

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

Title:	Independent Planning Forum for HS2 – Phase One	
Date & Time	Wednesday 30th August 2 Snow Hill Queensway Birmingham	Thursday 31st August Holiday Inn Regents Park Carburton Street London
Chair	██████████	Independent Chair
Promoter Attendees:	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd
	██████████	Interim Construction Commissioner
Local Authority Attendees:	North	
	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	South Northamptonshire Council (SNC) Northamptonshire County Council Warwick District Council Oxfordshire County Council Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) Lichfield District Council (LDC) Cherwell District Council (CDC) South Northamptonshire Council (SNC) Warwickshire County Council (WCC)
	South	
	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	Chiltern & South Bucks District Council (CDC/SBDC) South Northamptonshire Council Warwickshire County Council Chiltern & South Bucks District Council Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) Buckinghamshire County Council Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) London Borough of Camden (LBC) London Borough of Camden OPDC London Borough of Brent (LBB)
Apologies	██████████	North Warwickshire Borough Council

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

Item		Action Owner
1.	<p>Introductions</p>	
	<p>Introductions were made.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted that the agenda stated a start time of 12:00 rather than 12:30 as in the meeting invitation, and that the meeting started after this because the room wasn't ready. HS2 Ltd apologised and noted for future arrangements. It was also not clear whether lunch would be provided. Action HS2 to make clear in future.</p>	HS2 Ltd
2.	<p>Review of minutes and actions from last meeting</p> <p>The Chair highlighted that the draft minutes from the previous meeting had not yet been distributed formally but were now shared with LAs to give members the opportunity to comment by Friday 8th September.</p> <p>North & South, Mar 2017 Item 2: The Chair had shared an e-mail with the Forum containing information published by the Design Panel on their website. HS2 Ltd told the Forum that they are working with the HS2 Design Panel team to provide a more formal process for publishing minutes.</p> <p>North: The Chair asked if [REDACTED] (Design Panel Chair) would be attending a future meeting. HS2 Ltd took an Action to discuss with the HS2 Design Panel team.</p> <p>North & South, Mar 2017 Item 7: HS2 Ltd explained that they are working with their online team to publish the Planning Forum Notes.</p> <p>North & South, June 2017 Item 2: BCC and WCC were unsure if they had received the letter from [REDACTED] so HS2 Ltd took away an Action to check with relevant colleagues that these Authorities had been included.</p> <p>North & South, June 2017 Item 8: HS2 Ltd told the Forum that the Urban Compensation scheme is being worked on by HS2 Ltd, the DfT and Construction Commissioner and proposals are expected to be published in the Autumn. The Scheme sets precedent for Phase 2 and other major projects. The Chair asked if it was property related which HS2 Ltd confirmed - it is aimed at those who suffer from severe and prolonged disturbance.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
3.	<p>Phase One Construction – update</p> <p>[REDACTED] – Senior Interface Manager Area South gave the update for Phase One.</p> <p>Routewide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 bid farewell to [REDACTED], MD for Development in August • Current Land & Property Director, [REDACTED], is moving to Hybrid Bill in September • Former Director of Phase 2a, [REDACTED], is moving to Land & Property in October 	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

- [REDACTED] will be managing Phase 2a under Mike Lyons

Phase 1:

- Stations Construction PQQs issued 29 August for Old Oak Common and Euston stations
- Formal contests for Birmingham stations begin early 2018
- MWCC appointments made. Four joint ventures - SCS JV, Align JV, CEK JV and Balfour Beatty VINCI
- Large programme of ecological surveys planned across Phase 1 throughout the Autumn

Area North:

- Park Hall area haul road and site compounds planned to commence October
- Site clearance for Fosse Way, North Portal and Kenilworth Greenway planned November
- M6 J4 scheme due to commence February 2018
- Park Street burial ground exhumations planned Spring 18. A wider programme of archaeological investigations will commence across the station site from summer 2018.

Area Central:

- M25 enabling works complete and main works mobilising
- CPA compound and GI works in Colne Valley due to remobilise over next 3 months
- Planning applications for habitat creation sites outside Bill limits are due to be submitted shortly
- Next round of AONB and Colne Valley Panels are due.

