

# **High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester)**

**Equality Impact Assessment  
Report Consultation**



# Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.1 Context .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.2 The consultation .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3 Responses received .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Summary of responses .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.1 Note about responses from individuals.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.2 Route-wide impact assessment .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.3 Community area assessments .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.4 Appendices to the EQIA Report .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2.5 Further comments about the EQIA Report .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix A - List of organisations that responded to the consultation</b>	
<b>Appendix B - Response form</b>	
<b>Appendix C - Equalities and diversity monitoring form</b>	

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Context

As a public organisation, HS2 Ltd has obligations under the Equality Act 2010 to take account of the impact of its activities on groups with protected characteristics (PCGs). HS2 Ltd has undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) on the Proposed Scheme between Crewe and Manchester.

Objectives of the EQIA are to:

- identify the presence of PCGs along the route of the Proposed Scheme, where such groups are disproportionately represented amongst those most likely to be affected by the Proposed Scheme. The nine PCGs<sup>1</sup> share a particular protected characteristic which include age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex, and sexual orientation;
- draw on engagement with stakeholders to inform the understanding of likely needs of those groups, relevant to identified potential effects;
- assess the potential effects of the Proposed Scheme's construction and operation for PCGs, including how the Proposed Scheme could affect relations between groups;
- identify measures, including reasonable adjustments, to avoid, reduce and/or mitigate potential adverse equality effects on PCGs; and
- identify relevant measures, which as part of the Proposed Scheme design or mitigation, can further enhance equality, address existing disadvantage or support good relations between PCGs and other people.

The EQIA Report contributes towards HS2 Ltd's active fulfilment of its PSED obligations both during the design stage of the Proposed Scheme and during subsequent design development. The EQIA is a predictive assessment, considering, in advance of implementation, the potential impacts from the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme, and the potential effects of these for PCGs. The EQIA, which draws on the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), has also served to inform design, mitigation and other relevant project-related decisions.

## 1.2 The consultation

On 25 January 2022, HS2 Ltd launched a public consultation on the High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) Equality Impact Assessment Report. The consultation ran for just over nine weeks, closing at 11:45pm on 31 March 2022.

The purpose of the consultation was to provide those who wished to with an opportunity to put forward their views and to provide their comments on the EQIA report

---

<sup>1</sup> Not all PCGs are covered in the EQIA

A 148-page *Equality Impact Assessment Report for High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester)* was made available on the [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk) website.<sup>2</sup> It detailed the equality impact assessment for eight geographical areas between Crewe and Manchester, referred to as community areas. These community areas are:

- Hough to Walley's Green (MA01)
- Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam (MA02)
- Pickmere to Agden and Hulsheath (MA03)
- Broomedge to Glazebrook (MA04)
- Risley to Bamfurlong (MA05)
- Hulsheath to Manchester Airport (MA06)
- Davenport Green to Ardwick (MA07)
- Manchester Piccadilly Station (MA08)

The public consultation was publicised in a number of ways:

- an information leaflet was posted to addresses within 1 kilometre of the centreline of the route, or 500 metres from the consolidate construction boundary, whichever was most appropriate for each local area;
- notices placed in local and national newspapers;
- targeted social media advertising;
- information published on the gov.uk website.

All documents were available to download from the gov.uk site and to order in hard copy through the HS2 Helpdesk.

There were a number of formal channels through which respondents could make known their views by:

- Completing an **online response form** which could be accessed through <https://ipsos.uk/HS2EQIA>.
- Completing a **pdf version of the response form** that could be downloaded from the [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk) website. This could be completed electronically and submitted via email, or it could be printed out and sent as a hard copy response through the post. A freepost address (Freepost HS2 BILL EQIA) was provided with response forms in order for members of the public and organisations to post their response.
- **Written letter**. A freepost address (FREEPOST HS2 Bill EQIA) was provided in the consultation document in order for members of the public and organisations to post their response.
- **Email** via a dedicated consultation email address ([HS2BillEQIA@Ipsos-MORI.com](mailto:HS2BillEQIA@Ipsos-MORI.com)).

These response channels were all managed by Ipsos on behalf of HS2 Ltd. All responses dated and received within the consultation period (25 January to 31 March) were analysed and are briefly summarised in this report.

---

<sup>2</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1046541/M349.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1046541/M349.pdf)

Alongside this consultation, a second consultation was also undertaken on the High Speed Rail (Crewe to Manchester) Environmental Statement. This took place over the same period (25 January to 31 March), but is reported on separately.

### 1.3 Responses received

In total, 25 responses were received within the consultation period. Responses were received through different response channels, a breakdown of which is set out Table 1. The names of the organisations that responded are included in Appendix A as none of them requested confidentiality.

**Table 1 Response received by type and channel**

	<b>All</b>	<b>Individuals</b>	<b>Organisations</b>
<b>Online response form</b> Responses completed through the response form on the consultation website	14	14	0
<b>Email response</b> Responses submitted by email not using the response form structure (letters, emails, postcards, reports)	9	4	5
<b>Whitemail</b> Responses submitted by post not using the response form structure (letters, emails, postcards, reports)	1	1	0
<b>Postal response form</b> Responses submitted by post using the response form structure	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>

## 2. Summary of responses

### 2.1 Note about responses from individuals

Many of the comments received from individuals were considered to be beyond the scope of the consultation. Such comments tended to focus on perceived or actual wider impacts as a consequence of the construction of HS2, rather than on specific impacts on PCGs included within the EQIA Report. However in the interests of fairness, such comments have been covered within this summary report, along with more specific and detailed comments from stakeholder organisations.

### 2.2 Route-wide impact assessment

Respondents were asked for comments on the route-wide assessment as set out in Section 5 of the EQIA report. Comments were received from 11 individuals and four organisations.

Comments from individuals focussed on how the construction of HS2 could negatively affect local people and local communities, including those within PCGs.

