

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

Title:	Independent Phase One Planning Forum for HS2	
Date & Time	Phase One Planning Forum Meeting Thursday 20 th September 2018 12:30 – 16:30 Victoria House 37 - 63 Southampton Row London WC1B 4DA London	
Chair	[REDACTED]	Independent Chair
Promoter Attendees:	[REDACTED]	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd (HS2 Land & Property Team) SCS (MWC Contractor) SCS (MWC Contractor) Arup HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd
Local Authority Attendees:	[REDACTED]	Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Council (CDC&SBDC) Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Council (CDC&SBDC) Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) Birmingham City Council (BCC) Birmingham City Council (BCC) Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) Bucks County Council (BCC) Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) South Northants Council (SNC) Cherwell District Council (CDC) Old Oak & Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC) North Warwickshire Borough Council (NWBC) Stratford on Avon District Council (SAC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) London Borough of Camden (LBC)

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

		Solihull MBC (SMBC) Staffordshire CC (SCC) Lichfield DC (LDC)
Guests		Interim Construction Commissioner

Item		Action Owner
1.	Introductions	
	██████████ and ██████████ (SCS Railways consents team) introduced themselves to the Forum. (SCS are the South Area Main Works Civils Contractor).	
2.	<p>Review of notes & actions from last meeting The minutes of the July meeting were agreed. Action: HS2 to place minutes on website</p> <p>Outstanding actions: The Forum reviewed the action log and agreed/noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of Common Design Elements (CDEs). While agreeing which viaducts and overbridge were noted as a bilateral matter for discussion on a case by case basis as a matter for approval by the LPA, TA asked HS2 to confirm that a final list would ultimately be produced. HS2 agreed this was the intent. Action: HS2 to provide list of all viaducts and overbridges containing CDEs once these have been established through the bilateral Schedule 17 process. <p>SNDC asked if CDEs would come forward for LPA approval as part of Sch 17 packages. HS2 confirmed that the aim is to agree CDEs at the Forum, but whether the CDE is approved as part of any specific asset is a matter for the LPA through the Sch 17 process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix to PFN 6 (lorry routes) on conditions. Action: HS2 to circulate draft for the next meeting. Community Engagement: It was noted that the agenda for the November meeting (Action) will include a presentation and discussion on how communities are engaged in the design process for stations, key design elements and common design elements, and how LPAs are informed about what is being done through the Sch 17 process. Letter from ██████████ (about the role of the Independent Design Panel). TA advised that the LPAs have decided that no response is required to the letter. Collation of LPAs concerns regarding property notices. Noted that this action is now complete. 	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>Chair/ HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>3.</p>	<p>Operational Noise</p> <p>██████████ (MD) introduced ██████████ of Arup (RG). RG is a technical adviser to HS2 on noise matters, including planning consents strategy.</p> <p>RG gave a presentation covering the Environmental Minimum Requirements relating to operational noise from new roads and the railway, the information that will accompany relevant Schedule 17 submissions, the design strategy to minimize operational noise, and progress to date. The same presentation is to be given to the EHO Sub-group on 26 September.</p> <p>(The presentation has been circulated separately in the Forum slide pack).</p> <p>HCC asked if LPA EHOs have been asked to confirm receptors. RG said that this would be covered at the EHO Sub-group.</p> <p>SNDC asked what is meant by operational noise. RG confirmed that the subject being addressed here is the control of noise from operation of the railway or new roads, not construction noise, vibration, or noise from fixed plant. These noise sources are covered by other Information Papers.</p> <p>In response to TA’s question relating to the potential increases to the noise source terms, RG confirmed that the ES did not assume slab track throughout.</p> <p>TA asked RG to confirm what the ES assumed in relation to rolling stock. RG said the ES assumed classic-compatible and captive trains: the change has arisen as a result of further dialogue with manufacturers which has highlighted potential issues in managing noise output from classic-compatible trains.</p> <p>LBC asked when changes to the ES will be known and when will the ES be amended. RG referred to the timeline and process described in the presentation (slide 22 in the slide pack) to ensure that no such amendment will be required.</p> <p>NCC/ SNDC asked if a noise report will be needed for the Enabling Works (Fusion) Chipping Warden Relief Rd (CWRR). MD confirmed this would be the case.</p> <p>SNDC noted that it would be useful to give this HS2 representation at Fusion pre-application meetings for CWRR, to ensure the noise requirement issue is covered. While an expedient decision was taken to defer noise barriers to a separate Schedule 17 submission, no information on noise had been forthcoming from Fusion. MD confirmed a noise report had been drafted by Fusion which is currently with HS2. Construction noise is also a concern.</p> <p>Fusion’s CWRR scope of work involves some temporary and some permanent elements. TA asked for clarity on whether a temporary relief road is treated in the same way as a permanent road under Information Paper E20. HS2 confirmed that the noise report referred to in paragraph 7.5.2 of the Planning Memorandum is required where a design approval is required under Sch 17 paragraphs 2 or 3 (plans & specifications). Temporary works do not require such</p>	
-----------	--	--

