



## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>██████████</p> <p>██████████████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>Three Rivers District Council (TRDC)</p> <p>Warwick District Council (WDC)</p> <p>Warwick District Council (WDC)</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council (WCC)</p> <p>West Northamptonshire Council (WNC)</p>
<b>Other Attendees:</b>	<p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p>	<p>DfT</p> <p>DfT</p>

Item			Action Owner												
1.	<b>Introductions</b> – were made.														
2.	<p><b>Review of minutes of the last meeting and outstanding actions.</b></p> <p>Minutes from the November 2024 Planning Forum were agreed with two amendments to attendee list.</p> <p>Outstanding actions were reviewed:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Jan 22 (5)</td> <td>Prolonged Disturbance Scheme review being undertaken with Feedback to be provided by DfT.</td> <td>TH (DfT) noted that there had been internal progress, but did not have anything to update at this point. The scheme would be going to Ministers imminently and it was hoped a public update could be issued in the next few months. <b>Action open.</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mar 24 (9)</td> <td>Operational noise update. Given time constraints, this update will be given at the next Planning Forum.</td> <td>To be discussed at Agenda Item 8. <b>Action closed.</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>May 24 (13)</td> <td>SLAs – update to be given on simplified claims process.</td> <td>PG (HS2) had made a request with the SLA team. While the recent re-organisation meant responsibilities had changed, there would be an update at the next meeting. TA (Chair) to raise with Jackie Roe and Emma Head. <b>Action open.</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>July 24 (12)</td> <td>Unconsented works - Chair has received details from three planning authorities and HS2 Ltd will arrange bilateral</td> <td>The outstanding highway issues had been discussed at the Highways Subgroup. Bi-lateral meeting with WCC had taken place and further will be arranged</td> </tr> </table>		Jan 22 (5)	Prolonged Disturbance Scheme review being undertaken with Feedback to be provided by DfT.	TH (DfT) noted that there had been internal progress, but did not have anything to update at this point. The scheme would be going to Ministers imminently and it was hoped a public update could be issued in the next few months. <b>Action open.</b>	Mar 24 (9)	Operational noise update. Given time constraints, this update will be given at the next Planning Forum.	To be discussed at Agenda Item 8. <b>Action closed.</b>	May 24 (13)	SLAs – update to be given on simplified claims process.	PG (HS2) had made a request with the SLA team. While the recent re-organisation meant responsibilities had changed, there would be an update at the next meeting. TA (Chair) to raise with Jackie Roe and Emma Head. <b>Action open.</b>	July 24 (12)	Unconsented works - Chair has received details from three planning authorities and HS2 Ltd will arrange bilateral	The outstanding highway issues had been discussed at the Highways Subgroup. Bi-lateral meeting with WCC had taken place and further will be arranged	
Jan 22 (5)	Prolonged Disturbance Scheme review being undertaken with Feedback to be provided by DfT.	TH (DfT) noted that there had been internal progress, but did not have anything to update at this point. The scheme would be going to Ministers imminently and it was hoped a public update could be issued in the next few months. <b>Action open.</b>													
Mar 24 (9)	Operational noise update. Given time constraints, this update will be given at the next Planning Forum.	To be discussed at Agenda Item 8. <b>Action closed.</b>													
May 24 (13)	SLAs – update to be given on simplified claims process.	PG (HS2) had made a request with the SLA team. While the recent re-organisation meant responsibilities had changed, there would be an update at the next meeting. TA (Chair) to raise with Jackie Roe and Emma Head. <b>Action open.</b>													
July 24 (12)	Unconsented works - Chair has received details from three planning authorities and HS2 Ltd will arrange bilateral	The outstanding highway issues had been discussed at the Highways Subgroup. Bi-lateral meeting with WCC had taken place and further will be arranged													

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

		meetings with each authority.	with SMBC. TA agreed discussion would be best undertaken in the Highways Subgroup, but would keep the action open. <b>Action open.</b>	HS2
Sep 24 (8)		TA queried whether the Phase Two graphics could be amended to take account of the re-phasing of HS2.	To be discussed in Agenda Item 9. <b>Action closed.</b>	
Nov 24 (3)		TA asked whether the train mock-up could only be visited by invitation. PG would look into whether a small group could visit.	PG confirmed that a visit for up to 10 people to the rolling stock factory in Derby could be organised: it was noted that expenses were unlikely to be covered by the SLA. Email to follow meeting inviting attendees. <b>Action open.</b>	
Nov 24 (5)		SC suggested that it would be useful to understand the difference between mitigation and Site Restoration. SA offered to share details as this had been discussed at an earlier meeting of the Planning Forum.	Information circulated to Planning Forum on 22 January. <b>Action closed.</b>	
Nov 24 (5)		HS2 to circulate the draft update to Site Restoration PFN in December, with a workshop to discuss in early 2025. It was then intended to seek agreement of the revised PFN in the January and/or March 2025 Planning Forum.	Update to Site Restoration PFN still in progress, with revised draft proposed for circulation in February. Workshop to be arranged in February/March. <b>Action open.</b>	
Nov 24 (6)		Agreed PFN19 (Principles for Determination) to be uploaded to gov.uk	PFN to be uploaded once visuals have been updated. <b>Action open.</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Project Update</b>			