Two individuals provided comments on the proposed main construction compound at Hoo Green, and how this could negatively affect local people's health and wellbeing. The route-wide assessment in their opinion appeared to have overlooked such impacts. Furthermore, one respondent thought that while the route-wide assessment referenced how local impacts would be mitigated (including mitigated impacts on a nursery school and church in Community Area MA03), it, in their view did little or nothing to recognise the impact of HS2 on local residents. Concerns were also raised about perceived impacts on local people's physical and mental wellbeing as a consequence of construction works.

*"...the omission by HS2 Ltd to identify Hoo Green Residents impacted by the A50 main site compound is...very worrying. My concerns for physical and mental wellbeing, general safety, noise, air quality, road congestion, access to and from Oakwood Road are not addressed..."*

#### **Member of the public**

One respondent believed that Lostock Green would be adversely affected by closure of footpaths, making it more difficult for elderly people to access local amenities and shops. Another respondent mentioned that HS2 works near Lowton West School on Slag Lane could endanger school children getting to and from Lowton West School, and stated that a more thorough assessment would be needed before the Proposed Scheme could proceed.

*"(Slag Lane) is a very busy road used by ambulance crews and fire crews...as well as a quick route to the area around and further afield. Lowton West School is at the top of Slag Lane where the pedestrian walk is narrow already and would be a death trap for school children!! It is already a dangerous road for schoolchildren...this route for lorries would have a massive impact on both Stonecross and Slag Lane and needs to be given thorough and thoughtful examination before being decided on."*

#### **Member of the public**

Organisations provided more detailed comments on the route-wide assessment.

Cheshire West and Chester Council welcomed the route-wide impact assessment and mentioned that it appeared to be "comprehensive".

*“The route-wide impact assessment appears to be comprehensive. The Council welcomes the general measures and notes the positive approach taken around communications (5.2.6) and advocacy/support (5.2.8)...”*

### **Chester West and Chester Council**

However, the council raised a question over reference at 5.2.18 in the report to avoid HGV movements operating adjacent to schools during drop off and pick up periods. The council believed that where it was stated in the report that this would be where ‘reasonably practicable’, it queried how effective this would be.

Cheshire West and Chester Council also referenced an acknowledgement in the route-wide assessment that four care homes would be impacted by traffic increases, and that two care homes and a school would be impacted by visual impacts. This was accepted as a consequence of construction noise, as well as traffic impacts on a number of schools in the vicinity of the Proposed Scheme. The council stated that positive action commitments as set out in sections 5.2.20 - 24 of the route-wide assessment would be valued in terms of the employment of under-represented groups, although it would wish to see a pledge around employing local people from under-represented groups.

Additionally, while paragraph 5.2.26 in the route-wide assessment referred to maintaining footways of adequate width to facilitate pedestrian flows, Cheshire West and Chester Council suggested that this should include an accessibility consideration so that disabled people, including those who use wheelchairs are included. It was also mentioned that the permanent loss of Lostock Green Picnic area including an accessible toilet would be regrettable.

Warrington Borough Council had no specific comments to make on the route-wide assessment, other than to say that its findings and mitigation measures will have been guided by the methodologies employed towards stakeholder engagement and assessment of baseline data.

*“...as with the ES, significant reliance has been placed on the draft Code of Construction Practice and Local Environment Management Plan, which have yet to develop in their entirety, leaving significant elements of the EQIA open to future interpretation.”*

### **Warrington Borough Council**

Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) and Manchester City Council both provided similar comments. The authorities were concerned that the Proposed Scheme’s station at Piccadilly would not be appropriately integrated with the facilities of the existing Piccadilly Station. It was suggested that a more integrated design would provide a common and more legible approach for HS2 and non-HS2 passengers, enabling choice between a wider variety of ancillary facilities and reducing unnecessary changes of level and therefore allowing better accessibility for all.

GMCA and Manchester City Council also stated that further work would be required to optimise Piccadilly Station and the approach alignment to ensure HS2 Ltd’s proposals would be integrated with the existing station and cityscape, as set out within Manchester City Council’s previous consultation responses. Both authorities also provided comments on the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) which has been referenced in the route-wide impact assessment, and called for further consultation.

*“The route-wide section refers to the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and states that this will have a comprehensive community emergency plan and that when working with the relevant emergency service, that the community can be kept fully informed and adequate arrangements are in place for evacuation...further consultation is required to underpin the assessment and the CoCP should include further details about how the Emergency Response teams will be engaged and feed into the future community emergency plans and how the CoCP will be used by the appointed undertaker to protect the PCGs identified within the EQIA.”*

### **GMCA and Manchester City Council**

Manchester City Council noted that a substantial number of buildings and structures would be required to be demolished in Manchester to facilitate the Proposed Scheme. It was stated that HS2 Ltd should ensure that there was adequate engagement, assistance and support for anyone affected, and specifically anyone who would require additional support with understanding and going through the compensation process.

### **2.3 Community area assessments**

The EQIA report prepared by HS2 Ltd looked at potential equality effects route-wide along the Phase 2b route. It also looked at issues at a more local level, splitting the assessment into the following eight community areas:

- MA01 – Hough to Walley’s Green
- MA02 – Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam
- MA03 – Pickmere to Agden and Hulsheath
- MA04 – Broomedge to Glazebrook
- MA05 – Risley to Bamfurlong
- MA06 – Hulsheath to Manchester Airport
- MA07 – Davenport Green to Ardwick
- MA08 – Manchester Piccadilly Station

Respondents were asked for their comments on the community area (CA) assessments. Overall, 15 respondents provided comments on one or more of the CA assessments. A summary of the comments received is provided below.

#### **MA01 – Hough to Walley’s Green**

No comments were received

#### **MA02 – Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam**

Comments were received from three individuals and one organisation. Of the individuals who provided comments, one stated they had no concerns. Two others selected MA02 on the response form, but rather than providing responses on the Community Area Assessment, their comments were considered as out of scope as they were made about opposition to HS2.

