

APPLICATION REFERENCE: PL/2020/00291/HS2DIS

Site Address: Land And Buildings At The Interchange Triangle, Bounded By The M42 Motorway And Other Local Highways, The National Exhibition Centre, Birmingham International Rail Station And Birmingham Airport

Proposal:	Plans and Specifications submission under Schedule 17 to the High Speed Rail (London to West Midlands) Act 2017 for works comprising: Construction of a people mover system on an elevated viaduct together with four No. station stops, one No. maintenance facility and associated works.
Web link to Plans:	Full details of the proposal and statutory consultee responses can be found by using the above planning application reference number at: https://publicaccess.solihull.gov.uk/online-applications/

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee:	The application, in the opinion of the Head of Development Management, would have a significant impact outside of its immediate vicinity.
---	--

Recommendation:	APPROVAL SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS
------------------------	---------------------------------------

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This request for approval of plans and specifications relating to works associated with the construction of a People Mover system on an elevated viaduct together with four station stops, a maintenance facility and associated works. The request for approval is made by HS2's appointed Station Design Services Contractor (SDSC) via Schedule 17 of the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017 (The Act), rather than the Town and Country Planning Act.

1.2 Having regard to the parameters by which the local planning authority, as a qualifying authority, may consider them, the plans and specifications are considered to be acceptable, subject to conditions.

1.3 This request for approval should be read in conjunction with submissions PL/2020/00289/HS2DIS and PL/2020/00275/MAROT, comprising a request for approval under Schedule 17 of The Act, for the construction of a High Speed Rail Interchange Station and associated external works; and a Reserved Matters application for details of access, appearance, landscaping and layout for the provision of car parking (excluding short stay, taxi and drop off parking) in connection High Speed Rail Interchange Station pursuant to Section 23 of the High Speed Rail (London West Midlands) Act, respectively. These submissions can be found elsewhere on this agenda.

2. Background

2.1 The proposed People Mover system is specified as a Schedule 1 work in the Act. Work Nos. 3/20 and 3/20a apply as set out below:

2.2 *“Work No. 3/20 – An elevated People Mover commencing at a point 185 metres north-west of the centre of the Airport Way and Hermes Road roundabout at Birmingham International Airport passing eastwards over Vanguard Road, Bickenhill Lane, Birmingham International Station, Pendigo Way, Eastway, the M42 Motorway and Middle Bickenhill Lane and terminating at a point 498 metres south of the junction of Middle Bickenhill Lane with the A452 Chester Road;*

2.3 *Work No. 3/20A – An elevated People Mover commencing by a junction with Work No. 3/20 at a point 110 metres west of the crossing of Middle Bickenhill Lane over Hollywell Brook passing eastwards then south-eastwards and terminating at a point 137 metres north-east of the junction of the Eastway Link Road with Eastway. Work No. 3/20A includes a depot for the proposed People Mover.”*

2.4 Schedule 1 of the Act (Paragraphs 1 (1) and 1 (2)) sets out certain construction requirements, including in relation to the carrying out of Scheduled Works. In particular, such works need to be:

- Carried out within the horizontal Limits of Deviation (LoD) shown on the deposited plans referenced in the Act; and
- Vertically upwards to any extent not exceeding 3 metres from any level for that work shown on the deposited sections referenced in the Act.

2.5 Horizontal limits of deviation apply for the all components of the proposed people mover. Vertical limits apply to the height of the People Mover track system. This vertical upwards deviation does not however apply to any upper limits shown on deposited sections for stations, maintenance facilities or shafts.

2.6 Schedule 1 of the Act (Paragraph 2 (1) and (3)) allows for landscaping, mitigation and other (non-Scheduled) works which may be necessary or expedient for the purposes of HS2, to be carried out anywhere within the ‘Act Limits’. The ‘Act Limits’ are defined in Section 68(2) of the Act as being within the LoD for scheduled works, or within the Limits of Land to be Acquired or Used (LLAU) for ancillary works. In other words, Scheduled Works are to take place in the LoD, whereas other works can be carried out in either the LoD or the LLAU.

3. Proposed Plans and Specifications

3.1 The proposed plan and specifications tabled under this request for approval have been refined compared with the Hybrid Bill scheme and involves a People Mover system of approximately 2.3km in length. The system will operate on an elevated viaduct, which varies from approximately 6m to 14m in height, and is designed to rapidly transport people between the new HS2 Interchange Station, the National Exhibition Centre, Birmingham International Rail Station and Birmingham Airport. These details can be found on the condition related to the submitted plans for approval, which include the site location plan (delineated by a blue line); the site

wide plans; elevation and floor plans of the maintenance facility, APM stops and APM viaduct and piers.

3.2 The most notable changes made to the people mover scheme since the Hybrid Bill include:

- Relocation of the maintenance facility to create an online facility and consequent removal of the previous associated track spur resulting in a reduction of circa 800m in viaduct length and associated reduced vegetation loss;
- Adopting a pinched loop system with significant single-track sections rather than a twin track arrangement along the entire length of the people mover route;
- Reducing the number of viaduct piers by increasing the viaduct spans (from 20m – 30m spans to typically approximately 40m spans); and
- An overall lowering of the viaduct across much of its length;
- Separation of the airport stop from the terminus;
- Realignment of the route around the NEC and re-location of the NEC stop.

3.3 HS2 Ltd have advised that a number of factors have influenced and guided these changes. These factors include: specific HS2 operational, design and security requirements, the outputs of 'Design Sifts' to test certain design and development key options for the People Mover, the provisions and limitations provided for by the HS2 Act, identified Environmental Minimum Requirements, including Undertakings & Assurances relevant to the People Mover, consultation and engagement with stakeholders, communities and wider third parties, and feedback provided through independent design review sessions.

3.4 The viaduct deck will be constructed in weathering steel, while the viaduct columns and associated heads are formed in reinforced concrete. Spans between columns are typically around 40m, although longer sections are also provided to bridge certain pieces of important existing infrastructure along the route, such as the M42 motorway and the West Coast Main railway line. The viaduct column to be provided adjacent to the M42 slip road requires the installation of a Road Restraint System (RRS) to mitigate against the potential risk of vehicle impacts.

3.5 Standalone Stops are proposed for the new People Mover at the HS2 Interchange Station, the National Exhibition Centre (NEC), Birmingham International Railway Station (BIRS) and Birmingham Airport. The platform to the Stop at Interchange Station is proposed to be at the same level as the station's proposed western plaza, immediately adjacent to the Interchange Station, allowing direct connectivity for passengers. All other Stops require platforms at an elevated position as the viaduct needs to achieve certain clearance heights for existing roads and other infrastructure. The NEC Stop is located to the south of the main entrance to the NEC Exhibitions Halls and to the west of Pendigo Lake. The BIRS Stop is situated to the west of the existing station in the station car park. A bridge link to the existing railway station building is proposed. The Airport Stop is located at the southern end of the airport's arrivals hall.

3.6 All four Stops would share a family of common elements including escalators, lifts, platforms and platform screen doors, canopies and emergency exit stairs and a pallet of cladding types for the different elements. The common components would be configured differently at each Stop to suit their location and specific requirements, while keeping a common visual language. It is also intended that each Stop adopts a unique colour pallet for certain elements to help to define the location and assist in passenger wayfinding. The colours indicated within this submission are indicative only, with final details reserved for future consideration.

3.7 The terminating Stops, at the Interchange Station and the Airport, have been designed to also house the plant and equipment required for a cable pulled People Mover system, although, the exact form of system has not yet been confirmed. This will be decided in the next stage of the project following competitive tender and as such the design has been prepared to accommodate either type of system. The uncertainty around system choice does raise the question whether the Stop designs could be different if a self-propelled system were chosen. The scheme submitted accommodates the plant required for a cable pulled system. Should an alternative system be progressed through detailed design which requires a material change to the current design and external appearance of the Stops then a further schedule 17 request for approval may need to be made, depending on the scope of any changes.

3.8 The design ambition for the platforms is to create a durable and modern space, which allows for the customer to board and alight the trains quickly and navigate the space efficiently. The platforms, which are fully covered, vary from approximately 36m to 40m in length. Platform widths have been determined by vertical circulation requirements, and are designed to accommodate a bank of two escalators, leaving 3m clear width on either side. Platform zones are provided along the length and have been laid out in order to encourage separation of uses between waiting and queuing, circulation and the platform safety edge zone.

3.9 Platform canopies are split to reflect both the concept of a ribbon and the function underneath. The canopy over the circulation zone is raised by 600mm and the lower part of the canopy sits over the waiting zone next to the tracks. The gap between the canopies allows natural light through to the centre of the platforms. The proposed canopies would sit on a simple primary set of steel portals formed from rectangular sections. Joints are proposed to be welded and ground down flush so to form a seamless continuous frame. The canopies are proposed to be externally finished with aluminium standing seam with gutters incorporated into the lower canopies. The canopies would be fully lined on the underside with aluminium soffit panels.

3.10 Platform edge doors would be provided alongside the platforms providing security and safety for passengers when on the platform. Balustrades would be provided at the end of the platforms to prevent unauthorised access to the viaduct or along open edges. The outer part of the platforms would be lit by luminaries set into a service boom that would be suspended from the canopy structure above the platform zone. The central raised part of the canopy would be lit from luminaries mounted on the primary steel columns. Lighting is also integrated into the platform edge doors to provide the required lighting levels for the passengers alighting and boarding the trains.

3.11 Customers would have the choice of using either lifts or escalators at the three Stops where the platforms are elevated. Two lifts are provided at each Stop for resilience. These are through lifts where possible and are large enough for wheelchair users to turn around within the lift. An escape staircase is also provided at each Stop so that there is an alternative means of escape in an emergency.

3.12 The plans and specifications for approval feature a maintenance facility for the People Mover positioned alongside the viaduct and adjacent, east of, the M42 motorway. This is in a different location to that in the Hybrid Bill where it was originally proposed to the south of the new station much closer to the new HS2 railway line, with an access spur from the main People Mover route, which would have been approximately 400m in length. The maintenance facility is required for the upkeep and repair of the People Mover carriages. This includes heavy maintenance, light undercarriage maintenance and exterior washing. The building is arranged over three floors and its overall height is governed by the required height for vehicle maintenance.

4. MAIN ISSUES

4.1 The High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Act 2017 received Royal Assent on 23rd February 2017. Section 20 of the Act grants deemed planning permission under Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA) for HS2 Phase One and associated works between London and the West Midlands.

4.2 However Schedule 17 of the Act puts in place a bespoke process for the approval of certain matters to the design and construction of the railway which requires that the nominated undertaker must seek approval of these matters from the relevant planning authority.

4.3 The Statutory Guidance (see below) purposes of Schedule 17 is to ensure there is an appropriate level of local planning control over the HS2 Phase One construction works while not unduly delaying or adding cost to the project. The roles that a planning authority has in the determination of different requests for approval and the grounds on which they can determine them are set out in the Schedule.

4.4 The range of works that require plans and specifications approval depend on whether the planning authority is a qualifying authority. Non-qualifying authorities have a narrower ambit in considering requests for approval under paragraph 2 of Schedule 17 and non-qualifying authorities are not required to approve plans and specifications under paragraphs 3 or 7. Following agreement at Full Council on 12th July 2016, the Council signed the 'HS2 Planning Memorandum' and is consequently a Qualifying Authority under the terms of the Act.

4.5 In February 2017 The Secretary of State for Transport has published the "Schedule 17 Statutory Guidance" (updated May 2020). Under the heading "Scope of Schedule 17", paragraph 4.4 of the Guidance states:

"These approvals have been carefully defined to provide an appropriate level of local planning control over the works while not unduly delaying or adding cost to the project. Planning authorities should not through the exercise of the Schedule seek to:

- *revisit matters settled through the parliamentary process;*
- *seek to extend or alter the scope of the project; or*
- *modify or replicate controls already in place, either specific to HS2 Phase One such as the Environmental Minimum Requirements, or existing legislation such as the Control of Pollution Act or the regulatory requirements that apply to railways."*

4.6 In terms of this Request the nominated undertaker is seeking approval for plans and specifications under paragraphs 2 'condition relating to building works' and 3 'condition relating other construction works' of the Schedule. The specific works applicable to this Request within each category, are as follows:

Paragraph 2 – Condition relation to building works:

- Erection of People Mover viaduct including viaduct columns and deck structures
- Erection of four, People Mover Stops
- Erection of a People Mover Maintenance Facility

Paragraph 3 – Condition relating to other construction works:

- Road Vehicle Parks (provision of parking and related access arrangements to the Maintenance Facility, on and off street parking provision / re-configuration associated with the Birmingham Airport, Birmingham International and NEC stops).
- Earthworks (various located earthworks including (but not limited to) embankments to Interchange Station and Birmingham International Stops, provision of basins/ponds at the Maintenance Facility and Birmingham International Stops.
- Fences or walls (location of security fencing to the proposed Maintenance Facility. Erection of security bollards and associated works in connection with certain Stops. Provision of Rod Restraint Systems around the viaduct columns adjacent to the M42 motorway slip road.
- Lighting Equipment (Provision of operational lighting in association with the Viaduct, Stops and Maintenance Facility.)