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>a design approval so a report is not required. However, the noise requirements in the Information Paper E20 will continue to apply as relevant.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to confirm at a future meeting how E20 requirements are communicated to LPAs and how 'AFARP' principles apply to temporary highways.</p> <p>AVDC and BCC asked for confirmation that the intent is to get back to the ES levels or lower. RG confirmed this is the intent and the process described shows how HS2 intends to achieve that.</p> <p>JF asked how the noise mitigation requirements can be reconciled with the need for a high quality landscape design. RG said the intent is to maximize the benefits of landscape earthworks now through the Main Works Civils contracts, working with the 'worse-case' assumed noise levels and within the other design drivers.</p> <p>JF asked if potential changes to the design, given contractors are designing to a 'worse-case scenario', could be dealt with by a condition on a Schedule 17 approval. MD said that the process was one of progressive optimization of the design as greater certainty arises through the rail systems and rolling stock contracts. A condition could be a way forward in principle to manage this although the mechanism for agreeing to come back to adjust approved designs will need to be thought through and agreed with the LPAs.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to consider how the likely iterative design development could be managed in the Sch17 process.</p> <p>SNDC suggested that this principle of progressive review of designs could be set out in the proposed Planning Forum Note. Conditions could possibly be tied to significant effects as defined in the ES.</p> <p>SAC asked what the timescales are for finalizing the noise source terms from the rail systems and rolling stock contracts. RG referred to slide 20 which shows the broad programme for these contracts.</p> <p>SAC asked why it is necessary to secure Sch 17 consents in advance of this information becoming available. RG said this was because contractors need consents to get on and start the works. It is an on-going iterative process, to ensure the best outcomes are achieved through every step.</p> <p>AVDC noted that quite significant noise barriers on bridges and viaducts are going to have a considerable impact on designs, hence the need to get noise barrier heights right so as to avoid uncertainty in the community. TA noted that noise barriers need to be shown and not missed to avoid the need for coming back for approvals at a later date.</p> <p>RG said that there is an opportunity through the earthworks to get a better outcome and use the 'December 2017' reasonable worse case noise source terms to identify barrier locations and heights for discussion with the LPAs; there is then an opportunity to revise barriers downwards.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
--	-----------------------

