is contained in the Scope and Methodology report accompanying the ES.</li><li>• Therefore the number of vehicles which may use a route maybe higher than the number assumed in the ES providing no new significant effects arise as a result. The assumed vehicle numbers in the ES are not a cap.</li><li>• Contractors use the ES methodology to determine the impact of the works based on their actual forecast vehicle flows, which are recorded in their LTMP. If forecast vehicle flows exceed those assumed in the ES, the contractor must ensure that there are no new predicted significant effects, or if there are that the effect is mitigated so that significant effects do not arise.</li><li>• During construction all traffic movements are collated into HS2’s vehicle monitoring system, so that cumulative actual flows from all contractors can be monitored for compliance. Information on vehicle flows can be provided at Local Traffic Liaison Groups.</li><li>• LTMPs containing the forecast vehicle flows are produced and consulted on with highway authorities prior to Schedule 17 submissions together with the ROMIS document or statement. This sets out any accessibility measures required on the proposed routes and is submitted for information with the Schedule 17 route application.</li><li>• Where an approved lorry route is closed as a result of an emergency or other circumstance outside of HS2’s control, HS2 traffic will follow the stipulated diversion route. If the route is closed as a result of HS2 activity then an alternative route will need to be planned for by HS2 and approval obtain under Schedule 17.</li><li>• In the event that a new route is proposed that was not assumed in the ES, a new assessment of that route is undertaken. If the use of the route does not introduce new predicted significant environmental effects, it can come forward for approval under Schedule 17 if required.</li><li>• HS2 Ltd assures the above contractor assessments. There is an HS2 compliance team which visits sites to check that actual vehicle numbers are being recorded accurately.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

In response to a question from SM (CDC & SBDC), GM confirmed that HA



## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>representatives at TLGs can relay information from the TLG to non-unitary authorities. Planning applications submitted under the normal Town &amp; Country Planning Act regime will need to evidence construction traffic information as part of any environmental statement accompanying the application.</p> <p>DW (NCC) said that while the HS2 Act did not envisage liaison between planning authorities and highways authorities, in two-tier authorities this has proved necessary. This emphasises the need for joint pre-application meetings. PG (HS) confirmed that consultation between planning and highway authorities is a recoverable cost under the SLA.</p> <p>JF (HCC) queried how local authorities are to monitor compliance with vehicle numbers due to accumulation of movements in an area associated with multiple consents. GM responded that the accumulation of vehicle numbers will be picked up by the LTMP. LTMP is a live document and will monitor changes over several years.</p> <p>TA noted that local authorities are not required to ensure compliance with assumed vehicle numbers, only to ensure compliance with approved routes.</p> <p>GM said that it is not intended to place LTMPs on the Commonplace website. They will be consulted on through the TLGs and local authorities can consult on them more widely as they see fit.</p> <p>DL (BCC) asked what happens if the local authority disagrees with whether something is significant or not. PG (HS2) said that HS2 is obligated to comply with the EMR general principles. It does so through the self-assurance process described in the presentation, and the assessment of compliance with the EMRs does not form part of the Schedule 17 application for approval of routes. Schedule 17 submissions will however contain a statement that the intended use of the route submitted for approval has been assessed and is compliant with the EMRs. The relationship between the Schedule 17 process and EMRs is set out in the Statutory Guidance.</p> <p>DW (SNC) asked for confirmation that in the event that a stakeholder queries whether a Schedule 17 is compliant with the EMRs the local authority should respond that HS2 have assured the works are compliant and if they have further concerns they should be directed to the HS2 Helpdesk. PG confirmed this was the correct approach. TA noted that if an authority itself has a concern they can always look at the issue themselves and take it up with HS2.</p> <p>PG (HS2) noted that ensuring there is a robust internal process in place to ensure that its obligation to comply with the EMRs is kept is taken very seriously by HS2.</p> <p>JC (BCC) asked how HS2 publishes predicted vehicle flows. GM (HS2) said that the numbers will be in the LTMP, and could also be communicated by contractors outside of the LTMPs if they wish.</p>	
--	--	--

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Common Design Elements</b></p> <p>MD (HS2) introduced the item by recapping on the presentation to the May Planning Forum on the emerging noise barrier Common Design Element (CDE) proposal. At the suggestion of the local authorities, HS2 subsequently meet with Aylesbury Vale District Council on 21 May to discuss the proposals further. This meeting gave HS2 a useful steer on where to focus.</p> <p>MS (HS2) described how HS2 has since developed the CDE proposal. It is proposed that there should be two families of line side barriers (both constructed from concrete): visible and non-visible from public view.</p> <p>Key aspects of the visible noise barrier family comprise a ‘cranked’ or angled element at the top (above approximately 2 – 2.5 metres above rail level) to help reduce visual impact, concealed ‘king posts’ and a patterning applied to the exterior face where desired (a number of images of the proposals are contained in the slide pack). The design is still being reviewed internally for compatibility with rail systems and maintainability requirements.</p> <p>MD confirmed that following HS2 internal review the noise barrier CDE will be issued to the Forum as a draft Planning Forum Note for comment, after which a CDE Working Group would be held.</p> <p>MD reminded the Forum that the next decision point being aimed for is agreement that all three CDE proposals (piers, parapets and noise barriers) can be taken forward for public engagement.</p> <p>TA said that the full Planning Forum should have the opportunity to agree that the CDEs can go forward for public engagement.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to issue a draft Planning Forum Note noise barrier CDE and then arrange a CDE working group.</b></p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Service Level Agreement Scope Clarification</b></p> <p>JB (HS2) set out HS2’s position on some specific questions raised by the local authorities about whether costs associated with a number of activities are covered by the Service Level Agreements (SLAs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent Design Panel attendance is not covered by the SLA. Local authorities are invited but as attendance is optional, expenses are not recoverable.</li> </ul> <p>TA and the local authorities said that attendance at Independent Design Panel meetings should clearly be regarded as an essential part of the Schedule 17 pre-application process, and therefore a claimable expense. His exchange of letters with ██████████ had clarified that the LAs were expected to attend all Panel meetings and provide the planning context. SLAs should be interpreted flexibly to allow for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public engagement events and MP meetings are not covered, except</li> </ul>	