4.7 In terms of conditions relating to building works paragraph 2(5) states that a qualifying authority, may only refuse to approve plans or specifications for the purposes of this paragraph on the ground that—

(a) the design or external appearance of the building works ought to be modified—

(i) to preserve the local environment or local amenity,

(ii) to prevent or reduce prejudicial effects on road safety or on the free flow of traffic in the local area, or

(iii) to preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest or nature conservation value,

and is reasonably capable of being so modified, or

(b) the development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits

4.8 On approving such a plan or specification paragraph 2(3) of the Schedule allows the local planning authority to specify any respect in which it requires additional details of the building works to be submitted for approval. Paragraph 2(7) says that the relevant planning authority may only impose conditions on approval for the purposes of this paragraph on a ground specified in sub-paragraph (5) as above.

4.9 In terms of conditions relating to other construction works, paragraph 3(6) states that the relevant planning authority may only refuse to approve plans or specifications for the purposes of this paragraph on a ground specified in relation to the work in question in the following table:

Road vehicle parks	That the design or external appearance of the works ought to, and could reasonably be modified- a) To preserve the local environment or local amenity b) To prevent or reduce prejudicial effects on road safety or on the free flow of traffic in the local area, or c) To preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest or nature conservation value that the development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.
Earthworks	That the design or external appearance of the works ought to, and could reasonably, be modified a) To preserve the local environment or local amenity b) To prevent or reduce prejudicial effects on road safety or on the free flow of traffic in the local area, or c) To preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest or nature conservation value If the development does not form part of a scheduled work, that the development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits

Fencing and walls	That the development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.
Artificial lighting equipment	That the design of the equipment, with respect to the emission of light, ought to, and could reasonably, be modified to preserve the local environment or local amenity. If the development does not form part of a scheduled work, that the development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.

4.10 On approving such a plan or specification paragraph 3(4) of Schedule 17 allows the local planning authority to specify any respect in which it requires additional details of the operation or work which gives rise to the need for approval. However, paragraph 3(7) says that the relevant planning authority may only impose conditions on approval for the purposes of this paragraph on a ground specified in the table in sub-paragraph (6) (above) in relation to the work in question.

4.11 With regard to grounds for determination Section 7 of Schedule 17 Statutory Guidance states:

“Careful consideration of the grounds is therefore needed when determining a request for approval as these set out the matters a planning authority can take into account when making a decision. For example, in determining a request for approval of a building, one of the grounds is that the design or external appearance ought to be modified to preserve the local environment or local amenity. This ground should therefore be applied by the planning authority to ensure the design and/or external appearance of the building or construction work is appropriate to its local context. This could include the use of locally appropriate finishes to buildings, although this would need to be considered with other material considerations.

This ground should not be used to require a modification to the interior of a building, such as to create permeability, unless it could be demonstrated it is needed to not adversely affect/injure the local environment or amenity or to prevent or reduce prejudicial road safety of traffic flow effects. The experience of a passenger in the building and/or the operational efficiency of the building, in this instance, would not be material to the decision by the planning authority. Nor in the case of a proposed building or structure, or modification of an existing building, is there the ability to use this ground to require improvements and enhancements to the local area, as opposed to preserving its amenity. Enhancements are requirements that are beyond what is necessary and reasonable to mitigate the effects of the works and ensure a suitable quality of design. Similarly, as the ground refers to the preservation of local environment and amenity it cannot be used to require that designs be modified to facilitate future development not authorised by the Act.

Where the request for approval alters the interior of a listed building the ground relating to the preservation of a site of historic interest will be material insofar as the works affect the building's special character and interest.

When determining a request for approval a planning authority must only consider the grounds relevant to that approval. Therefore requests may only be refused, conditions be imposed, and modifications or additional information requested, where they relate to the grounds specified for determining the request for approval.

With regard to approvals of details of building and other construction works only the actual design, external appearance and siting of the works for which plans are submitted for approval are relevant, and conditions imposing requirements as to the maintenance or operation of the works may not be imposed. This is because the matter for approval is the design and external appearance of the building or work, not its use. Schedule 17 should not therefore be used to control matters such as opening times and/or cleaning regimes.

When considering requests for approval for which the grounds include the preservation of a site of archaeological or historic interest this ground should be taken to include the preservation of the setting of listed buildings. This ground should be applied in conjunction with other material considerations.

Planning policy and other considerations material to planning applications under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are only material to the determination of a request for approval under Schedule 17, insofar as they relate to the matter for approval (i.e. a building for HS2 Phase One) and the grounds specified for determining the request for approval.

When determining a request for approval planning authorities should not seek to control matters that are subject to other approvals under Schedule 17. For example when determining a request for approval relating to building or construction works under paragraph 2 or 3 of the Schedule, a planning authority should not seek to determine whether the work for approval provides appropriate mitigation for the effects of relevant scheduled work as that is a matter which is determined under paragraph 9 of Schedule 17."

4.12 Section 8 of the Statutory Guidance states that when approving plans and specifications the planning authority may impose a requirement on the approval (paragraphs 2(3), 3(4), and 7(4) of Schedule 17) that the nominated undertaker submits additional details relating to the building or work approval. The purpose of this provision is to enable the planning authority to approve some elements of the works and leave subsidiary issues for a subsequent decision. Such requests allow planning authorities' approval of further details of the design that they may reasonably require, while not delaying the determination of the request for approval. Examples of such requests for additional details include the submission of building materials and/or finishes for approval

4.13 Section 10 says states that conditions should not be imposed which reserve for future approval matters which are integral to the approval being sought. While there is a power to require additional details in relation to works that does not extend to deferring approval of integral elements of that development.

4.14 The guidance also notes that conditions should not be imposed which conflict with controls or commitments contained in the Environmental Minimum Requirements. This is because these controls would have been considered necessary or sufficient by Parliament when it approved deemed planning permission for the railway.

4.15 Section 10 of the Statutory Guidance notes the requirements of paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) apply to the imposition of conditions to approvals under Schedule 17.

Section 5 of the guidance states:

“the Act does not disapply Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Therefore, Section 106 agreements can potentially be entered into in relation to requests for approval under Schedule 17. This should only happen where the tests set out in paragraphs 203 to 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework are met. Additionally, a Section 106 agreement must only relate to the work for approval and the relevant grounds in Schedule 17.

A Section 106 should not be sought to:

- revisit matters settled through the parliamentary process;*
- seek to extend or alter the scope of the project; or*
- modify or replicate controls already in place, either specific to HS2 Phase One such as the Environmental Minimum Requirements, or existing legislation such as the Control of Pollution Act or the regulatory requirements that apply to railways.”*

4.16 HS2 Ltd as the nominated undertaker for the project is contractually bound through a development contract to comply with controls set out in the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) in designing and constructing the Phase One of High Speed Two Works. The EMR General Principles defines and explains the relevant minimum requirements, which are referred to as the ‘Environmental Minimum Requirements’.

1.1.3 The controls contained in the EMRs, along with powers contained in the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Act (the Act) and the Undertakings given by the Secretary of State, will ensure that impacts which have been assessed in the ES will not be exceeded, unless any new impact or impacts in excess of those assessed in the ES:

- results from a change in circumstances which was not likely at the time of the ES2; or*
- would not be likely to be environmentally significant3; or*

- *results from a change or extension to the project, where that change or extension does not itself require environmental impact assessment (EIA) under either (i) article 4(1) of and paragraph 24 of Annex 1 to the EIA Directive⁴; or (ii) article 4(2) of and paragraph 13 of Annex 2 to the EIA Directive⁵; or*
- *would be considered as part of a separate consent process (and therefore further EIA if required).*

3.1.3 The nominated undertaker shall comply with all undertakings and assurances as specified by paragraph 3.1.4 and those undertakings or assurances shall take priority over the remainder of the EMRs to the extent of any inconsistency.

3.1.4 The nominated undertaker shall comply with all undertakings and assurances concerning the project specified in the “HS2 Register of Undertakings and Assurances” published by the Department for Transport or as otherwise notified to the nominated undertaker.

4.17 The Written Statement confirms that the SDSC has been required by HS2 Ltd to continually assess the People Mover scheme throughout the evolution of its design to ensure that it complies with the EMRs. This includes compliance with Undertakings & Assurances and testing whether the People Mover design, and/or changes to the potential construction and logistics activities, is likely to result in environmental impacts which exceed those reported in the ES. The Written Statement confirms the applicants view that the works which relate to this request, and the cumulative impact of the works in conjunction with other HS2 development, have been assessed and any new impact or impacts in excess of those assessed in the ES would not likely be environmentally significant

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

5.1 Whilst the Act only requires consultation with the three statutory consultees (Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England) given the scale and nature of the proposals a much wider consultation exercise has been undertaken in this instance.

Statutory Consultees

5.2 The following Statutory Consultee responses have been received:

5.3 Environment Agency – No objection

5.4 Natural England – No objection

5.5 Historic England – Concerns raised on heritage grounds (impact on Park Farm and Packington Hall)

Non Statutory Consultees

- 5.6 The following Non-Statutory Consultee responses have been received:
- 5.7 Bickenhill Parish Council – No comments received
- 5.8 Birmingham City Council – No comments received
- 5.9 Birmingham International Airport – Supportive of HS2. Concerns raised with suggested conditions to mitigate
- 5.10 Highways England – No objection subject to condition
- 5.11 Network Rail – No response
- 5.12 North Warwickshire Borough Council - Maintenance building for People Mover is isolated and of no architectural merit. Building should be treated as extension to main station building;
- 5.13 SMBC Building Design Group - Concerns regarding design and choice of materials for stops at Birmingham Airport and BIRS.
- 5.14 SMBC Drainage – No objection
- 5.15 SMBC Ecology – No objection
- 5.16 MBC Heritage Assets – No objection
- 5.17 SMBC Highways – No objection
- 5.18 SMBC Landscape – No objection subject to further scrutiny of Indicative Environment Mitigation Proposals through future Bringing into Use Schedule 17 Request for Approval.
- 5.19 SMBC Public Protection – No objection
- 5.20 Warwickshire County Council (Archaeology) - No observations
- 5.21 West Midlands Police (incorporating British Transport Police) – No objections subject to conditions

6.0 PUBLICITY

6.1 The provisions set out by the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017 do not require the same statutory publicity and consultation requirements that apply to planning applications.

6.2 The Act requires a ‘Qualifying Authority’, which Solihull MBC is, to consult solely with the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England, as and where relevant.

6.3 The delegation and consultation arrangements in respect of submissions to the Local Planning Authority under the Act was reported to Cabinet Portfolio Holder Managed Growth Decision Session on 31st October 2017 where it was agreed that the local planning authority should conduct consultation on HS2 planning matters in accordance with the statutory requirements of the HS2 Act, with any additional consultation or publicity beyond that being at the discretion of the Head of Planning, Design and Engagement Services.

6.4 There is no requirement to conduct widespread consultation, post site notices or send out neighbour letters. However, relevant parish council members, local ward members and local residents have been notified of the proposal.

6.5 9 responses to publicity were received, including from Arden Cross Limited (Arden Cross), the Urban Growth Company (UGC) and Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) (these representations were submitted in response to all three submissions and only the comments relevant to this request are summarised). A representation was also received from Meriden Parish Council. All correspondence has been reviewed and the main issues raised are summarised below (Planning Committee Members have access to all third party correspondence received):

General

- The potential scale of opportunity identified at UK Central Hub will only be realised if the core development areas and key physical, policy and environmental considerations are co-ordinated and well planned in line with the on-going design of the HS2 Interchange Station, APM and long stay car parks, and accord with the place-making principles established at Section 2.4 of the UGC's Hub Framework Plan (Feb 2018).
- A key objective of the UGC is to ensure the necessary enabling infrastructure is being planned for and brought forward to allow early delivery (i.e. from Spring 2023) of major development at Arden Cross ahead of the arrival of HS2.
- Development adjacent to and in the vicinity of the HS2 Interchange Station, particularly to the west of the trace, must be facilitated in the lead up to HS2 becoming operational to ensure that market demand for development can be addressed immediately on (or before) the opening of the station. This should happen concurrently with, and maximise, the major infrastructure components being delivered around the HS2 Interchange Station.
- The UGC supports the provision of the People Mover and the associated intermodal connectivity it will offer within the UK Central Hub.
- This is a one-off opportunity to maximise local connectivity of HS2 to surrounding community – once other development occurs on the site it will be next to impossible to 'fix' a problem of there being too low a capacity on the Interchange – International connection.
- System layout is in breach of Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 "Public sector equality duty" with regard to the provision of facilities for people with reduced mobility arising from the protected characteristics of age; disability; or pregnancy and maternity.
- No concerns over the form of the design but concerns about its function which will be highest priority of passengers.

