



## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

Item		Action Owner
1.	<b>Introductions</b>	
	Introductions were made.	
2.	<p><b>CEF &amp; BLEF – update</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd and Groundwork UK gave the Forum an introduction to the two funding programmes which were announced by government in 2014 to offset the impact of construction of Phase One of HS2 on local communities and businesses - the CEF (Community &amp; Environment Fund) and BLEF (Business &amp; Local Economy Fund).</p> <p>HS2 Ltd presented slides, key highlights were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The combined total of £40m is available over a period of 11 years</li> <li>• Applications for funding opened on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2017</li> <li>• Groundwork UK are acting as the independent Grant Management Body</li> <li>• Priority will be given to projects within 1km of the route</li> <li>• Applications for funding must have a lead applicant and only one application is allowed from each lead applicant every six months</li> </ul> <p>WCC asked if applicants can reapply if they are unsuccessful. Groundwork clarified that a list of reasons why would be given to the applicant to encourage them to address them and reapply.</p> <p>LBC asked why there was a minimum 25% requirement for match contributions for LA led bids for CEF local applications and none for BLEF applications. HS2 Ltd took an action to review. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>LBC asked if there was any LA or community representation on the Panel to assess applications. HS2 Ltd took an action to provide details of the Panel. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>HCC queried whether it was possible to match fund and asked HS2 Ltd to find out if any other funding from HS2 Ltd or the DfT could be used to match fund. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>WCC asked if a charity could be given match funding, Groundwork said they would clarify. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>The Chair highlighted that on HS1, applications were made by individual farmers impacted by construction but funds could not be made by individuals so an individual would need to get a group together with a lead applicant. HCC said this might be difficult for some businesses, for example an individual who is running a playgroup.</p> <p>The Chair asked how applications would be determined within the 16 week timeframe stated when the Panel meet quarterly. HS2 Ltd clarified that the Panel only assess applications over £75,000 and a smaller internal Panel sift through applications under £75,000. Groundwork UK highlighted to the Forum that they would be engaging with local communities to explain the application process.</p> <p>██████████ (HS2 Ltd) asked how LAs are kept involved in the application process for</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>schemes that could create a burden for them, when applications are assessed internally. Groundwork UK explained that the applicant would be required to ensure and evidence that projects such as a 'right of way' are sustainable and maintenance has been considered. WCC added that authorities are not accountable for unadopted highways.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd said Groundwork would review this and respond accordingly to the applicant should not enough evidence be provided. It was recognised that the support of individual elected members is not necessary as the support of a local authority.</p> <p>BCC asked if would be unreasonable for LAs to be consulted on projects in locations that may impact their plans. Groundwork UK clarified that consultation process had not been included in the wider process for applications. ██████████ (HS2 Ltd) highlighted that consultation is a big process and that perhaps the process should be considered further. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>HCC asked for a monthly list showing what has been awarded so far. <b>Action.</b></p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Review of minutes and actions from last meeting</b></p> <p>Item AOB Sept 2016: The Community Engagement Team explained to the Forum that work on the Local Community Investment process is not yet ready to be shared with LAs but would be a future agenda item at the meeting.</p> <p>Item 3 Mar 2017: The DfT explained that an announcement had not been made following the cycle route feasibility study because of Purdah. The Forum asked for further clarity of the relationship between ██████████ and the DfT, suggesting that he attend a future meeting to explain his involvement. CDC/SBDC asked if there was a scope for the study. The DfT took the action away. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>Item 5 Mar 2017: NCC asked if a timeframe for publishing meeting material could be included in the Planning Forum ToR. HS2 Ltd explained that it was difficult to stick to a timeframe due to restrictions on gov.uk. HS2 Ltd clarified that they have had approval to have a separate website so this could be something discussed in the future as the new website process evolves.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Phase One Construction – update</b></p> <p>The Senior Interface Manager for Area Central attended the meeting on behalf of the Programme Directors and gave the Forum a presentation on construction.</p> <p>Key highlights were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enabling Works Contacts (EWCs) awarded to: Area South CS JV (Costain Group Plc, Skanska Construction UK Limited); Area Central Fusion JV (Morgan Sindall plc, BAM Nuttall Limited, Ferrovial Agroman (UK) Limited) and Area North LM JV (Laing O'Rourke Construction Limited, J. Murphy &amp; Sons Limited).</li> <li>• Main Works Civils Contracts (MWCCs) to be awarded in August 2017.