

## INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Independent Planning Forum for HS2 – Phase One</b>	
<b>Date &amp; Time</b>	North Meeting Wednesday 14 <sup>th</sup> September 2016 13:30 – 16:00 Warwick Hilton Stratford Road, Warwick	South Meeting Thursday 15 <sup>th</sup> September 2016 13:30 -16:00 The Euston Office, One Euston Square Melton Street, London
<b>Chair</b>	██████████	Independent Chair
<b>Promoter Attendees:</b>	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd HS2 Ltd DfT
<b>Guest Speaker</b>	██████████	Planning Portal
<b>Local Authority Attendees:</b>	<b>North</b>	
	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	Lichfield District Council Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council Warwick District Council Warwickshire County Council Birmingham City Council Birmingham City Council Oxfordshire County Council Birmingham City Council Northamptonshire County Council Stratford on Avon District Council Buckinghamshire County Council South Northamptonshire Council South Northamptonshire Council
	<b>South</b>	
	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	Chiltern District Council Three Rivers District Council Hertfordshire County Council London Borough of Camden Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Council Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Council Chiltern District Council & South Bucks District Council London Borough of Brent Aylesbury Vale District Council Aylesbury Vale District Council Staffordshire County Council Warwickshire County Council

## INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Westminster City Council</p> <p>London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</p> <p>Old Oak &amp; Park Royal Development Corporation</p> <p>Buckinghamshire County Council</p> <p>London Borough of Camden</p>
<b>Apologies</b>	<p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>North Warwickshire District Council</p> <p>Greater London Authority</p>

<b>Item</b>		<b>Action Owner</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions</b>	
	Introductions were made.	
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Planning Portal Process – Scott Alford (SA), Head of Local Authority Engagement, Planning Portal</b></p> <p>At a previous Planning Forum meeting LAs decided that it would be preferable for Schedule 17 requests for approval to be submitted via the Planning Portal.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd arranged for SA to attend the meeting to explain how the Planning Portal has been used previously to submit consents for major infrastructure projects. Thames Tideway was used as an example and a similar approach could be applied for Schedule 17 consents. This approach is based on using the discharge of condition form of the Planning Portal, completing the fields as per an agreed template and uploading supporting documents including the HS2 ‘pro-forma’ application forms.</p> <p>The system needs to be discussed with LA volunteers to ensure it matches existing back-of-house systems. Further discussion and testing with LA volunteers will determine this.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd said that Planning Portal volunteers will be contacted in the next few weeks to set-up meetings and discuss next steps.</p> <p>North: BCC asked if pre-application discussions will be submitted via Planning Portal. HS2 Ltd clarified that pre-application discussions will take place but they will be separate to this process so not submitted via Planning Portal.</p> <p>North: Bucks CC said that they currently receive notification of a submission via email so officer time is spent downloading the document. SA said that LAs with this set-up could invest in their ICT systems so that a submission would download automatically. Bucks CC suggested that this ICT system ought to be charged to HS2 Ltd as part of the SLA. HS2 Ltd said that the principle of such funding was not accepted but that this can be discussed in a separate SLA meeting.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>North: SNC said that some back-office systems are quite rigid so there might be a possibility of establishing new software to deal with publishing these new “types” of applications.</p> <p>South: LBB asked if all applications will be submitted using the same form. HS2 Ltd clarified that it would always be the condition discharge form that is used but that protocols would be established that will make this effective within the constraints of the Planning Portal system.</p> <p>South: SA said that he would check what system each LA volunteer is using to ensure every type of application is represented in meetings and discussion to develop the process. <b>Action</b> – HS2 Ltd to coordinate with SA to ensure each system is represented by the volunteer LAs.</p> <p>North &amp; South: Bucks and AVDC volunteered to be part of the Planning Portal system development.</p> <p>South: AVDC asked if the forms on Planning Portal will change. The Chair clarified that the existing forms will not be modified but the process of how the forms will be used will be discussed and tested with the LA volunteers.</p> <p>South: HCC said that LAs have not been engaged on this process. HS2 Ltd said that there has been a high-level meeting with Planning Portal previously to introduce Planning Portal to HS2 to establish an approach to start discussions with LA volunteers. SA clarified that a baseline consistent approach is proposed to be used because it has been used in LAs previously.</p> <p>South: CDC asked if the HS2 logo would be on the form because it would help differentiate. SA clarified that there would be a mechanism to highlight that the application was for HS2.</p> <p>South: CDC/SBDC stated that their back-office system automatically selects the appropriate consultees and not creating a bespoke form will result in extra work for their back-office staff, selecting the appropriate consultees for HS2 consents. HS2 Ltd said that there is not an appropriate time-frame to create a bespoke form because all LA back-office systems would also need to change their existing systems to accommodate a new bespoke form. HS2 Ltd also noted that the same approach had been used for the Thames Tideway Tunnel without the need for extensive change to back-office systems.</p> <p>South: WCC asked for clarity on the types of approvals to be submitted via Planning Portal. HS2 Ltd said it will be Schedule 17 approvals only.</p> <p>South: LBC asked if the form could include information stating which section of Schedule 17 the consent is for. HS2 Ltd said yes.</p> <p>South: HCC highlighted to the Forum that Bucks CC had made the point at the North Forum meeting that back-office admin time for processing applications</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>
--	----------------

## INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>ought to be captured in the SLA.</p> <p>South: HCC had been asked on behalf of Bucks CC to raise the point to the Forum that licensing costs could also be captured by the SLA.</p>	
	<p><b>Review of notes &amp; actions from last meeting</b></p> <p>North &amp; South: The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed. <b>Action – Publish the July minutes on the Phase One Planning Forum webpage.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sept 2015 Item 2.2 – HS2 Ltd clarified that there was no update from DfT</li> <li>• May 2016 – HS2 Ltd clarified that the document would be circulated to Highway Subgroup after their meeting. <b>Post-meeting note</b> – the document has now been circulated.</li> <li>• May 2016 – The Chair said that he had been in contact with [REDACTED] at HS2 Ltd who clarified that a board paper is currently being prepared which sets out the process in establishing the independent ICC panel (IAP): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North &amp; South: The Chair asked [REDACTED] to summarise her involvement as the LA representative during the interview process for the Construction Commissioner.</li> <li>North &amp; South: LAs said that the press release was misleading because it gave the public the impression that the appointment was by an independent panel when they did not consider this to be the case.</li> <li>North: HS2 Ltd clarified that [REDACTED] appointment was independent and the Construction Commissioner is interim until the IAP is set up to establish the process to include Local Authorities to appoint the permanent Construction Commissioner. HS2 Ltd said that Gareth Epps would be attending the meeting in October.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• July 2016 – North: Bucks highlighted that they have seen a different version of the LDA which has been circulated. HS2 Ltd clarified that the version circulated is the LDA and any different versions were draft and have been amended appropriately by designers at HS2 Ltd. The policies, however remain unchanged. Bucks CC said that local issues such as AONB had been removed from the LDA. The Chair suggested that this point be sorted with Bucks CC separately. <b>Action – Chase response to Jackie Copcutt’s email</b></li> <li>• July 2016 – The Chair clarified that there had been no LA comments on the approach to the Fee Regulations and Appeal Regulations HS2 Ltd confirmed that they are being prepared on the basis set out at a previous meeting of Planning Forum.</li> </ul> <p>South: The Chair confirmed his understanding that the multiplier used on the spreadsheet for estimated consents should have been three. South LAs said</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>

## INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>that a multiplier of four had been used to deal with amendments and did not include BIU consents. HS2 Ltd clarified that the multiplier is definitely three and that this number will become less important as the consents register progresses because it will contain much more detail.</p> <p>South: CDC said that there was concern as consents figures have changed since the spreadsheet was first presented in May. HS2 Ltd said that it could only update LAs on numbers when the information is available. The Chair noted that the original figures were heavily caveated and engineers do change their plans.</p>	
	<p><b>Community Engagement Framework</b></p> <p>██████████, HS2 Ltd Senior Engagement Manager, attended the meeting so that LAs could feed their further comments on the document to him directly.</p> <p>North: Bucks CC raised the issue of whether HS2 Ltd had responded to the findings in the Ian Bynoe report.  <b>Action – HS2 Ltd to confirm if a response was provided.</b></p> <p><b>Post-meeting note – HS2 Ltd published a response which can be found at: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/526353/160525_full_Response_to_Ian_Bynoe_Report_FV.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/526353/160525_full_Response_to_Ian_Bynoe_Report_FV.pdf</a></b></p> <p>North: Bucks suggested that HS2 Ltd have an accurate list of Councillors to contact them directly. HS2 Ltd said that other LAs have expressed preference for HS2 Ltd to contact the LA SPOC rather than directly with LA Councillors. The Chair said that the SPOC should be advised of any community engagement event and then it is up to the SPOC to notify Councillors or ask HS2 Ltd to inform members directly. HS2 Ltd clarified that there are local engagement teams who will discuss this process with the LA SPOC.</p> <p>North &amp; South: LAs asked if complaints would be published as it might deter further complaints if the public know the issue is already being investigated.</p> <p>North: BCC asked if the CLPs will be shared with LAs for comment. HS2 Ltd confirmed they would.</p> <p>South: The Chair said that during the LA pre-meeting comments were made regarding the CEF’s intention to implement a strategy which has not yet been produced. HS2 Ltd said that the Director of Engagement is yet to be appointed but will shape the strategy.</p> <p>South: WCC asked if LAs could be informed when the director is appointed and which board they will sit on - <b>Action.</b></p> <p><b>Action – Circulate an example of draft notification works letter</b></p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>



## INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p><u>Lorry Routes</u></p> <p>HS2 Ltd highlighted the key changes that had been made to the PFN following LAs' comments.</p> <p>The key changes were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Main routes' wording clarified</li> <li>• 'Shortest appropriate route' wording amended</li> <li>• Discussion at TLGs working added</li> <li>• Inclusion of predicted LGV numbers wording amended</li> </ul> <p><b>Action</b> – The LA comments and HS2 Ltd response table is to be circulated with the latest draft PFN.</p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
	<p><b>Draft Statutory Guidance</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd highlighted the key changes that had been made to the document following LAs' comments.</p> <p><b>Action</b> - Table to be circulated following the meeting for LA's to consider.</p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
	<p><b>Draft Class Approval</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd had previously sought LAs' comments but no comments on the draft class approval had been received on the latest version. HS2 Ltd stated that it is the DfT's intention that the formal consultation with affected planning authorities, as required by paragraph 5 of Schedule 17, will take place shortly after the end of Select Committee with the intention that a formal class approval will be made shortly after Royal Assent.</p> <p>North: Bucks asked if this document could be raised at EHO Subgroup. HS2 Ltd said they would take back to the Environment Team to raise with the independent Chair of the EHO Subgroup. <b>Action.</b></p> <p>North: BCC asked for clarity on the consultation process. HS2 Ltd said that it was expected that if the SoS receives no comments, he will make a class approval like the version that has been consulted on but if comments are received then DfT will consider them.</p> <p>The Chair asked if a second draft will be issued to LAs after the consultation. HS2 Ltd said no but all comments will be considered appropriately as it will be a formal Government consultation.</p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
	<p><b>Planning Memorandum</b></p> <p>HS2 Ltd clarified that DfT wrote to Planning Forum Members on the 7<sup>th</sup> September setting out the steps for a LA to become a Planning Authority.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>North &amp; South: The Chair asked any LAs that would struggle to meet 30<sup>th</sup> September deadline, to respond to the email. HS2 Ltd suggested emailing the DfT email address if any LAs will struggle with this deadline.</p> <p>North: WDC highlighted that they had not received the letter. <b>Action</b> - HS2 Ltd to query with DfT.</p> <p>South: LBB asked who HS2 Ltd are expecting to sign the Planning Memorandum. HS2 Ltd said this will depend on each LA's internal governance. The Chair stated that it is up to the LA SPOC to send onto the correct person as they will know the appropriate governance process.</p> <p>South: AVDC asked which version it is that will be signed. The Chair clarified that it is the version included in the published draft EMR's but a Planning Memorandum will be sent formally to the LA to sign if that LA has informed DfT that they wish to be a qualifying authority by the 30<sup>th</sup> September.</p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
	<p><b>Service Level Agreement</b></p> <p>North &amp; South: The Chair summarised what was discussed during the LA pre-meeting. The LAs would prefer a fourth draft of the document to be issued in response to their further comments on Rev 3.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd asked if comments were collated. The Chair clarified that they were sent individually but that comments should be collated and a fourth draft prepared.</p> <p>South: CDC said there were still comments on the third draft which they were awaiting a response from HS2 Ltd. <b>Action</b> – HS2 Ltd to chase internally.</p> <p><b>Action</b> - HS2 Ltd said they will feed that back to colleagues and update the Forum accordingly.</p>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p> <p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>
	<p><b>HS2 Ltd Updates</b></p> <p><u>Parliamentary Update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North &amp; South: DfT provided an update on the Parliamentary Process which highlighted that hearings have resumed after the summer recess and that the Select Committee are currently on Conference Recess but are scheduled to resume on 10<sup>th</sup> October. DfT reiterated their commitment to the HS2 project regardless of the recent resignation of [REDACTED], CEO of HS2 Ltd.</li> </ul> <p><u>Forward Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HS2 Ltd said that a document called the Early Works Stakeholder Contact List will be shared at the next Planning Forum meeting. Each LA needs to clarify who is their SPOC for Schedule 17 consents. <b>Action</b> – HS2 Ltd to circulate SPOC list currently held for LAs so that LAs can email the Planning Forum mailbox if relevant SPOC detail is incorrect. South: AVDC highlighted that the document would only be</li> </ul>	<p><b>HS2 Ltd</b></p>