Cheshire West and Chester Council raised a number of concerns including how a loss of an educational facility could impact young people, and that loss of a picnic area could be detrimental to PCGs.



*“The permanent loss of the educational facility of Greenhayes Farm is of concern, with no attempt at mitigation. The fact that it is free, and the nearest alternative is not only some distance away but also charges mean there is a distinct adverse impact on young people. Equally, the permanent loss of Lostock Green Picnic Area and its accessible toilet represents a detriment to children, older and disabled people, and pregnant and nursing mothers.”*

#### **Cheshire West and Chester Council**

Cheshire West and Chester Council also mentioned how Wimboldsley Community Primary School and Byley Primary and Nursery School could be impacted by HS2 construction works, with negative consequences for local school children. The council stated that it would be submitting a separate assessment of impacts to HS2 Ltd.

It was also suggested that as road closures and increased traffic would impact on staff and parents, a recommended mitigation would be to have before and after school clubs to ease congestion and travel issues. Additionally, the Council also made reference to care homes, and how construction works could result in fewer visits to older and disabled people, and as such, impacting their mental health and wellbeing.

*“The impact on Lostock Lodge Care Home does not make reference to the impact of construction on visitors who may visit less frequently as a result, impacting on the health and wellbeing of residents who are older and/or disabled. There is also presumably a typing error ...which refers to Bentley Manor Care Home.”*

#### **Cheshire West and Chester Council**

Cheshire West and Chester Council also mentioned that while the 'area-based effects' section of the EQIA report outlined some of the impacts on access to amenities, it believed that it did not recognise difficulties in access to local shops, likely to be an issue for older and disabled residents, nor access to the nearest hospitals in Crewe and Northwich.

#### **MA03 Pickmere to Agden and Hulsheath**

Two individuals provided comments. One individual said that they could not see that there had been any reference to, what they considered to be 'substantial impacts' of the position of the main site compound. The other individual also mentioned the site compound, and that, in their opinion, there would likely be more substantial impacts on the local community that covered in HS2 Ltd's assessment, and that as such, HS2 Ltd was being insensitive to the views and needs of local communities.

#### **MA04 Broomedge to Glazebrook**

Two organisations provided comments. Warrington Borough Council stated that the EQIA had failed to take into account construction impacts associated with the provision of a viaduct over the Bridgewater Canal.

*“This is a public right of way and a designated tourist route...which may be subject to closure for phases during construction. This is likely to impact PCGs (e.g. age, disability), especially in an area with a disproportionate representation of the older age groups. It is important to minimise disadvantage, encourage participation and advance equality of opportunity.”*

#### **Warrington Borough Council**

Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) believed that the Proposed Scheme would result in direct and indirect effects in Warburton and Mossbrow, and Partington as a result of construction works.

*“The proposed route will dissect the neighbouring communities of Warburton and Mossbrow...(these) settlements share a small number of community facilities to which access for residents would be significantly impacted by the realignment of the A6144 Paddock Lane...lack of well located, high quality, safe alternative routes will have a negative impact on residents with protected characteristics and other residents of the village.”*

### **GMCA**

Other impacts in the community area included that it was noted that the Warburton embankment satellite compound and the A6144 Paddock Lane satellite compound would both be located in Warburton between the A6144 Paddock Lane and the A57 Cadishead Way. It was believed that effects associated with these compounds would relate to travel disruption, visual effects and social isolation. GMCA suggested that HS2 Ltd should be required to confirm the measures to be secured to ensure that the potential effects on the village residents, specifically those aged 65 to 84 would be reduced. GMCA also stated that HS2 Ltd should be required to engage with the relevant authorities and local residents in what it would consider a timely manner to allow for suitable mitigation to be identified.

Furthermore, GMCA noted that The Manchester Ship Canal viaduct south satellite compound would be located in Partington south of the Manchester Ship Canal and north of the A6144 Warburton Lane and would be operational for four years and three months. Effects associated with an increase in HGV traffic and travel disruption was identified as a significant effect. In addition, traffic severance for pedestrians and other non-motorised users, in the view of GMCA, could have disproportionate and differential effects on children. Impact on low income households in Partington/Irlam were also considered to have the potential to be exacerbated by the impact on local transport. It was suggested that HS2 Ltd should be required to ensure that the detailed construction traffic management is approved in writing by relevant local planning authorities to ensure that PCGs are taken into account when mitigation measures are proposed.

### **MA05 Risley to Bamfurlong**

One individual and two organisations provided comments. The individual said they had concerns about the benefits and cost of HS2 between Ridley and Bamfurlong, although this was considered as being beyond the scope of the consultation.

*“I raise concern re the benefits and cost of HS2 Ridley to Bamfurlong (sic). Also the construction of HS2 through a conservation area and heavily populated area with a poor road.” infrastructure.*

### **Member of the public**

Warrington Borough Council mentioned that the EQIA identifies that the Proposed Scheme would result in the need to demolish the building used by the English Karate Academy, and that this could give rise to disproportionate effects on children and young people. The council welcomed HS2 Ltd's ongoing commitment to identify reasonably practicable measures to help mitigate the loss of the resource. However, the council also stated that proposed measures should extend beyond financial assistance and should involve relocation assistance in order to prevent a detrimental impact upon young people. It was believed that such assistance would minimise disadvantage, encouraging participation, and improve equality of opportunity.

GMCA mentioned a number of impacts of the Proposed Scheme including: permanent loss or direct and indirect effects on Lowton Junior and Infant School, Hesketh Meadows Playing Fields and English Karate Academy; significant damage to Lowton Village, and that Hesketh Meadow would be lost as part

of the proposals. It was thought that as the proposed replacement pitches would be on the other side of the line of the Proposed Scheme, this could adversely impact children, young people and other users of the existing pitches for formal or informal recreation.

