

## Annual Extraordinary Meeting Phase 2a Highways Subgroup Minutes Meeting 1

<b>Date, time &amp; Venue:</b>	<b>Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2019</b> <b>10.30 – 13.00</b> <b>North Staffs Conference Centre, Stoke on Trent</b>	
<b>Attendees:</b>	Paul Gilfedder (Chair) Simon Knight Peter Tomlin Richard Adam Ann-Marie Stubbs Terry Stafford Becky Shortt Nathan Cons Wayne Ashdown Sarah Plater Gaynor Irwin Steve Browne Neil Whitfield Trevor Parkin Jill Hood Bryan Fletcher	HS2 HS2 HS2 HS2 HS2 HS2 DfT Highways England Cheshire East Council Colton Parish Council Woore Parish Council Kings Bromley Parish Council Colwich Parish Council Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council Stone Town Council Stone Rural Parish Council
<b>Apologies</b>	- - - Matt Johnson Liz Garlinge	Ingestre with Tixall PC Armitage with Handsacre PC Swynnerton PC Shropshire Council Highways England
<b>Copies:</b>	Lee Palsler Gary Mallin James Jackson Brian Edwards Richard Peers Sarah Mallen Chris Bate Gemma Lawley Mark Wootton	Staffordshire County Council Cheshire East Council Stoke-on-Trent City Council Stoke on Trent City Council Staffordshire County Council Staffordshire County Council Highways England Shropshire Council Shropshire Council

Item	Topic
1.	<p><b><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></b></p> <p>Paul Gilfedder of HS2 chaired the meeting and welcomed all attendees, who in turn introduced themselves. The chair reminded all present of the Promoter’s response to the Select Committee:</p> <p><i>“The Promoter will ensure that, once a year, the Highways Sub Group meeting is widened to include both District and Parish Council representatives, with the agenda set by the invited authorities (the Highways Sub Group will be discussing routewide matters of common interest, rather than site specific issues; it is likely that the Parish Councils would find regularly attending a meeting which did not address site specific issues to be unproductive). In addition, the Promoter will ensure that papers and minutes of both the Planning</i></p>

	<p><i>Forum and Highways Sub Group are published online and that the Parish Councils are able to request that matters of principle related to traffic, highways and transport matters during construction are addressed by the Highways Sub Group'</i></p> <p>Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council stated that they did not accept that what the Promoter had agreed to do in their response was what the Select Committee had requested. They believed that the proposed design of the junction of the A34 and Yarnfield Lane was unsafe and that as a result Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council along with Stone Town Council and Stone Rural Parish Council should be involved in the design of the junction. They further asked that the Parish Councils should be involved in the detailed design and approval of highway proposals.</p> <p>The Parish Councils present were concerned that there was no representation at the meeting from Staffordshire County Council or Shropshire Council, or any of the Borough or District authorities invited.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><b><u>HS2 Phase 2a Project</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HS2 Phase 2a project timeline</b></li> </ul> <p>HS2 presented an indicative project timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary trial holes (on-going)</li> <li>• Royal Assent (end 2019)</li> <li>• Further scheme design commencing (Jan 2020)</li> <li>• Early Environmental Works (works commencing from Spring 2020)</li> <li>• Early Civils Works package (works commencing around Autumn 2020)</li> <li>• Utility works (Commencing Feb 2022)</li> <li>• Civils works to construct the route (award mid-2021 and complete Spring 2025)</li> <li>• Ballast/slab, rails, catenary, signal systems (end 2024 to early 2026)</li> <li>• Testing/commissioning (early 2026 to mid-2027)</li> <li>• Opening (end 2027)</li> </ul> <p>Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council queried the timeline and stated that it differed from the indicative programme included in the CA3 Volume 2 report of the AP2 ES (Environmental Statement). HS2 advised that the above indicative project timeline was an overall project-wide one, whereas the indicative programmes included in the AP2 ES were more location specific. Concerns were raised by Stone Town Council and Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council representatives that it was now over 2 years since Royal Assent to the Phase One Bill yet there was still no detailed design for Phase One and no Notice to Proceed. They queried therefore whether the indicative Phase 2a project timeline was realistic.</p> <p>HS2 advised that the project programme is determined by the timing of Royal Assent to the Bill, which is dependent on its passage through Parliament</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Bill process</b></li> </ul> <p>Department for Transport (DfT) presented information about the Bill process and stated that DfT are not anticipating any future additional provisions to the Bill to be brought forward in the House of Lords. First reading in the House of Lords would trigger a fresh petitioning period and is expected in late June 2019, though again this is dependent on the Bill's passage through its remaining stages in the House of Commons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental controls</b></li> </ul> <p>HS2 presented information about environmental controls within and outside the Bill. Arrangements within the Bill for approving detailed design and construction arrangements around scope of works (Schedule 1 &amp; 2), planning conditions, bringing in to use scheduled works and restoration of construction sites (Schedule 17), restoration of land following temporary possession and use (Schedule 15), construction of replacement buildings (Clause 55), protective provisions (Schedule 32) and highways approvals (Schedule 4).</p> <p>Controls outside the Bill are policies, commitments and undertakings based around the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs). The EMRs are a suite of documents developed in consultation with the local authorities in relation to the environmental impacts of the design and construction of the scheme.</p>

