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Executive Summary

The public consultation on the Supplementary Environmental Statement in connection with Additional Provision 2 for the High Speed Rail (West Midlands to Crewe) Bill ran from 16 February 2019 to 29 March 2019. This is the Report of the Independent Assessor on the issues raised by comments on that Statement published on 8 February 2019.

27 responses were received for consideration. In total, there were 12 public responses and 15 stakeholder responses. No campaigns or standard text letters were received as part of this consultation.

The key issue expressed in the consultation (by volume of responses) is concern over the impact of the proposed line construction and operation on the overall landscape through which the route crosses. This applies in particular to the impact of the proposed overhead line connecting the Grid Supply Point at Parkgate to the Auto Transformer Station at Newlands Lane in East Staffordshire and the visual impact of the proposed route on a golf course at Ingestre. Other issues of concern related to the impact of construction activities on traffic in certain community areas, particularly the increased use of Yarnfield Lane within CA3 by HGV vehicles during the construction phase of the scheme.

Other key issues identified by respondents to the public consultation related to the proximity of forestry and ancient woodland to proposed construction boundaries of the scheme, that were previously at considerable distances away from these boundaries.

Other submissions from organisations and public authorities highlight particular areas of detail and concern across specific geographic locations on the route. These range from ecological concerns to cultural heritage issues. These specific issues should be considered by HS2 Ltd. for the next stages of more detailed design.

A key section of the consultation was from 15 stakeholder responses which raised concerns on a broader array of issues relating to the scheme ranging from the overall economic and social benefits of HS2 to the public and the wider legal implication of the scheme.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document forms the Report of the Independent Assessor on the issues raised by comments on the supplementary environmental information which accompanied the Additional Provision for the High-Speed Rail Phase 2A (West Midlands - Crewe) Bill published on 8 February 2019.

The Additional Provision (AP) is a package of proposed amendments to the Bill that require additional powers (e.g. where land access is now permanently required, rather than temporarily). The AP ES reports on any new or different significant effects as a result of the amendments included in the AP. The Supplementary Environmental Information and AP ES report on recent baseline data and the environmental effects of new design elements where these are within the existing scope of the Bill.

In this report “AP” refers both to the overall set of amendments, and to each specific element of the Additional Provision, depending on the context.

Golder Associates (UK) Limited (‘Golder’) was appointed Independent Assessor (for Phase 2A) by the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills (officials of both Houses of Parliament) in July 2017, after an advertised public procurement procedure for the Phase 2A Bill (West Midlands to Crewe). The appointment was made under a Standing Order passed by the two Houses of Parliament which required the Examiners to appoint an Independent Assessor to prepare a summary of issues raised by comments on the Environmental Statement relating to the Bill. Golder’s most recent summary report for the Phase 2A route was published on 21 June 2018.

A period of public consultation on the supplementary environmental information and AP ES ran from 16 February to 29 March 2019. The Secretary of State for Transport set the consultation period, under the terms of the relevant Standing Order of the two Houses. The Examiners were required by the Standing Order to set a deadline for the Assessor to compile the summary report on the supplementary environmental information and AP ES responses and submit it to the Examiners. This period had to be a minimum of 28 days from the date all comments were made available to the Assessor following the end of the consultation period. 27 response comments were received during the Consultation.

This Report sets out the results of the work of the Independent Assessor in respect of comments arising from the supplementary environmental information and APs. It broadly follows the format of the report published on issues raised by comments on the Phase 2A Additional Provision March 2018 (Golder Associates, June 2018). This report is intended to enable the reader to understand the patterns and key issues arising from the public consultation, along with the presentation of a synthesis of the consultation responses. The results are presented in terms of key environmental issues raised as a result of the supplementary environmental information and AP ES, by Community Area (CA) for the proposed line (the APs affect four of the five CAs along the Phase 2A route) and by specific AP reference number.

The Report has been organised into two principal sections:

i) An introductory section setting out the Terms of Reference, work programme, approach, and methodology applied by the Independent Assessor; and

ii) Results, presented as:
   a. Key issues; and
   b. CA and AP results.

This Report was submitted to the Examiners 21 May 2019 and the Examiners submitted it to Parliament, in line with the Standing Order requirement. As required by the Standing Order, the Department of Transport will
publish all responses received. The responses will be made available online from 22 May 2019 via the ES Consultation page on the gov.uk website. The Independent Assessor has no role in the publication of responses.


Summary of Additional Provision 2

A variety of amendments are proposed in the AP. This includes engineering and minor utility amendments that require a change to Bill powers and other changes to Bill powers to enable permanent access for maintenance over certain areas of land.

More specifically, the amendments that require additional land and/or changes to Bill powers include:

- Temporary laydown works, diversion works and other works to utilities such as gas mains, water mains, overhead electricity lines and telecommunications cables;
- Relocation of balancing ponds;
- Construction traffic routes, maintenance access routes and a Network Rail access road;
- Highway improvements, including: improving visibility at highway junctions; widening of highway verges; highway realignments; and a roundabout at the junction of the re-aligned Dog Lane, the A51 The Rowe, Bent Lane and the A51 through Stableford;
- The viaduct crossing of the Norton Bridge to Stone Railway and track crossovers along the HS2 route. This includes: the raising of the alignment of the HS2 main line from the B5026 Eccleshall Road to the northern extent of Yarnfield North embankment; amendments to the viaduct crossing of the Norton Bridge to Stone Railway and Filly Brook; and the horizontal realignment of the HS2 main line from the northern extent of Yarnfield North embankment to Tittensor Road overbridge;
- Revised flood mitigation measures around the Stone Infrastructure Maintenance Base – Rail (IMB-R) and Norton Bridge to Stone Railway;
- A new junction of the A51 Bury Bank and Stone Rural Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) 34; and
- A change to the earthworks on the northern and southern approaches of the Swynnerton Estate North green overbridge.