Capacity

- Concerns about capacity of the people mover.
- At no point in the application is it demonstrated how the design is flexible allowing future capacity.
- Due to amount of single track any capacity uplift could only come from larger vehicles – still at 3 minute intervals.
- Applicant must demonstrate upper capacity limit of design and how it is achieved.
- Platform capacity inadequate.

Alignment

- In order to ensure the full economic potential of BIRS, its immediate surroundings and the UK Central HUB are not sterilised or prejudiced, it is considered that the general arrangement of the People Mover route alignment should be modified to maximise opportunities for future development at Birmingham International Station.
- Route alignment adjacent to BIRS Station does not preserve the local environment or local amenity and will not prevent or reduce prejudicial effects on road safety during construction.
- It is considered that the route and stop at BIRS can be located elsewhere within the HS2 safeguarded land.

Interchange Station Stop

- Only one platform means boarding passengers will have to wait for all alighting passengers to get off before they can start boarding – 2 platforms would allow a vehicle to be present for passengers to board and wait for it to depart which could happen immediately on arrival of second vehicle.

NEC Stop

- Application boundary includes part of the area of land at the front of the Bear Grylls Adventure (BGA) building where some of the Adventure activities are located, including the High Ropes course and the zip line.
- The application boundary is tight against the BGA building and incorporates the BGA disabled parking spaces, disabled access route into the attraction, the general exit and emergency exit. This raises substantial access and egress issues for Merlin in relation to the safe operation of the BGA attraction. Consider that the impacts will have prejudicial effects on road safety for general users of the attraction, disabled users and, in the event of an emergency, will particularly affect the ability of emergency service vehicles to access the attraction.
- Merlin is aware of the requirements to remove part of the BGA attraction upon notification in writing from HS2 (as per S106 dated 6/9/17), however, would welcome further engagement with HS2 now that the position, design and timetable for developing the people mover is known. This will enable Merlin to

understand the direct impacts on the BGA attraction during the construction and subsequent operation of the people mover

- Plant rooms are visually intrusive and block the view under the platforms and are harmful to visual amenity.
- The need for such plant rooms at intermediate stops on an automated people mover has not been justified.
- Request HS2 continue dialogue with NEC throughout the detailed design phase, specifically in relation to final design detail, colours and look of NEC stop to ensure it is in keeping with surrounding amenity and environment.

Birmingham International Stop

- Birmingham International APM stop will create an unsuitable social environment for the planned new plaza in front of Birmingham International Station, via overshadowing and noise pollution, thus detracting from the place-making principles articulated in the UGC's plans and publications.
- It sterilises high-value land which can alternatively be developed for the delivery of mixed use development.
- Pedestrian bridge link would be narrow, draughty, rain exposed, noisy 60m corridor.
- The need for such plant rooms at intermediate stops on an automated people mover has not been justified.

Airport Stop

- Design of airport stop is visually poor and would be very harmful to visual amenity and the success of the airport.
- There is complete lack of integration physically and conceptually between the Birmingham Airport Stop and the terminal.
- The proposed structure is totally out of character with the surrounding buildings that form the gateway to the West Midlands' premier Airport.
- External design needs to be improved, particularly to break up the bulk of the lift towers on the northwest elevation which passengers will see on approach from terminal
- Proposed metal cladding is inappropriate for this prominent elevation and should be replaced by decorative cladding in a suitable pattern or by glass so that the lift tower wall is transparent.
- In terms of usability the airport stop is located outside, and about as far as possible from the facilities of the airport. It is disappointing that passengers have to change between high level platforms and the ground, cross an outdoor space and change level again within the terminal.
- The additional walking and level changes will be unwelcome even for fit travellers.
- It will be impossible to use a baggage trolley for the train to the aircraft interchange.

Maintenance Facility

- The design of the maintenance facility is harmful to visual amenity.

- Design inspired by factories is inappropriate in this rural setting.
- Exterior design needs to be revised to complement the setting in order to minimise visual intrusion. This can be achieved by a design employing curves to create a more organic shape.

Other

- Numerous elements within the proposal appear to have been designed for much drier and sunnier climates – will make for a wet and draughty passenger experience with no space to shelter out of driving rain
- It will not facilitate the creation of a new pedestrian and cycle link to Pendigo Lake aligned with the People Mover, offering clear permeability and legibility.
- Lack of a segregated pedestrian and cycle alternative on the desire line – the only pedestrian alternative on pavement would be 3.6k rather than the 1500m from Interchange Station to Birmingham International Station as the crow flies
- If there was a direct pedestrian alternative a passenger could choose to walk instead of queuing for the people mover.
- Suggest an alternative ‘figure of 8’ route – allowing more stops at multiple NEC halls.
- It does not de-risk the construction interfaces between the redevelopment of Birmingham Interchange Station, the People Mover and on-going connections to BHX and NEC via existing transport modes.
- Lack of publicity around application.
- Concerns as to noise/lighting levels and disturbance it would cause when fully operational to nearby hotel residents and conference delegates.
- Seek assurances that the lake levels are not impacted, as currently rain water from Hilton hotel is discharged directly into the lake and any change in water level or surcharge could potential have a detrimental effect upon the integrity of the hotel’s drainage system.
- Lift dimensions at station stops seem to be on the narrow side. The width of the lift is only 1200mm (except for BIRS where it is 1600mm). Accept that this meets relevant standards but wonder whether it will be adequate for people with luggage and/or wheelchair users.
- Various questions/concerns regarding construction and impact on traffic flow and access to/from airport/NEC etc.
- No scale bar on many drawings – difficult to size any element.
- Design Panel has considered the form of the application but made no observations on its function.
- Note that the group of consultees does not have any transport user groups.
- No information on maximum vehicle weights, minimum curve radius of tracks, maximum track gradient, spacing of openings on platform edge doors.
- Applicant should demonstrate practicality of the scheme.

7.0 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The plans and specifications for approval.

7.1 The plans and documents listed in recommended condition 1 detail what plans and specifications have been submitted for approval, which include the site

location plan (delineated by a blue line); the site wide plans; elevation and floor plans of the maintenance facility, APM stops and APM viaduct and piers.

7.2 This assessment will consider the plans and specifications for approval under paragraph 2 and 3 of Schedule 17 separately, with the relevant development type and possible grounds for refusal of approval pertinent to each paragraph assessed in turn.

Matters for consideration under Schedule 17 Paragraph 2 Conditions relation to building works

7.3 In the context of this request for approval, “building works” involve the following:

- Erection of People Mover viaduct including viaduct columns and deck structures
- Erection of four, People Mover Stops
- Erection of a People Mover Maintenance Facility

7.4 In relation to the first matter under this paragraph, for building works, it falls to be considered:

Whether the design or external appearance of the building works ought to be modified

To preserve local environment or local amenity

7.5 An Independent Design Review Panel (IDP) specifically for the new station has been involved since the outset of the design acting as a critical friend to the project. The proposals were reported to the IDP at regular intervals. The IDP acts in an independent, non-executive advisory capacity, and provides a forum to review and critique designs at key stages in the design process.

- *The Viaduct and Piers*

7.6 The People Mover viaduct is approximately 2.3k in length and is elevated along the entire route, varying in height between approximately 6m and 14m, which is significant to its design as it is required to cross both rural and heavily urbanised environments.

7.7 HS2 Ltd assert that the viaduct has been carefully designed as a single simple slender ‘ribbon’ that threads through the landscape to minimise its visual impact on its setting. The viaduct deck is proposed to be constructed in weathering steel to ensure a durable and long lasting structure which requires minimal maintenance. Weathering steel, whilst maybe bright on first installation, will age and weather over time to develop a deep brown colour.

7.8 The applicants advise that options for the viaduct deck material have been thoroughly explored and the weathering steel option was chosen due to various advantages when compared to other potential materials and finishes. Solutions

based on a concrete deck were discounted because of the visual depth of the deck, structural inefficiency and poor constructability. Painted steel was also discounted due to maintenance implications.

7.9 The viaduct piers and associated heads are proposed to be formed from reinforced concrete. These are designed around a concept of simplicity with a straight shaft and cross head to support the viaduct above. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) notes that studies were carried out into a number of pier shapes and forms following comments from early Independent Design Review Panel (IDP) reviews.

7.10 A pier shaped like a diamond on plan at the base, tapering to a square top section, was selected. This top section is a constant length over all the piers, allowing for a repeating framework piece to be used, with a variable height lower section to allow for the change in height of the viaduct across the route.

7.11 There are 3 types of piers proposed, the choice of which is dependent on the support required for the different track formats proposed along the viaduct length. The majority of the viaduct length is either single track or paired single tracks which are supported by a typical 'type 1' pier. However, the viaduct section between the M42 motorway and Pendigo Lake is twin track and sits on 'type 2' piers which have a wider column and beam. The final 'type 3' pier, is a bespoke pier to support a split track to allow the viaduct to be carried over the pavilion building at the NEC and then across towards Birmingham International Railway Station over the existing West Coast Mainline railway. The form of this column is as a consequence of clearance required over part of the NEC.

7.12 Spans between columns are typically around 40m although longer sections are also provided to bridge certain pieces of important existing infrastructure along the route, such as the M42 motorway and the West Coast Main Line. The viaduct column to be provided adjacent to the M42 slip road requires the installation of a Road Restraint System to mitigate against the potential risk of vehicle impacts.

7.13 To prevent the concrete columns from staining, details have been developed at the top of the columns to prevent runoff water from reaching the columns which includes a weathering steel cover plate to prevent water landing near the column heads and then running down the columns. This infill is installed as a lining to the steel trough and will direct rain water away from the column. Drip details on the main beams to prevent water running along the underside of the beams to the columns, have also been incorporated.

7.14 The Viaduct has been designed with a grated deck therefore no positive drainage is required. However, for a small section of the viaduct over Birmingham to Rugby railway line, a solid deck slab is proposed which does require positive drainage. This will be detailed in a Schedule 33 Request for Approval.

7.15 The IDP recommended that further consideration be given to the type 3 pier. This pier is of an unusual form supporting the viaduct in a cantilever arrangement and as a result is much bulkier and far less elegant than all the other piers. HS2 note that the design of this column is in response to stakeholder engagement, notably

with the NEC, to balance their operational requirements with the need to design a workable structural solution. As part of the Hybrid Bill, HS2 entered into a legal undertaking to avoid direct impacts on NEC buildings. The IDP understands the need to develop a particular approach to the column at this location but recommended that further consideration is given to an alternative design.

7.16 HS2 Ltd have provided information as to the alternatives that have been given consideration in the design of this pier including options to clad the structure. However, these have been discounted due to the related increase in bulk and implications around routine inspection of concrete. Given its location, in a back of house service area of the NEC which would also be largely screened by existing NEC buildings and the APM stop itself, the pier would not be visually prominent and therefore officers do not consider that the design and appearance of the pier in this location would be unduly injurious to local environment and local amenity. On this basis, it is therefore considered that the proposed design solution for this pier is acceptable.

7.17 Third party representations received mention disturbance to nearby hotels through noise and artificial lighting of the viaduct. The operational impact of the People Mover was considered in the ES which allowed for a light rail solution and did not conclude there would be any significant impacts upon surrounding properties/business.

7.18 The People Mover route and design is within the parameters of the ES and the alterations to the route around the NEC was assessed in the additional provisions (SES5 and AP5 ES). Since the ES was published a new hotel has been constructed in close proximity to the APM viaduct and the NEC Stop. This hotel was granted planning permission (PL/2017/02960/PPFL) following the passing of the Bill in parliament. HS2 Ltd made representation on this application noting that the alignment of the People Mover may change to that shown in the ES. The potential impact of the People Mover on this hotel was taken into account during the assessment of that application and found to be acceptable.

7.19 HS2 Ltd confirm that the detailed design of the People Mover will ensure it remains within the parameters of the ES and the proposed People Mover technology in this submission is well below noise levels generated by a light rail solution. HS2 Ltd also advised that there will be future opportunities, in this regard, for engagement with local stakeholders on the system.

7.20 SMBC Landscape sought further clarification of the construction impact relating to the viaduct on Pendigo Lake and Hollywell Brook, and specifically the extent to which trees, hedgerows and other vegetation would have to be removed below its path. Section 30 of the Act allows for trees to be felled within Act Limits when needed for construction purposes. . In terms of impact on Pendigo Lake, this would have been considered during the ES. No earthworks are proposed that would affect the lake and the method of how the piers would be installed is not a ground for consideration under this Schedule 17 request.

7.21 Overall officers are satisfied that the design and external appearance of the viaduct deck in weathering steel with the reinforced concrete columns proposed

would create a lightweight, elegant and a high design quality structure that would respond both to the urban and rural landscapes that it will pass through. Therefore, the design and external appearance of the viaduct and piers, as presented within this request for approval, are considered to preserve local environment and local amenity.