### **MA06 Hulsheath to Manchester Airport**

Two individuals and two organisations provided comments. One of the individuals mentioned that they did not want HS2 to go ahead as they believed it would have a significant impact on local communities in Ashley. Another individual mentioned that they lived in Ashley and that they believed that the village would be adversely affected by HS2. They suggested that if HS2 must be built then it must be in a cutting through Ashley, and that there must be no temporary or permanent railhead in Ashley, that there should also be no IMB-R in Ashley and the alternative IMB-R site at Aldersey's Rough must be used to ensure local communities are not impacted. However, such comments were outside the scope of the consultation.

GMCA and Manchester City Council provided comments about the MA05 Community Area Assessment. It was stated that the Proposed Scheme would result in the permanent loss and direct and indirect effects on Children's Adventure Farm Trust, Fairfield Farm Project, Higher Thorns Green Farm, and 20 residential properties settlement along Sunbank Lane.

*“HS2 Ltd should be required to confirm the measures to be secured to reduce the potential effects on the affected residential communities and amenities within Community Area MA06 and confirm the mechanisms for providing support to PCGs identified within these residential areas. Where required, GMCA request that HS2 Ltd allow for the delivery of uninterrupted provision and alternative facilities should be provided to ensure the community continues to be served.”*

### **GMCA and Manchester City Council**

Other comments and suggestions included: a request that the EQIA provides additional information on the engagement with the residents of properties affected and clarify if any properties have residents that should be considered as part of the assessment of PCGs; and that HS2 Ltd should be required to provide appropriate mitigation for properties which are to be retained, through permanent landscaping with acoustic barriers offered to the impact properties closest to the construction activity.

GMCA mentioned that construction work had potential to impact on disabled residents and parents or carers with pushchairs. As such, it was stated that HS2 Ltd should be required to ensure that the EQIA considers, and where appropriate, proposes mitigation for the impacts associated with travel disruption, with particular attention given to disabled residents and visitors of the area.

Furthermore, GMCA also noted that a number of public footpath closures and diversions would be required, including footpaths Hale 16, Ringway 7 and Ringway 9. The authority believed that the impacts of these on the potential PCGs had not been assessed within the EQIA, and that as such, it considered the assessment as deficient of a full assessment on communities within which groups protected under the Equality Act 2010 may reside. To ensure the construction work did not compromise Trafford's Core Strategy Policy R3 (which protect and seek to enhance walking and cycling access network), it was requested that HS2 Ltd should be required to provide replacement footpath routes where existing routes would be impacted, ensuring that alternative routes are accessible for identified PCGs.

## MA07 Davenport Green to Ardwick

Two organisations (GMCA and Manchester City Council) provided comments on the assessment that identified that the Proposed Scheme would result in the permanent loss or direct/indirect effects on the Birchfields Primary School, and The Christie Hospital. GMCA and Manchester City Council were concerned about differential effects for patients with cancer who might be impacted with night-time effects associated with additional lighting from construction works, and that vibration from such works might affect vibration sensitive equipment.

*“...require HS2 Ltd to ensure that the EQIA considers and wholly mitigates the impacts associated with visual and vibration effects in the vicinity of the Christie Hospital which they stated has additional and significant sensitivities.”*

### GMCA and Manchester City Council

The authorities made reference to the Wilmslow Road vent shaft and that there would be implications for parking provision for the Christie Hospital, Car Park D. It was stated that a loss of 135 parking spaces would include 30 blue badge spaces. The authorities requested that the layout for the vent headhouse design must be designed to retain as much car parking as possible, as the loss of all Blue Badge parking spaces and wheelchair shelters, would, in their opinion, give rise to disproportionate and differential effects for disabled people including those with cancer attending the hospital for treatment or to visit other patients.

The authorities also requested that HS2 Ltd should be required to establish suitable mitigation and a reprovision strategy for the loss of parking spaces at the hospital and deliver that mitigation prior to any work. It was stated that HS2 Ltd should update the EQIA as design progresses to clearly articulate mitigations or actions, and to record engagement and consultation.

It was also believed that construction work would have potential to impact on disabled residents and parents or carers with pushchairs. The authorities requested that HS2 Ltd should be required to ensure that the EQIA considers and addresses the impacts associated with travel disruption, with particular attention given to disabled residents.

## MA08 Manchester Piccadilly Station

Two individuals and two organisations provided comments, although the comments from individuals were largely beyond the scope of the consultation. One of the individuals stated that, in their view, as there would be unacceptable impacts caused by five months of construction noise, it would mean that they cannot carry out their work of delivering training courses. The other individual mentioned that based on the EQIA report it would appear (in their opinion) that there was a bias towards negatively affecting facilities for young people, the elderly, and a number of minorities. It was believed that the loss of school facilities, religious facilities and other minority resources would be avoidable if HS2 Ltd changed their plans to build an underground station.

As with comments on other sections of the Equality Impact Assessment report, GMCA and Manchester City Council both provided similar comments. Both authorities mentioned that HS2 Ltd should be required to provide adequate engagement, assistance, and support to the users of the residential and community buildings permanently lost within Community Area MA08. It was stated that HS2 Ltd should be required to deliver support services for PCGs the details of which are to be consulted with the local authority equality specialists and agreed in writing with the relevant parties.

Other comments and suggestions received from both authorities included: that HS2 Ltd should include an equality expert's input on inclusive access on the new station design and modification to Metrolink at Piccadilly; that as construction works at Piccadilly Metrolink are ongoing, HS2 Ltd should be required to provide replacement bus services to offer a like for like services for disabled passengers, and to ensure that there is no conflict of space of wheelchairs and buggies due a lack of sufficient provision. The authorities believed that as there would be an increase in journey length of up to 700m, this would be likely to have a disproportionate effect on children, young people, older people, and disabled people who are more likely to use public transport, and that there was also a potential differential effect for pregnant women and mothers of babies up to six months, older people and disabled people, who may experience greater inconvenience or difficulty walking to Piccadilly Gardens to access replacement bus services and may be less able to make use of alternative public transport provision.