The EMRs comprise the general principles, environmental memorandum, planning memorandum, heritage memorandum, Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and the register of undertakings and assurances documents.

Existing legislation will also apply, eg section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act (noise), licenses for affected species, environmental permitting for waste. This legislation would only be disapplied if modified by the Bill.

An explanation of Schedule 17 was given. Schedule 17 is the town planning approval of lorry routes, approval will be needed for routes to and from working or storage sites, sites where anything transported to the site will be re-used and waste disposal sites. Approval of Schedule 17 will also be required for vehicle movements exceeding 24 movements a day and between sites and special/trunk road network. Schedule 17 applies to vehicles of at least 7.5tn. The County Council or unitary authority will determine all applications.

Further information can be found on the information papers on the below link:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environment-hs2-phase-2a-information-papers>

- **Managing construction**

HS2 gave a presentation about construction management. HS2 explained that there is the Route-wide Traffic Management Plan in place (RTMP) in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice. This document explains how the nominated undertaker will deliver the requirements relating to construction traffic in line with Bill powers, CoCP, ES and general principles, information papers and undertakings & assurances. HS2 explained that the RTMP is being reviewed with all authorities on Phase One and Phase 2a. Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council said that they believed that they and all other local authorities below the highway authority should be able to have input on the RTMP for consultation.

Stone Town Council and Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council expressed concern that Staffordshire County Council did not share information with the parish, district and town councils.

Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council stated that no transport logistics profile had been provided and queried the proposals for re-using material, saying that they considered that vehicle movements in the ES have been under-estimated. HS2 advised that there will be controls in place to manage and monitor contractor vehicle numbers and that the highway authorities will have an approval and enforcement role under the provisions of the Bill and existing planning legislation, Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council stated that they did not believe HS2 were sufficiently independent to monitor their contractors compliance and believed that a separate independent company should instead be put in place to audit vehicle movements.

The content of the RTMP was discussed. The RTMP provides an introduction to the document and information about traffic flow management, safety and environmental management, workforce travel management, highway works, streetworks & traffic management and highway management. A copy of the Phase one RTMP can be found on the below link:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/637988/hs2\\_phase\\_one\\_traffic\\_management\\_plan.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/637988/hs2_phase_one_traffic_management_plan.pdf)

HS2 noted that the RTMP sets out how the CoCP will be complied concerning liaison with highway authorities and requirements for contractors to prepare a series of plans setting out how they would comply with the requirements in the RTMP. A further chapter set out how contractors needed to provide forecast vehicle movement and assure compliance with the project EMRs general principles documents.

HS2 noted that the chapter on vehicle and driver safety required regular drivers to undertake the rural driver training course and advised the meeting that HS2 are the first to implement this. Whilst talking about the use of large goods vehicles on rural roads, Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council queried if it was realistic to expect contractors to use only Euro VI engines. Woore Parish Council said that assurances had been given on the use of Euro VI engines. HS2 explained that the commitment on the use of Euro VI engines, as well as further information on how air quality impacts would be managed, was set out in the information paper on air quality. This information paper can be found on the below link:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/779295/E14\\_Air\\_Quality\\_v1.1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/779295/E14_Air_Quality_v1.1.pdf)

HS2 summarised that the RTMP contained chapters on travel planning, temporary traffic management and asset protection, such as road cleansing and highway condition surveys. Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish

	<p>Council asked how the roads will be maintained during the construction period given the expected volumes of construction traffic. They believed that HS2 should be carrying out condition surveys at regular intervals during construction. HS2 advised that highway authorities were responsible for monitoring the roads during construction and that Schedule 32 of the Bill contained a range of protective provisions for highway authorities including provision regarding damage done to the carriageway. Schedule 32 provisions can be found on the below link on page 189:</p> <p><a href="http://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/2017-2019/0006/18006.pdf">http://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/2017-2019/0006/18006.pdf</a></p> <p>Stone Town Council and Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council asked whether highway authorities would have the resources to be able to monitor the condition of highways during construction. Cheshire East Council advised that roads are monitored based on risk. HS2 advised that funding for the authorities could be provided where a new burden is imposed and that more information about the new burdens doctrine could be found in the information paper on the below link:</p> <p><a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/701207/C12_Local_Authority_Funding_and_New_Burdens_v2.0.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/701207/C12_Local_Authority_Funding_and_New_Burdens_v2.0.pdf</a></p> <p>Additional information about managing construction can be found in information papers D10, E3, E4 and E8 on the below links:</p> <p><a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/779273/D10_Maintaining_access_to_residential_and_commercial_property_during_construction_v1.1.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/779273/D10_Maintaining_access_to_residential_and_commercial_property_during_construction_v1.1.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environment-hs2-phase-2a-information-papers">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environment-hs2-phase-2a-information-papers</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Design of permanent highway infrastructure</b></li> </ul> <p>HS2 presented information about the design of permanent highway infrastructure. This includes roads ranging from the M6 motorway to country lanes, public rights of way, bridges under or over HS2 that have been provided for all permanent crossings. Design standards for permanent highway infrastructure will be as appropriate for each type of highway.</p> <p>Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council asked how long it took to secure the necessary approvals for a highway structure from the date of the application for consent. HS2 advised that this can vary depending on the scale of the infrastructure being built and stressed that pre-application discussions with the highway authorities are key to paving the way for timely formal approval. In some cases, discussion with the highway authorities had been underway for some time as part of the design development of the proposals in the Bill. But pre-application discussions would begin in earnest once a contractor had been appointed, with formal applications for approval only being possible once the Bill had secured Royal Assent.</p> <p>More information can be found about this on the below link:</p> <p><a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/779290/E5_Roads_and_Public_Rights_of_Way_v1.1.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/779290/E5_Roads_and_Public_Rights_of_Way_v1.1.pdf</a></p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b><u>Questions &amp; Issues</u></b></p> <p>This section of the meeting was to review the questions submitted by invitees prior to the meeting. Questions were grouped by theme rather than by authority to avoid repetition. A number of questions had been answered during the Phase 2a project presentations.</p> <p><b><u>Questions and issues relating to timeline:</u></b></p> <p><u>Abbots Bromley</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the proposed timeline that may impact the area, either directly or indirectly? Please provide estimated start and finish dates.</li> <li>• <i>This question was responded to during the presentations.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Questions and issues relating to engagement and meetings:</u></b></p> <p><u>Kings Bromley</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request for regular engagement on issues during the construction phase</li> <li>• Meetings to include HS2, Kings Bromley Parish Council, Staffordshire CC, Highways England and Contractors</li> <li>• <i>Community engagement will continue through the remainder of the parliamentary stage and throughout the delivery stage, using the established and dedicated 2a community engagement</i></li> </ul>

*team. It will include parish councils, as is currently happening with the ground investigations programme*

During the response to these questions, Kings Bromley expressed their concern that not all people are being made aware of local community events as the local paper is not circulated to the whole area. HS2 explained that placing adverts in the local newspaper was not the only channel used to alert people to upcoming community events in their area. Other methods included mailings, as had been used for the recent ground investigations drop-in in the area.

