

LONDON-WEST MIDLANDS HERITAGE SUB-GROUP

NOTES

DATE: 13th January 2015
TIME: 11:00-14.00 pm
VENUE: Friends Meeting House, Euston

Attendees

<i>Helen Glass (HS2)</i>	<i>Anna Stocks (Warks CC)</i>	<i>Alan Mayes (Warwick DC)</i>
<i>Leila Du Toit (HS2)</i>	<i>Edmund Bird (TfL and GLA)</i>	<i>Mandy Lumb (South Northants DC)</i>
<i>Michael Court (HS2)</i>	<i>Rose Todd (Cherwell DC)</i>	<i>Lesley-Ann Mather (Northants CC)</i>
<i>Chris Jordan (HS2)</i>	<i>Sandy Kidd (EH for GLAAS)</i>	<i>Alan Wito (LB Camden)</i>
<i>Adam Ruane (HS2)</i>	<i>Stephen Dean (Staffs CC)</i>	<i>Andy Croft (Atkins)</i>
<i>Marian Hutchin (HS2)</i>	<i>Catherine Murray (Chiltern DC)</i>	<i>Philip Markham (Bucks CC)</i>
<i>Nick Molyneux (EH)</i>	<i>Ted Allett (Chair of Planning Forum)</i>	<i>Sarah Gibson (Bucks C</i>
<i>Jim Williams (EH)</i>		
<i>David English (EH)</i>		
<i>Chris Welch (EH)</i>		
<i>Shane Gould (EH)</i>		

1	Welcome and Introductions
2	<p>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</p> <p>a. CoCP & LEMP presentation</p> <p>LdT presented an outline of the principles and purpose of the CoCP, LEMPs, and EMRs, and how they fit together, as well as the programme moving forwards for redrafting. [presentation attached]</p> <p>CW asked about the procedure for enforcement.</p> <p><i>MH advised that the SoS will be the ultimate enforcement through Schedule 16 of the Hybrid Bill, and that the Register of Undertakings, attached to the Hybrid Bill, will include the CoCP and EMRs. As such, the SoS will need to report to the House of Commons if the undertakings are not met.</i></p> <p>AV asked if LEMPs will be put in place for the whole route?</p> <p><i>LdT confirmed they would be produced for every LPA crossed by the route. Discussions would be held with each LPA.</i></p> <p>AM asked where construction traffic, and its effect on Listed buildings (specifically bridges) would be addressed?</p>

LdT explained that traffic plans are still being finalised. MH noted that LPAs will have to approve lorry routes for haulage etc, and so will be able to manage impact on such bridges at that level.

CW asked when LEMPs will be available as drafts for discussion?

LdT explained that draft LEMPs had been prepared for a rural and an urban location (Warwick DC and Camden respectively) as example documents. LEMPs for West Midlands and Country North have been produced to date, Country South and London LEMPs are currently in production.

CM raised concerns about the number of heritage documents, and asked for a process flow diagram, outlining how each document fits together, to include CoCP, EMR, HM, EM, gWSI, LEMP, and Heritage Agreements.

*HS2 agreed to produce this diagram. **ACTION HS2.***

LAM asked about what kind of local detail the LEMPs would drill down to – would changes to PRoW be included?

LdT advised that they would, and as draft documents there will be further chances for stakeholders to input throughout the process.

b. Feedback on draft CoCP

HJG advised that the 3rd draft of the CoCP would be produced by the middle of 2015, and as such HS2 require comments by the end of January 2015. **ACTION LPAs/EH.**

Post meeting note: the deadline has been extended to Friday 13th February.

TA advised that LPAs have been collating comments through a single point of contact, and that might be possible through LB Camden. HS2 and AW to discuss. **ACTION HS2/AW.**

Post meeting note: discussions with LBC have concluded that for this round of comments on the CoCP and generic WSIs, HS2 will receive comments from individual LPAs and EH and will collate them.

CW asked for clarity on which draft CoCP went with which bill revision? HS2 to circulate links to the EMR review programme and new .GOV links. **ACTION HS2.**

PM advised that paragraph 8.2 (unexpected discoveries) is replicated in paragraph 6 and in the Heritage Memorandum, and asked about assets of regional and local importance, as well as how national importance will be defined.