Timeline of Assessment

As noted above, the AP was deposited on 16 February 2019. The AP ES and supplementary environmental information was published at the same time. The period for consultation ran until 29 March 2019.

The timetable for preparing the final Report was set by the Examiners following discussion with the Independent Assessor and, in setting the timetable the Examiners took account of the final volume of responses, the size and complexity of responses and the time that would be required to ensure each response received full consideration and analysis.

Process

Public responses to the supplementary environmental information and AP ES were submitted directly to the Department’s selected processing contractor, as required by the Standing Order. The consultation and the process for submitting comments was designed by HS2 Ltd, working with the Department of Transport. The process for the AP consultation followed the same format as that used for the prior Environmental Statement.
consultation period for Phase 2A and Additional Provision in March 2018. Every response was passed on
directly from electronic or physical post boxes to the Department’s selected processing contractor without any
third party opening or reviewing any response.

The Department’s contractor was responsible for logging, opening, and (in the case of hard copy responses)
electronically scanning all responses received, as the responsible party of receipt. The comments were securely
downloaded by the Independent Assessor in batches, with each response having its own individual reference
number.

On receipt of the responses, the Independent Assessor recorded the type of response, which area category it
refers to and the key issues raised. The Independent Assessor then completed quality assurance checks. The
GoldStake response management system was not used during this assessment due to the limited number of
responses received.

The Independent Assessor developed a bespoke approach for handling the responses within MS Excel, based
on the previous response logging methodology and categories. The categories logged from each response
were in line with those previously logged in GoldStake and include key environmental issues and types of
responses from both the public and stakeholder responders.

Each logged response was quality assured by a Senior Specialist from the Independent Assessor.

The Independent Assessor also had access to senior specialist experts in all technical areas of environmental
assessment throughout the course of the assessment to provide an additional level of expert input as necessary.

1.1 Responses

Volume of Responses

The total number of responses received by Friday 29 March 2019 was 27. The consultation response cut-off
time for receipt was set as 11.45 pm, with postal submissions accepted provided the posting time could be
demonstrated as being prior to the deadline. Electronic submissions were not accepted after the deadline.

The majority of responses arrived in electronic format, by email. As a result, the geographic origin of many of
these responses could not be determined. The Independent Assessor related each response to a CA where
this was indicated by the responder. The consultation was open to national responses (via the online
consultation form) and was therefore not restricted to the public within the immediate hinterland of the affected
area.
Figure 1: Responses Resulting from the Public Consultation on the SES and AP ES (March 2019) for Phase 2A of HS2

Figure 1 shows that the majority of the responses were of the type letter/email, between six and ten pages long. Ten of the 27 responses made use of the electronic form the Consultation Organisers had made available for the public to submit responses.

The Independent Assessor did not have access to any submissions made to the Department of Transport during public consultation presentations and events, unless the respondent followed up with a submission made directly to the consultation process as described above.

The responses included a number of documents presenting formal submissions from a range of organisations, including stakeholders and special interest groups. Whilst counting as an individual submission in the response statistics, all issues covered in each submission were assessed and considered, and so, where appropriate, they contribute to the overall results and commentary that follows in more depth.

Responses will be published by the Department for Transport and made available through their website, although, where requested by the respondent, confidential submissions will not be published.

**Campaigns**

There were no ‘campaigns’ specific to the AP consultation and therefore no ‘standard text’ was identified by the Independent Assessor. There were no instances where individuals responded with the same or very similar text, relating to the same CA(s) and specific AP(s).

**Calibration with Environmental Statement Categories**

The Independent Assessor has used the categorisation of issues as defined in the ES where possible as the foundation of its analysis. This was the format followed during the reporting of the ES consultation phase. This method enables the presentation and discussion of the results in Section 2.0 of this Report to be easily related to the material and locations presented in the ES material accompanying the AP.
These categories have been supplemented by the Independent Assessor to include a smaller number of issues that arose from multiple submissions in the response results. The Assessor has also used the designation of the CAs and specific APs as the foundation of the results presentation in Section 2.0. These will enable interested parties to quickly gain an understanding of and relate local issues (where expressed in this manner) to the relevant AP.

The CAs and their titles are illustrated in Figure 2 below. Maps for the CAs are available at:


Figure 2: HS2 Phase 2A CA Location Map

As shown in Figure 2 the Phase 2A scheme comprises the western section of Phase 2 between the West Midlands and Crewe. It includes approximately 58 km of HS2 main line and two spurs (approximately 6 km) south of Crewe. The spurs will allow trains to transfer between the HS2 main line and the West Coast Main Line.
Amount of responses per community area

![Pie chart showing responses per community area]

Figure 3: Responses per Community Area Resulting from the Public Consultation on the SES and AP ES (March 2019) for Phase 2A of HS2

CAs 1, 2, 3 and 4 are the most commonly referenced CAs in the responses received. The stakeholder responses make reference to multiple CAs, with public responses referencing single CAs.

Categories of Issues

The Independent Assessor used the following list of principal categories to present key issues relevant for expressed concerns. These categories included all those established in the ES along with some limited additional categories created by the Assessor. Not all of these categories were covered in the responses. Where responses covered a number of concerns and issues, these concerns and issues were logged as separate instances. In the following listing the issue headings are followed by examples of elements and concerns that are included under that heading.

