

High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement, A Summary of Consultation Responses

June 2017

A report to HS2 Ltd and the Department for Transport

Prepared by Dialogue by Design

Client	HS2 Ltd
Company	Dialogue by Design
Title	High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement, A Summary of Consultation Responses
Dates	last revised 11/07/2017
Status	Released
Classification	Open
Project Code	HST9
Author(s)	Hally Ingram, Skye McCool, Matt Reynolds
Quality Assurance by	Helen Ashley

If you would like a large text version of this document, please contact us.

Dialogue by Design

252b Gray's Inn Road

London

WC1X 8XG

+44 (0)20 7042 8000

www.dialoguebydesign.co.uk

info@dialoguebydesign.co.uk



Contents

Executive summary	1
Chapter 1: About the consultation.....	4
1.1 Background.....	4
1.2 The consultation process	5
1.3 Public events	6
Chapter 2: Participation	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Response channels	8
2.3 Response types	8
2.4 Responses by question	9
2.5 Responses by sector	10
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	12
Chapter 4: Reading the report.....	13
4.1 Reading the report.....	13
4.2 Numbers in the report.....	13
4.3 Structure of the report.....	14
4.4 Appendices	15
Chapter 5: Responses in answer to Question 1 - Crewe Tunnel Extension	16
5.1 Introduction	16
5.2 Overview of responses	16
5.3 Discussion	16
5.3.2 General comments on the proposed Crewe Tunnel Extension .	17
5.3.9 Comments on agriculture, forestry and soils	18
5.3.12 Comments on air quality	18
5.3.14 Comments on community	18
5.3.18 Comments on ecology and biodiversity	19
5.3.22 Comments on health.....	20
5.3.25 Comments on landscape and visual.....	20
5.3.44 Comments on sound, noise and vibration	22
5.3.54 Comments on traffic and transport	23
5.3.69 Other comments	26

Chapter 6: Responses in answer to Question 2 - Connection Spurs South of Crewe.....	27
6.1 Introduction	27
6.2 Overview of responses	27
6.3 Discussion	27
6.3.2 General comments on the proposed changes to the spur lines that connect HS2 to the WCML south of Crewe.....	28
6.3.10 Comments on agriculture, forestry and soils	29
6.3.13 Comments on air quality	29
6.3.16 Comments on community	29
6.3.21 Comments on health.....	30
6.3.25 Comments on landscape and visual	30
6.3.36 Comments on socio-economics.....	32
6.3.41 Comments on sound, noise and vibration	32
6.3.53 Comments on traffic and transport	34
6.3.69 Comments on water resources and flood risk	36
6.3.71 Other comments	36
 Chapter 7: Responses in answer to Question 3 - Railhead and Maintenance Facility Near Stone	 37
7.1 Introduction	37
7.2 Overview of responses	37
7.3 Discussion	37
7.3.2 General comments on the proposed railhead/permanent maintenance facility	38
7.3.15 Comments on agriculture, forestry and soils	40
7.3.25 Comments on air quality	41
7.3.30 Comments on community	42
7.3.52 Comments on cultural heritage.....	45
7.3.57 Comments on ecology and biodiversity.....	45
7.3.70 Comments on health.....	46
7.3.77 Comments on landscape and visual impacts	47
7.3.88 Comments on land quality	49
7.3.90 Comments on socio-economics.....	49
7.3.108 Comments on sound, noise and vibration	51
7.3.122 Comments on traffic and transport	52
7.3.150 Comments on water resources and flood risk	57
7.3.157 Other comments	57
 Chapter 8: Responses which did not address the consultation questions	 58
8.1 Introduction	58
8.2 Overview of responses	58

8.3 Discussion58

8.3.2 Comments on the consultation process and communications
from HS2 Ltd58

8.3.22 Overall comments on the project and the proposed route61

Appendix A Participating organisations and elected representatives.63

Appendix B Detailed methodology67

Appendix C Codes by theme and by question72

Appendix D Glossary of terms.....95

Appendix E Equality and Diversity monitoring99

Appendix F Equality and Diversity monitoring form103

Executive summary

This report provides a summary of the responses to the Government's HS2 Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement consultation. The consultation took place between Tuesday 13 September and Monday 7 November 2016.

