

<b>Document Number:</b>	HS2-HS2-ER-MRC-000-000006
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	22 May 2013
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	Warwick Hilton
<b>Meeting Title:</b>	Route wide planning forum (North)
<b>Zone/Area References:</b>	N/A
<b>GIS/Land Registry Reference:</b>	N/A
<b>HS2 Ltd Contact Person:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Stakeholder:</b>	Local Authority
<b>Topic Keywords:</b>	Planning Forum, Local Authority

<b>Chair</b>	[REDACTED]	Independent Chair
<b>Promoter Attendees:</b>	[REDACTED]	Town Planning Manager, HS2 Ltd London Planning Manager, HS2 Ltd Country Planning Manager, HS2 Ltd Planning Liaison HS2 Ltd Bill Manager, DfT
<b>Local Authority Attendees:</b>	[REDACTED]	Warwickshire County Council Warwickshire County Council Warwickshire County Council North Warwickshire BC Aylesbury Vale District Council Northamptonshire County Council Lichfield District Council Lichfield District Council Staffordshire County Council Staffordshire County Council Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council Birmingham City Council Birmingham City Council Oxfordshire County Council Buckinghamshire County Council

Item		Action/ Owner
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions</b>	
	Introductions were made.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Review of notes of last meeting &amp; actions arising</b>	
2.1	It was noted that the discussion regarding the desirability of a high level forum is omitted from the notes. HS2 to revise and reissue.	HS2 Ltd
2.2	Item 2.3: The consultation documents are available on the website and by hard copy. CD's will not be produced due to quality concerns. Members noted that it had also been requested that the draft ES consultation be 12 weeks rather than eight. HS2 Ltd needs time between the end of consultation and preparation of the formal ES, to properly consider responses to the consultation. The Parliamentary process is a consultation in itself and will be ongoing over 1-2 years.	
2.3	Item 3.2: A revised draft of the terms of reference was issued on the morning of the 21 May. Item three on the agenda.	
2.4	Item 3.2: A slide on bilateral engagement will be presented under item three on the agenda.	
2.5	Item 4.6 & 7.0: No comments received from members on the proposed planning regime so far. Comments are invited.	All
2.6	Items 4.6 & 4.7: A contact list for group members was circulated. Item closed.	
2.7	Item 6.2: The requests regarding the draft ES consultation were passed to the consultation team. It was not possible to advise dates of events before the announcement but these have now been circulated and advertised.	
2.8	Item 7.0: Dates of meetings have been revised to avoid the school holidays. They	