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

	<p>when local authority officers are expressly requested to attend. Email confirmation should be sought from the HS2 Interface Manager or the Third Party Assurance Manager beforehand that expenses for attending the meeting can be claimed. The local authorities said that this is an unnecessarily cumbersome process and it is often unclear from HS2 whether an explicit invitation is being issued, or officers are just being informed of meetings or events taking place. If a local authority officer has been asked to attend an event or meeting it should be taken that the costs can be recovered.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to ensure that Interface and Community Engagement teams are clear when sending out invitations or notifications of meetings as to whether attendance costs are reclaimable under the SLA or not.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complaints to Councillors are not covered and should be forwarded to the HS2 Helpdesk.</li> <li>• Travel time and expenses are covered for meetings concerning one of the activities listed in Schedule 1 of the SLA. Where there is any doubt, email confirmation should be sought from the HS2 Interface Manager or Third Party Assurance Manager, so as to avoid disputes when invoices are submitted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: TA said he would raise these issues with [REDACTED] when they next meet.</b></p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>TA</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>Community Engagement and Helpdesk Update</b> SG gave a Community Engagement and Helpdesk Update.</p> <p>The roadshow is now finished having visited 14 locations over a 6-week period and reaching over 3,000 people. A key outcome from the events is that there is a need for HS2 to spread awareness of the project and its wider benefits to those further from the line.</p> <p>HS2 has delivered 96 health and safety workshops in 63 schools reaching over 5,000 pupils.</p> <p>A number of other events have been attended, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area North: HS2 attended the annual family fun day at Birmingham City University where over 400 people were reached.</li> <li>• Area Central: Fusion held an event for residents in Chipping Warden and over 50 people attended.</li> </ul> <p>The number of helpdesk contacts increased during June, mainly due to Phase 2b design refinement consultation. There have been 295 complaints received in the</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>year to the end of June (Phase 1 and 2), 96% of which were responded to within 20 working days.</p> <p>Members of the Planning Forum were given the opportunity to meet the HS2 Helpdesk team prior to the meeting.</p> <p>SG presented a new reporting dashboard to display enquiries and complaints received by HS2, including a breakdown by local authority area.</p> <p><b>Action: SG to circulate for comment the proposed reporting dashboard. LAs' comments welcome within 1 month please.</b></p> <p>[Post meeting note: the draft report format was issued on 1 August, for comment by 30 August].</p>	<p>HS2 LAs</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p><b>Planning Forum Notes Update</b></p> <p>PG proposed an amendment to Planning Forum Note 4 (Consultation on Requests for Approval).</p> <p>The Canal &amp; River Trust (CRT) are not a statutory consultee under Schedule 17 of the Phase 1 Act, although they are proposed to be in the equivalent provision of the Phase 2a Bill. The Environment Agency (EA) and CRT believe CRT should be involved in the consultation process for Schedule 17 submissions relevant to their assets.</p> <p>HS2 therefore propose an amendment to Planning Forum Note 4 to include a list of CRT assets and to require the local planning authority to email the EA and CRT at the same time if it considers a CRT asset is affected. The EA will remain the statutory consultee but CRT will provide their comments with a statement from the EA that it comprises the EA's response.</p> <p><b>Action: HS2 to issue proposed amendment to PFN4 for comment.</b></p> <p>MD summarised the status of other draft Planning Forum Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Forum Note 6 (Appendix A: conditions on lorry route approvals). There is now an appeal being determined by PINS at which the appropriateness of conditions to a lorry route approval is the point at issue. HS2 would therefore prefer not to take this document forward until the appeal is determined. It might also be that the current draft of Appendix A requires alteration to reflect the outcome of the appeal. The Forum agreed that the note should not be progressed for the time being.</li> <li>• Planning Forum Note 7 (Bringing Into Use). HS2 issued a proposed revision to the existing document on 26 June following the presentation at the last Planning Forum. No comments have been received. It was agreed that comments might be provided up to 9 August and if no adverse comments were received, the revised PFN would be agreed.</li> <li>• Planning Forum Notes 14 and 15 (Pier and Parapet Common Design Elements) Third drafts of Planning were circulated on 16 July. The next</li> </ul>	<p>HS2</p>

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>CDE working group (see action under Item 7) presents an opportunity to discuss any outstanding comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Forum Note 16 (operational noise). A second draft was circulated on 14 June. Amendments have been made following comments received and a third draft issued on 16 July. The Forum agreed to the document subject to the EH Subgroup's approval. <b>Action: HS2 seek EH Subgroup approval at its next meeting on 24 July.</b></li> <li>• Planning Forum Note 17 (Noise Barrier CDE). Action on HS2 to issue a first draft (See action under Item 7).</li> </ul>	<p><b>HS2</b></p>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>Forward Plan/ AOB</b> The following agenda items were agreed for the September and November Planning Forums:</p> <p>September 26<sup>th</sup> (London)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common Design Elements update.</li> <li>• HS2 Urban Integration team to present an overview of their work looking at how HS2 works in urban areas interact with the wider public realm (mainly focusing on areas around stations).</li> <li>• Local Authority feedback.</li> </ul> <p>November 21<sup>st</sup> (Snow Hill)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common Design Elements</li> <li>• Arts strategy.</li> <li>• Local Authority feedback.</li> </ul>	