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Community Engagement Update</b></p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>HS2 Ltd gave the Forum an update on how community engagement had progressed on the project. HS2 Ltd said that it intended to complete its response to the Bynoe report by the end of the year.</p> <p>Key highlights from the presentation were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of the 'Community Hub' - to be located in Birmingham</li> <li>• New Freephone hotline number in operation – 08081 434 434</li> <li>• Publication of the Residents Charter</li> <li>• Tracker to capture complaints to provide LAs with intelligence</li> </ul> <p>HS2 Ltd emphasised that they want to communicate the message that it is not just about delivering this project within time and budget. HS2 Ltd understood that LAs needed to have information about complaints, the 'Community Hub' would act as an intelligence provider with the intention for LAs to be sent reports informing them what HS2 issues are being complained about.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted that the complaint process that was shared with the Forum previously was unclear. HS2 Ltd said they would review what was previously shared. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>HS2 Confirmed that the Community Engagement Strategy was still in draft form. HCC asked the Chair to write to the SoS explaining that an EMR had been breached because the Community Engagement Strategy had not yet been finalised prior to Royal Assent and this concerned LAs because it was the overarching document for community engagement on the project. HS2 Ltd said they were not aware the Royal Assent date for the Strategy and would review the EMRs. HS2 Ltd told the Forum that the document was in draft form and scheduled to go to Executive Board in July.</p> <p>CDC/SBDC said that the updates given showed progress which was positive to see.</p> <p>HCC highlighted that they were unhappy with the situation and felt they had not been proactively engaged with. HS2 Ltd took an action to speak to HCC after the meeting. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd asked the Forum what would be useful to include in the reports to be issued to LAs informing them of complaints received by HS2 Ltd. The Chair highlighted that there was already a model for community relations reports.</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Planning Forum ToR</b></p> <p>The Chair had made minor amendments to the ToR to ensure they were up-to-date. These are now the settled version but they can be reviewed in the future if required.</p>	
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>Planning Forum Notes</b></p> <p>The Chair asked HS2 Ltd to put a footnote at the bottom of each PFN stating that the document is considered final. HS2 Ltd took away the action. <b>Action.</b></p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p><b>Indicative Mitigation</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd explained that they had received a comment regarding the plans and sections paragraph and would tweak wording accordingly so it is less ambiguous. <b>Action.</b> HCC highlighted that it would be less onerous if the PFN could include wording to say that detailed comments would be provided if information is available.</p> <p>SADC queried the timeline for delivering indicative mitigation. HS2 Ltd used a scenario for early works to explain whereby the indicative mitigation plans showing the area of grassland would not require Schedule 17 approval, but LA comments on the indicative mitigation are required when the pond (which does require Schedule 17 approval) is submitted for pre-app/approval: the indicative mitigation plans for said grassland are included in the submission so that LAs can understand the manner in which the effects of the 'scheduled work' are to be mitigated.</p> <p>LDC said that it had not been clearly communicated whether landscaping would be delivered before a newt pond were removed. HS2 Ltd clarified that newt pond applications for approval had been submitted and this should be clarified during the pre-application process.</p> <p>CDC/SBDC asked if the indicative mitigation required an approval from the respective authority. HS2 Ltd clarified it does not. When a LA receives a Schedule 17 approval for a particular work, it would include an indicative mitigation plans and specs drawing for consultation. Any response given by the LA does not pre-empt or prejudice the bringing into use process, and in making any comment on indicative mitigation designs, the authority is not agreeing them at that stage. HS2 Ltd explained that it is a more collaborative and informed way of working and de-risks subsequent approvals by considering LA comments now rather than after they are built which can result in costly late design changes.</p> <p>SNDC asked how the process would work so that contractors making the BiU approval would take into consideration the comments made earlier, i.e. when the indicative mitigation plan was provided to the LA. HS2 Ltd said that it would be considering all comments received through this process as it proceeds through design and construction.</p>	HS2 Ltd
<p><b>Lorry Routes</b></p> <p>The Chair highlighted that the Forum felt the PFN had been 'recycled' too often and needed a linguistic review. The Chair took away the action. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>The Forum discussed routes for local suppliers and businesses in terms of when and where these discussions will take place. HS2 Ltd explained that the principle of approval of routes for local suppliers between worksites and the special/trunk road network being approved generally had been settled at previous meetings of the Forum and Highways Subgroup. This was necessary if the lorry routes approval process is not to inadvertently disadvantage local suppliers.</p> <p>LBC asked the Forum if any LAs had received any lorry route approvals yet – members in the room had not. They had been informed they would receive a request for</p>	HS2 Ltd