- Interchange Station Stop

7.22 The Interchange Station Stop of the People Mover is directly adjacent to the new station's west plaza with the platform being at the same level and having direct access to the plaza. The platform arrangement is similar to the other Stops with the canopy being divided into two parts as the Stop is single sided with just one platform with the viaduct arriving to the side of the public plaza.

7.23 The Stop would be approximately 65m in length including escape stair and plant room which is approximately 14.7m in width. The height of this stop varies due to the levels differences in this part of the site. Where the platform meets the plaza the Stop would be the height of the platform canopy at approximately 4.5m. At the escape stair core, however, the Stop stands at approximately 11m in height. This station Stop would define the southern edge of the west car park and plaza and as such it tends to lock the station into the land form.

7.24 Space for the plant rooms and motor rooms has been provided immediately below the platforms. They would therefore not be apparent from the station's plaza or other main customer vantage points. An outside plant area also occupies the space below the viaduct which would be screened from the station's service road, to the south, by louvres.

7.25 The difference in land level between the north and south sides of the Stop is approximately 7m which would mean the stop would be taller from the back of house service road than the west plaza. The southern elevation of the station Stop would form a continuation of the station podium. Around the Stop there is a small area required for maintenance access, however, this would only be visible from the station service road which will not be accessible for customers. Officers consider the design and external appearance of this Stop would sit comfortably alongside main Station and Western Plaza. By utilising the change in levels, much of the plant area would be hidden from the main vantage points and the platforms would be at grade. The plant rooms below would integrate well with the Station podium and back of house/service area. It is considered that this element of the proposals would preserve local environment and local amenity.

- NEC Stop

7.26 The NEC stop is located near to the main entrance of the NEC at the point where Pendigo Way meets Perimeter Road. Like the Birmingham International (BIRS) Stop, this Stop is also a through stop where two single tracks would sit either side of the central platform as it arrives from the west and south. At the point of entry into the Stop the viaduct would stand at approximately 12.7m in height (measured to the bottom of the deck). The Stop would have a length of approximately 49.2m (measured from either end of the lift/stair core) and a width of

approximately 9.6m (not including the viaduct). Both the lift and escape stair core at either end of the Stop would stand at approximately 23m tall and the plant room, that links the lift and stair core, at approximately 5.4m in height. The Stop would be open above the plant room.

7.27 The entrance to the NEC Stop faces onto Pendigo Way, which is the main access road leading to the NEC Plaza entrance. This Stop also faces towards the Moxy Hotel. Twin escalators lead directly from the ground level to the platform level with the elevator cores being positioned either side. Again, the platform arrangement is similar to those proposed at the other stops with an exposed structural portal frame and split canopies. The canopy is divided into three parts, with the middle 'ribbon' section raised above the platform canopies either side.

7.28 The escape stair and services riser are located at the western end of the platform. The plant rooms are located on the ground floor and extend for the entire length of the station Stop building.

7.29 In terms of public realm at the Stop frontage, the existing tessellated concrete block paving will be lifted and re-laid in order to tie into the finishes of the adjoining footways and maintain the appearance of Pendigo Way. The kerb line and dropped kerb will be realigned at the head of the service road to the north.

7.30 The hard landscaping around the foot of the escalators and lifts will be finished in concrete pavers. The new walkway serving back of house areas will be finished in tarmac. The two northern People Mover viaduct piers are within the existing parallel parking spaces along the perimeter road. These will be kerbed and the parking spaces will be re-provided in between the columns. The area to the south of the Stop will be levelled and grass-seeded. Seating will be provided either side of the escalator housing, in front of the lifts. Security bollards are proposed to be placed along the front of the entrance to the station which will form a continuous line with the NEC's security line.

7.31 The NEC Stop would be the highest stop due to the change in levels. This Stop would be dominated by the lift and escape stair cores at either end with the plant room at the bottom linking the two structures. The plant room would be open above.

7.32 Both the IDP and SMBC officers have raised concerns about the appearance of the three Stops that have raised platforms which includes the Stop at the NEC. In terms of the form and scale of the Stop, this is heavily influenced by the overall operational People Mover system and their platform height is influenced by the height of the viaduct at each location. Third party representations have questioned the size of the plant rooms needed at each stop due to the consequential visual impact.

7.33 The plant room is dictated by the cable pull system that is expected to be used and the design and external appearance of the building is assessed on this basis. The NEC Stop would be in a location that is dominated by large buildings including the NEC Exhibition halls, the Moxy Hotel, Resorts World and the Arena. An alternative drive system may afford opportunities to revisit the design and thus a

potential reduction in plant room size. However, the local planning authority has duty to consider what has been submitted and is of the view that the form and scale of the Stop at the NEC would not be considered out of context here and thus need not be modified under the grounds for consideration of this request.

7.34 The platforms at the NEC Stop are open sided to allow natural ventilation. Concerns have been raised by third parties about the impact of wind and rain on passengers who may be waiting at the Stops. This was considered during pre-submission stages. Given the service will operate every 3 minutes, the dwell time at each stop will be minimal. It was considered that open sided canopies would be preferable for customer experience and visual appearance given the short time that customers would be waiting. This also avoids the need for artificial heating/air conditioning/less lighting to the platform areas with the consequential advantage of to the sustainability credentials of the scheme.

7.35 Officers consider that the design could be improved via the use of alternative materials to those shown within the submission, namely the pressed aluminium panels. The IDP also raised a concern regarding the materials chosen, commenting that the pressed aluminium panels do not respond sympathetically to the scale of the buildings and may be vulnerable to damage at ground level. The panel encouraged exploration of different materials and textures that might be more sympathetic to the viaduct design and thus creating a cohesive whole. In general the panel sought the use of more subtle colours, better reflecting the naturalistic tones of the APM viaduct and the main station building.

7.36 Whilst the concept of a 'hierarchy of elements' was considered by the IDP to be the right approach, it recommended that further work be undertaken on the design of the Stops before they meet the aspirations of the HS2 Design Vision. The IDP considered that the small scale of the APM Stops could support more finely detailed design, with a more intimate quality. Any improvements could be secured through changes to materials, colour and textures by additional information through a condition. The IDP suggested this additional work could be carried out post Schedule 17 stage and HS2 have confirmed that the materiality of the stops will be developed at the next detailed design stage which will be explored in consultation with the Local Planning Authority and other stakeholders which would include the NEC, which will help to inform location specific material choices and colours etc.

7.37 The quality of the spaces between buildings is just as important as the buildings themselves and the IDP also raise concern over how the stops meet the ground and contribute to their surrounding context, including how the Stop entrances can be made more prominent. This is particularly pertinent to the NEC Stop given the use of the current space that connects a variety of different activities with areas where people often spend time in outdoor spaces i.e. by the lake. SMBC Landscape also shares these concerns. The IDP understands that the plans and aspirations of key stakeholders are not yet known but that a clear and robust vision for each Stop, similar to urban integration studies elsewhere along the route, will help drive and influence future conversations with stakeholders and allow a more cohesive and comprehensive design to emerge. It is acknowledged that this would extend beyond the 'red line' of the project and beyond the scope of this request. Therefore, similarly to the issues raised regarding materials, the IDP suggest this additional work be

carried out post Schedule 17 stage. Officers are content with this approach and it is considered that further details can be requested by condition, which has been agreed by HS2 Ltd, given the stop location is fixed with very little space available within the boundary line around the building.

7.38 Whilst modifications are required to materials and external finishes in the interests of preserving local environment and local amenity, the extent of the modifications is not considered to be integral to the design of the Stop buildings. It is thus considered that design and external appearance is reasonable capable of being so modified and this can be secured by condition. On this basis officers are satisfied that the design satisfactorily responds to its context and that the proposals would preserve the local environment and amenity.

- Birmingham International Railway Station Stop (BIRS)

7.39 The Birmingham International Station Stop would be located between the two levels of the car park (Network Rail Car Park and NEC West Car Park) adjacent to the main station, with the primary access to the existing station being from a pedestrian bridge link.

7.40 This Stop is a through stop with a central platform serving tracks either side which would be at a height of approximately 10m (to the bottom of the deck) on the NEC side. The viaduct is lower as it approaches from the Airport due to the change in land levels. The Stop would be approximately 47.7m in length and would be between approximately 6-7.5m in width and would predominantly be finished in a mixture of profiled perforated metal panels, profiled solid metal panels and metal louvered cladding around the plant room. The section between the mezzanine level and the platforms would not be filled in to the sides, with the platform canopies being visible. The Platform arrangement at this Stop would have the structural portal frame exposed and split into canopies. The height of the Stop varies due to the change in levels and would be between approximately 15.7m and 17.7m.

7.41 The pedestrian bridge linking the Stop to BIRS would be an elevated structure, with the bottom of the structure being approximately 5.7m above ground level, with balustrades on both sides and it connects with the main concourse of the station through a mezzanine floor of the People Mover Stop. There are escalators connecting the mezzanine to the platform level which would be located centrally on the platform. The fire escape walkway continues past the escalators and connects the link bridge to the escape stair. Lifts are located at the eastern end of the Stop.

7.42 Plant is located between the lift cores and the riser similar to other stops. External and internal plant rooms are located next to one another, forming one continuous block with access to either side of the building.

7.43 The Stop is located within an existing band of semi-mature self-seeded trees and undergrowth between the NEC and the lower Network Rail car parks. All of the existing vegetation within the boundary of this station Stop will need to be removed in order to facilitate construction operations. Whilst tree loss will be mitigated for, HS2 have indicated that these will not be replaced within the proposal boundary

7.44 There is a level difference between the car parks of approximately 2m. Currently there is a pond in the location of the Stop which will need to be relocated on site. Car parking spaces in the lower car park (Network Rail) will be lost as a result of the building's maintenance access requirements on the ground floor. 13 car parking spaces in total would be lost with the re-provision of the pond and landscaped slopes. Some of the car parking will be re-configured to address this loss, as the current layout is not as efficient as it could be. The final reinstatement of spaces will need to be agreed with Network Rail during the detailed design stage.

7.45 The rear of the Stop, when viewed from the NEC surface car park, would appear approximately 2m taller due to the existing levels change. Welded gabion baskets are proposed adjacent to the Stop to create a retaining structure where the levels change, which offer a green engineering solution.

7.46 It is expected that those alighting or joining the People Mover at this Stop will all use the pedestrian bridge link from the existing BIRS concourse. For this reason, HS2 have advised that the hard landscape treatment around the base of this Stop has been kept to a minimum as the public are not expected to use these areas. Given the Stop's location within existing car parking areas which are dominated by hardstanding, this is not considered unreasonable.

7.47 In addition to the concerns already discussed regarding Stop platforms being open to the elements, third party representations have raised concerns about the pedestrian bridge linking the Stop to BIRS and thus creating a somewhat substandard environment. The bridge would provide for a canopy but the sides would be left open. This would allow for natural ventilation and light which for a short distance is not considered unreasonable although it is understood that during inclement weather this may not be desirable. Given that none of the stops are fully integrated into any of their destinations, officers are of the opinion that this is no different to alighting at the NEC and undertaking the short walk to one of the attractions at that location.

7.48 The concerns about materiality discussed earlier in terms of external appearance also apply to the Stop at BIRS. Given the car park setting of this Stop, with the BIRS multi-storey car park being close by, the design and external appearance of the building is considered wholly appropriate subject to the condition previously discussed to request further details on materials/external finishes of the building. On this basis officers are satisfied that the design and external appearance satisfactorily responds to its context and that the proposals would preserve the local environment and local amenity.

- Birmingham Airport Stop

7.49 The People Mover would terminate at the Airport. The viaduct, which would stand at approximately 8.1m in height (to the bottom of the deck), comes in on the side facing the airfield and the Stop and would be located immediately adjacent the terminal building, opposite Diamond House on the other side of the Comet Road. The Airport Stop would be approximately 59.8m in length (including the escalatory canopy); approximately 14.4m in width (including the viaduct and escalator); and approximately 15.5m in height at its tallest part. The Stop would mostly be clad in a profiled solid metal panel with a light champagne satin finish, with the exception of

the platforms which, apart from the balustrading, would be open to the canopy that would allow some natural light through. The Stop would be accessed either via an escalator located along the Stop's façade or lifts, the entrances to which would be located on the north western elevation adjacent to the arrivals entrance of the terminal buildings. The escalator proposed would feature perforated, patterned metal screen to its elevation, and a canopy in the indicative colour chosen for that Stop, and would overhang the pedestrian walk way below.

7.50 The main canopy would be divided into three sections. The central section above the circulation area would be raised. The section facing Trident Road would extend down to form the roof of the escalator enclosure and entrance canopy. The third section, airport side, would sit above the platform.

7.51 This Stop has the system motor room located within the building, below the platform and viaduct, and plant rooms are located on the ground floor with access from the area below the viaduct. The height of the viaduct is determined by the clearance height needed for roads or structures along the route that it passes. On its approach to the Airport it has to cross the roundabout at Airport Way and also Comet Road which means it is not possible to drop the viaduct down to pavement level at this stop. The escape stair is located at the southern end of the stop.