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>AVDC noted that earthworks are not a mitigation option on viaducts.</p> <p>SNDC asked (in relation to the four criteria used in the ES and proposed now as the criteria to demonstrate noise has been reduced as far as reasonably practicable) if cost was the primary consideration as it came first on the list in the slide - 'costs' also include other environmental costs. 'Value for money' could be a better term than 'cost'.</p> <p>RG confirmed that the four criteria are in no special order and have equal weighting. The intent of the iterative design process described is to bake noise considerations into every design decision. The feedback received on how the list of criteria will be fed into the draft of the proposed Planning Forum Note.</p> <p>SAC asked how 'hot-spots' are identified. RG confirmed this will be addressed in discussions with EHOs commencing with the presentation next week.</p> <p>The Forum agreed that a draft Planning Forum Note would be prepared. Action: HS2 to circulate a draft Planning Forum Note on operational noise, for comment.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Phase 1 Update ██████████ provided an update on Phase 1 activities in north, central and south areas.</p> <p>TA asked for the revised Sch 17 written statement (WS) template to be provided to LPAs. MD explained that the new template provided a clearer way for contractors to detail what pre-application discussions had been held and other consent requirements, thus addressing some comments from the LPAs on early Sch 17 submissions. Action: HS2 to circulate new Schedule 17 WS template.</p> <p>In relation to the draft Schedule 17 'packaging strategy' drawing, SAC and CDC asked when they would receive theirs. MD said that EK's intention was to roll out similar drawings for discussion with authorities in their contract area. AVDC's was the first such packaging strategy to be produced: it was not yet agreed.</p> <p>A concern about the current status of CDE design has been raised by LPAs. PG said that some EWC works are coming forward in advance of CDEs being agreed on a route-wide basis. This was discussed under item 7 of the agenda.</p> <p>HCC asked about 'Gateway 9' and consents needing to be obtained to help fix costs. HS2 confirmed that the project is at Gateway 4. Designs continue to be optimized across the project prior to notice to proceed; obtaining consents and/or minimizing consents risk is part of this effort. MD noted there were further Gateways prior to Notice to Proceed.</p> <p>TA asked SC if ██████████ is still Chair of Crossrail. SC said she can't speak for Crossrail but he is now chair of HS2 Ltd.</p>	<p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>5.</p>	<p>Community Engagement and Helpdesk Update</p> <p>██████████ (TW) gave an update on community engagement in central area on Key Design Elements, heritage open days, the oral history project and primary school workshops.</p> <p>██████████ (SG) gave an update on the Community & Environment Fund (CEF), the Business & Local Economy Fund (BLEF) and the Helpdesk.</p> <p>TA asked if the forthcoming MORI poll to take place in October on the Community Engagement Strategy will involve Local Authority Councillors and officers as the Crossrail poll did? SG said the methodology is different – the poll will be based on postcodes either side of railway, so as to capture a complete sample of community. MORI are still developing the detailed methodology.</p> <p>BCC said they had passed on three complaints that had not been responded to. SG said that an update will be provided to BCC separately.</p> <p>WCC asked that when monthly reports for County Councils include data from district councils that are not on the line of route, this is explained. SG said she would look into this.</p> <p>WCC asked that contractor notifications tie up with the other commitments to notify arising from the community engagement plans as there have been inconsistencies. Likewise the Twitter feed from HS2 does not always match with Commonplace narrative on same subject.</p> <p>WCC observed the information on the Commonplace website is evolving well.</p> <p>LBC asked about the mechanism to have a deep dive into how long it takes to deal with complaints on a local basis. SG advised that any detailed questions can be dealt with by contacting her.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Hoarding Design Approach</p> <p>██████████ (TW) presented the hoarding design approach and guidance.</p> <p>HCC said that hoarding designs should be recyclable, allowing hoarding to be located in the correct place first time and then used by follow-on contractors, rather than new hoarding provided. SC/ TW agreed that this was the intent and was already in practice.</p> <p>It was agreed that while highways signage will need to follow highways standards, all HS2 worksites should be signed as such and display the HS2 helpline number. Some small sites had not had the minimum signage requirements described in the approach. TW agreed that the guidance should define what the minimum requirements are.</p> <p>TW confirmed that Network Rail works on behalf of HS2 will also be signed as HS2 worksites with the HS2 helpline number.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>7.</p>	<p>Schedule 17 Consenting Review</p> <p>MD summarized the main issues which LPAs had raised regarding the quality of pre-application consultations being undertaken by contractors. The key issues are some instances of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient time for pre-application discussion prior to start of works. • Meeting papers not provided in advance of meeting. • Agendas not issued in advance of meeting. • Poor quality drawings. <p>MD said that since hearing of the LPAs concerns he had provided some good practice suggestions to contractors on maximizing the effectiveness of pre-application discussions, noting that the only requirement on contractors is defined in the Planning Memorandum - to undertake 'proportionate' discussions.</p> <p>HCC noted that pre-application discussions need to be noted as such, with comments from local authorities and/or actions on HS2 formally recorded. HCC suggested a planning forum note on this issue might be useful. MD agreed - the need for formal documentation of meetings had been highlighted to contractors.</p> <p>At HCC's suggestion it was agreed a Planning Forum Note outlining best practice would be beneficial. Action: HS2 to circulate a draft Planning Forum Note.</p> <p>MD was asked to circulate his suggestions made to contractors. Action: MD to circulate the suggestions made. LPAs respond with any other suggestions.</p> <p>NWBC described pre-application engagement on enabling works highways proposals related to Birmingham Interchange. There was inadequate information on what are major works and an expectation of rapid turnaround of comments (2 weeks during the holiday season). MD noted that contractors had to strike a balance between engaging too early or too late. Early engagement is good provided the status of the early status of drawings is explained by the contractor.</p> <p>NCC suggested a comments log is used. Also, enabling works contractors have been unclear on what the consents requirements are.</p> <p>SNDC said that in some pre-application meetings it had been unclear whether statutory consultees had been consulted and/or what their views were. Statutory consultees need to be involved early on so as to avoid objections to the Schedule 17 application.</p> <p>The role of the public in influencing designs needs to be made clear. PG noted the agenda item for the next Planning Forum dealing with this issue.</p> <p>SNDC noted that recent engagement under the Class Approval on temporary spoil locations was accompanied by a poor quality plan and only one week was given to respond. Could the principles behind this process for this be clarified? MD agreed this would be sensible – HS2 to consider addressing this point in the proposed Planning Forum Note on pre-application engagement (Action).</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2/ LPAs</p> <p>HS2</p>
-----------	---	--