The purpose of the consultation was to inform the Secretary of State's decision on the next stage of design for the Phase 2a route, based on the views of those individuals and organisations who expressed their opinions on the Design Refinement consultation document.

Consultation process

The High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement consultation was managed by HS2 Ltd on behalf of the Department for Transport (DfT). [Dialogue by Design](#) was commissioned to receive, collate, analyse and report on responses to the consultation made via the webform, email or the Freepost address set up for this consultation.

A total of 572 responses were received. 43 responses were received from organisations and elected representatives, the remainder submitted by members of the public.

Chapter 1 provides a background to the consultation and Chapter 2 gives a breakdown of the responses to the consultation. Chapters 3 and 4 of this report offer a description of Dialogue by Design's approach to response handling, analysis and reporting. Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 summarise the issues raised by respondents during the consultation.

Consultation responses

This report summarises respondents' views by considering comments made in relation to the three consultation questions, as well as responses submitted to the consultation which did not follow the question format. Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 summarise the issues raised by respondents during the consultation.

Due to three HS2 Phase 2a consultations running concurrently (Design Refinement consultation, working draft EIA, working draft EQIA), respondents may have referred to information provided in the other two consultations' documents. Where this is the case these comments have been included in this report for completeness and will be considered as part of the EIA and EQIA.

Comments on Question 1 – Design Refinement 1

Chapter 5 addresses issues raised in relation to Question 1, in which respondents were asked to provide feedback on the proposed Crewe Tunnel Extension. 114 responses were received to this question. Around half of the respondents who answered question 1, express a position on the proposed extension of the Crewe Tunnel. Of those who express a position, 43 are in favour

of the proposal, though eight support it with caveats, and 12 do not support the proposal. Some of these respondents go on to explain their level of support. Some of the reasons respondents give for supporting the proposal include the potential for reducing impacts on existing rail services such as the West Coast Mainline, reducing sound impacts on local communities, reducing visual impacts from lowering the height of the line and reducing impacts on existing and future housing developments.

The key reason given for not supporting the proposal surrounds sound, noise and vibration; several respondents express concerns about the proximity of infrastructure to farming communities. Some respondents comment that the tunnel extension must be considered alongside the other design refinements, arguing that if the infrastructure maintenance depot (IMD) is relocated, no substantial alterations to the A500 and Weston Lane bridges would be needed.

Comments on Question 2 – Design Refinement 2

Chapter 6 addresses issues raised in relation to Question 2, in which respondents were asked to provide feedback on the proposed West Coast Main Line connection spurs south of Crewe. 112 responses were received to this question. Around half of the respondents who answered question 2, express a position on the proposed changes to the spur lines. Of those who express a position, 37 are in favour of the proposal, with 10 supporting it with caveats and 22 not supporting the proposal. Some of these respondents go on to explain their level of support. The most prominent reason given for supporting the design refinement is the potential reduced impact on the local landscape and visual environment. In addition, several respondents support the potential for reduced noise impact on local communities, some support moving lines away from current and future housing developments and others comment that the proposal could improve transition between HS2 and the West Coast Mainline.

The key reason given for not supporting the proposal surrounds sound, noise and vibration; some respondents express concerns about the potential noise during construction, from compounds and traffic, as well as during operation. Several respondents relate their position, both supporting and not supporting, on this design refinement to the design refinement proposed for the Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD).

Comments on Question 3 – Design Refinement 3

Chapter 7 addresses issues raised in relation to the proposed railhead and potential maintenance facility near Stone. 299 responses were received to this question. Of those who express a position on the proposal, 278 do not support the proposal, while 137 do support the proposal and 18 supported the proposal with caveats. Some of these respondents go on to explain their level of support. Two of the most prominent reasons for supporting the proposal relate to traffic and transport: the proximity of the proposed site to the M6 motorway and the

midway position between Crewe and the West Midlands. Respondents comment that both of these could save time, money and reduce impacts on the local road network. Conversely, other respondents give reasons for not supporting the proposal such as: potential impacts on local wildlife, 24/7 light and air pollution from the facility, visual impact of the facility, potential disruption to local communities and facilities including schools, increased congestion on the local road network as well as the impact this could have on emergency vehicle access.