#### Abbots Bromley

- The length of time between these meetings does not allow for feedback, what other means of communication will there be?
- What reassurances can be offered that HS2 will actually respond to concerns and requests from Parish Councils?
- *The Highways sub-group is not the only means of engagement between HS2 and parish councils. Community engagement will continue through the remainder of the parliamentary stage and throughout the delivery stage, using the established and dedicated 2a community engagement team. It will include parish councils.*

#### **Questions and issues relating to Traffic Management Plans**

##### Kings Bromley

- A traffic management plan agreed by all parties
- *Area-wide traffic management plans will be consulted on in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice.*

#### **Questions and issues relating to lorry routes and other construction traffic**

##### **Ingestre with Tixall**

- To use the haul routes as soon as possible
- *HS2 asked if the reference to haul routes was to the haul roads proposed as part of the scheme or to the lorry routes using the public highway. On the basis that it was a reference to haul roads, HS2 confirmed they will be used as soon as possible.*

##### **Abbots Bromley**

- To what extent has HS2 considered the impact on villages near to the proposed route in terms of through traffic from workers to the site and also HGVs? Some villages have conservation areas and listed buildings and an increase in general traffic and HGVs could have a detrimental effect on these.
- *HS2 explained workforce travel plans will need to be prepared by contractors. It is likely workers will travel pre-peak. HGVs will be monitored through the Vehicle Monitoring System and Schedule 17. Conservation areas and listed buildings have been considered in line with the EMRs.*
- Will villages be provided with weight restrictions or exclusion areas for contractors during the construction period? If so how will contractors be monitored and penalised if they take quicker, more convenient routes through villages.
- *Villages will not be provided with a weight restriction unless an assurance on the issue is in place. In line with the ES and EMRs, HGVs of 7.5tn will be managed through Schedule 17 on the designated lorry routes only. Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council asked if drivers would be sanctioned if found to be taking an alternative route to the designated lorry routes. HS2 advised that for first offences drivers would be sent for re-training and that ultimately there would be the possibility of enforcement action by the local authority. If residents see lorries in the incorrect locations, they should ring the HS2 helpdesk but must provide the vehicle registration number.*

#### **Questions and issues relating to construction traffic volumes and monitoring**

##### **Woore**

- Who will be responsible for monitoring the daily volume of HGV's that are currently advised on the Histograms along the proposed routes, how will this be recorded and reported to?
- *The contractor is required to self-assure on the monitoring of the daily volumes of HGVs. HS2 will then monitor the volumes and flows within the compliance team. The histograms are averages*

*over a peak period, not exact daily figures, and these figures are in line with the ES and EMRs. These may be reviewed by the relevant highway authority as reasonably requested.*

- What is the procedure/penalties if and when any volume of HGV's exceed the advised Histogram numbers?
- *Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council stated that the volume of HGVs was considerably higher at AP2 and questioned how the numbers will be monitored and policed. HS2 advised that the numbers can be exceeded and the numbers themselves are not a commitment; the contractor would need to ensure that their forecasts would not give rise to any new significant adverse environmental effects to those reported in the ES. It was then asked what would happen if the duration of the busy period needed to be extended. HS2 responded to say that again the contractors forecast would need to demonstrate that it would not result in any new significant adverse environmental effects – it was not automatic that any increase in forecast numbers or duration of busy periods would lead to a new significant environmental effect - and HS2 would engage with the highway authority if the duration of the busy period did need to be extended. It was then asked what would happen if new significant adverse environmental were created. HS2 explained that under the EMRs any such proposal would have to be reported to the Secretary of State.*

#### **Questions and issues relating to vehicle identification**

##### **Kings Bromley**

- All HS2 and contractors vehicles to have clear identification to ensure that the agreed Traffic Management Plan is adhered to.
- *HS2 advised that HGVs will have A4 signs in the window and will follow HS2 routes to and from the strategic road network with the exception of any circumstances outside of their control, such as a road traffic accident, in which case HGVs would then need to find an alternative route, which may mean taking instruction from the police or following diversion signing.*

##### **Abbots Bromley**

- Will contractors be easily identifiable as working for HS2? eg vehicle markings.
- *HGVs will have HS2 signs in the windows. However, drivers often forget to take signs out when not working for HS2. In addition, there may be cases that drivers are not working for HS2 the whole day and therefore do not need to follow lorry routes when not working for HS2 but working for other clients.*

#### **Questions and issues relating to Road closures**

##### **Woore**

- What period of notice will be given for any road closures caused by abnormal loads and who will issue these notices?
- *Abnormal loads will follow normal processes and procedures; there will be no separate HS2 process.*

##### **Abbots Bromley**

- Will there be road closures when tracks cross main roads or will temporary flyovers be provided?
- *The Schedule 4 process will be followed for any road closures, during construction either an off-line diversion or a permanent replacement will be provided or potentially the road will be stopped up. For tie-in works weekend and overnight closures will be in place. It was then asked what would happen if there was an accident which closed the HS2 route. HS2 advised that the traffic would need to follow any diversions with all other road users.*