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>SAC asked if HS2 have provided advice to contractors on how to package Sch 17 submissions. SAC have advised the contractor not to include multiple elements in applications. MD said the packaging strategy needs to be discussed and agreed on a bilateral basis. Other authorities had taken a directly opposite view to the one outlined by SAC, for example.</p> <p>SAC/ WCC asked if HS2 would provide advice to contractors on who to invite to Schedule 17 pre-application meetings. There had been instances of the county not being invited to meetings resulting in further meetings having to be arranged. PG/ MD said that meeting attendees should be agreed on a bilateral basis: planning authorities have differing views about who they would like at meetings. There is no reason why any consultee should be excluded.</p> <p>SAC asked if HS2 instruct contractors to provide a packaging strategy that comprised a Schedule 17 application for each structure. MD said HS2 would not do this. It is important that agreement as to the most appropriate way to package applications was reached on a bi-lateral basis. Many authorities took the opposite view about the appropriate packaging strategy.</p> <p>CDC said that the EWC contractor had not proposed a packaging strategy. MD noted that the strategy referred to that had been provided to AVDC was produced by EK, who are intending to roll this out to all authorities in their contract area. Align may have a different approach as their works are generally focused in smaller geographical areas in CDC.</p> <p>Common Design Elements (CDEs) MD said he understood the LPAs had concerns about the progress of CDEs, and how to respond to enabling works contractors designs where these contained elements that are proposed to be agreed as CDEs (such as bridge parapets).</p> <p>Regarding design progress, MD said that progress had been slower than hoped compared to the original programme outlined to the Forum, largely due to contractor resources being drawn away to develop design maturity prior to the Notice to Proceed (referred to by ██████████ at the July Forum (minute 4)).</p> <p>In response to TA noting the considerable delay and the recent email from ██████████ ██████████s of EK, MD confirmed that it is still intended to issue a draft Planning Form Note proposing CDEs for bridge/ viaduct parapets and viaduct piers for comment by the Working Group and to hold another Working Group (assuming this proves necessary). TA said that HS2 would need to move very quickly if this was to happen before the next Planning Forum in November. Action: HS2 to issue draft Planning Forum Notes on bridge and viaduct parapets and viaduct piers.</p> <p>Regarding the status of enabling works designs, MD advised that LPAs should consider every proposal on its merits within the context of Schedule 17. The position is currently no different to how it would be if CDEs had been agreed by the Planning Forum, except that if and when a CDE is agreed by the Forum, there</p>	<p>HS2</p>
--	--	------------