	are set out on the back of the meeting schedule. Closed.	
2.9	Item 2.3: Request for the consultation documents to be on CD from the north meeting. See response above.	
2.10	Item 3.2: Two volunteers from the north meeting were received to review the Terms of Reference. Comments received with thanks. Closed.	
2.11	Item 3.4: No volunteers for the interview for the chair panel have been received. HS2 Ltd will keep members updated on progress with the appointment.	HS2 Ltd
2.12	Item 4.4: Links to the Crossrail fee regime are included in the papers and will be circulated with the slides following this meeting.	
2.13	Item 6.1 WCC: The request for an ecology sub group this has been discussed with the ecology lead. If there is an interest in HS2's general approach to ecology, a presentation could be given to the forum. Otherwise area specific meetings are being organised. Discussions are ongoing with the environmental statutory undertakers. WCC officers noted that there are implications from the planning regime that impact on ecology and in that respect a subgroup is still requested.	HS2 Ltd
2.14	Items 16 & 17: Clarity was requested on when the community forums were likely to re-start. Officers noted that it would be helpful to have dates in the diary as soon as possible to mitigate people's concerns that they may not be resumed. HS2 Ltd to clarify likely start dates.	HS2 Ltd
2.15	Item 6.1 BCC: HS2 Ltd to investigate dates for the next CoCP meeting. It was suggested that a meeting would be helpful during the consultation period.	HS2 Ltd
<b>3.</b>	<b>Terms of Reference (ToR)</b>	
3.1	Following comments received, the terms have been revised to take account of the majority of points raised. The Chair noted the tone could be adjusted to better reflect the nature of the group being a local authority forum rather than an HS2 meeting. It was also suggested that the following line be included at the start of paragraph three on the second page: 'Decisions are reached by consensus'. The date will be included in the footer. In light of the request for further clarity on the relationship between the forums and other engagement activity, a slide was presented and discussed. It is proposed that the slide be appended to the ToR for context. Officers requested supporting wording on the slide to clarify the relationship with the project governance structure. Formal recognition of the link between Phase one & two was requested. HS2 to revise and reissue.	HS2 Ltd
3.2	Reference to 'external attendees' on the meeting notes will be revised to 'local authority attendees'.	HS2 Ltd
3.3	Officers made a general request for information for all meetings to be provided in advance to enable proper constructive discussion. It is unreasonable to present complex information and expect decisions to be made in the meeting. HS2 Ltd will make best endeavours to provide information in advance where possible. In practice sometimes this is not possible or the complexity of the information justifies a face to face explanation in the first instance: however it is recognised that officers should not be expected to respond immediately. Further opportunity to have additional visibility and a period for response will be made available in such instances.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Planning regime discussion</b>	
4.1	No comments were received following the presentation last month so it was proposed to run through some of the key issues to foster discussion and comment.	
	Qualifying and non - qualifying authorities	
4.2	Qualifying authorities become so by signing up to the planning memorandum. This gives additional controls over design and other matters. With Crossrail, Bucks CC, LB Barking & Dagenham and Tendring DC in Essex chose not to sign up, largely due to the very limited extent of works in their areas. Authorities were required to sign before the end of the House of Lords Select Committee. The Crossrail authorities are producing a 'lessons learnt' document and this is expected to be available shortly. The link to the Crossrail Planning & Heritage Memorandum has previously been issued and the document is on the Crossrail website. A draft of the HS2 Planning Memorandum will be available in the next	

	few months.	
4.3	Clarity was requested on the likely number of applications to be made. It is not currently known. HS2 Ltd will attempt to produce a high level estimate based on previous project experience. There were approximately 2000 on HS1 although a number of these were relatively small amendments.	HS2 Ltd
4.4	WCC noted concerns about the scale of minerals and wastes impacts from other areas of the line and requested a feel for the scale of the impacts route wide. More detail will follow in the formal ES.	
	Plans and Specifications	
4.5	Detailed design approval is not given by the Act. The Act establishes the locations in which works can take place and Plans and Specifications give the design approval for all the works set out in the planning schedule. This is to design detail RIBA stage D approximately so is commensurate with normal planning application level. Crossrail authorities generally felt they had sufficient control through the process and that it enabled the level of quality of design required by local authorities.	
4.6	Highways approvals (e.g. for access to auto-transformer stations) would go to County Councils as the Highways Authority.	
	Construction arrangements	
4.7	The Crossrail CoCP set out the controls on construction. For the majority of matters requiring approval, CTRL & Crossrail's Construction Arrangements submissions involved cutting and pasting the relevant text from the CoCP and submitting it repeatedly for each Construction Arrangements submission. This gave enforcement powers to authorities but was an administrative burden on both parties. (Typically 30 pages of repeated text on something already agreed.) For HS2 Ltd it is proposed that a 'Class approval' be used. Standard text will be approved once by the SoS following consultation with the Local Authorities and then no further approvals will be required unless the proposed arrangements differ from those in the CoCP.	
4.8	If lorry movement numbers exceed the threshold, then a lorry route approval is required. For Crossrail, this threshold is more than 24 movements a day to a site. The total lorry movement volume for the whole project is assessed within the transport assessment. The draft ES starts to quantify numbers in the Traffic and Transport section: more detail will follow in the final ES. HS2 to clarify the process for making good damage to roads caused by construction traffic.	HS2 Ltd
	Site restoration	
4.9	A site restoration application is required to be approved within eight weeks of submission, but also by six months of works ending on site. This is a final back stop measure to give confidence that the application will be approved. Local Authorities have enforcement powers. Site restoration is not submitted at the start of works due to the length of the programme and need for flexibility on both sides. Although the contractor on site would usually undertake the site restoration, this may not always be the case. So far Crossrail has only submitted two site restoration applications. The Chair suggested that there was no need for the six month 'grace' and that it is entirely practical in his experience for restoration schemes to be approved by the end of works on a site. SL said he would consider this proposal. The process is not designed for betterment, it is only to restore the site to what was there before, but in discussion to achieve a mutually acceptable situation.	DfT
	Fees	
4.10	There are a set of statutory instruments for fee regulations. The view that local authorities may prefer to have officers funded to work on applications was noted. This was done on CTRL and Crossrail through a separate arrangement and this will be explored in the future for HS2 Ltd.	
4.11	The CTRL and Crossrail Acts required the production of a 'context report' for each LA before their first submission, which assessed the potential number of submissions allowing an assessment of planning staff requirements for the project.	