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>PG gave an update that comprised the HS2 Construction Update Report (January 2025). Details of the update are available at: <a href="https://assets.hs2.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/HS2-Construction-Update-Report-January-2025.pdf">https://assets.hs2.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/HS2-Construction-Update-Report-January-2025.pdf</a></p> <p>TA queried the position regarding the Euston tunnels; PG will seek details and update at the next Forum.</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Planning Consents Performance &amp; Appeals and Judicial Reviews Update</b></p> <p>SA (HS2) presented the planning consents performance and appeals update.</p> <p><i>Performance on determinations within last six months</i></p> <p>Performance for the recent period was largely the same as the previously reported period, although there were a larger proportion of applications taking longer than 16 weeks to determine. The reasons were consistent with those highlighted at previous Forums.</p> <p><i>Applications awaiting decision</i></p> <p>The split of applications awaiting decision over 25 weeks was also consistent with the previous period, although there was a reduction in the number awaiting a decision for less than eight weeks. This position reflects the fewer number of Plans &amp; Specifications (P&amp;S) submissions, noting that the north area still has a number to submit. In the coming months, numbers will increase with Bringing into Use (BiU) and Site Restoration (SR) submissions, as well as submissions where changes are needed to P&amp;S approvals.</p> <p>TA asked whether BiU and SR submission were included in the figures reported. SA confirmed they are included, but non-material change submissions are excluded.</p> <p><i>Application performance</i></p> <p>During October and November, half of forecast submissions were made. While the forecast was exceeded in December, only one submission had been expected. For the January period, it did not look like submissions were on track. Although the full reasons for the limited January submission were not known at this stage, new forward plans would be provided in March. SA noted that there would be a future increase in the volume of submissions with BiU and SR submissions.</p> <p><i>Appeals</i></p> <p>There were currently no live appeals awaiting determination.</p> <p>There are judicial reviews for both the Bromford Tunnel East Portal and the Bromford Tunnel East Portal Headhouse. The initial hearing is scheduled towards the end of February. Given the similarities, the headhouse judicial review has been stayed until the first hearing.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>Details of all appeals and JR decisions are available on the Planning Forum gov.uk website and the appeals digest will be updated to reflect any decisions:</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-planning-appeal-decisions">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-one-planning-forum-planning-appeal-decisions</a></p>	
5.	<p><b>Bringing into Use – Planning Forum Note 7 (PFN) Review</b></p> <p>TA explained that the consultation period for the review of PFN 7 on Bringing into Use, which was underway at the time of the last Forum was now closed.</p> <p>SA gave a brief history of the update, explaining that given the phase of the project moving into Bringing into Use and Site Restoration, it was a sensible juncture to review the PFN. A workshop had taken place in November and there were very few changes proposed during that exercise. A comment was then received at the November Forum and comments were subsequently submitted from Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>SA gave an overview of the feedback and HS2 responses, as outlined in the slide presentation. Then agreement of the revised PFN was sought.</p> <p>GK (BC) noted the positive discussion on the whole and that the PFN was good, clarifying their view that where the HS2 Environmental Statement is relevant, then it should be taken into account in terms of the submission for a Scheme of Mitigation, which should be picked up by the cover letter.</p> <p>The revised PFN was agreed on the basis that there were no responses after TA asked for comments. <b>Action:</b> The revised PFN 7 to be posted to gov.uk.</p>	HS2
6.	<p><b>Consultation Requirements for Schedule 17 Requests</b></p> <p>SA provided a reminder of the consultation requirements for Schedule 17 requests. The presentation was considered worthwhile given newer members of the Forum and the aspiration to reduce unnecessary delays in the determination process.</p> <p>Schedule 17 paragraph 18 (4) is clear, where a planning authority has invited a statutory consultee to make representations, it must not make any decision until either:</p> <p>(a) it has received representations from the body about the request,  (b) it has been informed by the body that it does not wish to make any representations, or  (c) 21 days have elapsed since the date of the invitation.</p> <p>Where any of (a), (b) or (c) above have been met there is no reason for a planning authority not to make a decision.