Other comments

Chapter 8 of the report covers additional comments made in relation to the HS2 project as a whole and the consultation process. Several respondents are critical of the consultation process in relation to Design Refinement 3. This includes concerns that those affected may have been unaware of the consultation or community events, as well as concerns that outdated maps were used in the consultation documents. Both members of the public and organisations made requests for further or continued engagement with HS2.

Some respondents express general opposition to HS2, often highlighting the perceived high cost and lack of need case. In contrast, several respondents express general support for HS2, highlighting potential economic benefits.

Chapter 1: About the consultation

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 High Speed Two Ltd. (HS2 Ltd) is the organisation responsible for developing and delivering the High Speed Two (HS2) project. HS2 Ltd is owned by the Department for Transport (DfT).
- 1.1.2 In November 2015 the Secretary of State for Transport announced his decision to bring forward plans for the West Midlands to Crewe section of the HS2 route, known as Phase 2a (the Proposed Scheme), to open in 2027, six years ahead of schedule. To obtain the legal powers to build and operate this part of the railway, the Government intends to deposit a hybrid Bill in Parliament by the end of 2017.
- 1.1.3 The development of a major engineering project such as HS2 involves a series of design refinements right up until the point of construction. When refining the design, HS2 looks to make improvements, where possible, on environmental, technical, service and cost aspects of the scheme. The majority of these are minor and are reflected in the scheme design described, and shown in maps, within the working draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report.
- 1.1.4 However, there are three proposed changes to the design that were consulted on separately as part of this Design Refinement Consultation and are being considered by the Secretary of State for Transport. These are:
- extending the proposed tunnel at Crewe, re-siting the tunnel entrance south of the A500 and Weston Lane;
 - moving the lines near Crewe that would connect HS2 to the West Coast Main Line (WCML) further south and extending their length; and
 - constructing a temporary railhead near Stone, with the potential to convert it to a permanent maintenance facility.
- 1.1.5 These design refinements were consulted on between 13 September and 7 November.
- 1.1.6 The DfT will separately publish a report explaining how the comments received have been used to inform the final decision on the proposed refinements.
- 1.1.7 Dialogue by Design (www.dialoguebydesign.co.uk) is a specialist company that works with many organisations in the public and private sectors to handle responses to large or complex consultations.

1.2 The consultation process

- 1.2.1 The High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement consultation was managed by HS2 Ltd on behalf of the Department for Transport (DfT). Dialogue by Design was commissioned by HS2 Ltd to set up consultation response channels for this consultation, including a consultation webform, email and Freepost address, and to receive, collate, analyse and report on responses to the consultation made via the response channels.
- 1.2.2 Two other consultations for Phase 2a ran in parallel with this consultation. These were the HS2 Phase 2a West Midlands to Crewe Working Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report consultation and the HS2 Phase 2a West Midlands to Crewe Working Draft Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) Report consultation.
- 1.2.3 This report summarises the consultation responses sent through the West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement consultation response channels, regardless of which consultation documents or proposals respondents referred to. Due to three HS2 Phase 2a consultations running concurrently (Design Refinement consultation, working draft EIA, working draft EQIA), respondents may have referred to information provided in the other two consultations' documents. Where this is the case these comments have been included in this report for completeness and will be considered as part of the EIA and EQIA.
- 1.2.4 HS2 Ltd and the DfT produced a number of documents and maps to enable people to provide informed responses to the design refinement consultation:
- **High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe - Design Refinement Consultation** – providing the public and stakeholders with an opportunity to review and comment on three proposed design changes along the Phase 2a route. Comments received during the consultation will inform the Secretary of State's decision on the next stage of design for the Phase 2a route;
 - a leaflet providing basic information about the consultation, the proposals, associated events and information on how to access further information;
 - HS2 Phase 2a (West Midlands to Crewe) working draft plan and profile maps;
 - consultation response forms; and
 - diversity monitoring forms.
- 1.2.5 All documents were available to download from www.gov.uk and to order in hard copy through the HS2 Helpdesk. Complete sets of the documentation relating to the three consultations were available to view at libraries along the Phase 2a route and made available to take away at the associated public information events.