#### **Questions and issues relating to alterations to roads – passing places**

##### **Woore**

- Will HS2 have to apply for any Planning Consent in the creation of any Passing Points along the proposed routes?
- *If the works are within the highway boundary, a submission would be made to the relevant highway authority under schedule 4 of the Bill. Submissions would need to comply with the CoCP and the ES. Where planning permission is required outside of Bill limits, normal planning application processes and conditions would apply.*

- Will HS2 have to follow the Planning Regulations Conditions regarding any creation of Passing Points i.e. removal of hedges during bird nesting season and other Environmental concerns.
- *It would depend on the location of the passing place. If it is within Bill limits, construction would be compliant with the Bill, EMRs and CoCP. If it is outside Bill limits and required planning permission, construction would be subject to the conditions imposed on the planning application.*

**Questions and issues relating to emergency services**

**Woore**

- What provisions are being made for the emergency services along haul routes?
- *HS2 advised that the emergency services will be invited to regular liaison meetings with HS2 and the relevant highway authority. In addition, other meetings with the emergency services will take place. For example, these could be via local resilience forums.*

**Questions and issues relating to emissions and monitoring, health and well-being**

**Woore**

- How will pollution levels be monitored along haul routes and if exceeded from HS2's modelled levels, what action will be taken to bring them safe limits?
- *Under the U&A that is in place for Woore, monitoring will be carried out. Lorry movements will be monitored by the contractor. The ES contains air quality modelling of construction traffic impacts based on maximum traffic numbers (highways and haul routes). That assessment concludes whether there are any significant air quality effects. There are no significant air quality effects predicted along any Phase 2a haul routes. HS2 advised that their air quality modelling is done on a worst case scenario. Where there are significant effects (e.g. adjacent to the M6) then HS2 will undertake air quality monitoring (as is happening now) which will inform the annual air quality review and actions as set out in Chapter 7 of the CoCP.*

**Abbots Bromley**

- What assessments have been made regarding health and psychological wellbeing of residents that will most likely have reduced enjoyment of their properties through an increase in noise and atmospheric pollution?
- *Further information regarding health and wellbeing effects can be found in section 9 of each of the CA Volume 2 ES reports. See for example the CA3 Volume 2 ES report which is available at the below link:*

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/627565/E15\\_CA3\\_Stone\\_and\\_Swynnerton\\_WEB\\_final.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/627565/E15_CA3_Stone_and_Swynnerton_WEB_final.pdf)

**Further Questions and Comments**

- Stone Town Council and Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council asked for a separate meeting to discuss the detail of site specific proposals. Stone Town Council and Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council would like all the district, borough and parish councils to be involved so that they can find out what is happening in the area.
- Stone Town Council said that HS2 had refused to hold an information event in Stone. HS2 responded to say that they had previously emailed the councillor inviting suggestions on how best to engage with people in Stone.
- Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council said that HS2 had not been to Yarnfield since October 2018, in advance of deposit of the Additional Provision 2 proposals in February 2019.
- Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council informed the attendees that they believed that the design proposal for the A51/A34 roundabout were unsafe. HS2 noted that the normal road safety audit process is followed.
- Another query was raised regarding how pollution levels will be managed. HS2 advised that the project will follow the information which is provided in the information papers. Woore Parish Council advised that they are paying for their own air quality levels to be monitored by a university.
- Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Council asked how the project proposed to move 8.5million tonnes of material between borrow pits on the haul routes. HS2 noted that the project EMRs would apply.

## DRAFT COPY

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was asked who at HS2 the parish councils should contact if they had further queries. HS2 advised that this should be the Phase 2a community engagement team in the first instance and they would co-ordinate a response as necessary.</li> </ul>
4.	<p><b><u>Conclusion</u></b></p> <p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share links for Information Papers</li> <li>Share the slides with all attendees</li> </ul>
5	<p><b><u>AOB</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kings Bromley Parish Council mentioned that they're very grateful for the work being carried out by Liz Davis of HS2.</li> <li>Stone Town Council, Kings Bromley and Yarnfield and Cold Meece Parish Councils expressed their disappointment again that there was no representation at the meeting from Staffordshire County Council.</li> </ul>
6	The Meeting closed at 13:00. The date of the next meeting will be mid-2020 and a date will be confirmed one month before the meeting.