Both GMCA and Manchester City Council were also concerned about loss of car parking facilities at Manchester Piccadilly Station multi-storey car park. It was thought that this would impact journey length which had been mitigated with accessible motorised linkage between a replacement car park and station. It was stated that HS2 Ltd should be required to engage with stakeholders or to identify any previous data/engagement which highlights positive/negative impacts of motorised links and how the motorised links have been assessed in relation to disabled users and accessibility, and that HS2 Ltd should be required to present the associated effects within the EQIA.

Finally on route diversions as a consequence of the Proposed Scheme, it was mentioned that such diversions would lead to increases in journey length for non-motorised users of between 100 and 220m. The authorities believed that there would be potential for a differential effect for older people and disabled people as well as young children and mothers of babies up to six months. The authorities stated that it was not made clear what mitigation measures would be put in place to reduce risks identified with replacement services, length of distances and disruption on PCGs

## **2.4 Appendices to the EQIA Report**

In addition to the route-wide assessment and community area assessments, respondents were asked for comments on the appendices to the EQIA Report (Appendix A Literature Review and Appendix B Community Profile). Comments were received from five individuals and one organisation.

Although members of the public used the response form and provided comments at the question, comments received did not specifically reference the appendices to the EQIA report. Instead, most of the responses tended to repeat comments already made on the overall report, as well as out of scope comments, including a belief that HS2 should not go ahead.

Cheshire West and Chester Council said that it had no comments on the appendices as it believed them to be accurate and robust. However, it mentioned that as information becomes available from the 2021 census, that this should be updated

## **2.5 Further comments about the EQIA Report**

Respondents were asked if they had any further comments they would like to make about the EQIA report. Thirteen respondents provided comments, including nine individuals and four organisations.

One respondent thought that the EQIA was missing something on who would be more likely to lose out.

*“This is a development that will benefit primarily business travellers, most of whom come from certain demographics e.g. wealthier, probably white, lots of men...for genuine equality you need to engage people from all walks of life at the outset in the design and not think of impacts on them as an afterthought.”*

### **Member of the public**

Another respondent believed that the construction of HS2 at Manchester Piccadilly would have a detrimental impact on PCGs, with the loss of school facilities, religious facilities and other minority resources. It was thought that such impacts could be avoided if HS2 Ltd were to pursue an underground station.

Several respondents provided comments that tended to repeat their responses given at earlier questions on the response form about how local communities could be affected, particularly by the construction of HS2 between Crewe and Manchester. Some individuals provided also comments in opposition to HS2 which were considered to be out of scope.

Organisations tended to provide detailed comments. Cheshire West and Chester Council stated that it recognised the magnitude and complexity associated with construction and subsequent operation of the Proposed Scheme. Whilst acknowledging work already undertaken, the Council believed that the Government and HS2 Ltd should continue to make meaningful provision for change, particularly as technical work develops, and new findings and strengthened mitigation solutions are identified.

Cheshire West and Chester Council also stated that in its opinion HS2 was already having a major adverse impact on communities, businesses, the natural and built environment. It was suggested that Government and HS2 Ltd would need to keep a firm focus on the project, ensuring that the decisions being made are equitable. In the interests of fairness, the Council urged the government to establish a regional ombudsman function to help ensure that reasonable and proportionate measures are taken. It also believed that it wasn't possible to comment on impacts based on the whole life of the project, and that there should be periodic and ongoing review.

*“It is impossible to comment on environmental and equality impacts at this stage of the scheme, based on the whole life of this project. This needs to have periodic and ongoing review and be structured so that all people, including under-represented groups, understand impacts and what decisions they can influence.”*

### **Cheshire West and Chester Council**

Warrington Borough Council was concerned that the EQIA in its opinion could not fully assess the impacts of the proposed development because there is a link to the findings of the Environmental Statement. It also mentioned that as the spatial scope of the EQIA is based on community areas defined by the Environmental Statement (ES), it disagreed with this approach because of what it considered to be an arbitrary subdivision of areas based solely on the ease of assessing environmental impact.

*“It is important to assess the equality effects across the area of Warrington as a whole. This makes it easier to consider data and to bring together feedback from the public. Furthermore, it also allows for easier comparisons between communities within Warrington taking into account the individual Protected Characteristic Groups (PCG) where the proposed development may lead to greater impacts in one area than another.”*

### **Warrington Borough Council**

Warrington Borough Council made a number of other points in its response to the consultation. Such points included that: differential impacts of the development would be difficult to consider at this stage, given that HS2 Ltd has stated that it would continue to assess the impacts of the development as the design process moves forward; that it was not clear why a buffer of 1km has been used to determine the age ranges for the Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA); that people aged 25 to 64 had not been considered within the assessment; and that the use of mapping data to show clustering of PCGs could give rise to the underestimation, or discounting, of the needs of these groups where there are lower numbers or proportions not shown in the mapping. The Council was concerned about reliance of data from the 2011 Census, believing this to now be out of date.

Both GMCA and Manchester City Council made similar comments. While welcoming the approach undertaken by HS2 Ltd to identify equality groups likely to be impacted by the Proposed Scheme, the two authorities raised a number of concerns. Such concerns included a belief that mitigation measures were at a high level, and that the assessment was dependent upon HS2 Ltd agreeing appropriate mitigation measures to reduce the potential effects.