- 1.2.6 Local authorities and Parish Councils were offered briefings following the launch of the consultations.
- 1.2.7 HS2 Ltd and the DfT raised awareness of the consultation process in a number of ways. Once the consultation had been launched HS2 Ltd commissioned Royal Mail to send a letter and a leaflet to addresses up to 1km each side of the line of route and 1km from the design refinement changes proposed in the areas around Crewe and Stone.
- 1.2.8 Letters were also sent to local authority, parish council and Citizens Advice Bureau offices along the Phase 2a line of route as well as statutory organisations and other stakeholders to inform them of the launch of the three consultations.
- 1.2.9 Posters advertising the consultation's information events were sent to local libraries, village halls and places of local interest. HS2 Ltd used its social media presence to advertise the launch of the three consultations.
- 1.2.10 Advertisements in newspapers distributed along the Phase 2a route were issued to raise awareness of the consultations and public information events.

1.3 Public events

- 1.3.1 HS2 Ltd organised a series of information events at community venues along the Phase 2a line of route between 30 September and 19 October 2016. The events were intended as an opportunity for members of the public to view relevant maps and documents and to speak with appropriately qualified members of staff about how the consultation proposals might apply to them. In total, the events attracted over 1,900 visitors.

Table 1.3.2: List of Information Events

Venue	Location	Date	Event Time
Whitmore and District Village Hall	Coneygreave Lane, Newcastle-under-Lyme ST5 5HX	Friday 30 September	11am – 7pm
Kings Bromley Village Hall	Alrewas Road, Kings Bromley, Burton-on-Trent DE13 7HW	Wednesday 5 October	12pm – 8pm
Great Haywood Memorial Hall	Main Road, Great Haywood, Stafford ST18 0SU	Friday 7 October	12pm – 8pm
Stafford Gatehouse Theatre	Eastgate Street, Stafford ST16 2LT	Monday 10 October	12pm – 8pm
Yarnfield Park Training and Conference Centre	The Cedar Suite, Yarnfield, Stone ST15 0NL	Wednesday 12 October	12pm – 8pm
The Madeley Centre	New Road, Madeley, Crewe CW3 9DE	Saturday 15 October	10am – 5pm
Wychwood Park	The Wychwood Suite, Weston, Crewe CW2 5GP	Wednesday 19 October	12pm – 8pm

Chapter 2: Participation

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 This chapter provides an overview of participation in the consultation. It covers response types and a breakdown of respondent sectors.

2.2 Response channels

- 2.2.1 There were three ways to submit a response to this consultation, all of which were advertised in consultation material and on the www.gov.uk website. The three response channels – a Freepost address, an email address and an online response form – were free for respondents to use. The online response form and the email address (subject to the user's account settings) provided confirmation messages explaining that each response had been successfully received by Dialogue by Design.

2.3 Response types

- 2.3.1 A total of 572 responses were received, in a number of different formats. Table 2.3.3 describes these in more detail.
- 2.3.2 In addition to the response types described in the table, Dialogue by Design also received other documentation that was categorised as a null response, according to the following classification agreed with HS2 Ltd Null responses comprised: general enquiries such as requests for consultation documents; duplicate submissions; or submissions which were obviously not intended as consultation responses. Twenty-eight records were categorised in this way and were not processed or analysed any further for the consultation. General enquiries were sent to HS2 Ltd to be processed.

Table 2.3.3: Count of different response types

Response type	Count
Online response form Responses submitted via the response form on the consultation website	214
Offline response form Completed response forms submitted via freepost or email	62
Letter or email Individual responses submitted via freepost or email	296
Total	572

2.4 Responses by question

- 2.4.1 Respondents could answer any number of the three questions that were included in the High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement – Response Form. Table 2.4.2 shows a count of how many respondents provided responses to each question.