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC said letters often take too long to reach the right person for any response to be made within the required 7 day timescales. • Plans, notices and letter should all have the same details and should identify the site more clearly. • BCC said that often it is very difficult to identify the land subject to the notice from a postcode or description. A grid reference or CAD shape file would be better. • LBC said that is was often difficult to understand what surveys were intended on what land or property from the information given. <p>NK will review the comments made and look to improve the process.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p>Woodland Fund ██████████ provided an update on the Woodland Fund:</p> <p>HCC asked when the next £4m of funding will be released. Action: HS2 to advise.</p> <p>HCC asked if the Woodland Fund can be match funded with CEF or BLEF funding. HS2 advised that no, it could not.</p> <p>SNDC asked what were the applications and range of applicants. PG confirmed that the applicant has to be a landowner.</p> <p>SNDC asked if the allocation of funds will feed into the green corridor. PG confirmed that to be the case.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Updates PG advised the Forum that ██████████ (DfT) is moving to a new role in DfT. The Forum expressed its thanks to Merida for her contribution to its work.</p> <p>Prolonged Disturbance Scheme PG gave an update on the scheme. A further update is to be provided at the next Forum.</p> <p>HCC asked if people have current issues or problems, can they claim retrospectively once the scheme is finalised. Action: HS2 to advise.</p> <p>The Interim Complaints Commissioner said that he has recommended that the overlap with Prolonged Disturbance Scheme and the Construction Complaint process needs to be clarified. Action: HS2 to clarify at next meeting.</p> <p>Independent Construction Commissioner (ICC) (NB. GE (Interim Construction Commissioner) left the room prior to the discussion of this item).</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>TA said that the LPAs had raised concerns at their pre-meeting regarding the process for the appointment of the ICC.</p> <p>PG showed slides from DfT regarding the appointment of the ICC and advised that questions on the process by which the appointment was made should be directed to DfT.</p> <p>SC said the LPA's Interface Manager is the first point of contact for all U&A queries. In addition, the HS2 Helpdesk is able to respond to all queries, including undertakings and assurances, and has an escalation processes in place to deal with these. Action: HS2 to email HCC DfT contact details.</p>	HS2
12.	<p>Forward Plan The Forward Plan was agreed. Action: TA/ PG to liaise on dates for future Forum meetings. [Post meeting note: a list of proposed dates in 2019 was issued to the Forum on 24 September and no objections were received]</p>	HS2/ TA
11.	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NWBC asked if HS2/contractors could avoid acronyms wherever possible, or explain what they mean when used. • SNDC asked if there was an update from the Interim Complaints Commissioner on complaints. GE said there had been a spike in complaints in June in Euston, mainly due to NR works. He will be issuing his sixth report soon. The meeting thanked GE for his advice and help and for attending the Forum. • BCC said DfT had advised the HS2 cycle strategy recently, but noted there is no funding. • AVDC asked that there is an update at a future meeting on how HS2 is going to safeguard broadband. Action: HS2 to provide answer at next Planning Forum. • TA asked for a presentation from HS2 on how HS2 ensures compliance with route-wide undertakings. Action: HS2 to present at a future Planning Forum. • The draft Appendix to PFN 6 (lorry route conditioning) should also be shown to the Highways Sub-group. 	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>