*“The embedded mitigation measures are...extremely high level and the robustness and deliverability of the measures are almost exclusively reliant on HS2 Ltd and affected facilities within which the PCGs have been identified to agree upon appropriate mitigation to minimise / avoid any potential impacts.”*

#### **GMCA and Manchester City Council**

Both authorities also asked for a number of clarifications including: methods for securing a framework consultation and engagement strategy to demonstrate how future engagement and direct consultation on specific design concerns (specifically for MA08) could be undertaken; and the extent of support required from all affected partner authorities to engage and support the facilities, communities and PCGs affected. It was also mentioned that by undertaking some direct engagement with the local authorities and their partners, that it was anticipated that HS2 Ltd could provide further information on how any potential effects on the identified PCGs would be reduced and where possible, avoided.

# Appendix A - List of organisations that responded to the consultation

The following is a list of organisations who responded to the consultation within the advertised consultation period. Any organisation that took part in the consultation using the online or paper form were able to select which category they belonged to. Organisations that responded by email were allocated to categories by Ipsos UK to the best of its judgement. Organisations that requested confidentiality have not been included in line with their wishes.

(Please note that the categorisation of organisations has been undertaken to demonstrate the breadth of the response; the categorisation is not definitive and has no bearing on the way in which the responses were dealt with).

## **Local Government**

- Cheshire West and Chester Council
- Manchester City Council
- Warrington Borough Council

## **Real Estate, Housing Associations or Property-Related Organisations**

- Homes England

## **Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation**

- TfGM (on behalf of GMCA)



# Appendix B - Response form

# High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester)

## Equality Impact Assessment Report Consultation

### Response form

**We are seeking your views on the High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Equality Impact Assessment Report.**

You can find the Equality Impact Assessment report here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-phase-2b-crewe-manchester-equality-impact-assessment>

You can respond to the consultation in the following ways:

Online: <https://ipsos.uk/HS2EQIA>

Email: [HS2BillEQIA@Ipsos-MORI.com](mailto:HS2BillEQIA@Ipsos-MORI.com)

Post: **FREEPOST HS2 Bill EQIA**

**This consultation will close at 11:45pm on 31 March 2022.**

This consultation on the Equality Impact Assessment Report (EQIA) is taking place alongside a consultation on the Environmental Statement (ES).

For more information about these consultations, please visit <https://www.gov.uk/hs2> or contact the HS2 Helpdesk at [HS2enquiries@hs2.org.uk](mailto:HS2enquiries@hs2.org.uk) or on **08081 434 434**.

Please write your response clearly in black ink within the boxes below and, if you need to, attach additional information to the response form ensuring you clearly state the question you are answering.

# Confidentiality and data protection

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes. These are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) 2004, the Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018, and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

Please be aware that, under the FOIA and the EIR, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals with, among other things, obligations of confidence.

In view of this, it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, in itself, be regarded as binding on the Department for Transport or HS2 Ltd.

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential please tick  the box below.

I want my response to be treated as confidential.

*Please write your reasons in the box below, and attach additional pages if required.*

*Please attach additional pages if required.*

We will process your personal data in accordance with the DPA 2018 and GDPR. We may share your personal information with our partner agencies and government, when doing so enables us to fully consider your response. If you change your mind about us using your personal information you have the right to have the relevant information deleted. If this is the case, please email [hs2dataprotection@hs2.org.uk](mailto:hs2dataprotection@hs2.org.uk)

To view our full privacy notice please visit [www.hs2.org.uk/documents/collections/activity-privacy-notices](http://www.hs2.org.uk/documents/collections/activity-privacy-notices)

# Part One: Your information

Please provide your name, address and full postcode in the boxes below.

While these details are not compulsory, if you can provide your contact details, these may be helpful in feedback analysis.

Please note that your response, or parts of it, may be published or be included within reports on the consultation unless you have requested confidentiality earlier on this form.

First name:
Surname:
Address:
Postcode:
Email (your email address will be used to inform you of the outcomes of the consultation):

## Are you responding on behalf of an organisation or group?

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	-----------------------------

## If yes, please include the name of your organisation:

--

*Please note: if you are providing a response on behalf of an organisation or group, the name and details of the organisation or group may be subject to publication or appear in the final report, unless you have requested confidentiality.*

**Are you under 16?**  If so please ask a parent, guardian or teacher to print their name and sign below to indicate that they are happy for your response to be considered.

Parent / guardian / teacher name:
Parent / guardian / teacher signature:

## What category of organisation or group are you representing?

Please select  all boxes that apply.

- Academic (includes universities and other academic institutions)
- Action group (includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals)
- Business (local, regional, national or international)
- Elected representative (includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors)
- Environment, heritage, amenity or community group (includes environmental groups, schools, church groups, residents' associations, recreation groups, rail user groups and other community interest organisations)
- Local government (includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships)
- Other representative group (includes chambers of commerce, trade unions, political parties and professional bodies)
- Statutory agency
- Real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations
- Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation (includes transport bodies, transport providers, infrastructure providers and utility companies)
- Other – Please describe:  

---
- Prefer not to say

**Please tell us whom the organisation or group represents and, where applicable, how you assembled the views of members.**

*Please write in the box below, and attach additional pages if you need to.*

# Part Two: High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester) Equality Impact Assessment Report consultation

The Equality Impact Assessment Report (EQIA) presents the equality impacts of the planned new high speed railway between Crewe and Manchester.

It includes assessments of impacts in eight geographical areas, known for reporting purposes as Community Areas. It also includes a route-wide assessment and a report on any impacts occurring 'off-route' - beyond the immediate location of the planned new railway.

The Community Areas are listed below:

- **MA01 – Hough to Walley's Green**
- **MA02 – Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam**
- **MA03 – Pickmere to Agden and Hulsheath**
- **MA04 – Broomedge to Glazebrook**
- **MA05 – Risley to Bamfurlong**
- **MA06 – Hulsheath to Manchester Airport**
- **MA07 – Davenport Green to Ardwick**
- **MA08 – Manchester Piccadilly Station**
- **Off-route works**

The EQIA Report is accompanied by an executive summary, literature review and a community profile. There is also an 'easy read' version of the EQIA Report.