Table 2.4.2: Count of responses to each question

Question	Total
<p>Question 1:</p> <p>Crewe Tunnel Extension. This proposed change consists of extending the Crewe Tunnel south by approximately 2100m and re-siting the tunnel portal south of the A500 and Weston Lane. Please give your views on this proposal, indicating whether or not you support the proposal together with your reasons.</p>	114
<p>Question 2:</p> <p>HS2 to West Coast Main Line connection spurs south of Crewe. This proposed change consists of moving the spur lines that connect HS2 to the West Coast Main Line (WCML) south of Crewe, further south and extending their length. Please give your views on this proposal, indicating whether or not you support the proposal together with your reasons.</p>	112
<p>Question 3:</p> <p>Railhead and potential maintenance facility near Stone. This proposed change consists of building a temporary construction facility (railhead) in-between the proposed HS2 route and the M6, with the potential that its use could then be changed to become a permanent maintenance facility. Based on the limited information available, please give your views on the potential change of use of the site to a permanent maintenance facility, as well as the railhead, indicating whether or not you support the proposal together with your reasons.</p>	299
Responses that did not directly respond to the question structure or added additional information.	286

2.5 Responses by sector

- 2.5.1 Respondents that used the response form or the consultation website to respond to the consultation were asked to classify which sector they identified themselves as being from. Organisation responses that did not self-classify have been categorised based on any relevant information provided in their response or through information available online, in an iterative process between Dialogue by Design and HS2 Ltd. A list of organisations within these sectors is included in Appendix A.

Table 2.5.2: Breakdown of responses by sector

Sector	Count
Members of the public	526
Action groups (includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals)	3
Businesses (local, regional, national or international)	11
Elected representatives (includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors)	4
Environment, heritage, amenity or community groups (includes environmental groups, schools, church groups, residents' associations, recreation groups, rail user groups and other community interest organisations)	5
Local government (includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships)	15
Real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations	1
Statutory agencies	4
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation	3
Total	572

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1.1 This summary report does not:

- make recommendations or seek to draw conclusions from responses;
- attempt to respond to comments made by respondents;
- seek to verify or pass judgement on the accuracy of comments made by respondents.

Its purpose is to organise, analyse and report on the responses received and provide results in a format that is as accessible as possible for the general public and for decision makers in Government.

3.1.2 There were four stages to processing and analysing the consultation responses:

1. Data receipt and digitisation of all submissions
2. The development of an analytical framework
3. The implementation of an analysis framework
4. Reporting

3.1.3 Appendix B provides a detailed explanation of the methodology used in processing and analysing responses.

Chapter 4: Reading the report

4.1 Reading the report

- 4.1.1 This report summarises the responses to the HS2 Phase 2a West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement consultation. The report summarises the issues raised by respondents and indicates where specific views are held by a large proportion of respondents.
- 4.1.2 This report summarises the consultation responses sent through the West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement consultation response channels, regardless of which consultation documents or proposals respondents referred to. Due to three HS2 Phase 2a consultations running concurrently (Design Refinement consultation, working draft EIA, working draft EQIA), respondents may have referred to information provided in the other two consultations' documents. Where this is the case these comments have been included in this report for completeness and will be considered as part of the EIA and EQIA.

4.2 Numbers in the report

- 4.2.1 Numbers are used in this report to provide the reader with an indication of the balance of views expressed by respondents. It is important to note that this consultation was an open and qualitative process, rather than an exercise to establish dominant views across a representative cross-section of the public. Therefore, no conclusions can be reliably drawn about any population's views beyond those who responded to the consultation. Dialogue by Design's intention is to accurately reflect the issues raised, rather than attributing any weight to the number of respondents raising them.
- 4.2.2 Where appropriate and possible, and by way of context only, numbers have been used to illustrate whether a particular point of view was expressed by a greater or smaller number of respondents.
- 4.2.3 Throughout the report, respondents' views are summarised using quantifiers such as 'many', 'some' and 'a few', to ensure the narrative remains readable. These are not based on a rigorous metric for use of quantifiers in the report – reporters have exercised their editorial judgement over what quantifiers to employ. Quantifiers used are therefore generally relative to the number of responses raising the topic discussed, rather than an objective measure across the report. For a detailed, quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue, the reader can refer to Appendix C.
- 4.2.4 Some responses were made partly or entirely without reference to specific consultation questions. The points made in these responses have been integrated into the chapters which cover the relevant themes identified.

