

INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

Guests:	██████████ ██████████	Interim Independent Construction Commissioner Historic England
Apologies		London Borough of Camden

Item		Action Owner
1.	Introductions	
	The Chair invited new attendees to introduce themselves. ██████████ ██████████, HS2 Ltd introduced himself and thanked the Forum for the invitation.	
2.	<p>Review of notes & actions from last meeting</p> <p>The January minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the previous meeting and are to be published on the gov.uk website. ACTION.</p> <p>The Forum reviewed the action log and agreed/noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 website – HS2 Ltd said progress was being made and would seek further detail on progress from the HS2 Communications team to report back to the Forum at the next meeting in May. • Local Area Engagement Plan (LAEP) – NCC said they had only seen a draft and progress was slow. • Planning Forum Note: Statutory Consultee Engagement (PFN 12) – HS2 Ltd said they would share a draft with the Forum prior to the May meeting. • Common Design Elements (CDE) Working Group – HS2 Ltd said the format of the group had been finalised and meeting invites for the 26th March had been circulated. Some LAs highlighted that the date was during school holidays therefore likely to be inconvenient. The Chair suggested that LAs propose alternative dates. • Green Corridor Workshop – HS2 Ltd said that invitations were based on the invitation list for the Ecology Review Group (ERG). SNC pointed out that they were invited to the workshop but do not attend the ERG. CDC/SBDC said there was no action following the workshop and its purpose was unclear. The Chair asked HS2 Ltd to feedback to colleagues and provide an update at the next meeting. ACTION. 	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
3.	<p>Heritage Subgroup update with attendance from Historic England</p> <p>Helen Wass, Head of Heritage at HS2 Ltd introduced herself to the Forum and presented slides showing how historic environment work was being delivered on the project. The slides includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic Environment Research and Delivery Strategy (HERDS) 	

INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

document sets out how the project will meet its commitments set out in the Heritage Memorandum. A copy of the document is published online [here](#)

- The fieldwork programme is underway along the route and includes heritage from all time periods. .
- Series of community engagement events are currently being scheduled for later this year and beyond as well as TV series.

WDC asked if there was a programme for works within the Heritage Memorandum. HS2 Ltd said the Heritage Memorandum sets out the key requirements of the entire historic environment programme. Each contractor (Area North, Central and South) was developing their programme of works overseen by HS2 historic environment staff). A suite of technical standards and procedures supported that implementation. The Chair queried whether the EWC had archaeological specialists. HS2 Ltd confirmed that was the case and quoted Fusion as an example. The Chair asked if contractor archaeologists attended the Heritage Subgroup: HS2 Ltd confirmed that they did.

HS2 Ltd explained that the Contract Management Organisation (CMO) managed the Enabling Works Contracts, which included the historic environment specialist contractors. A key aspect of the CMOs role was to ensure that work was appropriately sequenced. The EWC had direct engagement with Las to facilitate their works.

HCC said that the Heritage Subgroup had discussed percentages in terms of trial trenching. HS2 Ltd noted that these discussions regarding sampling strategies were subject to Heritage Subgroup discussions.

██████████, Historic England (HE) was in attendance, so the item on Statutory Consultees was pulled forward. HS2 Ltd introduced HE and explained the proposed process for engagement with statutory consultees, such as HE regarding Schedule 17 approvals. The Heritage Subgroup had discussed the process at their meeting the day before and suggested that the lookaheads be sent to the LA archaeologists at the same time they are shared with LA SPOCs.

HE explained to the Forum that the applications they wish to be consulted on should come via HS2 or their contractors in advance of the approval being submitted. However, HE also advised the LA to discuss the approval with their own archaeologist.

CDC/SBDC asked how the process will be communicated to the LPAs. HS2 Ltd said that this was still being worked out but will be explained in a Planning Forum Note.

WDC said that they have consulted HE on Schedule 17 approvals rather than using their own archaeologists. HS2 Ltd asked if WDC were

INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>able to seek advice from the county archaeologist, but WCC pointed out that there was not an agreement in place to enable this. HS2 Ltd said that the District authority were able to seek costs under the SLA if they wish to seek advice from the relevant county archaeologist. SADC and NWBC said that they contract such work out as they do not have a relevant inhouse resource to obtain archaeological advice. HS2 Ltd took away an action to clarify whether the LA would be reimbursed for contracting such work under the SLA. ACTION.</p> <p>The Forum pointed out that as HE is a statutory consultee, they should be consulted on all Schedule 17 approvals that effect a site of archaeological or historic interest. HS2 Ltd explained that there was no intent to put LAs in a position that might be challengeable, only to ensure that the statutory consultees were being consulted on approvals relevant to the requirements of paragraph 18 under Schedule 17.</p> <p>HE said that they do not have the capacity to provide meaningful consultation responses should they be consulted on all approvals that effect a site of archaeological or historic interest, which is why the process needs to ensure that the LA archaeological advisers (usually the county archaeologists) are engaged so that HE are only consulted on approvals that affect highly designated assets or are particularly significant.</p> <p>SNC said they suspected there might be a problem for the process to work for two-tier areas and suggested that a framework for how districts consult the counties ought to be considered.</p> <p>WCC said that they thought the county archaeologist would benefit from being sent the forward look-ahead list. HS2 Ltd said they would consider how this could be incorporated into the process. ACTION.</p>	<p>SADC/NWBC/HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Design Panel – update</p> <p>██████████, HS2 Ltd presented slides on the HS2 Independent Design Panel which included a diagram to show its relationship with other Panels and stakeholders.</p> <p>Some LAs highlighted that they hadn’t received invitations to some of the Panel meetings shown, or that invitations were sent with too short notice.</p> <p>HCC raised that they were not clear on how the Regional Park Advisor feeds into the Colne Valley Viaduct Panel. HS2 Ltd said they would organise a call outside of the meeting to clarify. ACTION.</p> <p>CDC/SBDC asked if the LAs views are sought on the Panel’s recommendations. HS2 Ltd said they would if the recommendations impacted the LA.</p> <p>The Forum generally agreed that there was room for improvement in the way the meetings were organised. HS2 Ltd agreed and suggested</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>the relevant Project Directors needed to attend the meetings: however this would require agreement across Phase One with support from the Programme Directors. Additionally, HS2 Ltd need to work more closely with Frame who provide the independent secretarial services to ensure the correct attendees are present. The Chair said that it seemed HS2 Ltd were giving the Panels the right recognition but it is not a balanced meeting if the relevant consenting authority are not at the meeting.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Prolonged Disturbance Policy</p> <p>██████████ (HS2 Ltd) presented slides on the Prolonged Disturbance Compensation Scheme which had been circulated to the Forum in advance of the meeting for comment.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd explained that the Scheme had been developed based on the plentiful Camden data and that this was a target area for engagement, but confirmed that it will apply route-wide. HS2 Ltd emphasised that the policy would be launched by the DfT and not HS2 Ltd.</p> <p>CDC/SBDC asked where this policy stood in terms of equality. HS2 Ltd said that an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) was carried out which resulted in the decision not to consult the community.</p> <p>HCC highlighted that the deadline for LAs to respond would be difficult due Bank Holidays and other work priorities. HS2 Ltd said they could extend the deadline if the Forum needed it, although the Forum should be mindful that there is an urgent need for this policy to be proposed.</p> <p>HCC said that it would be useful to have access to a map of what funds are available to residents. HS2 Ltd said this was raised internally and the community engagement website would be used to publish it.</p> <p>OPDC said that the policy was only partly related to planning so there was concern that should the Forum agree to the policy that they might be blamed by residents so would be interested to understand how HS2 Ltd are publicising how the LAs are being consulted on the policy.</p> <p>BCC asked if the EHO Subgroup would be consulted. The Chair highlighted that the presentation suggested that the policy was only applicable to urban areas: although this is its origin, he assumed it is applicable route-wide. HS2 Ltd said that is why comments from LAs, particularly those with residents in less urban areas are important. HS2 Ltd said they needed to get a policy in place as it was required by residents and an output from Select Committee.</p> <p>SADC asked if HS2 Ltd would publish noise contour maps and HS2 Ltd said it would depend on the location and the works being designed at the time. The Chair asked if the Environmental Statement (ES) gave any further detail and HS2 Ltd clarified that the ES looked at where the policy might “bite”.</p> <p>ACTION: HS2 Ltd and the Forum agreed that <u>Friday 6th April</u> was the deadline to send comments.</p>	<p>LAs</p>

INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>██████████, HS2 Ltd presented slides to the Forum outlining the principles to be adopted by LPAs when considering conditions on LGV approvals. The Chair thought the presentation was helpful even though it did not highlight anything new. HS2 Ltd said that recent legal advice and discussions with LPAs were informing HS2’s consideration of the circumstances under which conditions could be applied. ACTION – HS2 Ltd to circulate amended PFN dealing with conditioning of LGV route approvals to the Forum for their review.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>DfT Response to Local Authorities’ Comments on Disqualifying Policy</p> <p>██████████, the DfT, presented a high-level overview of the comments LAs had sent on the policy. It was explained that those comments had been considered and responded to in a table and the next version would have appropriate comments inserted as tracked changes. ACTION – HS2 Ltd to circulate an amended version of the policy as well as the comments and response table.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Phase 1 Construction – update</p> <p>██████████, HS2 Ltd presented slides to give the Forum an update on Phase One construction.</p> <p>The presentation included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground Investigation video • SLA update – HS2 Ltd reiterated that focused engagement has occurred with some LAs but they were keen to extend to all LAs • Area (South, Central and North) updates <p>The Chair asked for the background to the recent SLA engagement on time-sheets, and why it had not been received positively by some LAs. HS2 Ltd apologised for how the recent correspondence had been received and that it had been sent to LAs without the proper context. The Chair asked the Forum to raise their hand if their SLA had not yet been signed by HS2 Ltd: about half a dozen LAs raised their hand. HS2 Ltd said it was aware of the SLAs that had not yet been signed. HCC highlighted that it had recently submitted an invoice and was waiting for it to be resolved. HS2 Ltd said they would circulate the proposed format for the new spreadsheet for the Forum to comment on. ACTION.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd requested comments within a week so that the new spreadsheet could be used from the start of the new financial year. The Chair suggested this was unrealistic, especially given that it is now ‘year-end’. HS2 Ltd agreed to extend the deadline for LAs’ comments to the end of April.</p> <p>AVDC said that naming the HS2 Ltd officer related to the work would</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>be difficult and that HS2 Ltd should be aware of the work they are carrying out with LAs: LDC agreed. WCC said that the proposed timesheets should be as simple as possible and highlighted that the timesheets used for the MoU process worked so should be considered here.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd explained that more information was required for the SLA timesheets so that HS2 Ltd would be able to justify any reimbursements made to the National Audit Office if required.</p> <p>BCC said that their Finance team had reviewed the proposed SLA timesheet and they considered it too onerous and requires simplification.</p> <p>CDC/SBDC said they had concern regarding the delay of payments to LAs and HS2 Ltd said that delays are caused by insufficient evidence which is why it was so important.</p> <p>WCC highlighted that the timing to communicate this was not appropriate as it was two weeks before the financial year end. HS2 Ltd said that it was purely coincidental and that the Service Level Agreement Managers were only appointed 6 weeks previous to manage this work. The Chair said that these needed to be progressed quickly and suggested that the Forum discuss at the next inter-borough meeting.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p>HS2 Updates</p> <p>DfT Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nusrat Ghani MP (Assistant Government Whip and Parliamentary Under Secretary of State Transport) is the new Minister for HS2, replacing Paul Maynard MP • 25 January 2018 - First recipients of grants from the HS2 Phase One Community and Environment Fund and the Business and Local Economy Fund were announced. • 30 January 2018 - Search began for rail systems, track and mechanical & electrical contractors • 2 February 2018 – Winners of the Station Design contracts were announced (see circulated slide for further information) • 22 February 2018 – Lendlease was announced as the Euston Master Development Partner <p>Phase 2a and 2b</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented a slide to highlight the lessons learnt from Phase One which were being integrated into working practice for Phase 2a and 2b. This included examples such as the Community Engagement team working alongside Petition Managers on Phase 2a and closer collaboration.</p> <p>Forward Plan</p> <p>The next meeting had been scheduled for Thursday 17th May with the</p>	

INDEPENDENT Phase One Planning FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>following items proposed for the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community Engagement• Design Panel Chair update• Common Design Elements• Feedback from Common Design Elements Workshop• Draft PFN – Engagement with Statutory Consultees <p>The Chair highlighted that recent meetings have been very tight in terms of timing and questioned whether there was a need to have another meeting between the May and July meetings. HS2 Ltd said they would consider and took it away as an action. ACTION.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>WCC asked HS2 Ltd to consider having a future agenda item on non-planning consents. ACTION.</p> <p>HCC said it may be useful to share the Phase One Planning Forum’s knowledge with the Phase 2a Planning Forum. HS2 Ltd said that two Phase One LAs were members of the 2a Planning Forum so could share knowledge with the other Phase 2a LAs.</p> <p>AVDC asked the Forum if they would like to use their facilities for the next meeting: however the Forum felt that it was easier to hold South meetings in London for travel reasons.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>