Your comments will be collected and independently analysed, so that they can be considered as part of future planning, design and construction work.

**Please let us know your views on the EQIA Report by responding to these questions:**

**Question 1**

Please let us know your comments on the route-wide impact assessment, set out in section 5 of the EQIA report.

*Please write in the box below, and attach additional pages if you need to.*



## Question 2

Please let us know your comments on the Community Area (CA) assessments, set out in the EQIA Report.

You are welcome to comment on one or more of the Community Areas listed below. Please tick  those that you wish to comment on:

MA01 - Hough to Walley's Green

MA05 - Rislely to Bamfurlong

MA02 - Wimboldsley to  
Lostock Gralam

MA06 - Hulsheath to  
Manchester Airport

MA03 - Pickmere to Agden  
and Hulsheath

MA07 - Davenport Green  
to Ardwick

MA04 - Broomedge to Glazebrook

MA08 - Manchester Piccadilly Station

*Please write in the box below, and attach additional pages if you need to.*

### **Question 3**

Please let us know your comments on appendices to the EQIA Report (Appendix A Literature Review and Appendix B Community Profile). Please indicate in your response which appendix your comments apply to.

*Please write in the box below, and attach additional pages if you need to.*

### **Question 4**

Are there any further comments you would like to make about the EQIA Report?

*Please write in the box below, and attach additional pages if you need to.*

## Part Three: Submitting your response

Thank you for completing the response form. If you are sending your comments by post, please send it to this address:

### **FREEPOST HS2 Bill EQIA**

*Please note: no additional address information is required and you do not need a stamp. Please use capital letters. Responses sent by FREEPOST will be considered as long as they are sent on or before the closing date.*

- An online version of this response form can be found at <https://ipsos.uk/HS2EQIA>
- You can also email your response to [HS2BillEQIA@Ipsos-MORI.com](mailto:HS2BillEQIA@Ipsos-MORI.com)

The consultation will close at **11:45pm on 31 March 2022**.

**Please only use the response methods described here to respond to the consultation.**

**We cannot guarantee that responses sent to other addresses will be considered.**

We are committed to keeping you informed about work on HS2. This includes ensuring you know what to expect and when to expect it, as well as how we can help.

## Residents' Commissioner

The Residents' Commissioner oversees and monitors our commitments to you. The Commissioner's reports and our responses can be found at <http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-ltd-residents-commissioner>

The Residents' Commissioner makes sure we fulfil the commitments in the [HS2 Community Engagement Strategy](#). The Residents' Commissioner can be contacted on: [residentscommissioner@hs2.org.uk](mailto:residentscommissioner@hs2.org.uk)

## Construction Commissioner

The independent Construction Commissioner regularly meets our Chief Executive Officer to raise any concerns or emerging trends across HS2. The Construction Commissioner's role has been developed to monitor the way we manage and respond to construction complaints.

The Commissioner mediates on disputes about construction, involving individuals and organisations, that we can't resolve. The Commissioner advises members of the public about how to make a complaint about construction.

The Construction Commissioner can be contacted at: [complaints@hs2-cc.org.uk](mailto:complaints@hs2-cc.org.uk)

## Property and compensation

You can find out all about HS2 and properties along the line of route by visiting: [www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-property](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-property)

Find out if you're eligible for compensation at: [www.gov.uk/claim-compensation-if-affected-by-hs2](http://www.gov.uk/claim-compensation-if-affected-by-hs2)

## Holding us to account

If you are unhappy for any reason, you can make a complaint by contacting our HS2 Helpdesk team. For more details on our complaints process, please visit our website: [www.hs2.org.uk/how-to-complain](http://www.hs2.org.uk/how-to-complain)

## Contact us

Our HS2 Helpdesk team are available all day, every day. You can contact them via:

 Freephone **08081 434 434**

 Minicom **08081 456 472**

 Email **[hs2enquiries@hs2.org.uk](mailto:hs2enquiries@hs2.org.uk)**

Write to

**FREEPOST  
HS2 Community Engagement**

Website **[www.hs2.org.uk](http://www.hs2.org.uk)**

To keep up to date with what is happening in your area, visit:

**[www.hs2inyourarea.co.uk](http://www.hs2inyourarea.co.uk)**

**Please contact us if you'd like a free copy of this document in large print, Braille, audio or easy read. You can also contact us for help and information in a different language.**

HS2 Ltd is committed to protecting personal information. If you wish to know more about how we use your personal information please see our Privacy Notice ([www.gov.uk/government/publications/high-speed-two-ltd-privacy-notice](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/high-speed-two-ltd-privacy-notice)).

# **Appendix C - Equalities and diversity monitoring form**

## High Speed Rail (Crewe – Manchester)

### Environmental Statement and Equality Impact Assessment Report Consultations

#### About you

As part of our commitment to considering diversity in the delivery of HS2, we want to understand who is responding to our consultations.

Information you give us will help us improve future engagement activities.

Completing this form is voluntary and is not a requirement for your response to be accepted. The form will not be linked to the information you have provided in your response(s) or your name and we won't share the information with anyone else. We will use this information to provide a summary of the types of people who responded to these consultations. This summary will not identify individuals who have provided information.