- 4.2.5 In this report, specific views or issues are frequently presented without presenting a number of how many responses were made containing this view or issue. This is because this is a consultation summary report, which needs to provide a balance between qualitative findings and the numbers of respondents raising specific points. For a detailed, quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue, the reader can refer to Appendix C.

4.3 Structure of the report

- 4.3.1 Chapter 5 address issues raised in relation to question 1 on the Crewe Tunnel Extension:

‘This proposed change consists of extending the Crewe Tunnel south by approximately 2100m and re-siting the tunnel portal south of the A500 and Weston Lane. Please give your views on this proposal, indicating whether or not you support the proposal together with your reasons.’

Chapter 6 addresses issues raised in relation to question 2 on the West Coast Main Line connection spurs south of Crewe:

‘This proposed change consists of moving the spur lines that connect HS2 to the West Coast Main Line (WCML) south of Crewe, further south and extending their length. Please give your views on this proposal, indicating whether or not you support the proposal together with your reasons.’

Chapter 7 addresses issues raised in relation to question 3 on the Railhead and potential maintenance facility near Stone:

‘This proposed change consists of building a temporary construction facility (railhead) in-between the proposed HS2 route and the M6, with the potential that its use could then be changed to become a permanent maintenance facility. Based on the limited information available, please give your views on the potential change of use of the site to a permanent maintenance facility, as well as the railhead, indicating whether or not you support the proposal together with your reasons.’

Chapter 8 covers additional comments in relation to the HS2 project as a whole and the consultation process.

- 4.3.2 Comments are discussed under different thematic sub-headings such as ‘community’ or ‘landscape and visual’. Where a significant number of comments have been raised in relation to one of these themes, these sections maybe be further subdivided into ‘Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals’, ‘Reasons for not supporting and concerns about the proposals’, or ‘Other comments and suggestions’.

- 4.3.3 Quotations from responses have been included in the following chapters to illustrate views discussed in the narrative. The quotations are taken from a mix of responses including organisations, elected representatives and members of the public. Quotations have been attributed where these are taken from a response from an organisation or an individual in a public role such as an MP. Quotations have not been attributed to private individuals other than indicating that they are from an individual's response. No quotes have been included from confidential responses.
- 4.3.4 Quotations are taken directly from responses and any typos are the respondents' own. This report reflects what respondents say without judgement or interpretation. Comments from respondents that misinterpret or misunderstand the content of HS2 Ltd's or other organisations' proposals are therefore reported in the same way as any other comments. Similarly, this report does not seek to judge the accuracy of respondents' comments.

4.4 Appendices

- 4.4.1 Appendices include:
- a list of organisations and elected representatives that responded to the consultation (Appendix A);
 - a detailed methodology explaining how responses were received, processed and analysed (Appendix B);
 - a table listing all codes in the analysis framework and the number of times they were used in the analysis of responses to each of the consultation questions (Appendix C);
 - a glossary of terms (Appendix D);
 - the results of a simultaneous equality and diversity monitoring exercise (Appendix E) and the form used in this monitoring exercise (Appendix F).

Chapter 5: Responses in answer to Question 1 - Crewe Tunnel Extension

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This chapter provides a qualitative summary of responses to question 1 in the consultation response form, which asks about the Crewe Tunnel Extension.

5.1.2 Question 1 asks:

‘This proposed change consists of extending the Crewe Tunnel south by approximately 2100m and re-siting the tunnel portal south of the A500 and Weston Lane. Please give your views on this proposal, indicating whether or not you support the proposal together with your reasons’.

5.2 Overview of responses

5.2.1 Question 1 received 114 direct responses. However this chapter also covers issues raised by respondents that did not follow the structure of the consultation questions in their response, but were deemed relevant to the question.