	CTRL funded planning and some highways staff, Crossrail funded Environmental Health Officers (EHO) and highways staff (planning staff being paid for through fees). A similar arrangement has happened with other developments, e.g. Ascot Race Course. Probity is not a concern as there is no management control by the Nominated Undertaker over the staff.	
4.12	Officers requested that fees for pre-application discussion be recognised and discussed. This is not a matter that affects the primary legislation but is a matter for later discussion. Comments on any of these points are requested. If an additional meeting, or a route wide meeting in June is preferred to discuss the planning regime then this will be accommodated. It would be helpful to have this discussion in light of the Crossrail lessons learnt document.	Members
4.13	The protections diagram was tabled and explained. This will be further updated to clarify the links.	HS2 Ltd
4.14	Discussions on the Environment Memorandum have not yet started. It was requested that its status be updated at the next meeting.	HS2 Ltd
<b>5.0</b>	<b>HS2 Update</b>	
5.1	A presentation was given on the draft Environmental Statement. The slides have been issued to members.	
5.2	Concerns were noted that it was not sufficiently clear on the website that there are two separate consultations. Comments will be forwarded to the appropriate team.	HS2 Ltd
5.3	Limited discussions have taken place to date with authorities on highways for the transport assessment, although more discussions can be arranged. Officers noted that conversations on emerging thoughts are helpful. The Transport Assessment will be part of the formal submission with the hybrid Bill. It was noted that it would be helpful to members to receive the baseline traffic information. This will be dealt with on a county by county basis.	HS2 Ltd
5.4	Counting started last year, is ongoing and modelling is taking place now. If information has not been available for the draft then assumptions are made, based on the worst case. WCC to confirm whether a local discussion or a route wide presentation on principles and approach is required.	WCC
5.5	Feedback on the NGO and Environment Forums was given. See appendix A.	
5.6	Briefings were offered for elected Members on the draft ES. Contact TB to arrange.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
6.1	The safeguarding direction is expected shortly although no date is available. HS2 Ltd will advise as soon as possible. Once it is issued, the town planning team will meet with Local Authority development teams individually.	HS2 Ltd

#### Appendix A - NGO & NEF update

NGO: Notes of the meeting are available on the following link:

<http://www.hs2.org.uk/have-your-say/forums/environment-forum>

Items discussed:

- Future Design Panel
- Greenhouse gas modelling approach
- Green Corridor - the community initiative submission
- Presentation from the Land Trust – on long term sustainable management of a broad range of open spaces in the UK
- Presentation from the Wildlife Trusts – this included information on their 'Living Landscapes' programmes and also touched on what the Wildlife Trusts would like to see from HS2 Ltd
- Presentation on mitigation principles in urban environments
- Presentation on the hybrid Bill design requirements

NEF:

The National Environment Forum comprises Government departments and statutory bodies and was established to advise on environmental policy for HS2 Ltd, including project-wide

strategies for reducing the environmental impact of the line. The last meeting in May focused on the draft ES for Phase one and provided an update on Phase two. Updates were also given on the ongoing engagement with statutory bodies, the National NGO forum and the urban landscape strategy.

DRAFT