ES environmental topics are as follows:

- **Agriculture and Rural Business**: farming and other rural enterprises, farm buildings and related land use;
- **Woodlands and Forestry**: woodland planting and ancient woodlands;
- **Air Quality**: dust and emissions/pollutants related to construction and operational traffic, including as, a result of, road traffic increase around stations and depots;
- **Community**: general effects on residential property, community facilities and communities as a whole: e.g. effects on public footpaths, bridleways, parks and gardens and temporary presence of construction workers;
- **Cultural Heritage**: ancient burials, old buildings, designated assets (e.g., Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas), buried archaeology, historic landscapes. The ‘setting’ (local landscape situation) of these heritage assets is covered here. Paleo-environmental resources (ancient environments) are also considered;
- **Ecology**: protected species, biodiversity, wildlife, habitat disturbance, loss, and restoration. Nb. ‘ecological value’ is covered here but the community and social/economic value of ecological resources is considered within other categories;
Land Quality: contaminated land and newly occurring ground contamination. Groundwater concerns where related to contamination. Leaks/spillages etc. geological issues are also in this category, as are mineral resources;

Landscape and Visual Impact: change to landscape character and views. Concern re: visible components related to the development – e.g. overhead lines and changes in lighting;

Socio-economics: trade, employment, business and the economy/markets (local and national). E.g. isolation effects on businesses or opportunities for jobs during construction/operation. Labour supply. Changes in demographics also included here;

Sound, Noise and Vibration: as an issue for people and where they live, and as related to shared community open areas, schools, hospitals, etc. or the route in general;

Traffic and Transport: covers all modes of transport, to include walking and cycling, road and rail, waterways and air. Includes diversions and change in the volume of traffic/congestion/emptiness. Also includes accident/health and safety risks;

Waste and Material Resources: off-site disposal to landfill of solid waste from construction and demolition activities (and related earthworks design). Includes waste generated (not material inputs e.g. aggregates required for construction). Disposal of contaminated soil; and

Water Resources and Flood Risk Assessment: Surface water features, both natural and artificial and ground water concerns (where not related to contamination – a land quality issue). Flood risk and drainage networks (and sewers). Disposal of liquid waste.

In addition to the above further categories were included to cover comments that did not fall into any of the above categories. These are:

Sustainability: strategic environmental impacts including carbon issues, economics, energy requirements, long term environmental consumables and climate change;

Tunnel: this was used for comments expressing the desire for a particular section to be tunnelled;

Not specified: used when no comments have been made at all;

Property Value: used when the comment specifically relates to property value;

Compensation: used when the comment specifically relates to compensation;

Expense: general issues relating to the project cost;

Public Consultation Issues/time: used for issues related to the public consultation process in general, e.g. too many pages, not enough time to respond, methods, difficulty with electronic forms;

Government: used for general issues purely with regards to the Government or government policy e.g. ‘I will not vote for this government again’;

Environment: for comments regarding the environment that are general statements that do not specify any of the other categories e.g. ‘the project will damage the environment’. If more specific issues are mentioned, then the appropriate issue category was used e.g. if it says ‘the project will damage the environment and all the wildlife’ then the response was categorised under ‘Ecology’;

Infrastructure: This is for comments that relate to suggestions to upgrade/improve the existing infrastructure (railway lines) rather than build a new one;
Mental Health/Anxiety Concerns: This is for perceived mental health issues, for example if somebody writes “the stress will kill me”. Only used for perceived health issues that do not fit any other category. Any specific health issue related to a specific environmental impact is categorised in the appropriate issue, for example ‘Air Quality’;

Other: used for ‘other’ issues such as requests for information (RFI) or additional topics not covered elsewhere. All use of this category included a comment preceded by the word ‘other’, for example “Other: RFI”. The ‘other’ comments were closely monitored and if any trends were observed then an additional category issue was added; and

Positive for the Environmental Statement Process: used when positive comments were made, with regard to approving specific aspects of the scheme or the process in general.

2.0 RESULTS

2.1 Key Issues
This section of the Report presents a summary of the key issues and concerns received from all respondents to the AP (March 2019) public consultation. The Key Issues section is designed to provide the reader with a quick and accurate picture of the feedback received from the entire public consultation. The results include responses from a range of respondents from individuals to public authorities. It does not evaluate responses on a technical level against assumptions presented in the AP. This is in line with the role of the Independent Assessor to only summarise comments, rather than give an evaluation of them. Responses specifically referencing individual CAs and/or APs are detailed in Section 2.2.

This section is intended to provide the reader with a snapshot of the issues expressed within each category. However, where particular geographical features or themes are a recurring element of the relevant responses, this Report highlights these issues.

Key issues are presented in Figure 4 in ranked numerical order of comments received. Many responses referred to numerous issues within each response. These separate issues were logged as separate comments where appropriate. Consequently, the figure for the total number of comments/issues is greater than the total number of responses.
**Issue 1: Landscape and Visual Impact – Eleven Comments**

Respondents citing this issue are mainly concerned as to why the visual landscape impact from the erection of pylons and wires around the Grade II listed Newlands Farmhouse was described as ‘permanent’ whilst the impact on the historic landscape was considered to be of ‘temporary’ significance for the period of construction only.

Further concerns were raised as to the impact of the proposed overhead line connecting a Grid Supply Point at Parkgate to the Auto Transformer Feeder Station at Newlands Lane on the open rural countryside area in East Staffordshire.

One respondent was concerned about the visual impact of the railway line on a club house located within the premises of its golf course at Ingestre in CA2.