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>Any further consultation undertaken that is not required under the Act, is at the discretion of the planning authority and it is for the planning authorities to manage any representations received. SA reminded planning authorities that Schedule 17 requests must not be delayed or withheld where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the consultation requirements of the Act have been met (Schedule 17 paragraph 18);</li> <li>• representations have not been received or are considered unsatisfactory following consultation not required by the Act; or</li> <li>• objections have been received following consultation not required by the Act.</li> </ul> <p>PG reinforced the message given by SA, particularly given there are some quite significant delays due to consultation. Concern was flagged about the continued issue where parish councils are sometimes consulted, who then raise non-material comments, and the planning authority then seeks responses from HS2 Ltd, which is not an effective use of time and resources. PG requested that consultation requests are managed appropriately, and reminded attendees of the update to PFN 12 that was agreed by Forum members.</p> <p>TH raised that it was never envisaged that planning authorities would undertake non-statutory consultation and asked for feedback on whether it could be reviewed; whether they think it adds value from their perspective; and what the appetite would be to change the approach. GK responded that BC does not seek comments from parish councils and only informs them of submissions; also, where a statutory consultee had not responded within 21 days, a judgement is taken on whether a response is necessary. GK suggested that each planning authority had its own political needs to inform Members and parish councils, and that where there is an issue, separate discussions could be held.</p> <p>PG did not wish to single out a specific planning authority, but instead wanted to provide a useful reminder to the Forum.</p> <p>SC (BCC) understood the points about consultation and would make things clear internally.</p>	
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Local Authority Feedback and Issues Arising</b></p> <p>No comments were raised.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Operational Noise Update</b></p> <p>OB (HS2) presented the operational noise update and began by reminding the Forum that following the new estimate of noise from the HS2 train pantograph, the train manufacturer had been required to reduce noise</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>emissions. While the manufacturer had reduced expected noise, the output was still louder than intended. Further testing will confirm performance.</p> <p>The re-scoping of HS2 has the potential to reduce the service pattern to around 10 trains per hour (tph) in each direction, rather than the 18tph design by main works civils contractors. Should this be instructed by Government, this would reduce noise further.</p> <p>Additional information on train performance (ie. Acceleration and speeds), is now available from the manufacturer, which is being included in the noise modelling.</p> <p>Based on the new noise parameters and existing railway designs it is expected that the HS2 Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) will be met. The updated parameters are being instructed to contractors to enable noise demonstration reports to be updated to support the Bringing into Use approvals required by Paragraph 9 of Schedule 17.</p> <p>CG (BBV) suggested that the instruction had not yet been received by BBV. PG responded that the matter could be addressed between HS2 Ltd and the supply chain in the appropriate forum.</p> <p>GK highlighted the main point that noise demonstration reports should be based on the latest and hopefully verified date for the operational train to inform schemes of mitigation involving noise mitigation. OB noted that it may take contractors a while to incorporate the updated parameters in the noised demonstration reports.</p> <p>TA asked TH whether there was an update on the proposals for the Handsacre junction. TH was not able to provide any detail as a decision is still to be taken by Government in the context of various deliberations, such as the spending review.</p>	
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Helpdesk Update</b></p> <p>VB (HS2) presented the helpdesk update. The period of over Christmas period was quiet, which typically happens with the slow-down of works.</p> <p>Given the re-scoping of HS2, the complaints graphic has been updated to only include Phase One, although figures are still presented for complaints related to the former Phases 2a and 2b. VB welcomed any feedback on the new graphic.</p> <p>The Phase One complaints showed a spike in traffic related contacts in December, which was attributed to a single event in Wendover that resulted in multiple complaints raised on the same issue.</p>	

## INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>Given that the helpdesk slides are very informative and there are usually no queries, TA asked whether the helpdesk update could in future be provided by sharing the slides rather than having them presented. Any items raised could then be addressed at the next Forum. VB endorsed the proposal and confirmed the material is already produced in any case.</p>	
<b>10.</b>	<p><b>Forward Plan/ AOB</b></p> <p>Placeholders have been sent for the following scheduled Planning Forum dates:</p> <p>13 March 15 May 17 July</p> <p>Dates for the second half the year have been suggested and <b>Action:</b> will be shared at the next meeting.</p> <p>There was no AOB, although it was suggested that the July meeting could be a hybrid meeting held on site at Curzon Street. <b>Action:</b> PG will explore.</p>	<p><b>HS2</b></p> <p><b>HS2</b></p>
	<b>End</b>	