7.52 The Airport Stop also requires ancillary works to allow for the realignment of road layout. Comet Road will be re-aligned to meet Concorde Road providing the same level of existing access. The proposed barrier on the re-aligned Comet Road replicates the existing access restriction and a security line, including bollards, will also be provided. British Transport Police and Airport Operations car parking, to replace the area currently used for emergency vehicles, is proposed to the south east of the Stop which will be discussed under the Vehicle Road Park section below.

7.53 In response to third party representations about the lack of integration and physical connection between the Airport Stop and the Airport terminal building. HS2 note that the Hybrid Bill/ES design to connect to the Stop into the Airport terminal building would have created significantly more disruption to the Airport's operations than the scheme now proposed. The Stop as submitted is considered to be well located for access to the terminal buildings. HS2 Ltd confirm that the Stop has been developed in conjunction with the Airport to make sure the Stop and the proposed public realm does not impact on the Airport's future plans. The Airport does not object to the proposed design approach as submitted, and both parties confirm agreement to separate the People Mover from their terminal building to minimise disturbance to the terminal building.

7.54 Birmingham Airport have raised concern about how the Stop would limit existing views of the terminal, associated infrastructure and signage which could reduce legibility and amenity for Airport users of this area. This would only be the case for customers arriving at the Airport using the covered pedestrian walkway, who will have to wait until they have passed the HS2 stop before arriving at the airport forecourt. HS2 Ltd confirm that wayfinding has been an important consideration in the development of the Airport Stop concept with the detailed development of wayfinding proposals being carried out at the detailed design stage in consultation with Birmingham Airport via the stakeholder engagement process.

7.55 The submitted permanent works design includes reinstatement of a covered walkway underneath the viaduct but terminates when it reaches the Stop and does not extend around the eastern side of the Stop., This situation is not materially different to the existing arrangement in this area as there is currently an open air section of walkway outside the terminal building and therefore it is not considered reasonable that this element of the proposals be modified. While the provision of canopies can be explored between HS2 Ltd and BIA in the future, as required by them, the design as submitted is considered to preserve local environment and local amenity notwithstanding any future plans for further canopy provision. The passenger routing of a wide path around the stop building provides a route that remains segregated from vehicle traffic on a route that is clearly defined. Once customers arrive at the end of the walkway the airport terminals and associated infrastructure will be clear just as it is when customers leave the existing covered walkway.

7.56 As is the case with the NEC and BIRS Stops officers consider that the design and external appearance of the Airport Stop could be improved by the use of alternative materials to those shown within the submission. In terms of the Airport Stop officers consider that alternative materials could better relate to the design and choice of high quality materials used at the airport, thus presenting as an extension of a gateway to and from the airport and beyond. In general the panel sought the use of more subtle colours, better reflecting the naturalistic tones of the APM viaduct and the main station building.

7.57 With regard to concerns about the appearance of the buildings, any improvements could be secured through changes to materials, colour and textures. The IDP suggested this additional work could be carried out post Schedule 17 stage and HS2 have confirmed that the materiality of the stops will be developed at the next detailed design stage which will be explored in consultation with the Local Planning Authority and other stakeholders - notably, the NEC, BIRS and Birmingham Airport, which will help to inform location specific material choices and colours etc. At officers' request, the applicants have provided indicative potential options as to how the Stops could be changed to improve their appearance. The submitted information shows different cladding materials for the exterior of the building which would add different textures. The option of a weathering steel panel rather than pressed aluminium shows how the use of different colour and finish to the escalator canopy could soften the appearance of the buildings, whilst also linking it to the viaduct. Whilst this detail will come forward during the detailed design stage, these options do at least demonstrate how the change in materials and colours used could achieve a much improved appearance to the Stops. Similarly with the NEC and BIRS Stops, officers are satisfied that these modifications can be secured by attaching an appropriately worded planning condition to any consent at this stage. In terms of preserving local environment and amenity of the open space around the Airport Stop, it is considered that additional details can be secured by condition to ensure improvement in materials/external finishes used.

7.58 This will allow the flexibility to develop the detailed design of the Stop with the Airport to potentially deliver a bespoke design solution, and integrate the public

realm around it with a changing environment such as the Airport's security measures.

7.59 The Airport Stop would introduce a striking feature within the Airport landscape. Its bulk and massing is governed by the length of platform and the need for adequate height for the viaduct to clear existing roads which are in close proximity to the airport and thus a short distance available to allow the viaduct to drop down significantly in height. Given the context of the Airport, whose character is dominated by very large buildings, including terminals, office blocks, hotels, and multi-storey car park, which are significantly larger than the proposed stop, the form of the proposed Stop is not considered unacceptable in this context. Subject to further consideration of materials and public realm, to be agreed by condition, this Stop is considered appropriate in its context. On this basis officers are satisfied that design satisfactorily responds to its context and that the proposals would preserve the local environment and amenity.

- Maintenance Facility

7.60 The Maintenance Facility is proposed to the east of the M42 motorway and would sit alongside the new viaduct. This is in a different location to the scheme considered in the ES which was proposed to be located south-west of the Interchange Station set in a shallow cutting and accessed via a road from East Way. This alternative location, which remains within the LoD as defined by the Act, has been chosen by HS2 Ltd so to minimise impacts on land-take, surrounding landscape and community.

7.61 Third party concerns, as well as that from North Warwickshire Borough Council, have been raised in relation to the design of the depot which has been described as being at odds to its rural setting, due to its angular nature, isolated location and being of no architectural merit. North Warwickshire Borough council also comment that the building should be treated as extension to main station building. The DAS that supports the request for approval explains that the depot takes its inspiration from the industrial landscape of the West Midlands in its primacy as the birth place of industrial revolution. The building consists of three main elements – the maintenance bay, plant and the enclosed escape stair. The access track for People Mover carriages to enter the facility is located at the eastern end of the building. The DAS explains that architecturally, the concept is for the form to follow the function, with each functional element given appropriate architectural treatment. The maintenance bay has an iconic saw tooth profile, which up until the latter part of the 20th century formed a familiar sight on the horizon in the area with reference to the Triumph motorcycle factory in nearby Meriden. This is visually reinforced by breaking the length of the façade into distinct bays, which are further articulated by the use of standing seam cladding set at an angle

7.62 Officers are of the view that the design and appearance of this new building, has been well considered. The saw tooth profile reflects the type of manufacturing building that would have once been present in the landscape and adds interest and articulation to what is otherwise a functional building. The materials indicated, which can be secured by condition, would be high quality and would also help articulate the building further. Part of the depot is first floor only creating a canopy which allows for

part of the service yard to be underneath which helps to keep service activities within the footprint of the depot.

7.63 SMBC Landscape raised concern about how the building meets the ground given the rural setting and the impact on the surrounding local amenity, landscape and ecology of the area and how any negative impacts such as severance and the fragmentation of habitats might be further avoided or mitigated. Officers note that whilst this building and associated infrastructure may not reflect its current immediate setting, when read with the M42, A45 and new Interchange Station, the Maintenance Facility becomes a logical part of this grouping of infrastructure.

7.64 The Hybrid bill scheme noted that the depot which was to be located to the south of the Interchange station would have been set in a shallow cutting with an access road off the East Way. The Maintenance Depot would now appear in a visually more prominent position in the landscape. Whilst the revised position would have a greater visual impact particularly when travelling on the M42, as it straddles a field boundary, located on the edge (but outside) of the Hollywell Brook floodplain, officers consider it to have much less of an impact on the environment given the proximity of the original location to the Hollywell Brook. Furthermore, the IDP considered that the design of the facility works well.

7.65 The loss of existing trees due to the Maintenance Facility building and access route is shown to be offset by the proposal to plant a new stand of approximately 2500sqm of native trees to the south east of the new building. The information submitted with the request for approval indicates that species selection will follow the guidelines of Warwickshire County Council's Arden parklands document with predominantly Oak/Birch mix on the higher slopes and Alder, Willow and Poplar moving into the flood plain of the Hollywell Brook. An under storey of Midland Hawthorn, Dogwood and Hazel is shown as being provided and the area seeded with a locally relevant hedge bottom wildflower mix. Landscape planting details, insofar as they qualify as earthworks, are indicative at this stage and will come forward through a 'Bringing into Use' Schedule 17 request for approval. For these reasons officers are satisfied that the design and external appearance of the maintenance facility satisfactorily responds to its context and that the proposals would preserve the local environment and amenity with no need for modification.

- Sustainability (in relation to new buildings)

7.66 One of HS2's strategic goals is 'to design, construct and operate HS2 to reduce carbon and promote sustainability sourced resources.'

7.67 Sustainable design principles have underpinned the refinement of the people mover design. Embodied carbon reduction, which offers one of the most significant opportunities when considering sustainable buildings, is promoted within the design. The design adopts efficient structural elements to minimise the use of natural resources, and material specifications will promote the use of sustainable materials and local sourcing wherever possible.

7.68 Climate change Adaptation and Resilience has been considered as part of the design work, in particular, the potential changes in climate variables with respect to the viaduct, highways, buildings, drainage and MEP aspects of the people mover.

7.69 The applicant has demonstrated their commitment to sustainable development which runs through the heart of this request and this is secured by condition relating to approved plans and by HS2's commitment to compliance with their sustainability policy as outlined within the Environmental Memorandum of EMRs. Officers are content that the proposal is therefore compliant with the objectives of the NPPF 2019.

- Overview of the design and external appearance of building works on local environment and local amenity

7.70 In summary, officers concur with the views of the IDP, who consider design and external appearance of the APM viaduct and maintenance facility are successful, and both promise to meet the aspirations of the HS2 Design Vision. Options have been provided that demonstrate how the Stops could be improved so to meet the HS2 Design Vision. Fulfilling this potential will also depend on detailed design, materials and construction to deliver the quality promised in the Schedule 17 request for approval. Whilst modifications are required to materials and external finishes in the interests of preserving local environment and amenity, the extent of the modifications is not considered to be integral to the design of the Stop buildings. It is thus considered that design and external appearance is reasonably capable of being so modified and this can be secured by condition. On this basis officers are satisfied that the viaduct alignment and design satisfactorily responds to its context and that the proposals would preserve the local environment and amenity.

7.71 In relation to the second matter under this paragraph, for building works, it falls to be considered:

Whether the design or external appearance of the building works ought to be modified

To prevent or reduce prejudicial effects on road safety or on the free flow of traffic in the local area

7.72 The ES supporting the Act contained a detailed Transport Assessment (TA). Impacts from construction traffic were considered as part of this TA.

7.73 Highways England and SMBC Highways make no objections to the proposed scheme, with matters of interest covered by separate schedules, and officers are satisfied that the new buildings would not cause undue harm to road safety or on the free flow of traffic in the local area.

7.74 In relation to the third matter under this paragraph, for building works, it falls to be considered:

Whether the design or external appearance of the building works ought to be modified

To preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest or nature conservation value

- Archaeology

7.75 HS2 Ltd has confirmed that archaeological evaluation of the site was undertaken in 2019. This evaluation opened 298 trenches along the route and was preceded by desk-based research and nonintrusive survey work. A total area of 29,800sqm, approximately 2% sample of the evaluation area, was trenched. The evaluation demonstrated that the majority of the evaluation area was dominated by the remains of medieval to post-medieval ridge and furrow and associated field boundary ditches. Large areas of the evaluation showed extensive levels of modern made ground, likely associated with construction of nearby major roads. A small number of isolated pits were also excavated, one of which produced Late Bronze Age pottery and a small quantity of heat affected stones. However, in the northern half of the evaluation area, in Area B, a small group of medium sized pits in a linear arrangement was revealed.

7.76 A total area of approximately 2000sqm was opened as an additional area of evaluation to further investigate the area around the pits; revealing them to be part of an east-west orientated pit alignment.

7.77 The pits ranged from between approximately 0.5m and 2m in diameter and the alignment extended for a length of nearly 100m. Towards the west, the alignment was seen to change from a single row to a double row of pits. No artefacts were recovered from any of the fills. Environmental samples were taken and some material suitable for radiocarbon dating was recovered. Based on the morphology of this feature it is likely of Bronze Age or Early Iron Age date.

7.78 Liaison with both the local planning authority archaeologists and Historic England has been undertaken regularly in relation to the works at Bickenhill (including within the Triangle site). Stakeholders have been consulted during the production of the project plans for archaeological works and also in discussions on the need and scope for any further works following the completion of the evaluation. SMBC Archaeology have confirmed that they have no comments to make on the request.

- Heritage Assets

7.79 In terms of impact of heritage assets, the nearest heritage asset of significance is Park Farm (grade 2* listed) but that will be separated from the APM by the Interchange Station and a significantly increased distance (since Hybrid Bill) because of the new site of the depot near to the M42. No cumulative impacts upon the setting of Park Farm will be evident.