Area South:

- Stations' Design and Euston MDP shortlisting and ITT announced in July.
- First public possession at St James's Gardens in June. Interfaith community service held prior to start of detailed archaeological surveys.
- Bank holiday Euston works completed on time, train services returned to normal as planned.
- Noise Insulation programme well underway with first tranche of instillations expected in September at Euston. Community Engagement programme to promote the scheme and encourage take up will be rolled out across Phase 1 in the coming months

South: The Chair asked HS2 Ltd when the planning context reports were being rolled out. HS2 Ltd said that their production depends on the consenting programme. The Chair asked if the front end of the document could be sent to the Forum. HS2 Ltd said they could distribute with the meeting papers. **Action.**

North & South: The Programme Director, Area North, told the Forum that the main civil contractors were mobilising and highlighted that consents were a contract requirement. In coming months, contractors would be introduced to members to build relationships.

HS2 Ltd

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>North & South: The Chair asked if all consents would pass through HS2’s Town Planning team. HS2 Ltd clarified that all planning consents were considered ‘category one’ which are accepted by HS2 Ltd to ensure statutory requirements had been met.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd said they were unable to review every consent (all consent types, not Schedule 17) because of the time and cost factor so it is a risk-based assurance approach. The Chair said it would be useful to see a list of consents categories. HS2 Ltd took an Action away to look into producing a table to present to the Forum in January.</p> <p>South: WCC asked if Schedule 4 consents could be included in the table. HS2 Ltd said they would need to discuss with Highways colleagues but generally speaking, permanent Schedule 4 consents were in the same category as Schedule 17.</p> <p>North: SNC highlighted they had received a Schedule 17 and the title on each document was different so it was difficult to match documents. HS2 Ltd agreed that titles needed to be consistent and that they were working through these with their contractors.</p> <p>South: CDC/SBDC asked if any progress had been made on the relocation of HeX. HS2 Ltd said it was still being worked on and they would tell the Forum as soon as a decision is made. Action</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>SLAs</p> <p>██████████ – Head of Commercial Agreements gave an update to the Forum to clarify the latest position:</p> <p>Following the special ‘Forum’ meeting, HS2 Ltd proposed an amended July formula and LAs have the opportunity to accept this formula or amend their rates and submit to HS2 Ltd for agreement. LAs may also have their rates assessed by HS2 Ltd if requested.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd are aware schedule 2 needs amending to incorporate the amended July formula.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd said that six LAs have accepted the amended July formula and 11 have submitted their rates to HS2 Ltd. HS2 Ltd encouraged other LAs to engage or continue to engage with their Interface Manager.</p> <p>North: CDC asked HS2 Ltd if there was guidance to be provided to LAs as that was their understanding following the special ‘Forum’ meeting. HS2 Ltd said that DCLG attended that meeting and explained that it was difficult to provide ‘real’ guidance as it did not exist. HS2 Ltd added that an e-mail had gone out to provide additional clarity on overheads and gave the Forum an example whereby if HS2 Ltd paid a LA legal costs directly, HS2 Ltd would not expect them to be included in the LAs overheads.</p> <p>South: The Chair asked if HS2 Ltd could clarify the approach for accommodation costs. HS2 Ltd said that generally speaking, if HS2 Ltd are using LA staff and services provided from a head office location those head office costs can be reflected in the rates for using those facilities.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

North: SMBC said they would want to ensure an element of consistency and clarity so comparatives with other LAs could be shared in the future. The Chair explained to SMBC (who had not attended the special Forum meeting) that LAs had agreed it would not be a way forward to compare rates with other LAs and that the message was that if a LA were recovering a higher cost it was because they have higher costs. SMBC said it would be useful to know how much detail LAs are going into before submitting their rates to HS2 Ltd.

North: LDC highlighted that there is likely to be a scenario whereby LAs will wait for one LA to 'jump' first and unless there is consistency there is no definitive who will go first. LDC said there is a general feeling that if you 'jump' first, you would get a worse deal. HS2 Ltd said that if a LA felt their costs were not being covered by their agreement the formula can be re-assessed to ensure the burden was being compensated. The Chair asked if there was a break clause in the SLA stating that. HS2 Ltd clarified that it was included but could add additional text to schedule 2 to assure LAs. **Action.**

North: SMBC asked what level of evidence HS2 Ltd were expecting to receive from LAs. HS2 Ltd said they would expect to see what the bands of salary were, not payslips and contracts of employment of officers.

