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Dear Mr Cole


I am writing to you in my capacity as the Director of Hybrid Bill Delivery at HS2 Ltd, which is acting on behalf of the Promoter of the High Speed Rail (West Midlands-Crewe) Bill (‘the Bill’) currently before Parliament. I understand that you have a number of concerns about the impact of Phase 2A of HS2 (known as ‘the Proposed Scheme’) and have submitted petitions on that basis against the Bill and the Additional Provision (AP) in the House of Commons.

This letter sets out the Promoter’s position in relation to the issues you have raised and the measures identified to address your concerns.

Petition against the Bill

Common Lane

In your petition you state the Parish Council supports the proposal put forward by Staffordshire County Council that Common Lane is diverted to go underneath the proposed HS2 viaduct at the end of the embankment. The following assurance on the retention of Common Lane and alternative route has been given to Staffordshire County Council:

“(a) Recognising Staffordshire County Council’s request for Common Lane to not be permanently stopped up and subject to the satisfaction of the condition in paragraph (b), the Secretary of State will require the nominated undertaker to design and construct a permanent alternative vehicular route between Common Lane and A515 Lichfield Road to the north of the Proposed Scheme to replace that part of Common Lane which is to be permanently stopped up under the Bill between points P6 and P7 on Sheet No. 1-05 of the plans deposited with the Bill (“the Alternative Route”).

(b) The assurance in paragraph (a) is subject to the successful promotion of an amendment to the Bill through the introduction of an Additional Provision, and any requisite environmental information, which confers on the Secretary of State the land and works powers to acquire compulsorily the additional land required for the provision of the Alternative Route and to construct the Alternative Route.
(c) The Promoter will use reasonable endeavours to promote the Additional Provision referred to in paragraph (b)."

**Borrow pits**

Your petition raises an objection to the use of land to establish four borrow pits for construction of the Proposed Scheme.

You may know that the Promoter has now given the National Farmers Union (NFU) the following assurance on borrow pits:

"Following the completion of preliminary Ground Investigation of the sites proposed under the Bill for development of Borrow Pits but prior to the termination of proceedings on the Bill before the House of Commons Select Committee, the Promoter will publish a review of the extent of land likely to be required and in preparing the report the Promoter will consult with the NFU and those landowners on whose land the Borrow Pits are proposed to be developed."

**Height of viaduct and embankment**

In your petition you ask that we work closely with Staffordshire County Council to ensure the height of the viaduct and embankment is kept to a minimum.

The Promoter has now given the Staffordshire County Council the following assurance regarding the lowering of the proposed Kings Bromley viaduct:

“(a) Subject to the satisfaction of the conditions set out in paragraph (c) below, the Secretary of State will require the nominated undertaker to reduce the height of the Kings Bromley Viaduct by up to 3m at the highest horizontal level shown on Sheet Nos. 2-01 and 2-02 of the sections deposited with the Bill for that part of Work No. 1 on the Kings Bromley Viaduct together with any consequential and associated reduction in height of both the Bourne Embankment and the River Trent Viaduct ("the Lowered Viaduct"). The Secretary of State will require the nominated undertaker to act in good faith in seeking to achieve as great a decrease in height as far as reasonably practicable (up to 3m) under this paragraph (without prejudice to the need for all parties to act in good faith generally in respect of these assurances) and to engage with Staffordshire County Council during the detailed design stage in respect of the implementation of this paragraph; and

(b) Subject to the satisfaction of paragraph (a) and the conditions set out in paragraph (c) below, the Secretary of State will require the nominated undertaker to use reasonable endeavours to seek to further reduce the height of the Lowered Viaduct so far as is reasonably practicable and to act in good faith and to engage with Staffordshire County Council during the detailed design stage in respect of this (without prejudice to the need for all parties to act in good faith generally in respect of these assurances)."

**Traffic management**

Your petition requests that a number of changes be made with regards to traffic management. The following assurance on the use of local roads through the village of Kings Bromley has been given to Staffordshire County Council:
“1. The Promoter will require the nominated undertaking to restrict HS2 Large Goods Vehicle construction traffic from entering the village of Kings Bromley and using the A513 Alrewas Road within the village as a through route, except:

i. in circumstances where it is required to do so by the relevant planning authority under the powers conferred on it by paragraph 6 of Schedule 17 to the Bill, or

ii. in circumstances where it would not be reasonably practicable to use other access routes, for example (but not limited to) in respect of any utilities works proposed within the village of Kings Bromley as part of the Proposed Scheme, or

iii. in the case of an emergency or if directed to do so by the police or emergency services, or

iv. where, it would prejudice the safe, timely and economic construction and/or operation of the Proposed Scheme.”