## INDEPENDENT PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>up-to-date for a limited time because people leave employment. HS2 Ltd said they recognise this issue and will consider a process to ensure the contractor is informed if the SPOC changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South: LAs suggested that the term “Pre-submission funding” on the Planning Forum Document Route Map be amended as the term has been superseded by the SLA. <b>Action</b> – HS2 Ltd to amend the table.</li> <li>• The next Planning Forum is scheduled for the 26<sup>th</sup> (South) and 27<sup>th</sup> (North) October.</li> <li>• South: WCC suggested the Forum meeting in December be a longer meeting. <b>Action</b> – HS2 Ltd to consider this and send out calendar invites accordingly.</li> <li>• HS2 Ltd said that Planning Forum meetings will continue after Royal Assent but the content will be different. The Chair requested to meet with HS2 Ltd to discuss future agendas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Subgroup Updates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway Subgroup scheduled for the 21<sup>st</sup> September in London</li> <li>• Heritage Subgroup on the 15<sup>th</sup> September (‘today’) in London</li> <li>• Environmental Health Subgroup scheduled for the 23<sup>rd</sup> September in London</li> </ul> <p><b>Action</b> – Circulate Forward Plan to Planning Forum</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p> <p>HS2 Ltd</p>
	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>North: Bucks CC asked when the Approvals Consenting Programme will be seen as per the Planning Memorandum. HS2 Ltd stated that this is likely to be done through bilateral meetings with LAs.</p> <p>South: CDC asked if the HS2 programme was extending by 12 months. DfT confirmed that the Phase One railway is scheduled to open in 2026, as planned.</p> <p>North and South: The Chair highlighted that comments on the Soils Paper were required by 14<sup>th</sup> September (date of the Forum meeting) so to send any further LA comments promptly.</p> <p>North: OCC asked how the Local Community Investment, which is mentioned in the CEF is determined. HS2 Ltd said it will be a Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activity that contractors will carry out. HS2 Ltd are awaiting further clarity on this to share with LAs via the CEF. <b>Action.</b></p> <p><b>Next Meeting: 26 October (London) and 27 October (Warwick)</b></p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>