### Q1. How would you describe your national identity?

<input type="checkbox"/> British	<input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	<input type="checkbox"/> English
<input type="checkbox"/> Welsh	<input type="checkbox"/> Northern Irish	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
<input type="checkbox"/> Other ( <i>please specify</i> )	<input type="text"/>	

### Q2. How would you describe your ethnicity?

#### Asian

<input type="checkbox"/> Bangladeshi	<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/> Indian
<input type="checkbox"/> Pakistani	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Asian background ( <i>please specify</i> )	<input type="text"/>

#### Black

<input type="checkbox"/> African	<input type="checkbox"/> Caribbean
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Black background ( <i>please specify</i> )	<input type="text"/>

#### Mixed ethnic background

<input type="checkbox"/> Asian and White	<input type="checkbox"/> Black African and White	<input type="checkbox"/> Black Caribbean and White
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Mixed background ( <i>please specify</i> )	<input type="text"/>	

#### White

<input type="checkbox"/> English	<input type="checkbox"/> Gypsy or Irish Traveller	<input type="checkbox"/> Irish
<input type="checkbox"/> Northern Irish	<input type="checkbox"/> Scottish	<input type="checkbox"/> Welsh
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other White background ( <i>please specify</i> )	<input type="text"/>	

### Q3. Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?

A disabled person is defined under the Equality Act 2010 as someone with a **physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.**

Do you consider yourself to be disabled under the Equality Act 2010?

Please mark 'X' in the appropriate box.

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know

If **YES**, please answer the following question; otherwise proceed to the next section.

Please indicate by marking 'X' in the appropriate box; mark all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> Hearing impairment	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual impairment
<input type="checkbox"/> Speech impairment	<input type="checkbox"/> Mobility impairment
<input type="checkbox"/> Physical co-ordination difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/> Reduced physical capacity
<input type="checkbox"/> Severe disfigurement	<input type="checkbox"/> Learning difficulties (e.g. dyslexia)
<input type="checkbox"/> Mental ill health	<input type="checkbox"/> Progressive conditions
<input type="checkbox"/> Other ( <i>please specify</i> )	<input type="text"/>

**Q4. Which of the following describes how you think of yourself?**

<input type="checkbox"/> Male	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
<input type="checkbox"/> In another way	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say

**Q5. What is your religion or belief?**

<input type="checkbox"/> Buddhist	<input type="checkbox"/> Christian	<input type="checkbox"/> Hindu
<input type="checkbox"/> Jewish	<input type="checkbox"/> Muslim	<input type="checkbox"/> Sikh
<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other ( <i>please specify</i> )	<input type="text"/>	

**Q6. Are you married or in a civil partnership?**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

**Q7. To which of the following age groups do you belong?**

<input type="checkbox"/> 16-24	<input type="checkbox"/> 40-44	<input type="checkbox"/> 60-64
<input type="checkbox"/> 25-29	<input type="checkbox"/> 45-49	<input type="checkbox"/> 65+
<input type="checkbox"/> 30-34	<input type="checkbox"/> 50-54	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
<input type="checkbox"/> 35-39	<input type="checkbox"/> 55-59	

**Q8. What is your sexual orientation?**

<input type="checkbox"/> Bisexual	<input type="checkbox"/> Gay man	<input type="checkbox"/> Gay woman
<input type="checkbox"/> Heterosexual/straight	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say	

**Submitting your form**

Thank you for completing this diversity monitoring form. Please include it with your consultation response.

**Data protection**

All information supplied will be held by HS2 Ltd and will remain secure and confidential and will not be associated with other details provided in your response. The data will not be passed on to any third parties or used for marketing purposes in accordance with the Data Protection Act (2018).



We are committed to keeping you informed about work on HS2. This includes ensuring you know what to expect and when to expect it, as well as how we can help.

## Residents' Commissioner

The Residents' Commissioner oversees and monitors our commitments to you. The Commissioner's reports and our responses can be found at <http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-ltd-residents-commissioner>

The Residents' Commissioner makes sure we fulfil the commitments in the [HS2 Community Engagement Strategy](#). The Residents' Commissioner can be contacted on: [residentscommissioner@hs2.org.uk](mailto:residentscommissioner@hs2.org.uk)

## Construction Commissioner

The independent Construction Commissioner regularly meets our Chief Executive Officer to raise any concerns or emerging trends across HS2. The Construction Commissioner's role has been developed to monitor the way we manage and respond to construction complaints.

The Commissioner mediates on disputes about construction, involving individuals and organisations, that we can't resolve. The Commissioner advises members of the public about how to make a complaint about construction.

The Construction Commissioner can be contacted at: [complaints@hs2-cc.org.uk](mailto:complaints@hs2-cc.org.uk)

## Property and compensation

You can find out all about HS2 and properties along the line of route by visiting: [www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-property](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-property)

Find out if you're eligible for compensation at: [www.gov.uk/claim-compensation-if-affected-by-hs2](http://www.gov.uk/claim-compensation-if-affected-by-hs2)

## Holding us to account

If you are unhappy for any reason, you can make a complaint by contacting our HS2 Helpdesk team. For more details on our complaints process, please visit our website: [www.hs2.org.uk/how-to-complain](http://www.hs2.org.uk/how-to-complain)

## Contact us

Our HS2 Helpdesk team are available all day, every day. You can contact them via:

 Freephone **08081 434 434**

 Minicom **08081 456 472**

 Email **[hs2enquiries@hs2.org.uk](mailto:hs2enquiries@hs2.org.uk)**

Write to

**FREEPOST**  
**HS2 Community Engagement**

Website **[www.hs2.org.uk](http://www.hs2.org.uk)**

To keep up to date with what is happening in your area, visit:

**[www.hs2inyourarea.co.uk](http://www.hs2inyourarea.co.uk)**

**Please contact us if you'd like a free copy of this document in large print, Braille, audio or easy read. You can also contact us for help and information in a different language.**

HS2 Ltd is committed to protecting personal information. If you wish to know more about how we use your personal information please see our Privacy Notice ([www.gov.uk/government/publications/high-speed-two-ltd-privacy-notice](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/high-speed-two-ltd-privacy-notice)).

# For more information

3 Thomas More Square  
London  
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

[www.ipsos.com/en\\_uk](http://www.ipsos.com/en_uk)  
<http://twitter.com/IpsosUK>

## About Ipsos Public Affairs

Ipsos Public Affairs works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.200 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. Combined with our methods and communications expertise, this helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.