Overhead power lines

We refer the Petitioner to our original response to paragraph 5 of your Bill petition.

Pyford Brook viaduct satellite compound

You have requested that the Pyford Brook Satellite compound be moved to the north of the line of route to help alleviate issues of traffic, noise, light and dust pollution.

Firstly, with regards to the issues you have raised of traffic, noise, light and dust pollution resulting from the proposed location of the compound, we refer to our original response to paragraph 6 of your Bill petition.

Secondly, measures to protect the woodland and pool during the construction phase from risks such as dust blowing off haul routes into the pool or surface water runoff would be provided in accordance with the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).

Thirdly, the requested relocation of the compound would be constrained by a fuel pipeline diversion and flood plain and would be partly outside of Bill limits. Additionally, the haul road would need to be relocated on the far side of the trace, requiring additional management of the crossing and bring it closer to the existing ponds and copse.

Pyford North embankment satellite compound

Your petition requests the relocation of the Pyford North embankment satellite compound to alleviate impacts on Bromley Hayes Cattery.

We have identified that the location of the satellite compound could be exchanged with the western part of the transfer node as you have proposed, providing the overall area of the transfer node is not reduced. Utility diversion works are required along the A515 Lichfield Road which could have a greater impact on the compound. Additionally, under this proposal construction activity would still remain in proximity to the Cattery. However, it is important to note that the detailed design of the Proposed Scheme has yet to be undertaken, and will not take place until after Royal Assent.
Petition against the Additional Provision to the Bill

In your petition against the AP you raise concerns about additional traffic for the Pyford North embankment satellite compound and additional land required for a temporary laydown area for the Pyford North Embankment Satellite compound.

Please see below our response to each of these issues.

**Traffic for the Pyford North embankment satellite compound**

On page 5 of the Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES) and Additional Provision Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 2 – Community Area 1, Fradley to Colton, Table 1 entitled ‘Summary of changes to the design and construction assumptions within the existing powers of the Bill in the Fradley to Colton area’, reports that “the increase in railways systems HGV movements will not result in total daily HGV movements that will be greater than those assessed for the peak of civil engineering works in the area for the original scheme”.

The main purpose of the SES and the AP ES is to report any new or different likely significant environmental effects arising from the updates and changes reported in the SES and the amendments reported within the AP ES. These new or different likely significant environmental effects are compared to those contained within the ES which accompanied the Bill deposited in July 2017 (the main ES).

As reported in the main ES it is proposed that the use of Common Lane (between Lichfield Road and the Proposed Scheme) as a construction route would be limited to the duration of site set-up and servicing, which is programmed to be approximately nine months. The changes to HGV movements reported in the SES and AP ES relate to railway systems work which are planned to occur later in the programme. It is not proposed that these would use Common Lane.

The predicted peak use of Common Lane (between Lichfield Road and the Proposed Scheme) construction route by HS2 HGVs would be 10 daily two-way trips (total of 20), as shown in Table 142 in Annex B of Volume 2 of the main ES.

**Additional land required for the temporary laydown area**

Table 3 entitled ‘Summary of engineering amendments in the Fradley to Colton area’ on page 33 of the SES and Additional Provision ES Volume 2 – Community Area 1, Fradley to Colton, sets out that ‘additional land will be required for a temporary laydown area required during construction of the British Pipeline Agency 10-inch pipeline diversion’ at the Pyford North embankment.

We would continue to engage with the affected landowners on this matter.

I hope that the information set out above in relation to the issues raised in your petitions gives you the comfort required in order to withdraw your petitions.

Petitions may be withdrawn by sending an email or letter to the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons informing the Clerk to the Select Committee that you wish to withdraw your petition.2


2 Contact details can be found on the Select Committee website at [http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/high-speed-rail-west-midlands-crewe-bill-select-committee-commons/contact-us-17-19/](http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/high-speed-rail-west-midlands-crewe-bill-select-committee-commons/contact-us-17-19/)
If you have any further questions in advance of your appearance before the Select Committee next week, please do not hesitate to contact Rachna Shah, Petition Manager, on 020 7944 0159 or Rachna.Shah@HS2.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Oliver Bayne
Director, Hybrid Bill Delivery
High Speed Two (HS2) Limited