Respondents were also concerned that changes to the connection of HS2 to the West Coast Mainline (WCML) at Fradley Junction (CA1) may have additional visual impact on the Trent & Mersey Canal between Wood End, Fradley, and Handsacre, and also at Great Haywood.
**Issue 2: Forestry and Ancient Woodland – Nine Comments**

The majority of respondent's comments in this category related to loss of hedgerows, mature trees/woodland, grassland and other detrimental effects on protected native species and local wildlife along all of the CAs. Concerns were also raised by a majority of respondents regarding the close proximity of proposed construction boundaries of the scheme to woodland previously situated away from the proposed boundary in CA1, CA4 and CA5.

Respondents pointed mostly to an unnamed wood to the west of Holly Wood along CA4 previously situated 3km away from the construction boundary but now adjacent to the scheme. This is as a result of the provision of a power supply to power the tunnel boring machine for Whitmore Tunnel. Pipewood in CA1 originally 200 m away from the construction area, and Trent Wood in CA5 originally 500 m away from the construction boundary, now directly adjacent to a utility diversion and placement of traffic signals were also given as examples by respondents to this effect.

Other respondents were concerned about the impact of the scheme on approximately 0.2 hectares of woodland at Lower Birches Plantation/Titlers Plantation being subject to tree height reductions to comply with tree heights as part of minimum clearance requirements. Concerns were also raised about the loss of approximately 18.3 hectares of floodplain grazing marsh along CA2.

The loss of approximately 5.5 hectares of woodland at Whitmore Wood in CA5 was also an issue of concern raised by one of the respondents in this category.

**Issue 3: Water Resources and Flood Risk Assessment – Eight Comments**

A respondent was of the opinion that proposed changes in the amended provision AP2-001-006 could potentially have more significant effects on flood risk associated with the Bourne Brook (ordinary watercourse) along CA1 of the scheme. As such, additional work may need to be undertaken to determine the level of this risk and any impacts.

Another respondent raised an issue as to why Fradley to Colton in CA1 had only been mapped in the Technical Appendices Map Book and required confirmation as to whether other rivers had been adequately modelled and whether such models included smaller ordinary watercourses.

Additional issues raised by other respondents related to visual impact on the canal at Fradley Junction on CA1 arising from changes required to connect HS2 with the West Coast Mainline, construction impacts resulting from additional land required for construction on the north side of HS2 between the canal at Great Haywood and the existing railway along CA2 and impacts on various residential and non-residential communities at Great Haywood Marina along CA2.

Concerns were also raised by respondents that groundwater drawdown from dewatering of the borrow pits at Kings Bromley South, Kings Bromley North and Shaw Lane could affect water retention in the Trent and Mersey Canal along CA1 of the scheme.

**Issue 4: Other Issues – Seven Comments**

Respondents were mainly concerned about the economic and social benefits of HS2 to the public and also raised concerns about the legal implications of the scheme as they felt that construction of the scheme will breach existing laws and regulations.

One member of the public raised an issue concerning how proposed alterations to Handsacre Junction (part of Phase 1 of the scheme) can be made under an Additional Provision to the Phase 2A Hybrid Bill, as the Phase 2A Hybrid Bill does not permit HS2 Ltd to revisit Phase 1. Another member of the public raised an issue regarding the transparency of the cost of HS2.
A member of the public raised a concern about the effect of temporary lights used by HS2 Ltd. causing a delay to residents of Madeley going about their daily activities. The lack of communication by HS2 Ltd. on the impact of the scheme to the community as it relates to deformities and miscarriages during pregnancy were also raised as a concern by the member of the public.

**Issue 5: Traffic and Transport – Six Comments**

Respondents were generally concerned about the increased volumes of traffic resulting from road congestion and as a result of diversions due to road works and construction. One of the respondents raised an issue relating to designing a traffic management system that will mitigate the impact of construction traffic, particularly around Junction 15 of the M6 and surrounding areas.

A respondent raised a concern regarding the provision of access to their lands along Manor Road on CA4 resulting from the provision of a new power supply line that cuts across the current access route to the land.

Serious concerns about the increased use of Yarnfield Lane along CA3 during the construction phase of the scheme by HGV vehicles were also raised by a respondent in this category. This relates to the need for HS2 Ltd. to implement the Select Committee’s requirement to install a wider M6 overbridge at Yarnfield Lane prior to its widening to at least 6.8 metres to safely accommodate passing HGV vehicles.

Respondents were concerned that the proposed traffic lights at the junction of Yarnfield Lane with the A34 will lead to increased delays and traffic queues as well as compromise overall safety of motorists and pedestrians.

**Issue 6: Sound, noise and vibrations – Five Comments**

The generality of responses in this category related to concerns about the impact of noise during construction on residential dwellings over a longer period of time.

Respondents raised a concern that several dwellings at Hopton along CA2 of the scheme will experience high levels of noise and recommended that noise could be mitigated through appropriate site management in addition to the controlled measures detailed within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) with particular reference to permitted working hours.

Respondents also raised the concern that dwellings at Pirehill Lane at Stone and Swynnerton along CA3 of the scheme will be subjected to high noise levels during Western Power powerline diversion works and expected that the noise will be mitigated by the relevant authorities through appropriate site management and control measures detailed within the CoCP.

A respondent raised a concern about the impact of noise generated during the construction and operation phases of the scheme on an existing club house, as HS2 Ltd had proposed no mitigation measures for this. The respondent mentioned that the clubhouse would require turning through 180 degrees and to be soundproofed to relieve the noise impact of trains passing in the vicinity of the clubhouse.

A respondent in CA4 of the scheme raised a concern relating to a quote from a newspaper publication which stated that noise from HS2 would breach acceptable WHO limits.