7.80 The main impact of the People Mover in terms of heritage is therefore upon the (undesigned) general historic landscape character which includes Middle Bickenhill Lane and the surviving historic cottages along that route. The cottages and the lane itself represent the remains of the lost mediaeval settlement of Middle

Bickenhill, with Park Farm probably at the site of the lost settlement of Hill Bickenhill. The viaduct and its piers appear sufficiently well considered and detailed to avoid creating any unexpected visual impacts. IDP considers these elegant and SMBC Heritage Assets agree. The station stops will be more distant from the Middle Bickenhill group and very much related to and merging with the station itself and the west car park.

7.81 Again, the contrasting appearance of the maintenance facility, with heritage assets nearby, will be justified by the high quality of materials and finishes, the detail of which can be secured by condition, to ensure a building that clearly appears carefully conceived and very well detailed whatever the view of its actual form and massing. Ensuring that its compound and yards are free of stored items, additional storage containers and other associated bulky items will allow the viaduct and piers to have their intended dramatic impact in the landscape. Regardless of which submission and decision process secures the proposed landscaping along its access road and south of the yard, it is critical that this is achieved and remains carefully maintained to screen some views of the engineered road and yard.

7.82 In response to the concerns raised by Birmingham Airport regarding the potential impact on Grade II listed Elmdon terminal building, due to the distances involved between this building and the airport stop, as well the intervening runway and other infrastructure, it is considered that the People Mover will have little, if any, impact on this heritage asset.

- Nature Conservation

7.83 In terms of the impact of the proposed building works and associated public realm on nature conservation sites, there are existing features of ecological value within the area that will be affected by construction at both ground level and at height. This includes the County Local Wildlife Site Holywell Brook which is crossed by the viaduct. The viaduct also crosses over Pendigo Lake.

7.84 HS2 Ltd confirm that the area of land (that within the blue line) that is covered by this Schedule 17 Request for Approval has been classified as low ecological value because they mainly comprise hardstanding or cultivated arable land with quarry voids, former landfills and backfilled borrow pits (from the M42 construction). HS2 Ltd confirm that the low ecological value has been verified by a suitably qualified ecologist through the self-assurance process under the EMR's. With regards to the Holywell Brook, which HS2 Ltd acknowledge is of ecological value, the scheme has been designed to minimise disturbance to these features by avoiding the pond by Middle Bickenhill Lane; not siting the viaduct columns in the water course; and proposing a slightly larger span between them so that only one support sits within the 1/1000 year flood plain.

7.85 With regard to the impact on Holywell Brook, HS2 Ltd advise that a Water Framework Directive impact assessment for the viaduct was undertaken during the Hybrid Bill. The assessment also concluded that, with the mandatory implementation of the Code of Construction Practice (part of HS2's EMRs), the construction of the People Mover would have a negligible effect to the Holywell Brook.

7.86 In relation to the impact on nature conservation value, HS2 Ltd assert that under the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) governing the HS2 project, impacts which have been assessed in the ES will not be exceeded and that the Station Design Service Contractor (SDSC) has assessed the impact of the Schedule 17 and reserved matters scheme design against the ES assessment and have concluded that there will be no worsening of effects. The local planning authority has not been party to this self-assurance exercise.

7.87 Whilst SMBC Ecology raise no objection to the plans and specifications as submitted under this Schedule 17 request, SMBC Ecology offer no comment on the appropriateness of landscape and ecological mitigation measures in terms of impact on protected species, without sight of up to date baseline survey information, which HS2 Ltd have declined to provide, given the reliance on EMRs to secure a scheme that has no worsening effects above that identified within the ES assessment. However, given that planting details under this Schedule 17 request for approval is submitted for indicative purposes only, being a matter that will be considered via a future 'Bringing into Use' schedule 17 request for approval, it is not considered fundamental to the determination of this schedule 17 request for approval that such survey information is submitted for consideration at this time.

7.88 Natural England have considered the proposals and note HS2 Ltd's confirmation that the ES completed for the scheme considered all aspects of the proposals cumulatively, which demonstrated that the potential impact upon the special interests of nearby nationally protected sites, the River Blythe SSSI and Coleshill and Bannerley Pools SSSI, would not be adversely affected by the proposals. Natural England's understanding is that HS2 Ltd have a legal commitment to the works remaining within the established Environmental Minimum Requirements for the proposal. Given information provided by HS2 that prior assessment found only a 'negligible' impact to the sites expected – thereby establishing the EMR – and that this impact is to be mitigated via commitment to stringent construction management practices, Natural England raise no objection to the submitted plans and specifications.

7.89 On the basis of the above, officers consider that sufficient information has been submitted with this request for approval to enable consideration of the impact of the proposed design or appearance of building works on nature consideration interests. The potential impact of the proposals, including during construction, on nature consideration interests is controlled through EMRs and the Local Planning Authority will be afforded the opportunity of further consideration of the appropriateness of landscape and ecological mitigation through the submission of details accompanying future a 'bringing into use' request for approval. The plans and specifications as submitted with this request for approval are therefore considered to be acceptable in relation to the impact of the proposed in relation to the design and external appearance of building works, without modification.

7.90 The Environment Agency raise no objection to the plans and specifications pertinent to this request for approval, confirming that the primary impacts of the APM building works will be on Pendigo Lake. Protection of this area will be considered at the appropriate time through the Schedule 33 of the HS2 Act.

7.91 It is therefore considered that the proposed design and external appearance of the building works are acceptable, without modification, to ensure preservation of sites of archaeological, historic interest and nature conservation.

7.92 With regard to the fourth matter under this paragraph, for building works, it falls to be considered:

Whether the development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.

7.93 The limits of the APM are explicitly defined within the Act. Whilst changes have been made since the Hybrid Bill the current scheme remains within the Act limits and delivers the infrastructure required by the Act.

7.94 In so far as meeting what can be considered under this request, the new buildings are, subject to conditions, considered wholly appropriate in terms of their impact on amenity, highway safety, archaeology, historic assets and nature conservation sites.

7.95 Third parties note the opportunities provided by the HS2 Interchange Station in providing a catalyst for growth of the wider site area, however, concerns have been raised that the scheme does not adequately support the vision of the wider area as envisaged within the UGC UKC Hub Framework Plan (Section 2.4) including facilitating enabling infrastructure to allow early delivery of the future development of the surrounding site adjacent and in the vicinity of the station with particular reference to the west of the trace before HS2 becomes operational.

7.96 The UGC have raised concerns about the route alignment and location of the Stop at BIRS. The UGC is working to ensure the full economic potential of BIRS and its immediate surroundings and seeks to ensure that the UK Central Hub is not sterilised or prejudiced. The UGC consider that the general arrangement of the People Mover route alignment should be modified to maximise opportunities for future development at BIRS. The UGC also consider that the route and Stop at BIRS could be located elsewhere within the HS2 safeguarded land.

7.97 HS2 Ltd has legally binding agreements in place with stakeholders and partners, through its U&As, which form part of the EMRs under the HS2 Act, including commitments that HS2 Ltd will work with partners to facilitate in delivering the UK Central Hub Vision,. HS2 Ltd note that they have been actively involved in the project to develop BIRS over the last few years and they support the aspirations for this area in terms of improving connectivity and stimulating new development. This area of work relates to a parallel scheme, for which a Design Funding Agreement (DFA) is in place to secure the work moving forward. The purpose of the DFA is to provide an over-arching agreement so that SMBC / UGC can request individual pieces of design development to be undertaken by HS2. Each item was colloquially known as an 'Outcome'. At the time of signing the DFA, there were 7 specific 'Outcomes' that SMBC and UGC had identified, including;

- changes to the local road network

- conduits to allow additional utilities to cross the railway
- amendments to the alignment of the Automated People Mover

7.98 HS2 Ltd identify work undertaken in March/April 2020 between HS2 Ltd and the UGC, to sift alignment options for the people mover at BIRS, which concluded that the base scheme is the most suitable in delivering HS2's project requirements, with all alternative alignments being worse off when considering the sift criteria of the construction, environmental and operational aspects of the project.

7.99 The alternative suggestions raised by the UGC with regards to the potential alternatives at BIRS are not deliverable at the current time as this would require a consented scheme to be in place for the BIRS redevelopment. No planning applications have been submitted to the Council for the redevelopment scheme. . Officers consider that the approval of the submitted plans and specifications would not preclude future adaptations or changes to respond to future development plans, subject to obtaining necessary approval, including compliance with relevant local and national planning policies. As such, it is not considered reasonable to request modifications to the location of the BIRS Stop and viaduct alignment.

7.100 Third parties raise concern in relation to passenger experience while using the APM, notably in relation to walking distances and levels at Birmingham Airport Stop and the provision of a single platform at Interchange Stop, noting that two would afford more efficient boarding and disembarking from the APM. Third parties also comment that IDP did not consider the function of the APM in their assessment of the proposals.

7.101 With regard to the above third party representations, it is not considered that the proposals as tabled under this submission would adversely affect/injure the local environment or amenity or to prevent or reduce prejudicial road safety of traffic flow effects. In accordance with paragraph 7 of High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Act 2017 Schedule 17 Statutory Guidance Statutory Guidance, the experience of a passenger in a building and/or the operational efficiency of a building, in this instance, would not be material to the decision by the local planning authority. The proposal as tabled is therefore considered to be acceptable. Subject to conditions the proposals ensure that the scheme is delivered in accordance with the scope of the scheme authorised under the Act without requiring modification to the location of the new buildings and it is not considered that the development ought to be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.

Matters for consideration under paragraph 3 of Schedule 17 – Other Construction Works

7.102 With regard to matters for consideration under this paragraph 'Other Construction Works', involve Road Vehicle Parks; Earthworks, Fences and Walls; and Lighting. Each will be considered in turn below.

- Road Vehicle Parks

7.103 A car parking area is proposed at the Maintenance Facility with a new access road from Bickenhill Lane. 9 car parking spaces are proposed including one blue badge bay.

7.104 Works to reconfigure existing highways arrangements around the Airport are included in the submission which include the widening of Concorde Road to connect to Comet Road to allow for queuing of taxis and buses. British Transport Police and Airport Operations car parking accommodating 10 spaces is proposed to the south east of the stop.

7.105 Minor alterations are proposed to the existing car parking area at BIRS with a loss of 15 existing spaces. The car parking around the new stop will be re-configured to ensure the most efficient use of the existing space available.

7.106 Parking for maintenance vehicles is provided for the Interchange Station Stop in a lay-by adjacent to the proposed Interchange Station 'back of house' road. Adjacent maintenance vehicle parking for other Stops is already available.

7.107 With regard to the first matter under this paragraph, for road vehicle parks, it falls to be assessed:

Whether the design or external appearance of the works ought to be modified

To preserve local environment/amenity

7.108 The new car parking area and road re-alignment at Birmingham Airport would assist to consolidate an area that has been subject to much adaptation over the years due to changes in security requirements.

7.109 With regard to these alterations outside the terminal forecourt Birmingham Airport requested a condition that a Threat and Vulnerability Risk Assessment (TVRA), Vehicle Dynamics Assessment (VDA) and a Fire Strategy be submitted prior to development commencing. HS2 Ltd note that both a TVRA and Fire Strategy have been developed to inform the scheme design submitted for Schedule 17 approval. At this stage the proposed alterations to the defensive line and road layout have been based on the current road layout with flexibility built in to adjust to future changes so far as practicable. Whilst these matters are not relevant under Schedule 17, the importance of safety and security to the airport is acknowledged by HS2 Ltd.

7.110 Given the nature of the Airport Environment and BIRS, no objections are raised to the car parking areas proposed at these locations. Whilst the Maintenance Depot is in a more rural area, it is acknowledged that car parking is required and the design approach, so that it sits parallel with the access drive, is considered suitable. Landscaping is shown in the indicative environment mitigation plans which would help to soften the appearance of this in the long term.

7.111 The impact of the new parking areas are considered acceptable on local environment and amenity.

7.112 With regard to the second matter under this paragraph, for road vehicle parks, it falls to be considered:

Whether the design or external appearance of the works ought to be modified

To prevent or reduce prejudicial effects on road safety or on the free flow of traffic in the local area, or

7.113 The alterations to the car park layout at BIRS would result in the loss of 15 spaces. It is not intended for these spaces to be provided elsewhere. However the existing car parking will be configured to make the best use of the space available. This will be done at the detailed design stage in conjunction with Network Rail. Given the significant number of spaces available, the loss of this small number is considered negligible and Network Rail have not objected to the proposals.

7.114 The car parking areas proposed are not considered to unduly impact on road safety or on the free flow of traffic in the local area.

7.115 With regard to the third matter under this paragraph, for road vehicle parks, it falls to be considered:

Whether the design or external appearance of the works ought to be modified

To preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest or nature conservation value

7.116 There are no archaeological impacts over those considered above, in relation to building works.

7.117 With regard to the fourth matter under this paragraph, for road vehicle parks, it falls to be considered:

That the development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.

