

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

|                                   |  |   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Title:</b>                     | <b>Independent Planning Forum for HS2 – Phase One</b>  |   |
| <b>Date &amp; Time</b>            | <b>25<sup>th</sup> January 2017</b><br><b>South Planning Forum</b><br><b>The Euston Office</b><br><b>One Euston Square</b><br><b>London, NW1 2FD</b> | <b>26<sup>th</sup> January 2017</b><br><b>North Planning Forum</b><br><b>2 Snowhill, Queensway,</b><br><b>Birmingham</b><br><b>B4 6GA</b> |
| <b>Chair</b>                      | ██████████   | Independent Chair   |
| <b>Promoter Attendees:</b>        | ██████████   | HS2 Ltd   |
|                                   | ██████████   | HS2 Ltd   |
|                                   | ██████████   | HS2 Ltd   |
|                                   | ██████████   | HS2 Ltd   |
|                                   | South  |   |
| ██████████                        | HS2 Ltd  |   |
| ██████████                        | HS2 Ltd  |   |
| ██████████                        | HS2 Ltd  |   |
| North                             |  |   |
| ██████████                        | HS2 Ltd  |   |
| <b>Local Authority Attendees:</b> | South  |   |
|                                   | ██████████   | Bucks County Council  |
|                                   | ██████████   | Bucks County Council  |
|                                   | ██████████   | London Borough of Camden  |
|                                   | ██████████   | South Bucks/Chiltern District Council   |
|                                   | ██████████   | South Bucks/Chiltern District Council   |
|                                   | ██████████   | South Northants Council   |
|                                   | ██████████   | Hertfordshire County Council  |
|                                   | ██████████   | Three Rivers District Council   |
|                                   | ██████████   | Three Rivers District Council   |
|                                   | ██████████   | Warwickshire County Council   |
|                                   | ██████████   | Aylesbury Vale District Council   |
|                                   | ██████████   | OPDC  |
|                                   | ██████████   | Greater London Authority  |
|                                   | ██████████   | Northamptonshire County Council   |
| ██████████                        | Cherwell District Council  |   |
| North                             |  |   |
| ██████████                        | South Northants Council  |   |
| ██████████                        | North Warwickshire Borough Council   |   |
| ██████████                        | Oxfordshire County Council   |   |
| ██████████                        | Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council  |   |
| ██████████                        | Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council  |   |
| ██████████                        | Warwick District Council   |   |
| ██████████                        | Warwickshire County Council  |   |
| ██████████                        | Lichfield District Council   |   |
| ██████████                        | Staffordshire County Council   |   |

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

|                  |  |   |
|------------------|--|---|
|                  | ██████████<br>██████████<br>██████████<br>██████████ | Birmingham City Council<br>Birmingham City Council<br>Birmingham City Council<br>Stratford District Council |
| <b>Guests</b>    | ██████████<br>██████████<br>██████████<br>██████████ | DfT<br>Atkins<br>Atkins<br>Interim Construction Commissioner  |
| <b>Apologies</b> | ██████████<br>██████████<br>██████████               | London Borough of Ealing<br>Chiltern District Council<br>London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham             |

| <b>Item</b> |  | <b>Action Owner</b> |
|-------------|--|---------------------|
| <b>1.</b>   | <b>Introductions</b><br><br>Introductions were made  |                     |
| <b>2.</b>   | <p><b>Common Design Elements</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd introduced ██████████ and ██████████ (Atkins) who are undertaking work on common designs on behalf of HS2 Ltd. Paragraph 4.1.4 of the Planning Memorandum states that, “<i>the Forum will consider common design items for certain structures associated with the railway</i>”. HS2 Ltd said that the presentation was the start of that consideration.</p> <p>The presentation included noise barriers, retaining structures and handrails. Atkins emphasised that designs were indicative. They had identified precedents from other infrastructure projects and assessed the design against criteria which included safety, sustainability, cost, durability, maintainability, vandalism, appearance and construction.</p> <p><u>Noise Barriers</u><br/>South: BCC raised concern regarding the proposed IMD in their area in terms of how far the area’s context would be explored. BCC also asked if local people would be involved in commenting on designs. HS2 Ltd said that the opportunity to discuss local areas’ contexts would be during pre-submission discussions with the relevant LA and it is for LAs to decide whether to engage with their communities.</p> <p>South: BCC asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of the designed structures. HS2 Ltd said that a formal decision had not yet been made, as it relates to railway operations.</p> <p>South: HS2 Ltd suggested that the Forum view the design as a ‘style-guide’ for the contractor. HS2 Ltd proceeded to say that the MWCC will be on-board in June or July and viewed the design work taking 6-9 months.</p> |                     |