**Issue 7: Ecology – Seven comments**

General comments in this category related to loss and creation of new Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), green corridors and fragmentation of priority habitats. Respondents raised concerns about the impact of the construction phase on water voles along CA5 as the mitigation measures where considered inappropriate in addressing such impacts. Some of the respondents in this category required further evidence from HS2 Ltd. to prove that significant adverse effects on bird populations at Blithfield Reservoir Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) can be avoided. Concerns were also raised by respondents about the need to establish if the proposed...
scheme will affect land outside the SSSI which is used by wintering birds or bird flightpaths into and out of the SSSI.

Respondents raised the need for Bourne Brook located along CA1 (identified as an ecologically sensitive feature) to be protected during the construction phase of the scheme.

Concerns were raised by a respondent that proposed amendments to the scheme along CA3 will result in the loss of assumed barn owl roosts. Although measures have been proposed to mitigate the loss of the roosts (including hedgerow and woodland planting between Blakelow and Birchwood) the respondent wished to draw HS2 Ltd.’s attention to the fact that mitigation areas should be at a sufficient distance from the line to be used safely by barn owls. Other respondents also pointed out the fact that proposed amendments along CA5 will result in the additional loss of woodland identified as being habitat to the Alder Leaf Beetle.

Another respondent raised concerns that limited ecological surveys have been conducted across the proposed amendment areas along CA1, with several areas along the proposed route having only partial protected/priority species and habitat data. Concerns were also raised by the respondent that in areas where there has been a dearth of ecological understanding, HS2 Ltd. has adopted a ‘worse case scenario approach’, however it remained unclear as to how HS2 Ltd. have reached the determination of what represents an ecological ‘worst case’. A respondent raised concerns that no mentions were made of the potential of the scheme to impact on Cannock Chase or Pasture fields Saltmarsh along CA2 via increased deposition of nitrous oxides (NOx).

**Issue 8: Waste and Material Resources – Four Comments**

General concerns were predominantly related to the management of surplus excavated materials.

A stakeholder respondent raised issues regarding site specific geologies along CA4 of the scheme concerning waste handling and volumes which may require disposal. The respondent recommended that HS2 Ltd. consult local Environment Agency (EA) waste teams with regards to potential management and disposal of generated waste in this community area. In addition, concerns were raised by the stakeholder respondent that HS2 Ltd. may encounter difficulties in disposal of generated waste along CA4 of the scheme or in securing an environmental permit in this regard.

One stakeholder was concerned about the surplus excavated materials, along with associated traffic impacts.

Another stakeholder raised concerns related to environmental route-wide effects associated with waste and material resources during construction, including the use of local placement of surplus excavated materials. They reference the borrow pits in the Fradley to Colton area and raise the belief that additional disposal capacity should be included.

Further concerns were raised about the placement of stockpiled surplus materials and whether it would impact on the land use in the future.

**Issue 9: Agriculture and Soils – Four comments**

One respondent raised an issue that an additional 507 ha of agricultural land will be required during the construction phase, of which 302 ha has been identified as Best and Most Versatile agricultural land (BMV). Although HS2 Ltd. has advised that the land required temporarily for this construction phase of the scheme will be reinstated to its pre-existing condition, the respondent provided the advice that the land being returned to agricultural use is restored to a high standard and to its original capability (Agricultural Land Classification grade) as far as is practicable.
One respondent raised concerns regarding the plan that surplus material will be placed in a stockpile, commenting that the landforms part of an arable farm and therefore forms a vital asset to the core business. Further concerns were expressed relating to the reinstatement and whether it will suitable for use.

Other concerns were raised about access and impact on pasture fields.

**Issue 10: Community – Four Comments**

One respondent raised concerns that the scheme would cause huge disruptions to activities at Madeley, located along CA4 of the scheme, and does not benefit residents of the community as there is already full employment. Concerns were raised for the potential of community severance and impact on non-motorised users as a result of the proposals.

Another responder believed that the community of moorers at Great Haywood Marina should be included in the Community Impact Assessments.

**Issue 11: Air Quality – Three Comments**

One respondent outlined the fact that changes in background air quality monitoring model parameters have resulted in an increase of 30% since the last modelling was undertaken in 2016. This was used to gauge future traffic pollution along the entire route of the scheme.

Another respondent recommended that HS2 Ltd should assess the impact of the scheme on air quality during the operation of the scheme on Strategic Road Networks (SRN) and mitigate effects appropriately.

Another raised the fact that any changes in HGV movements need to be considered in HS2 Ltd.’s air quality analysis.

**Issue 12: Land Quality – Two Comments**

General responses in this category related to the placement of surplus excavation material on sensitive aquifers and source protection zones. Respondents raised concerns that a proposed location for the deposit of surplus excavation materials along CA2 of the scheme was on a Principal Aquifer, and that it was unlikely that a permit will be granted for a landfill at this location. Similarly, a proposed location for the depositing of surplus excavation material along CA3 and CA4 of the scheme was situated on a Principal Aquifer and within Source Protection Zone 3.

Concerns were raised by respondents that site investigation logs for tunnel cuttings at Whitmore, Netherset Hey and Madeley along CA4 of the scheme, relating to geology, hydrogeological impact assessment and groundwater level, had not been provided by HS2 Ltd.

A respondent raised a concern that likely regional geologies and soil conditions along CA5 of the scheme such as salt bearing strata, historical contaminated land or coal measures had not been considered.

**Issue 13: Expense – Two Comments**

One member of the public mentioned that the costs of constructing and maintenance of HS2 are continually increasing and was of the opinion that the scheme, when completed, will be unaffordable to most intended users.