North: SNC said that some LAs were transitioning to a more commercial rather than public business approach. HS2 Ltd said they would work through such detail with LAs as they each have different productivity levels which made it difficult to provide all LAs with a meaningful comparison.

North: The Chair asked HS2 Ltd if they could share the benchmarking in terms of what checks and comparisons HS2 Ltd would carry out. HS2 Ltd said it would need to be a trusting relationship but if one LA's property costs were significantly higher that would raise questions.

North: SCC said if the overall rates were broadly similar why so much time was being spent on their negotiation. HS2 Ltd clarified that they were not broadly similar. LDC asked if overall rates were similar regionally.

North and South: The Chair said that the questionnaire LAs had completed said that a third were not expecting SLAs to be signed for three months.

South: HS2 Ltd apologised to the Forum and said the process had not been handled as well as it might have been: it had started with the right intention to be efficient but it had not worked out as intended.

North: HS2 Ltd asked LAs if HS2 Ltd had commitment from them to keep supporting the SLA approach. LDC highlighted that they had already put resource in place to provide a good service.

North: SCC highlighted to HS2 Ltd that they had been treated poorly given that HS2 Ltd had previously confirmed agreement. Their Senior Team needed a firm position soon to

HS2 Ltd

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>ensure a good working relationship between SCC and HS2 Ltd. When asked how much time they had spent on negotiating the SLA, SCC replied, probably more time than (as a County) they will bill to the Project.</p> <p>South: AVDC highlighted that there had been some confusion as to when a meeting between the LA and HS2 Ltd should take place. HS2 Ltd took away an action to speak to Area Central Interface colleagues. Action.</p> <p>South: LBB asked what the position was regarding interim payments. HS2 Ltd said they had made a commitment to reimburse LAs for services at the SLA rate (when signed) but if it is causing a problem during the interim HS2 Ltd could make arrangements.</p> <p>South: LBC highlighted that their authority were making progress and believed they would be reaching agreement soon.</p> <p>South: WCC said that if HS2 Ltd are asking LAs to assist with community engagement then it should be included on schedule 2 and that the CE Director, [REDACTED], had said at a previous meeting that HS2 Ltd needed the local authorities' support on community engagement. BCC agreed that LA could add value on community engagement. HS2 Ltd took an Action away to review policy and provide a formal response.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Planning Forum Notes</p> <p>[REDACTED] confirmed he is the new Head of Town Planning at HS2 Ltd and that his previous role – Phase One Lead would be backfilled. Senior Town Planning Manager, Area North ([REDACTED]) and Senior Town Planning Manager, Area Central ([REDACTED]) would be taking a more active role at future meetings.</p> <p><u>PFN10 Indicative Mitigation</u> LAs had provided comments on PFN10: Indicative Mitigation. HS2 Ltd had incorporated all comments into a table and presented the 'headlines' to the Forum.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd told the Forum that the table and PFNs presented would be shared with the Forum on Monday 4th September with three weeks to comment. Action.</p> <p>The Chair said that if no further comments were received, Planning Forum Notes should be marked 'Final' with a date and placed on the website. The Chair noted that PFNs 1, 6 and 8 had already been subject to considerable review.</p> <p>South: HS2 Ltd highlighted that at the end of scheme design, contractually at that point a target price is agreed so it would be poor value if HS2 Ltd were not to agree with the LA the mitigation in principle. Any subsequent change in design would impact on the target price. The Chair said that HS2 Ltd may therefore need to consider making bringing into use requests during Stage 1 scheme design to tie down design.</p> <p>South: CDC said there was a risk of the design changing should additional noise mitigation be required for example.</p> <p>South: WCC asked how HS2 Ltd were going to effectively engage with petitioners and</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd/LAs</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>communities on design and mitigation. The public perception is that the design will be developed with them: this expectation will need managing. HS2 Ltd clarified local communities are being engaged on noise mitigation and that engagement on key design elements is a requirement of Information Paper D1. WCC highlighted that clarity was needed from the engagement team with regards to contractor design engagement. HS2 Ltd said they were aware of the perception and were working on a solution.</p> <p>Action.</p> <p>South: AVDC highlighted that they had been approached by bodies such as the Woodland Trust to be part of the engagement process.</p> <p>South: CDC/SBDC said that the Chiltern North Portal had been taken off the key design list. HS2 Ltd clarified that the wrong portal is recorded in IPD1 due to a copying and pasting error – this will be amended.</p> <p><u>PFN6 Lorry Route Approvals</u> The Chair had an action from the previous meeting in June to review the PFN and send comments to HS2 Ltd. The note has been amended based on these comments except the comment regarding paragraph 2.2, which the Chair accepted.</p> <p><u>PFN8 Use of the Planning Portal</u> The PFN had been tidied up and reference to a ‘wet signature’ being required removed from the proforma.</p> <p><u>PFN1 Contents of Submission</u> The PFN had been tidied up and mistakes amended.</p> <p>North: WDC highlighted that they are receiving application fees currently and were not aware this was going to happen. HS2 Ltd said that once their SLA is signed it will supersede application fees and any costs above the fees would be recoverable under the SLA.</p>	HS2 Ltd