7.118 The new car park locations are all suitably located in terms of the uses that they serve and are also of an appropriate size, given the limited space available for road vehicle parking within the Act Limits. The proposals ensure that that the scheme delivered in accordance with the scope of the scheme authorised under the Act, whilst affording the Local Planning Authority an appropriate level of control over the works, while not unduly delaying or adding cost to the project. It is not considered that any of the road vehicle parks proposed ought to be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.

- Earthworks

7.119 There are various localised earthworks across the length of the proposed People Mover with the most significant being embankments to the north and west of the Interchange Station stop and to realignment of highways or new roads ancillary to new buildings. The earthworks at the BIRS Stop also include the

filling in of an existing attenuation pond and providing a replacement adjacent to the BIRS station stop. A further attenuation pond is proposed at the Maintenance Facility.

7.120 With regard to the first matter for under this paragraph, for earthworks, it falls to be considered:

Whether the design or external appearance of the works ought to be modified

To preserve local environment/amenity

7.121 The extent of these earthworks are minor in comparison to the wider station site and would assist to tie in the development into the landscaping proposed as part of the interchange Station itself. The impact of these earthworks on local environment and amenity are considered wholly acceptable given their contexts.

7.122 With regard to the second matter under this paragraph, for earthworks, it falls to be considered:

Whether the design or external appearance of the works ought to be modified

To prevent or reduce prejudicial effects on road safety or on the free flow of traffic in the local area, or

7.123 There would be no highway impacts as a result of the earthworks as they are not located close to existing public highways.

7.124 With regard to the third matter under this paragraph, for earthworks, it falls to be considered:

Whether the design or external appearance of the works ought to be modified

To preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest or nature conservation value

7.125 There are no archaeological impacts over those considered above, in relation to building works.

7.126 With regard to the fourth matter under this paragraph, for earthworks, if the the development does not form part of a Scheduled work, it falls to be considered whether :

The development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.

7.127 All earthworks with regard to this application relate to the scheduled work identified within Act and therefore further consideration of whether the earthworks ought to be carried out elsewhere is not applicable.

- Fences or Walls

7.128 The Maintenance Facility would be fully bounded by a Security Fence in accordance with HS2 Ltd security requirements. This also includes a sliding security vehicle gate to the Facility with motorised opening and access control.

7.129 Security bollards are proposed at certain stops, notably at the airport and the NEC and security fencing is proposed around the balancing pond at Birmingham International Railway Station. Road restraint system barriers around the viaduct columns next to the M42 motorway slip road are also proposed.

7.130 The following ground is relevant for consideration of fences or walls:

Whether the development ought to, and could reasonably, be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits.

7.131 Whilst HS2 Ltd have provided details on what height and type the fencing/security bollards likely to be at each location, their appearance or justification of need for them are not grounds for consideration unless it was considered that an alternative location could have less of an amenity impact, for example.

7.132 The security bollards at Birmingham Airport and NEC are the structures that will have the most visual impact and this is linked to the references above regarding the space around the stop buildings. Given the very small space around each station stop that the applicants have to work with, the location of security bollards is considered appropriate. It also provides a clear boundary between the small areas of public realm and the adjacent highways.

7.133 The fencing details submitted are considered acceptable and thus it is not considered that the development ought to be carried out elsewhere within development's permitted limits.

- Lighting Equipment

7.134 The following ground is relevant to the consideration of Lighting Equipment:

Whether the design of the equipment, with respect to the emission of light, ought to, and could reasonably, be modified to preserve the local environment or local amenity.

7.135 Lighting will be required at the stops and maintenance facility. HS2 Ltd advise that it is not currently proposed to illuminate the viaduct itself.

7.136 The DAS notes that the Maintenance Facility has been designed to maximise the benefits of natural light. External lighting columns would be integrated with the fencing around the site so to create a safety environment.

7.137 At the Stops, escape stairs, lifts and escalators will all need to be illuminated with fittings proposed to be incorporated into the building. Whilst details of external lighting have not been provided, such details not being developed until

detailed design stage, it is considered reasonable that such detail can be secured via the imposition of an appropriately worded condition to secure details of luminaries including, lux levels and any column types, in the interests of securing an acceptable level of light emission emanating from proposed new lighting, and thus the preservation of the local environment and local amenity.

7.138 All lighting with regard to this application relates to the scheduled work identified within Act and therefore further consideration of whether the earthworks ought to be carried out elsewhere within the development's permitted limits is not applicable.

Other matters

- Accessibility

7.139 In response to the third party comments made regarding the size of the lifts, HS2 Ltd advise that they have been sized based on detailed passenger demand modelling to estimate the numbers of passengers using the lifts and to enable fully inclusive accessibility in accordance with industry standards and guidance. The modelling has also considered the mix of passengers at the Airport and the mix of baggage carried. The sizes allow use by the anticipated numbers of Persons of Restricted Mobility, including wheelchair users and people with luggage or prams. Where practicable the lifts have been designed as 'through' lifts to avoid the need for users to turn around within the lift. Where this is not possible wider lifts have been used to allow for unaided turning. At all stops multiple lifts have been provided to ensure resilience in the event of a lift failure or closure of a lift for maintenance.

- Capacity

7.140 Concerns have been raised by third parties, about capacity. The People Mover has been designed around a 4 unit operation with allowance for variations in carriage configurations for various suppliers. HS2 Ltd has undertaken work to determine the optimum design solution for the People Mover and this has been informed by technical analysis and the systematic testing of different potential options. Following the HS2 Act a People Mover Technical Working Group was established as a regular forum between the design team and stakeholders with an interest of interface with People Mover. Members of this working group included SMBC, UGC, NEC, Birmingham Airport, Arden Cross, TfWM, Genting Solihull Ltd, Birmingham City Council, Highways England, Network Rail and Midland Metro Alliance. Amongst the key themes considered by the working group was forecast passenger demand and feedback was used to influence aspects of the design including the passenger demand modelling that informed the capacity and configuration of the infrastructure and the location of the viaduct columns along the route.

7.141 There are a number of key operational requirements which the People Mover is required to meet and these have been key to the design, which include:

- Maximum 3 minute interval between trains;
- Minimum capacity of 2,100 people per hour per direction; and
- Maximum end to end journey time of 6 minutes

7.142 Scalability can be accommodated up to a certain level within the current design through the upgrading of rolling stock and subject to some minor modifications needed to the people mover stops. There is allowance for increase in future capacity from surrounding stakeholders but primarily the system has been designed to meet the requirements and growth of HS2. Connectivity

7.143 Third party concerns have been received regarding the route and lack of pedestrian/cycle path alongside the viaduct to provide an alternative to using the APM. However, the People Mover Route is confined to land within the Act Limits which is what has been approved. The People Mover, as a Schedule 1 work, did not specify a pedestrian/cycle path link to be provided also.

7.144 Connectivity of the wider Interchange Station site is included within the Schedule 17 request for approval for the Station.

- Drainage

7.145 The detailed drainage design, supported by further investigations as may be required, will form the basis of any necessary subsequent submissions to be made under Schedule 33 of the Act. The applicants confirm that in advance of finalisation of the detailed drainage design and in the context of this Plans and Specifications submission, the overall drainage strategy and principles for the viaduct, and the associated stops and maintenance facility, has been discussed with the Environment Agency and SMBC as the Local Lead Flood Authority.

7.146 Third party representations seek assurances that Pendigo Lake levels are not impacted, with consequential adverse impact to existing drainage systems which discharge directly into the lake.

7.147 The Environment Agency have confirmed that they have begun detailed pre submission discussions with the applicant with regard to the potential impacts on Pendigo Lake. They confirm that they will seek to ensure sufficient protection through powers afforded under schedule 33 of the HS2 Act. No objections are raised by this Schedule 17 submission. SMBC drainage also have no objection to the proposals given that the detailed drainage designs and calculations will be covered by a future Schedule 33 submission.

- Impact on Birmingham Airport

7.148 Birmingham Airport have provided a detailed representation to the request for approval which suggested a suite of conditions including: carbon assessment, Wayfinding/impact on forecourt amenity, CCTV equipment, and details of integration with Birmingham Airport's security systems, Security Assessments, Utilities and Services, Bird-strike Management, Crane Usage, Construction Management Plan, Lighting details, drone and radio usage, Integration with West Coast Mainline, details of the APM hours of operation, journey times and timetables, Information Technology and Communications, Traffic Management Plan.

7.149 Whilst concerns relevant to the grounds for consideration under Schedule 17 are incorporated in the main assessment in regard to the APM Stop, all other points raised fall outside of the scope of this Schedule 17 request and the suggested conditions either duplicate controls elsewhere in the EMRs or are not relevant to the matters for consideration.

7.150 The Airport has commented that they welcome further engagement as the detailed design progresses and the project moves forward to construction. HS2 Ltd confirm that it will maintain its commitments in that regard.

- Impact on Bear Grylls Adventure (BGA)

7.151 Merlin Entertainments note that part of the Schedule 17 boundary includes part of the area of land to the front of the BGA building where some of the Adventure activities are located, including the High Ropes course and zip line. Merlin note the S106 requirement to remove part of the BGA attraction upon notification in writing from HS2 Ltd. The boundary of the request for approval is tight against the BGA building and incorporates the BGA disabled parking spaces, disabled access route into the attraction, the general exit and emergency exit which raises substantial access and egress issues for Merlin in relation to the safe operation of the BGA attraction. Merlin raise concerns that this would have prejudicial impacts on road safety for general users of the attraction, disabled users and, in the event of an emergency, will affect the ability of emergency service vehicles to access the attraction.

7.152 In terms of the disabled bays, HS2 Ltd confirm that these are not specifically re-provided on the proposed layout because the BGA development was consented and constructed post Hybrid Bill/the Act. However post construction of the People Mover, there is the potential opportunity for these spaces to be provided, as there are no columns or structures that directly affect them, with the appropriate arrangements put in place between BGA/NEC/HS2 on future land ownership arrangements.

7.153 In terms of the emergency access in the corner of the site adjacent to the service yard, HS2 Ltd advised that, in consultation with the NEC and BGA the column spacing was designed to specifically retain this emergency access. During construction temporary alternative measures will be required and these will need to be agreed between HS2 Ltd, the Contractor and BGA as the detailed construction proposals are developed. These have not been designed in detail at this stage. Under paragraph 1.3 in Schedule 2 of the Section 106 Agreement Merlin/BGA and HS2 Ltd will agree arrangements for alterations to access routes to and from the attraction and these will of course facilitate suitable access for the continued operation of the attraction, as well as emergency provisions.

7.154 Merlin request further engagement with HS2 Ltd now that the position, design and timetable for developing the people mover is known (as per the current Schedule 17 request). Merlin also requests engagement from HS2 Ltd on other ancillary matters.

7.155 HS2 Ltd confirm that through its continued obligations under the Act and its close relationship with the NEC as stakeholder on the project, they will engage directly with the NEC and BGA on the works around the site. Although falling outside the scope of consideration of this schedule 17 request, for information this will include (but not be limited to) further detailed design work, construction sequencing and programme, compound arrangements and access and impacts on the BGA operation in the context of the obligations under the S106 Agreement. HS2 Ltd have advised that any identified road safety or other ancillary concerns will be mitigated through such further engagement and practical measures that are taken forward.

- Impact on NEC

7.156 The NEC's main concerns were related to the impact of traffic movements to and from construction compounds around the main interchange site.

7.157 The impacts of construction, including traffic, were assessed in the ES. Furthermore, HS2 have obligations through the Act and EMRs to engage with the NEC as key stakeholder affected by the People Mover scheme, throughout the delivery of the project. HS2 confirm that all the matters raised by the NEC will be subject to such future engagement, for example access/egress proposals; traffic/HGV movements (with further consents sought for these matters where necessary); compound locations; and construction arrangements. The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which forms part of the EMRs, outlines controls that HS2 need to adhere to.

- Indicative Environment Mitigation

7.158 As set out in the Planning Memorandum, the proposals include the proposed mitigation measures in respect of the station works. These measures are not for detailed consideration at this stage as further submission would need to be made once implemented known as the 'Bringing into Use', However, through this Schedule 17 request there is an opportunity to comment on the initial measures proposed.

7.159 HS2 note that there is relatively limited scope for the provision of direct soft landscape and ecological mitigation specifically as part of the people mover submission. This is due to constraints resulting from the narrow linear extent of the physical Act Limits and the urbanised nature applying to much of the route, particularly to the west of the M42. Soft landscaping around the stops is, therefore, generally limited to the seeding of unpaved areas with low maintenance grass seed. It should also be noted that comprehensive ecological and landscape mitigation is being provided was part of the Schedule 17 request for the Interchange Station.

7.160 In terms of the Maintenance Facility, which would involve losses of existing trees, it is proposed to plant a new stand of approximately 2500sqm of native trees to the south east of the new building. Species selection will follow the guidelines of Warwickshire County Council's Arden Parklands document with predominantly Oak/Birch mix on the higher slopes and Alder, Willow and Poplar moving into the food plain of the Hollywell Brook. An under storey of Midland Hawthorn, Dogwood

and Hazel will be provided, and the area seeded with a locally relevant hedge bottom wildflower mix.