Another respondent noted that, due to the fact that HS2 requires a piece of their land from 2021 for the mainline works along CA2 of the scheme, it will interfere with the maintenance programme for their golf course between 2021 and 2023. This could potentially cause the facility to cease trading and hinder their ability to generate sufficient income to cover operation costs, as well as pay the wages of its staff. They have a total wage bill in excess of £250,000 per annum.
Issue 14: Cultural Heritage – Two Comments

Two comments were received from stakeholders in this category. The first respondent mentioned that the appendix to the ‘Volume 5 Cultural Heritage Baseline’ report assessed the impact on the Blyth Valley and Bromley historic landscape as having a significant temporary effect but no significant permanent effect.

The second respondent noted that the AP2 Technical Appendices for Cultural Heritage identified circular enclosures (possibly associated with the Bronze Age period) immediately adjacent to the vicinity of potential land required for the scheme along CA1. Concerns were also raised that a portion of Heritage Asset FRC018 located along CA1 of the scheme would be lost to the construction of Pyford Embankment. Extensive prehistoric remains to the east and west of Shaw Lane along CA1 were identified by the respondent, identified in the AP Technical Appendices report, as potentially containing deposits of Pleistocene sands and gravels and Holocene alluvium with significant archaeological and paleoenvironmental potential.

The second respondent also highlighted the fact that the Cultural and Heritage baseline report for Supplementary Environmental Information 2 and AP2 recognises that the River Blithe, which Ash Brook feeds into, contains significant deposits of Pleistocene sands and gravels as well as Holocene alluvium with significant archaeological and paleoenvironmental potential. Consequently, the construction of a proposed overhead line could impact on these deposits.

Issue 15: Property Value – Two Comments

Two comments were received relating to property value and difficulties in selling properties as a result of the proposed plans.

Issue 16: Tunnelling – Two Comments

One of the respondents raised a concern that changes to the vertical alignment at Whitmore Heath Tunnel in CA4 will result in lowering of the elevation of the tunnel. The view of the respondent is that the potential impact of this will have to be assessed in a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment.

Another respondent commented that HS2 Ltd. should anticipate that waste generated during construction and tunnelling of CA4 may generate waste which, in their view “may not be suitable for beneficial reuse as engineering fill material, in the environmental mitigation earthworks, or in backfilling borrow pits” due to the composition of these materials. HS2 Ltd. may therefore encounter difficulties in its disposal or in securing an environmental permit.

Issue 17: No Comments in Response to this Consultation – One Comment

One of the respondents stated that they had no comments to make regarding the public consultation.

Issue 18: Environment – One Comment

A respondent raised concerns about HS2 Ltd.’s intentions to disrupt valuable green space and areas used heavily by the Madeley community and failed to calculate the health and environmental implications of such measures.

Issue 19: Socio-Economics – One Comment

The respondent raised concerns about the effects it would have on a local business that would be affected. There were concerns the business would have to close, causing a negative impact on local employment.

Issue 20: Public Consultation Issues – One Comment

Comments were received from one respondent relating to issues with the consultation process, including lack of responses and withholding of information.
2.2 Community Areas and Related Additional Provisions

This section of the Report presents the results from the public consultation related to the geographical/spatial groupings along the proposed route. Not all submissions referred specifically to a CA or AP, although where possible the Independent Assessor related submissions to the appropriate CA through references to local settlements and features mentioned in the text.

The CA and AP references are taken from the Supplementary Environmental Information and AP ES consultation documents and the Independent Assessor has decided to apply the same categorisation for ease of reference with HS2 Ltd. project material.

The results are presented in the following section in numerical order.

All five CAs are mentioned by respondents. Community areas along the route with the largest volume of public responses were CA1 and CA2.

2.2.1 CA1 – Fradley to Colton – Eleven Responses

Most of the comments received in this community area related to the proposed grid supply point connection to the proposed National Grid Parkgate substation which will include new permanent grid substations at Parkgate and Newlands lane, as well as the steel pylons on which the 7.7 km of powerlines will run. Respondents were mainly concerned about the visual and ecological impact of the proposed connection.

One of the respondents in this community area raised a concern that the route of the proposed dual pylon line from Newlands Lane Auto Transformer Site to Blithford Farm does not take into consideration its effect on householders or nature. The respondent also mentioned that traffic flow on Newlands Lane (a single-track road with sharp bends and undulating terrain) as a result of the pylon project will place significant hazards to motorists and pedestrians. The respondent recommended the use of composite plastic poles instead of wooden poles or steel lattices for the Grid Supply Point connection at Parkgate.

Another respondent mentioned that proposed changes, as stated in AP2-001-006, have the potential to have more significant effects on flood risk associated with Bourne Brook watercourse and recommended that adequate measures be taken to mitigate any resultant effects.

Another respondent recommended that HS2 Ltd.’s objective of ‘no net loss of biodiversity’ be replaced with ‘biodiversity net gain’, and also mentioned that the almost 2,000,000 tonnes of surplus material to be deposited at 20 local sites to minimise HGV movement may have serious implication relating to securing required permitting, including pre-application ground investigation and monitoring during and after the depositing of waste.

A stakeholder also mentioned that the change in depth to borrow pits along CA1 may have the potential to have a permanent major adverse effect on deeply buried archaeological remains. These include deeply buried Pleistocene deposits that might contain waterlogged materials or near surface waterlogged archaeological materials adjacent to rivers or surface waters.

Another respondent in CA1 noted that changes from construction activities in the area will result in the loss of small parts of a significant number of Local Wildlife Sites and sought clarification on Option 4 of the traction power alternatives proposed by HS2 Ltd. in CA1.

Comments from the Woodland Trust mentioned that proposed changes at the southern end of CA1 were confusing because of the overlap between Phase 1 and Phase 2A works, and that the following ancient woods in this community area may be affected by an increased footprint of the construction boundary. These are Tomhay Wood, Vicar's Coppice, Westfield Covert, and Pipe Wood.
Another respondent raised a concern that ecological surveys along CA1 by HS2 Ltd. appeared to be limited with several areas along the proposed route having only partial protected/priority species and habitat data. They also noted that HS2 Ltd. has not applied ‘best practices’ and have not worked to the mitigation hierarchy as expected.