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>approval at the end of this year. LBC said that they believed the Council had received an assurance given through the Parliamentary process that a ROMIS is to be issued to them before a request for approval of lorry routes. HS2 Ltd were unsure of the specific Assurance and took the action away. <b>Action.</b></p> <p><b>Planning Portal</b> HCC highlighted that the titling of plans with numbers is complex and asked if they could be simplified so it is clearer what is plan is. HS2 Ltd confirmed that this could not happen because of the how the document management system works.</p> <p>WDC said that they are receiving inconsistent file names for the same schedule 17 approval. The Senior Town Planning Manager has attempted to resolve this. HS2 Ltd thanked WDC for highlighting so they could discuss internally.</p> <p>SNC asked if a sentence could be added to clarify that the contractor would contact the LA to discuss the most appropriate process to pay the application fee. HS2 Ltd asked the Forum if they would be happy to consider this PFN final once this wording had been incorporated, the Forum agreed. HS2 Ltd would share the PFN once changes had been made. <b>Action.</b></p> <p><b>Decision Notices</b> HCC suggested adding ‘county’ to footnote. HS2 Ltd said the footnote need not include this amendment because contractors will be aware if the authority is unitary or not. HS2 Ltd said that a minor amendment was required as a wet signature was not mandatory. HS2 Ltd asked the Forum if they were happy to agree the PFN as final subject to wet signature amendment. The Forum agreed. HS2 Ltd to make proposed change. <b>Action.</b></p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>8</p>	<p><b>Draft Appeals Guidance</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd said that the guidance would be circulated to LA’s for their consideration and comments to be sent to <a href="mailto:planning.forum@hs2.org.uk">planning.forum@hs2.org.uk</a> by <b>25<sup>th</sup> August</b>. <b>Action.</b></p>	<p>LAs</p>
<p>9</p>	<p><b>HS2 Updates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLA’s – HS2 Ltd said that the letter which has been circulated to LAs was a placeholder and actions had been fed back to the Commercial team who were unable to attend the meeting today. The Chair highlighted the frustration felt by LAs. HS2 Ltd said they would feedback to Commercial colleagues and ensure that they attend the next Planning Forum meeting.</li> <li>• Project Updates – The DfT gave the Forum the following key updates:  <u>New Ministerial Team</u>            Secretary of State – Chris Grayling MP            Minister of State – John Hayes MP            Parliamentary Under Secretary of State - Paul Maynard MP            Parliamentary Under Secretary of State - Jesse Norman MP            Parliamentary Under Secretary of State - Lord Callanan</li> </ul>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p><u>New Permanent Secretary</u> Bernadette Kelly was appointed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, replacing Philip Rutnam who has moved to the Home Office.</p> <p><u>New Acting Director General of High Speed Rail Group</u> ██████████, Director General of HSRG, leaves DfT on 23 June to take up a new role as Pro Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Resources at the University of Oxford. ██████████ (currently Director of HS2 Phase 1) will be Acting Director General of HSRG while a permanent successor for ██████████ is recruited. ██████████ (Director of HS2 Programme and Funding) will also take on the Director of Phase 1 responsibilities.</p> <p><u>Other staff changes</u> ██████████ left HSRG at the end of March to take up the role of Programme Director, Operation Stack and National Lorry Park Plan. The DfT HS2 Phase 1 Bill Team ceased to exist on 31 March and has been replaced by the HS2 Phase 1 Act Powers and Environment Team. The Act Powers and Environment Team sits within the HS2 Phase 1 Route Wide Sponsor Team and consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ██████████ (Act Powers and Planning Lead)</li> <li>• ██████████ (Environment Lead)</li> <li>• ██████████ (Head of the Act Powers and Environment Team)</li> </ul> <p>The team reports into ██████████ who is Deputy Director, HS2 Phase 1 Route Wide Sponsor Team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forward Plan – The Forum agreed that the next meeting would take place on the 30<sup>th</sup> August in Birmingham and 31<sup>st</sup> August in London. The next Forum meeting will consider whether to have a single meeting which could alternate between North and South locations. WCC asked if the SLA could be on the future meeting’s agenda if it has not yet been resolved. <b>Action.</b> LBC asked if there was an update on the urban compensation scheme – it was due to be published but delayed because of Purdah. HS2 Ltd took away the action. <b>Action.</b> BCC highlighted that they had not seen the Highways Maintenance Agreement. HS2 Ltd took away action to feedback to Highways colleagues. <b>Action.</b></li> </ul>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
<p>10</p>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>HCC asked when the Planning Context Reports would be shared with the County Councils. HS2 Ltd said that all County Councils would receive a copy of any Planning Context Report issued to their district authorities before their first submission.</p> <p>HS2 confirmed that Main works Civil Contractors will collaborate on common design elements</p>	

**INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2**