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>South: WCC pointed out that there would be different package areas within their boundary, so questioned how consistent designs would be if there were separate MWCCs. HS2 Ltd stated that design should be consistent regardless of having separate contractors because it is important from a consistency and functionality perspective.</p> <p>South: LBC asked if the Design Panel were involved in this process. HS2 Ltd clarified that they were.</p> <p>North: LDC highlighted that there would be differences in costs, for example whether green vegetation is designed into noise barriers. Atkins said they could not put a cost on different design options but noted that more maintenance would be required if green vegetation were included.</p> <p>North: The Chair said it was worth remembering that noise barriers are there for a purpose because of the human context.</p> <p>North: BCC asked if there were any plans of where the designs were to be located. HS2 Ltd said that the ES indicated areas for noise mitigation.</p> <p>North: The Forum discussed translucent noise barriers. Atkins said that the difficulty with such barriers is that they are very reflective and also that if travelling at high speed your eye does not have time to adjust to a translucent wall. Tests were being carried out and findings presented to the Design Panel next week.</p> <p><u>Retaining Structures</u></p> <p>South: The Forum discussed scenarios whereby the public would be able to view a retaining structure within a cutting.</p> <p>South: SNC assumed that raised embankments would use natural land contouring. HS2 Ltd agreed with that assumption.</p> <p>South: HS2 Ltd said that if a situation arises whereby the LA deems a retaining structure inappropriate then discussion with HS2 Ltd can happen.</p> <p>North: The Chair summarised the discussion at the South meeting regarding the public being able to view retaining structures within a cutting. HS2 Ltd thought that such a view would only be from a distance or a high viewpoint.</p> <p><u>Handrails</u></p> <p>South: HCC asked how LAs would deal with painted handrails in terms of maintenance. BCC said that the Highways Subgroup are discussing the Highways Maintenance Agreement which captures that element.</p> <p>North: SDC said that in situations where the public are crossing footbridges, it could be their first experience of the high speed railway so</p> |  |
|---|--|

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

|                  |  |                                     |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
|                  | <p>those areas need to be considered carefully.</p> <p>North: The Chair emphasised that most handrails are to prevent railway maintenance staff from falling but agreed that some handrails will be in publically accessible areas so detail is important.</p> <p>North: SNC suggested that clutter should be minimised if health and safety standards can still be met. SNC questioned how frequently maintenance staff would need to use handrails and wondered if temporary solutions could take away clutter from the environment. Atkins said that is a question they would put to engineers. HS2 Ltd said that from previous experience, planning for the local environment can be driven by health and safety requirements.</p> <p>North: WDC asked if HS2 Ltd would be discussing gantries with the Forum in the future. HS2 Ltd said that it formed part of the Railway Systems contract.</p> <p>North: BCC asked if lighting would be a common design. HS2 Ltd said they were unsure if lighting comes under a design contract or the civil contractors’ design, but lighting design would be approved under the planning regime.</p> <p>North: HS2 Ltd suggested LAs research and feedback to HS2 Ltd any design ideas they wish to discuss with the Forum.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – HS2 Ltd to circulate the Common Design Elements slides and asked for LA feedback within 4 weeks.</p> | <p>LAs</p> <p>HS2 Ltd &amp; LAs</p> |
| <p><b>3.</b></p> | <p><b>Review of notes &amp; actions from last meeting</b></p> <p><u>Minutes</u></p> <p>South: SNC requested a change to the December minutes to reflect the discussion regarding the Complaints Process.</p> <p>South: LBC requested a change to the December minutes to record their point made regarding LBC’s assurance regarding engagement on the community engagement framework.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – HS2 Ltd to amend the minutes accordingly.</p> <p><u>Outstanding Actions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item 2.2 – HS2 Ltd updated the Forum and said that Ministers were considering the Feasibility Study but no decision had been made with regard to HS2 Ltd funding cycleways. HS2 Ltd were aware that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had met with some LAs. [REDACTED] had been instructed</li> </ul>  | <p>HS2 Ltd</p>                      |