Comments from the Forestry Commission regarding CA1 relate to the impact of the route of proposed powerlines on potential woodland at Lower Birches Plantation/Titler’s Plantation with the pollarding of trees across a linear 0.2 ha of the site alongside an existing line and recommends that care be taken during this operation so as not to damage the ancient woodland soils.

A response from a public stakeholder mentioned that changes to connect HS2 with the West Coast Mainline’s slow lines (as opposed to the faster lines) at Handsacre junction may have a minor additional visual impact on the Trent & Mersey canal.

Another respondent mentioned that, although the HS2 Ltd. document ‘Summary of Changes to Ecology Baseline Data that do not Generate New or Different Significant Effect (EC-018-000)’ mentioned that updated surveys on John Gorse Local Wildlife Site have reduced the impact of the scheme on the site from 2.7 hectares to 2.4 hectares, they do not have any documentation or records to this effect from HS2 Ltd. and sought clarification as a result.

2.2.2 CA2 – Colwich to Yarlet – Ten Responses

Eight out of the nine responses relating to CA2 were from stakeholders and one from the public. Issues raised by respondents in this community area were varied in nature. A respondent raised a concern about the construction impacts resulting from the inclusion of additional land for construction by HS2 Ltd. at Great Haywood on the Trent and Mersey canal.

Ingestre Park Golf Course (IPGC) raised concerns about the impact of the scheme on their golf course as outlined in the Supplementary Environmental Statement 2 (Supplementary Environmental Information 2). They identified ‘fundamental flaws’ from the report relating to the golf course which include referring to effects resulting from proposals to reconfigure the golf course (including a necessary minimum 15 month closure) as ‘temporary’ rather than ‘permanent’ as set out in previous environmental statements. They also mentioned that the assessment failed to include any evaluation of the likely impact on the existing community, recreational and employment matters. Other issues raised by IPGC about the impact of the scheme on the golf course relate to utility diversions (inability to consider the impact of the proposed diversion of an existing fuel pipeline running through the golf course), irrigation and drainage, project time frames, and viability.

The Forestry Commission’s response in this community area relate to an inconsistency between the mitigation planting as described in map CT-06-211 (grassland and ponds) and paragraph 5.4.89 of the Supplementary Environmental Information 2.

The Woodland Trust mentioned four ancient woodlands that could be affected by proposed changes set out in the AP2 report to be Tithebarn Covert, Flushing Covert (directly affected by the proposed scheme with 0.2 ha of ancient woodland to be lost), Townfield Plantation (0.1 ha of ancient woodland to be lost) and Ingestre Wood.

The EA raised a concern that a proposed location for the placement of surplus excavation material (Supplementary Environmental Information 2-002-007) was situated on a Principal Aquifer and mentioned that it may not be possible for a permit to be granted for a landfill to be used at this location for this purpose.
A public respondent raised concerns about HS2 Ltd.’s proposal for the local placement of surplus excavated material stored permanently on land to the south of the railway line at Moreton cutting (map number CT-05-210) in an area already proposed to be occupied by temporary material stockpile in the original scheme. The surplus material is expected to cover an area of 1.9 ha and will be up to 3 metres in height. While it is proposed that the stockpile will be graded to allow the area to be returned to agricultural use, the respondent raised concerns that its reinstatement will leave the land in a much worse condition which will not be fit for its existing use as productive arable land. The respondent welcomed the opportunity to engage with HS2 Ltd. on this matter prior to the bill being agreed.

### 2.2.3 CA3 – Stone to Swynerton – Eight Responses

Six of the seven responses in CA3 were from stakeholders and one was from the public. Responses in this CA were varied and comprised issues relating to Land Quality, Traffic, as well as Forestry and Ancient Woodland. The EA raised an issue regarding the proposed change to the diversion of a Scottish Power Energy Network, 132 kV overhead power line and a new utility compound south east of Swynnerton Footpath. The stakeholder noted that the route of the underground powerline (proposed to replace the overhead powerline) may possibly lie within Source Protection Zone 2 and sought clarity on if the underground powerline will be below the groundwater table, and if it would comprise fluid filled cables. A second issue raised by the EA pertained to the proposed location for the placement of surplus excavation material (Supplementary Environmental Information 2-003-006) being situated on a Principal Aquifer and within Source Protection Zone 3. The agency noted that a permit will not be granted for a landfill at this location, depending on the nature of the material to be deposited.

Another respondent mentioned one ancient woodland and one area of wood pasture in CA3 that would be affected by changes proposed in AP2. These are Trent Wood (originally 500 m away from the construction boundary but now adjacent to a utility diversion due to changes under AP2 as shown on map CT-06-222-R1) and Tittensor Chase (originally a significant distance away from the proposed construction boundary, now located immediate south west of a proposed power supply connection due to changes under AP2).

The Forestry Commission noted in their response that Birchwood is an ancient woodland and should be considered of national value.

Another respondent mentioned that Stone Meadows Local Nature Reserve will be impacted by the need for additional land required for the provision of new permanent traffic signals at the junction of Yarnfield Lane and the A34 which would result in the permanent loss of 200 m² (0.2%) of habitats, mostly made up of broadleaved woodland and scrub. The respondent also mentioned that Lodge Covert Local Wildlife Site has now been re-designated as a Biodiversity Alert Site (BAS) and as a result would change the significance of the effects of the scheme to the site from ‘district borough’ level to ‘county’ level’. They also expected that an appropriate level of mitigation, including translocation of valuable soils, ground flora and dead wood materials into newly created woodland sites, be provided. The respondent also mentioned that the loss of 200 m² of woodland of the original scheme presents a new likely residual permanent adverse effect on the structure and function of the site as no specific mitigation has yet been included in proposals in AP2 and Supplementary Environmental Information 2.