7.161 The balancing pond (which is assumed will not be permanently wet) will be seeded with a mix of creeping bent grass and creeping red fescue at a rate of 350kg/ha.

7.162 Currently there appear to be no proposals to mitigate the hedgerow loss or any negative impacts to the Hollywell Brook caused by severance and the fragmentation of habitats.

7.163 Appropriate management and maintenance of any indicative landscape proposals can be secured via EMRs to which the applicant is legally bound. It is also encouraged that a comprehensive long-term landscape management and maintenance strategy be developed alongside a future land ownership strategy.

7.164 These comments have been sent to HS2 to inform the environment mitigation that will come forward in the 'Bringing into Use' Schedule 17 and an informative is recommended in this regard.

- Stakeholder Engagement

7.165 This request for approval is supported by a Consultation and Engagement Report which sets out the pre-submission engagement with stakeholders and wider third parties.

7.166 The report notes that there has been extensive pre-submission engagement with SMBC which commenced in April 2018. The proposals were reported to the HS2 Independent Design Review Panel (IDP) at regular intervals. The IDP acts in an independent, non-executive advisory capacity, and provides a forum to review and critique designs at key stages in the design process. The report details a summary of these discussions and how the scheme has responded to concerns raised.

7.167 The report also identifies what stakeholder engagement took place throughout the scheme design. There has been a high level of interest in the People Mover from regional stakeholders specifically in relation to future passenger demand and the capacity of the infrastructure. HS2 advise that it has been through this engagement, that data to inform demand modelling has been captured and respond to challenges throughout the design process.

7.168 Stakeholders were identified through the U&A requirements and through early studies into the People Mover alignment. A variety of methods were used to engage with stakeholders which included an 'APM Technical Stakeholder Working Group'. This group was established in May 2018 as a forum between the design team and stakeholders with an interest/interface with the People Mover and the purpose of the group was to discuss technical and design related matters as the scheme design progressed. Topic areas covered included capacity study and system selection, emerging design development, scheme design development and final design updates. HS2 note that issues and priorities have been captured throughout the

design process and accommodated where possible within the scope and budget of the scheme design for the People Mover.

7.169 Four rounds of local community engagement events took place between June 2018 and January 2020 at a variety of different venues including Melbicks Garden Centre, The NEC, BIRS and Touchwood Shopping Centre. The purpose of these events has been to keep local communities informed on the latest designs, understand what local concerns and priorities for the people mover may be and capture feedback to inform ongoing design development.

7.170 Pre-submission engagement was also undertaken with the three statutory consultees Natural England, the EA (and the LLFA) and Historic England. This pre-app included various meetings to explain the relevant aspects of the scheme design and to respond to any questions/concerns.

7.171 Key themes raised centred around connectivity, design, user experience and accessibility. Whilst all these points have been addressed in the report, The Community Engagement Report explains how the scheme has responded to these concerns where appropriate and provided reasons if suggestions could not be incorporated into the scheme.

7.172 While third parties comment on a lack of engagement with transport user groups in developing the proposals, it is noted that engagement with key stakeholders has been planned taking the various U&A's into consideration, to ensure compliance throughout the station and associated works design process. The requirement for Engagement is not a Statutory Requirement and is not a matter that can influence the determination of the schedule 17 submission.

7.173 Details of meetings and events can be found in the Community and Engagement Report.

- Public sector equality duty

7.174 In determining this request for approval, Members must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions).

7.175 A third party has objected that the Stops be contrary to the Equalities Act with regard to the provision of facilities for people with reduced mobility arising from the protected characteristics of age; disability; or pregnancy and maternity. Lifts are available for those with mobility difficulties. The size of the lifts would allow use by the anticipated numbers of Persons of Restricted Mobility, including wheelchair users and people with luggage or prams. They have been designed as 'through' lifts to avoid the need for users to turn around within the lift and multiple lifts have been provided to ensure resilience in the event of a lift failure or closure of a lift for maintenance. The lifts are positioned at the terminal end of the Stop building, on the same façade and adjacent to the customer escalator entrance and exit so whilst customers will have travel some distance outside before entering the airport terminal this is the same for all passengers. The reasons why the Stop is not integrated into the main airport terminal has already been addressed earlier in this report.

7.176 The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149 is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors. It is not considered that the recommendation to grant permission in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

- Human rights

7.177 In determining this request for approval, Members should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

7.178 Members are referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation to grant permission in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation to grant permission is considered a proportionate response to the submitted request based on the considerations set out in this report.

8.0 CONCLUSION

8.1 In conclusion, the design of the people mover viaduct and piers are considered simple and elegant and have the potential to deliver a high quality people mover. The maintenance depot has been well considered and responds appropriately to the new landscape being created. With regards to the station stops themselves, modifications are required to the materials and finishes used to the external appearance of the Stops, however, such modifications are not considered to be integral to the approval being sought and can be secured via the imposition of a suitably worded condition. On this basis, the Stops are considered to be appropriate in their respective contexts, having a simple and functional appearance. Officers are satisfied that, no other modifications are needed, to the new buildings and other construction works that are necessary, to preserve the local environment or local amenity, reduce impacts on road safety or the free flow of traffic or to preserve sites of historic or archaeological interest or nature conservation importance.

8.2 Having regard to the parameters by which the Local Planning Authority may only consider arrangements for new buildings and other construction works the proposals are considered to be acceptable subject to the conditions that follow:.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval is recommended subject to the following conditions:

1. Compliance with Approved Plans and Specifications: The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and specifications subject to conditions that follow:

Plan and Drawing Ref Number	Title
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-601012	HS2 APM – Proposed Site Location Plan
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200001	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Site Wide Plan
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200010	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Birmingham Airport Stop) Sheet 1 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200011	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Airport Roundabout and Bickenhill Lane) Sheet 2 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200012	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Birmingham International) Sheet 3 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200013	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Birmingham International Railway) Sheet 4 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200014	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Birmingham International Railway) Sheet 5 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200015	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (NEC Stop) Sheet 6 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200016	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Moxy Hotel) Sheet 7 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200017	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Pendigo Lake) Sheet 8 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200018	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Pendigo Lake) Sheet 9 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200019	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Pendigo Way and NEC Car Park E5) Sheet 10 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200020	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (NEC Car Park E4) Sheet 11 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200021	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (M42 Motorway) Sheet 12 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200022	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Maintenance Facility) Sheet 13 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission

200023	Plan and Profile (Interchange Station Triangle) Sheet 14 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200024	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Plan and Profile (Interchange Station Stop) Sheet 15 of 15
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200501	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Viaduct Pier Details Sheet 1 of 2
1SN03-ARP-BR-DGA-NS07-200502	HS2 APM - Schedule 17 Submission Viaduct Pier Details Sheet 2 of 2
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-614201	HS2 APM - Interchange Station Stop Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 1
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-614202	HS2 APM - Interchange Station Stop Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 2
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-614001	HS2 APM - Interchange Station Stop Detailed Arrangement Ground Floor Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-614002	HS2 APM - Interchange Station Stop Detailed Arrangement Platform and Roof Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSE-NS07-614101	HS2 APM - Interchange Station Stop Section
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-624201	HS2 APM - NEC Stop Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 1
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-624202	HS2 APM - NEC Stop Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 2
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-624001	HS2 APM - NEC Stop Detailed Arrangement Ground Floor Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-624002	HS2 APM - NEC Stop Detailed Arrangement Platform and Roof Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSE-NS07-624101	HS2 APM - NEC Stop Section
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-634201	HS2 APM - Birmingham International Railway Station Stop Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 1
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-634202	HS2 APM - Birmingham International Railway Station Stop Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 2
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-634001	HS2 APM - Birmingham International Railway Station Stop Detailed Arrangement Ground Floor Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-634002	HS2 APM - Birmingham International Railway Station Stop Detailed Arrangement First Floor Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-634003	HS2 APM - Birmingham International Railway Station Stop Detailed Arrangement Platform and Roof Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSE-NS07-	HS2 APM - Birmingham International

624101	Railway Station Stop Section
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-644201	HS2 APM - Birmingham Airport Stop Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 1
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-644202	HS2 APM - Birmingham Airport Stop Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 2
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-644001	HS2 APM – Birmingham Airport Stop Detailed Arrangement Ground Floor Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-644002	HS2 APM - Birmingham Airport Stop Detailed Arrangement Platform and Roof Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSE-NS07-644101	HS2 APM - Birmingham Airport Stop Section
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-654201	HS2 APM - Maintenance Facility Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 1
1SN03-ARP-AR-DEL-NS07-654202	HS2 APM - Maintenance Facility Detailed Arrangement Elevations -Sheet 2
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-6454001	HS2 APM – Maintenance Facility Detailed Arrangement Ground Floor Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-6454002	HS2 APM - Maintenance Facility Detailed Arrangement First and Second Floor Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-654003	HS2 APM - Maintenance Facility Detailed Arrangement Third Floor and Roof Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSO-NS07-654004	HS2 APM - Maintenance Facility Detailed Arrangement Middle Bickenhill Lane Plan
1SN03-ARP-AR-DSE-NS07-654102	HS2 APM - Maintenance Facility Section

Reason: In order to define the permission in accordance with Schedule 17 of the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017.

2. Street Furniture: Details of proposed street furniture, comprising any external seating, bollards, CCTV and other hard landscaping details, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their installation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to preserve the local environment and local amenity in accordance with Paragraph 2 of Schedule 17 of the High-Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017.

3. External Lighting: Details of proposed external lighting, comprising type, height and appearance of associated columns, bollards or similar installations, and the details of associated lighting fittings comprising details of colour, watts and any cowls or similar to direct light, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation. All lighting works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to preserve the local environment and local amenity, and to preserve a site of historic interest and nature conservation, in accordance with Paragraph 2 of Schedule 17 of the High-Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017.

4. Sample Materials (People Mover Stops): Prior to the installation of external façade and roof cladding materials at the People Mover Stops at the Interchange Station, NEC, Birmingham international Rail Station and Birmingham Airport, samples of these materials at that Stop shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to preserve the local environment and local amenity in accordance with Paragraph 2 of Schedule 17 of the High-Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017.

5. Amended Design Details at People Mover Stops:

Notwithstanding the details shown on Drawing Nos 1SN03_ARP_AE_DEL_NS07_624201; 1SN03_ARP_AR_DEL_NS07_624202; 1SN03_ARP_AR_DEL_NS07_634201; 1SN03_ARP_AR_DEL_NS07_634202; 1SN03_ARP_AR_DEL_NS07_644201 1SN03_ARP_AR_DEL_NS07_644202, details of the façade materials to the NEC, Birmingham International Railway Station and Birmingham Airport Stops, hard surfacing materials and other Public Realm features associated with the Stops are not approved. Prior to the commencement of development of each respective individual stop, amended details for the NEC, Birmingham International Rail Station and Birmingham Airport, comprising alternative façade materials to the Stops and hard surfacing materials and other Public Realm features associated with the Stops, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans and specifications

Reason: to preserve the local environment and local amenity in accordance with Paragraph 2(3) of Schedule 17 of the High-Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017.

6. Sample Materials (Maintenance Facility): Prior to the installation of external façade and roof cladding materials at the Maintenance Facility and samples of these materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to preserve the local environment and local amenity in accordance with Paragraph 2 of Schedule 17 of the High-Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017.

Informatives

NOTE: Following the detailed design stage, should the operating system chosen allow for less plant room at the Stops, it is expected that an amended scheme will come forward for amended designs of the Stops.

NOTE: In accordance with assurances given by the Secretary of State, the applicant is reminded that HS2 Phase 1 Environmental Minimum Requirements must be fully complied with in undertaking the works.

NOTE: In accordance with the HS2 Phase 1 Heritage Memorandum, the applicant must adhere to the general principles for design, evaluation, investigation, recording, analysis, reporting and archive deposition to be adopted for the design development and construction of the scheme, in accordance with the HS2 Historic Environment Research and Delivery Strategy (GWSI: HERDS), and to any relevant location specific archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.

NOTE: The applicant is reminded that, where relevant, all works must be undertaken in accordance with the arrangements approved by the Secretary of State in the 'Class approval' for matters ancillary to development under Schedule 17' (March 2017).

NOTE: The applicant is reminded that prior to the bringing into use of relevant scheduled works, approval from the Council will need to be obtained under Schedule 17 (paragraph 9) to the HS2 Act. The Council will need to be satisfied that there are no reasonably practicable measures which need to be taken for the purpose of mitigating the effect of the work or its operation on the local environment or local amenity.

NOTE: The applicant is reminded that within four months of the discontinuation of the use of any site for carrying out operations ancillary to the construction of any of the scheduled works, the site must be restored in accordance with a scheme agreed with the local planning authority, in accordance with paragraph 12 of Schedule 17 to the HS2 Act.