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

|           |   |                           |
|-----------|---|---------------------------|
|           | <p>by the DfT to look at cycle pathway schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South: WCC asked HS2 Ltd to keep the Forum updated on the item.<br/>South: SNC queried why the proposal had been given such a priority. HS2 Ltd clarified that it was being progressed separately from HS2.</li> <li>• Item 2.3 - HS2 Ltd said a board paper would be considered in February and once decided it would be bought back to the Forum.</li> <li>• Item AOB – HS2 Ltd said that now the EWC were on-board they would develop plans for their package areas which included producing the associated Community Investment Plans.<br/><br/>South: WCC asked if there was a timeline for the CEF and BLEF. HS2 Ltd said that they expected the criteria to be published after Royal Assent.<br/><br/>South: WCC asked whether [REDACTED] (Independent Chair of the Community &amp; Environment Fund – CEF, and Business &amp; Local Economy Fund - BLEF) could attend the next meeting. HS2 Ltd said they would ask if she were available to attend. <b>Post-meeting note:</b> [REDACTED] is scheduled to attend the May Planning Forum.</li> <li>• Item 4 – HS2 Ltd told the Forum that SLA discussions were ongoing. The Chair asked LAs if there were any concerns and none were raised.</li> <li>• Item 2 – HS2 Ltd said they would circulate a revised draft ToR with tracked changes for discussion at the March Forum.</li> <li>• Item 6 – South: AVDC and HCC said they had not received test Portal submissions. HS2 Ltd said all volunteer LAs would receive test submissions soon: it was suggested by LDC that all LAs should receive a sample Schedule 17 submission. South: SNC pointed out that it would be helpful to ensure back-office systems were in place prior to that.</li> <li>• Item 7 – The Chair pointed out that it might be helpful to share WDCs members briefing slides as an example of one LA’s approach – <b>Action</b>.</li> <li>• Item 10 – North: NWBC questioned why Planning Forum SPOCs had not been issued the LEMPs when they had previously been consulted on the document. HS2 Ltd said that the latest engagement was EHO focused so they had been sent to the EHOs. The Chair asked HS2 Ltd to issue the LEMPs to the Planning Forum SPOCs – <b>Action</b>.</li> </ul> | <p>WDC</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> |
| <p>4.</p> | <p><b>Look Ahead 2017 – Construction</b></p> <p>ML – HS2 Area North Programme Director and MH – HS2 Area Central Programme Director gave a verbal update on behalf of the Construction Directorate. In summary, this included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current main activity was procurement of MWCCs.</li> <li>• EWC were on-board and mobilising – early works such as ecology surveys and translocation are planned which would require a timely consent programme otherwise the ecology season window could be missed.</li> <li>• There would be an opportunity for Planning Forum to consider the</li> </ul>  |                           |

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

|    |  |         |
|----|--|---------|
|    | <p>construction programme as it develops, such as the number of consents, beyond what has already been shared, and would be available in due course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS2 Ltd were reaching agreement with the DfT on assumptions for stations procurement. HS2 Ltd said that colleagues were already discussing station design with LAs to understand context to ensure masterplans align with LA plans and policies. That would trigger the RIBA 3 process.</li> </ul> <p>South: CDC said that it was very important that a flow of information regarding consents was available to help LAs manage resourcing. HS2 Ltd said that the EWC have submitted their plans which contains that information but further work needed to be carried out before a programme could be shared.</p> <p>North: LDC said that the key to speed up LAs granting approvals was to share the programme sooner.</p> <p>South: BCC asked if a draft programme could be shared. HS2 Ltd stated that when detailed consents figures were available, beyond what has already been shared, they would be shared with LAs via bilateral discussions rather than at Forum meetings. As each LA has a distinct programme that should be discussed in detail.</p> <p>South: WCC said that the biggest value to the Forum was the strategic overview and suggested that HS2 Ltd did not discuss everything in bilateral discussions. The Chair said that both Crossrail and CTRL had shared consents programmes with their Planning Forums. HS2 Ltd said that future Planning Forum meetings were an opportunity to discuss common issues LAs experience during the construction phase.</p> <p>North: SCC asked what business engagement HS2 Ltd had undertaken. HS2 Ltd said that there was a Regional Government Structure which focused on business relocation and support.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd said they would find out which SCC officer had discussion with HS2 Ltd regarding business engagement – <b>Action</b>.</p> | HS2 Ltd |
| 5. | <p><b>Suite of Schedule 17 documents – signposting</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd highlighted key documents that had been developed through the Parliamentary process and confirmed that the suite of final EMRs would be published at Royal Assent.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd also said that the class approval would be made following the public consultation process.</p> <p>South: HCC suggested that the class approval should be discussed by the</p>  |         |