<p>6.</p>	<p>Draft Appeals Guidance</p> <p>HS2 Ltd told the Forum that shortly after Royal Assent the SoS laid in Parliament the regulations for the appeals process for Schedule 17 requests for approval.</p> <p>The DCLG and the DfT produced a guidance document which had been presented and circulated to the Forum for comment. None were received so the Departments are finalizing the document and expect it to be published this Autumn.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>Single Planning Forum Meeting</p> <p>North & South: The Chair led on the item and highlighted that two meetings were time consuming for senior HS2 staff to attend, so asked LAs if a single meeting would be preferable in the future to help facilitate such senior support and participation. The venue could alternate between north and south. The consensus was positive and it was proposed that the next single meeting would take place in Birmingham on <u>2nd November</u>. LAs added that it would be beneficial to have clarity on whether lunch would be provided.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>North & South: The Chair added that he had met with the CEO of HS2 Ltd and discussed the Community Engagement Strategy and possibility that he could attend a future Planning Forum meeting. He explained that the Strategy was being considered by the Board that week, and that he would like to attend the Forum – perhaps annually.</p> <p>North & South: SNC suggested that LAs also consider what would be most effective in terms of the LA pre-meetings. The Chair highlighted that the Crossrail Planning Forum pre-meetings occur weeks before the Forum meeting and assist in setting agendas. SNC suggested the Chair e-mail members asking for their thoughts on this. Action.</p> <p>South: AVDC highlighted that some meetings conflict with their planning committee meetings so would require calendar invitations for meetings to be sent out at least 6 months in advance to ensure resources are in place to attend the Forum meetings. HS2 Ltd and the Chair took an Action away to discuss future dates.</p>	<p>Chair & LAs</p> <p>Chair & HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Project Updates</p> <p>Community Engagement Strategy HS2 Ltd said that the Community Engagement team intend to bring the final version to the next meeting in November. Currently, the engagement team are developing local engagement delivery plans which are viewed as a ‘ground level’ community engagement strategy. They will set out engagement in the form of look-aheads as the construction programme develops.</p> <p>South: The Chair said that he understood that the Board had delayed the final version of the Community Engagement Strategy because they were pushing for more benefit to the community so any delay was for a good cause.</p> <p>South: WCC agreed that the local delivery plans were sensible and practical.</p> <p>South: CDC/SDBC said that there were many recommendations in the Bynoe report and it would be useful to see how many of these are taken up in the Community Engagement Strategy. HS2 Ltd assured the Forum that the Bynoe recommendations flow through various streams of the business, even personal objectives. HS2 Ltd took an Action away to discuss how to show this, perhaps in the form of a matrix.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd told the Forum that a new Head of Public Response, [REDACTED], had been appointed, and the complaints procedure was his priority. The Chair highlighted to HS2 Ltd that the LAs were more interested in the external facing complaints process than internal processes.</p> <p>The Interim Construction Commissioner added that it had been difficult to publicise his role in the absence of an established complaints process.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd gave updates on behalf of the DfT.</p> <p>National Cycleway Feasibility Study</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>LAs will hear formally from the DfT but in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DfT will share the final feasibility report with relevant LAs as a resource for consideration when LAs are developing their own local cycle networks• DfT does not intend to publish the report on gov.uk as it is a technical document for transport planners• DfT does not have plans to implement or fund the routes from the study, nor is HS2 Ltd funded to implement any of the plans• LAs interested in developing routes from the study were encouraged to incorporate them into a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan• LAs were encouraged to explore the scope for funding routes with their Local Enterprise Partnerships and other potential funders. This could include funding allocated through Growth Deals where the money has not already been allocated to specific projects, as well as the CEF.• [REDACTED] is not currently carrying out any work for the DfT. <p>HS2 Ltd said they will ask DfT if the report can be shared with all members. Action.</p> <p>Noise Appeals Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guidance would be published in the autumn about the determination of noise appeals under Schedule 27 to the Act.• Guidance was considered by the EHO Subgroup and one set of comments were received. <p>Traffic Regulation Order Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The DfT are currently reviewing LA comments (deadline was 11th August) and aimed to publish guidance in the autumn. <p>Road Safety Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The DfT are currently reviewing LA comments (deadline was 11th August) and aimed to publish guidance in the autumn. <p>General HS2 project updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• On 17th July the Phase One Main Works Civils Contractors were announced, as well as the Station Design Contracts shortlist and Euston Master Development Partner shortlist: the HS2 Phase 2a hybrid Bill has been deposited in Parliament and HS2 Phase 2b route confirmed.• Conservation project started in Warwickshire on 7th August to create new wildlife habitats at a site in Kenilworth. <p>North: CDC asked when the Planning Forum for Phase 2a would commence. HS2 Ltd said they had been briefing Phase 2a LAs throughout the summer and anticipated that the Forum would be set-up in October. The Chair pointed out that only a few LAs new to HS2 were involved in Phase 2a.</p> <p>The Chair asked HS2 Ltd when the Phase 2b bill would be deposited and HS2 Ltd confirmed it was 2019.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
--	----------------

