

Phase One Planning Forum – Heritage Sub-Group Meeting Agenda – 13th June 2017

Date & time:	13th June 2017 2, Snow Hill Birmingham 10.30 – 13.00
Chair:	Helen J Wass

Item	Topic	Lead
1	Welcome and introductions	Chair
2	<p>Phase One Forward Look and Area Update</p> <p>Area updates were provided for South, Central and North.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works at the National Temperance Hospital in Euston was highlighted, including the discovery of two time capsules. • In Area Central, test pitting and trial trenching at the M25 was discussed. • For Area North, the trial trench evaluations at several sites was shown and the discovery of possible Iron Age remains noted. <p>GLAAS raised the issue of differing approaches to comparable assets.</p> <p>HS2 highlighted the role of the HERDS team to provide oversight of such issues. There are also regular roundtable meeting with the EWC to discuss route-wide matters and varying approaches.</p> <p>The Technical Standards are the main mechanism whereby consistency of approach is enforced.</p>	HS2 Ltd
3	<p>Phase One Communication</p> <p><i>Discussion about EWC engagement on Project Plans</i> Generally the HS2 and EWC consultation on project plans has been straightforward, but piecemeal.</p>	HS2 Ltd

	<p>WCC asked if the EWC received direction on when/how they are to engage with them?</p> <p>HS2 was grateful for the feedback and highlighted that the HERDS set out the requirements for consultation. Clearly there is still work to do and HS2 is currently process mapping to assist this.</p> <p>HS2 expected that the EWC should discuss the project plans beforehand via a series of conversations, depending on the scale of works.</p> <p>The engagement thus far has indicated that the EWC do not appear to be using the HER refresh for Phase One.</p> <p>HS2 confirmed that the EWC are using the refreshed version, but some of the earlier work by the EDP may not have always included the refresh data. This has been highlighted to the EWC.</p> <p>HSG requested that all communications include national grid references, as many thus far had not and this is not helpful.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to progress/implement.</p> <p><i>HSG 'Meet the EWC'</i> The HSG requested that they have the opportunity to meet the EWC leads.</p> <p>HS2 suggested that the EWC attend the next Heritage Sub-group meeting in September. This would give processes and relationships the opportunity to develop, as well as more site work having been progressed.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to progress.</p> <p><i>Unique Identifiers and accounting for time and SLAs</i> Members of the HSG noted that the Schedule 17 applications have unique identifiers to enable them to record their input. There have been discussions at the Planning Forum.</p> <p>It would be helpful if the project plans had a similar identifiers.</p> <p>NCC noted that it would be especially useful for use on SLA to assist in the quantification and provision of cost information, so can each can audit internally and externally.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to check internally about the process and provide any feedback/further information as necessary.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>HS2 noted that it had developed a site code system that tied in with the asset management system.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to consider if this code could be used for Project Plans.</p> <p>WDC requested that they be informed/copied into the Project Plan discussions with WCC. Could they be supplied with the list of Priority Sites?</p> <p>HS2 noted that the project plans and DDBAs are in the process of being uploaded to Sharepoint.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to action provision of this information.</p> <p><i>Geotechnical Investigations</i> HCC stated that they had not been notified of the GI works.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to clarify the programme of GI works and communications.</p>	
4	<p>Historic Environment Research and Delivery Strategy</p> <p>HS2 outlined the work on the digital platform and the information that would be available for roll out on Gviewer towards end of next month.</p> <p><i>Topsoil sampling</i> Test pitting had been undertaken at the M25 site and where this technique was considered appropriate it would be undertaken.</p> <p>NCC highlighted the work undertaken in Cambridgeshire to test for flint work.</p> <p>HE asked if more field walking was required especially for the earlier sites and queried whether HS2 could undertake ploughing if needed.</p> <p>HS2 responded that where there was clear need then all techniques would be considered, as with any techniques.</p> <p><i>Trial trenching</i> There was a discussion regarding the appropriate percentage for trenching areas.</p> <p>NCC would like a higher level of trenching percentages; HS2 should be doing more trenching more than anyone else because</p>	HS2 Ltd

	<p>we're a prestigious project. They also noted that HS2 would be used as a benchmark by other developers.</p> <p>NCC noted that it was in HS2 best interests to clearly identify and characterise deposits at an early stage.</p> <p>It was noted that thus far project plans received had a variable percentage.</p> <p>WCC noted the Aggregate Levy Sustainability Fund (ALSF) project work that looked at past field work, mostly mineral sites and their strategies. That work suggested a 4% minimum.</p> <p>Post meeting note: ALSF material is available on the ADS at:- http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/alsf/background.cfm</p> <p>GLAAS asked that if geophysics and trial trenching revealed no archaeology, would there be any further work?</p> <p>HS2 stated that if evaluation had revealed nothing then no further work would be proposed.</p> <p>HS2 noted that the regular roundtables with the EWC allowed for good discussion about methodology and consistency.</p> <p><i>Deposit modelling</i></p> <p>BCC asked if there would be a detailed deposit modelling of the Colne Valley and whether it would be available for all work.</p> <p>HS2 noted that there were ongoing route-wide work streams on geo-archaeology and on the palaeo-environment.</p> <p>The GI works is ongoing and will provide considerable information to the historic environment programme of works.</p> <p>HE asked what the percentage of historic environment work was undertaken on the GI contract.</p> <p>HS2 reminded all that there was a technical standard to enable selection.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to review what percentage had been selected.</p>	
	<p>Community Engagement</p> <p>CDC sought definition about what HS2 Community Engagement and Mitigation included and what could be progressed as part of</p>	<p>HS2 Ltd</p>

	<p>other opportunities such as the CEF & BLEF/Colne Valley/Chiltern AONB.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to consider who is best placed to clarify this – it is not a strictly historic environment matter.</p> <p>GLAAS asked the timescale for engaging with community groups.</p> <p>HS2 outlined the various strands, e.g. LEMPS and school engagement and that HS2 would be undertaking a wide range of community engagement.</p> <p>HS2 clarified that historic environment engagement and information would be paced, we would not be releasing information on a daily basis, we will not be highlighting early works, but rather focusing on the key sites.</p> <p>LAs would have the opportunity to comment on the Project Plans.</p>	
5	<p>SharePoint</p> <p>There remain considerable issues with access to Sharepoint; many have tried and most have failed.</p> <p>Despite revised logins being issued after the March meeting, user name and password were not recognised.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to action. Further briefing details to follow.</p>	HS2 Ltd
	<p>AOB</p> <p>HS2 to arrange a meeting to discuss the provision of information to Historic Environment Records.</p> <p>Next meeting will be in Birmingham in September. The meeting will focus on updates and discussion with the EWC.</p>	All