A public respondent raised concerns about the use of Yarnfield Lane during the construction phase of the scheme and was concerned that the need for HS2 Ltd. to implement the Select Committee’s requirement to install a wider M6 overbridge at Yarnfield Lane prior to its widening to 6.8 metres to accommodate passing HGV vehicles and to ensure the safety of road users had not yet been addressed. Other issues raised by this respondent related to HS2 Ltd.’s proposals to reduce the number of vehicles removing spoil from Yarnfield Site and the inability of emergency vehicles to access Yarnfield from the A34 during the construction phase of the scheme due to proposals in the AP2 to increase the number of HGV vehicles to 2,329.
2.2.4 CA4 – Whitmore Heath to Madeley – Eight Responses

Five of the seven responses in CA4 were from stakeholders and two were from the public. One stakeholder response made reference to proposals in AP2-004-007 involving the provision of a new power supply to cross AP2-13, identified as a pasture field and running along Manor Road. The respondent recommended to HS2 Ltd. that they ensure that access be provided to the pasture field at all times and that current flooding problems on Manor Road be resolved by HS2 Ltd. This is in light of the fact that the installation of the power supply along Manor Road may exacerbate the flooding problems which may disrupt drainage culverts under the West Coast Mainline.

Issues in a response by the EA related to the proposed placement of surplus excavation material (Supplementary Environmental Information 2-004-001) on an area identified by a Principal Aquifer and within Source Protection Zone 3. The EA also noted that an Environmental Permit for a landfill in this location may not be granted to HS2 Ltd. depending on the nature of the material to be deposited. Other issues raised by the EA in their response related to changes to the vertical alignment at Whitmore Heath Tunnel (resulting in a lowering of the tunnel’s elevation), and the unavailability of site investigation logs or a hydrogeological impact assessment to prove the geological or groundwater level data for Whitmore Tunnel and Cuttings. The EA also raised concerns regarding the lack of availability of site investigation records to prove the geological structure or groundwater level data for Netherset Hey Borrow Pit.

The Woodland Trust identified the following woodlands as potentially affected by proposed changes proposed in AP2. These are Trentham Park Golf Course, Whitmore Wood (a loss of 5.5 ha of ancient woodland as a result of construction works relating to the scheme), Hey Sprink (a loss of 0.2 hectares resulting from the construction of the Lea South Embankment), an unnamed woodland to the West of Holly Wood (originally 3 km from the proposed construction boundary, but now adjacent to proposed works associated with provision of a power supply to power the tunnel boring machine for Whitmore Tunnel), and Grafton’s Wood and the Lum (originally adjacent to the construction boundaries relating to works on the West Coast Mainline but no longer affected by the proposed works according to AP2 map CT-05-234).

A respondent raised concerns that no design changes have been made in AP2 to cover for the impact of an access track through the most diverse and valuable part of Bower End Lane Local Wildlife Site and recommended that a detailed design and amendments to the road layout be made to minimise habitat loss at the site.

A member of the public raised the concern that proposed vertical alignments to Whitmore Tunnel would result in an increase in noise and vibration nearer the surface and also mentioned that HS2 Ltd. have failed to recognise the rights of residents of the community.

Another member of the public submitted correspondence between themselves and HS2 Ltd. regarding the decision to no longer pay statutory compensation or purchase the property due to a decision by HS2 Ltd. to construct a deep tunnel near the property as against a surface route as originally intended. Further enquiries by the respondent to HS2 Ltd. regarding this decision were not responded to. The correspondence between the respondent and HS2 Ltd. also showed that issues were raised regarding divergent opinions on the geology of the area on which the tunnel is to be constructed.

2.2.5 CA5 – South Cheshire – Six Responses

A response from the EA mentioned that the additional land for the new underground Openreach telecommunications cable to Crewe South Crossovers railway (AP2-005-102) runs very close to Basford Brook. The brook was noted to contain the most significant white-clawed crayfish populations in Cheshire and recommended that the Environmental Statement assess all potential impacts of the amendments to the scheme on legally protection species. The EA raised concerns that no statement was made by HS2 Ltd. for likely
regional geologies and soil condition that may be encountered and may not prove suitable for reuse and disposal without increased risk to the environment and recommended that Environmental Permits may be required for any disposal sites for these wastes. The EA also mentioned in their response that they have previously objected to HS2 Ltd.’s plans for mineral extraction activities to take place at Betley Mere Borrow Pit as the extent of available mineral resources at this location had not been established.

Concerns were also raised by the EA as to the unavailability of site investigation records to prove the geological structure or groundwater level data at Madeley Borrow Pit. A hydrogeological impact assessment for the proposed borrow pit was also not made available to the EA. Concerns were raised by the agency that it was not possible to establish the potential impact on water resources in the Secondary A aquifer through which the southern extension of Crewe Tunnel brings the railways to the surface via the approach cutting at Hough. This was due to the absence of site investigation logs and groundwater level monitoring data. Record species of water voles were noted in their response.

Three of the five responses that referenced this area were from members of the public. They mention issues with the public consultation process, landscape, noise, and impacts on traffic and public footpaths. They make no reference to particular elements of the AP.

The Forestry Commission recommend that mitigation and compensation methods be increased as a result of a 67% increase in the amount of habitat loss in this area. Natural England suggest the HRA screening assessment for Betley Mere in CA5 is updated.
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