HJG advised that procedures for defining significance will be based upon the EH

	<p><i>Scheduling criteria, and that a methodology for assessing significance will be produced which will include mechanisms to allow construction to stop to allow engagement with LPAs and EH and allow unexpected discoveries of national importance to be assessed. The GWSI section 7.6 discusses the management of unexpected discoveries and that a contingency arrangement for managing unexpected discoveries will be prepared.</i></p> <p>NM asked about the need to include consultation with stakeholders about landscaping works in relation to impact on heritage assets.</p> <p><i>HJG advised that consultation with LPAs would be through Schedule 16 and that the Environmental Memorandum was being revised and comments had been received relating to providing greater emphasis on the historic environment.</i></p> <p>CM asked about heritage agreements for Listed buildings, particularly for situations where LB consent would not normally be required. CM concerned that not discussing works that don't require LBC may be an omission.</p> <p><i>HJG advised that LBs identified as potentially requiring protection or monitoring are named in Schedule 17 Table 2. For buildings not named in Scheduled 17, where LBC would normally have been required then LBC would be sought.</i></p> <p>TA suggested that the phrasing in the CoCP between 'works contractors' and 'heritage contractors' was not clear.</p> <p><i>HS2 to review wording ACTION HS2.</i></p> <p>PM asked if HERs were likely to be asked for large scale data for SES documents.</p> <p><i>HJG thought unlikely on the scale asked for previously, but this would be handled by sub-contractors producing the SES.</i></p> <p>CW asked about the SES process and AS asked about on-going survey work.</p> <p><i>MH advised that the SES would include updated baseline based on survey, and may provisionally be deposited at the end of 2016. MH clarified that all disciplines which record significant new impacts as a result of survey will require SES.</i></p> <p>AS asked about the reference in Para 8.1.5 to 'areas of defined interest', and sort clarification.</p> <p><i>HS2 review this phrasing. ACTION HS2.</i></p> <p>CW asked why para 8.14 referred to lead contractor rather than NU?</p> <p><i>HJG clarified that the lead contractor would be the party 'on the ground' and hence more relevant to this section. Wording to be reviewed. ACTION HS2.</i></p>
--	---

5	Phase 1 Update
	<p>a. Museums and Archiving HJG provided an update on the Museums and Archiving Group Meeting in November 2014. Minutes will be circulated shortly. The purpose of the meeting was to garner general opinion on, for example facilities, capacity, deposition. Further to this end, HS2 will shortly be circulating a questionnaire to relevant bodies to capture information about provision along the route. ACTION HS2.</p> <p>b. Generic WSI Review HJG explained the status of the generic WSI, which has now been issued to the subgroup for comment. The subgroup agreed to provide comments by CoB 20/2/15. ACTION LPAs/EH.</p> <p>To facilitate this, HS2 agreed to provide a template form for these comments. ACTION HS2.</p> <p>CW raised issue of anonymity of comments.</p> <p><i>DECISION: HS2 to continuing anonymising comments.</i></p> <p>c. Draft Heritage Memorandum HJG thanked the group for comments on the Heritage Memorandum; these will be synthesised and actioned where possible, with a revised draft provided by June 2015.</p> <p>d. Model Heritage Agreements and Undertakings HJG thanked the group for comment on Model Heritage Agreements and Undertakings.</p> <p>CW asked if a Schedule 17 Model Agreement would be agreed for each Listed building within each LPA.</p> <p><i>HJG confirmed that discussions would commence in 2015 with each LPA affected by Sch 17, Table 1 to work towards a draft Heritage Agreement</i></p> <p>e. Non-viability HJG thanked CM for the detailed comments on the concept of non-viability and Listed Buildings. HS2 Ltd is considering the methodology for defining and quantifying this perceived matter.</p> <p>ACTION HS2. To facilitate this, group members were invited to provide specific local examples of non-viability and how it has been dealt with. ACTION ALL.</p>
2	Update on Risk Model
	<p>a. AC provided an update; the risk model will be with HS2 by the end of the</p>

	<p>week, for feedback and comment. This will take at least a month, with the Risk Model released to the heritage subgroup as soon as possible after this process. Presentation attached.</p>
3	Scoping the Research Strategy
	<p>a. AC outlined that Atkins had been commissioned to scope the research strategy for Phase One of HS2. To this end, as a first stage they propose to produce a discussion document, and follow it up with a meeting to discuss on the 16 Feb. The document will be circulated in early February.</p> <p>ACTION HS2</p> <p>CW asked about deadlines for the document.</p> <p><i>AC indicated that the draft scoping document would potentially be produced by April.</i></p> <p>JW asked about terminology; Resource Base/Research Strategy/Agenda Topics etc.</p> <p><i>AC clarified that this will not be research strategy itself, but rather a document setting out how to produce the research strategy.</i></p> <p>AS suggested Dan Miles at EH, and the Worcestershire CC Heritage team, might have useful insight.</p> <p>SD raised the need to include HLC and landscape within the discussion document.</p>
6	AoB
	<p>SG asked about how heritage will tie in with GI works.</p> <p><i>MC explained HS2 will be instructing PSCs to scope which boreholes, window samples, test pits etc will require monitoring.</i></p> <p>LAM asked if it was worth providing areas of boreholes to LPAs to provide a heads up for any key impacts.</p> <p><i>MC clarified that these issues will be part of the scoping contract.</i></p>
7	Summary & Close
	<p>Next meeting: 22nd April 2015 11am Host: Staffordshire County Council</p>
	Doc Ref: LWM-HS2-EV-MRC-000-000066