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>Forward Plan</p> <p>HS2 Ltd highlighted that PFN11: Site restoration would be circulated to LAs for comment in November.</p> <p>The Chair emphasised that LA members could and should suggest PFNs they felt would be beneficial.</p> <p>The next meeting in November would contain the following agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Engagement Strategy • Complaints process update • Local Community Investment update • Phase One Construction update • PFN11 – Site restoration • Consultation on heritage matters <p>North: SNC asked if there was any information on the Ecology Review Group. HS2 Ltd took away an Action to ask colleagues and update at the next meeting.</p> <p>North & South: The Chair said that the Forum felt somewhat detached from the Heritage Subgroup and would benefit from an update or presentation in the future. HS2 Ltd took away an Action to discuss with Heritage colleagues.</p> <p>South: HS2 Ltd said there had been discussion at the North meeting in terms of the role Historic England (HE) has in consultation. It was felt by LAs at the North meeting that further clarity was required so it would be a future agenda item. Action.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
	<p>AOB</p> <p>Statutory Consultee Process</p> <p>HS2 Ltd asked the Forum if LAs are referring Schedule 17s to their county archaeologist for comments. WDC said they are consulting Historic England by default because there is some confusion as to who should be consulted on archaeology. WDC said they expected HE as statutory consultee to give comments on all archaeology not just scheduled moments or Grade I/II Listed Buildings.</p> <p>It was agreed this issue would be added as agenda item for a future Planning Forum.</p> <p>North & South: SNC questioned how the cost of consulting the county archaeologist would be picked up by the SLA as some Districts may already have existing agreement in place with the county archaeologist. HS2 Ltd said it would be simpler for the district to recover its costs as the LA processing a submission.</p> <p>South: CDC/SBC highlighted that the process seems inefficient for local authorities as the district would bill HS2 Ltd and the county would bill the district, requiring two</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>invoices.</p> <p>South: The Chair highlighted to HS2 Ltd that the website needed updating with meeting minutes and material. HS2 Ltd took the Action away to arrange with the online team.</p> <p>South: OPDC highlighted that they had received their look ahead but that the actual dates of submissions have not been accurate. HS2 Ltd explained that their contractors produce the look aheads and are trying to ensure more accuracy. HS2 Ltd said that the Area Town Planning Managers should be keeping their LAs up-to-date.</p> <p>South: BCC said they were receiving Schedule 4s and it would be helpful to receive look aheads for future submissions. HS2 Ltd said that BCC should speak to the Highways team at HS2 Ltd or highlight this at Highway Subgroup.</p> <p>South: AVDC said that their Area Interface Manager and Area Town Planning Manager had been keeping them informed and there had been no issues. AVDC added that it would be useful to have information for heritage works to see the demand on all areas of expertise. HS2 Ltd said that as soon as they were able to give more information, it would be shared.</p>	HS2 Ltd
--	--	---------