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

|           |   |  |
|-----------|---|--|
|           | <p>Planning Forum before it is formally published but pointed out that the next scheduled meeting did not allow time for that to occur. HS2 Ltd clarified that the text in the class approval was the same as in the CoCP and the SoS would issue a response to comments raised during the consultation. HCC said that the current consultation had generated key issues that had not been addressed in the CoCP. HS2 Ltd explained that the class approval is critical to the programme and a draft class approval had been shared on three occasions previously. HCC said that the text had changed significantly. HS2 Ltd responded and said that every change to the CoCP had been shared with LAs at Planning Forum or the EHO Subgroup.</p> <p>South: CDC agreed that the document had been considered at Planning Forum a number of times, but said that LAs were concerned the class approval may give contractors too much freedom.</p> <p>South: TRDC asked if the class approval could come back to Planning Forum if there were concerns. HS2 Ltd said that although the SoS will consider comments, if the SoS is comfortable with the content of the class approval that it will be made by the SoS.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd clarified that although the draft class approval text is extracted from the CoCP, the consultation responses can result in the text in the class approval changing if it is appropriate.</p> <p>South: The DfT explained that there is a statutory consultation underway, and the comments received during that time will be considered. There is no intention to come back to Planning Forum during that time.</p> <p>South: CDC suggested that LAs meet themselves and submit their comments together. The Chair highlighted that it would need to occur before the 13<sup>th</sup> February. HCC offered to host the meeting.</p> <p>North: SNC said it was clear in the letter to LAs that the purpose of the class approval was to provide an enforcement mechanism. SNC explained they had attended the South meeting and felt that the wording might not be precise enough for LAs to enforce. HS2 Ltd took the point and explained that standard text is used because construction sites are fluid so do not want to restrict them. Standard text was used on Crossrail and CTRL.</p> |  |
| <p>6.</p> | <p><b>Planning Forum Notes (PFN)</b></p> <p><u>Submission of Schedule 17 requests for approval</u><br/> HS2 Ltd said that the planning portal process for Schedule 17 submissions would be formalised in a PFN, which would be circulated so LAs can consider if information in the appropriate fields is relevant.</p> <p>South: AVDC asked if HS2 Ltd would test sending submissions. HS2 Ltd said it would. AVDC said that there had previously been situations whereby an</p>   |  |

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**

|                  |   |  |
|------------------|---|--|
|                  | <p>application for planning permission was on land that straddled more than one LA boundary and Planning Portal would notify the incorrect determining LA.</p> <p>South: TRDC asked what fees would be paid. HS2 Ltd said this would be based upon the fee regulations.</p> <p>South: WCC suggested testing the process to submit requests to LAs that do not use Planning Portal.</p> <p>North: LDC asked HS2 Ltd if they could provide a decision notice PFN which could guide LPAs on what they can lawfully include. <b>Action</b> – HS2 Ltd to circulate a draft PFN.</p> <p><u>Lorry routes – revision</u></p> <p>South &amp; North: HS2 Ltd stated that the PFN had been considered by both Planning Forum and Highways Subgroup. LBC had produced later comments which had been incorporated into the comments and response table. HS2 Ltd said they would circulate the updated comments and response table and amended PFN. <b>Action</b> – HS2 Ltd to circulate comments and response table, and amended PFN.</p> <p>South: The Chair said he believed LAs were expecting a PFN on TROs. The DfT said they understood it was to be a guidance document but will take the comment back to colleagues and clarify – <b>Action</b>.</p> | <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>DfT</p> |
| <p><b>7.</b></p> | <p><b>Context Reports – content</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd said that the reports would be in similar format to the Crossrail reports and will be submitted to each LPA prior to their first Schedule 17 request for approval – this is a requirement of the Bill.</p> <p>The report will comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- general overview of project and planning regime</li> <li>- description of works within the LPA</li> <li>- proposed programme for submitting Schedule 17 requests</li> </ul> <p>HS2 Ltd highlighted that the report would not be updated after it has been submitted to the LPA.</p> <p>South: BCC asked when they would receive their report. HS2 Ltd said it would depend when BCC has their first Schedule 17 request.</p> <p>South: The Chair asked HS2 Ltd about a paragraph in the Planning Memorandum which says that every quarter HS2 Ltd will produce a six months planning consents programme. HS2 Ltd clarified that they would submit a forward programme in accordance with the Planning Memorandum to each planning authority.</p>  |  |



## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 8.  | <p><b>HS2 Updates</b></p>  |  |
| 8.1 | <p><b>Parliamentary Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HoL Select Committee finished hearings in early December and published their report on the 15<sup>th</sup> December. The DfT published their response on the 17<sup>th</sup> January.</li> <li>• During the Report Stage, several amendments to the Bill were raised but none accepted as they had been addressed already by the Committee.</li> <li>• Amendments were made to draw in legislation from the Housing and Planning Act.</li> <li>• Amendments were made with regard to TROs to address concerns that had not been addressed in the original Bill – the DfT apologised for the recent events regarding the TROs and admitted that Highway Authorities should have been consulted before making the amendment.</li> <li>• The Third Reading was due in the HoLs on Tuesday 31<sup>st</sup> January</li> </ul> |  |
| 8.2 | <p><b>Project Updates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a £2.7 billion contract to be awarded in 2019 to a company contracted to build the high speed trains. The search for this contractor had started.</li> </ul>   |  |
| 8.3 | <p><b>Forward Plan</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented the list of PFNs which had been developed through the Forum. The only outstanding PFN was the Decision Notice PFN which HS2 Ltd planned to bring to the March meeting.</p> <p>The next Planning Forum meeting was scheduled for the 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> March and the agenda would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Forum ToR</li> <li>• Draft Appeals Guidance</li> <li>• PFNs Update</li> <li>• Common Design Elements</li> <li>• CEF/BLEF</li> <li>• Enabling Works</li> </ul>  |  |
| 8.4 | <p><b>Subgroups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Health Subgroup last met on 19<sup>th</sup> January and discussed the monthly monitoring data report template; data sharing strategy feedback and S.61 guidance document. The next meeting had not yet been set.</li> <li>• Highways Subgroup last met on 14<sup>th</sup> December and discussed road safety audits and highway related departures; permanent highways approval processes; winter maintenance and the lorry</li> </ul>  |  |

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

|    |  |                               |
|----|--|-------------------------------|
|    | <p>routes PFN. The next meeting was scheduled for 8<sup>th</sup> February.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage Subgroup last met on 13<sup>th</sup> December and discussed historic environment research and delivery strategy and a look back on 2016. The next meeting was scheduled for 16<sup>th</sup> March.</li> <li>Flood Risk &amp; Drainage Subgroup last met on 15<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> December and discussed the consents programme and consents process. The next meeting had not yet been set.</li> </ul>  |                               |
| 9. | <p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>The Chair highlighted the National Suicide Prevention Strategy on behalf of SCC. A question had been raised asking whether HS2 Ltd were involved in the strategy or at least considering it. HS2 Ltd said they would feedback the question to appropriate colleagues and respond at the next meeting if not before - <b>Action</b>.</p> <p>North: WDC said that Council members were keen to share information to publicise the Construction Commissioner within their communities. Gareth Epps (GE) suggested that his contact information be circulated with the meeting papers – <b>Action</b>. GE said he was hoping to have a leaflet available to him soon. HS2 Ltd reiterated that there is a helpline and that should be the first point of call.</p> <p>North: NWBC asked when the helpline would be available as there were GI works currently happening. HS2 Ltd clarified that there was already a 24 hour helpline to field enquiries.</p> <p>North: SNC asked for an update with regards to extending the 2016 MoU. HS2 Ltd said that it is intended to roll on and are currently following up with their Commercial Team to confirm that.</p> <p>Next meeting: 22<sup>nd</sup> (2 Snowhill) and 23<sup>rd</sup> (Euston) March</p> | <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> |