5.2.2 A detailed quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue can be found in Appendix C of this report.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 This section provides a qualitative summary of the issues respondents raise in response to question 1. This is broken down into the following themes:

- General comments on the proposed Crewe Tunnel Extension
- Comments on each of the individual themes including:
 - agriculture, forestry and soils;
 - air quality;
 - community;
 - ecology and biodiversity;
 - health;
 - landscape and visual;
 - socio-economics;
 - sound, noise and vibration;
 - traffic and transport; and

- other comments.

5.3.2 General comments on the proposed Crewe Tunnel Extension

- 5.3.3 Approximately half of the respondents who answered question 1, express a position of support or lack of support on the proposed extension of the Crewe Tunnel.
- 5.3.4 Forty-three respondents support the proposal, eight support the proposal with caveats and 12 oppose the proposal. The caveats and reasons for supporting and not supporting the proposals are explored under the relevant themes below.
- 5.3.5 A couple of respondents request further information and financial evidence to justify the design refinement. Several respondents support the refinement listing various anticipated cost reductions as a benefit. 20 Miles More questions whether the high cost of extending the tunnel can really be balanced by savings from not constructing at ground level. They seek assurance that the cost saving is not going to be achieved by lowering the line speed through the tunnel in order to reduce tunnel diameter and construction cost. They also feel that the volume of traffic using the tunnel should be maximised in order to justify its cost.

‘Creating the tunnel will also hopefully reduce the need to realign the A500 Shavington bypass which will help to balance the cost of the tunnel. The tunnel extension will be greatly appreciated.’

Individual submission

- 5.3.6 A couple of respondents support the proposal on the current route projection, but feel that if Alternative Option 1 (from the Atkins November 2015 report, cited in the Non-Technical Summary) were to be implemented this would remove the need for a tunnel altogether.

‘However, if Option 1 of the Atkins Report of November 2015, referred to on page 32 of the Non-Technical Summary (NTS), were to be implemented, in that HS2 would join the West Coast Main Line (WCML) south of Baldwins Gate, then this would obviate the necessity of a tunnel under Crewe altogether, thus saving not only the expensive tunnelling but also the laying of a new track.’

Madeley HS2 Action Group

- 5.3.7 One respondent supports the proposal as they feel it facilitates the relocation of the WCML spurs, minimising disruption to local infrastructure.

- 5.3.8 Some respondents raise concerns about the consultation process, and/or the design refinements of the HS2 to WCML Connection spurs and the IMD. Several respondents object to the design refinement of the IMD, alongside the entire HS2 project. These are discussed under the relevant sections of this report.

5.3.9 Comments on agriculture, forestry and soils

- 5.3.10 A couple of local landowners argue that the proposed tunnel portal will result in a larger area of temporary and permanent land-take of high quality agricultural land, which will have a detrimental effect on their farming businesses. Wybunbury Parish Council specifically requests that consideration is given to extending the tunnel portal further south. They expect this would allow Casey Lane to pass over the tunnel, preventing the construction of a railway crossing that would use good quality agricultural land.

- 5.3.11 One respondent emphasised the need to consider the impact on agricultural needs in every aspect of planning and construction.

5.3.12 Comments on air quality

- 5.3.13 A couple of respondents argue that other infrastructure features in the area, such as moving the A500 viaduct south and the introduction of a satellite compound on Mill Lane, would have an unwelcome impact on air quality and pollution.

‘The introduction of a compound would be most unwelcome in this farming community. Noise, traffic, air quality and pollution - environmental impact per sae.’

Individual submission

5.3.14 Comments on community

- 5.3.15 A couple of respondents oppose the design refinement as they believe infrastructure and connection lines would move closer to properties that were not originally impacted. One respondent is concerned that their property was outside of any safe-guarded area, but is now ear-marked for demolition, with surrounding land ear-marked for storing materials for construction work.
- 5.3.16 Weston and Basford Parish Council feels the new design would not divide their local community as the previous design did. One respondent feels that all options should be considered if they reduce impacts on Basford, Weston and Chorlton, to enable them to keep their community spirit and small village life. One respondent suggests that the tunnel is extended further south so that Casey Lane could remain open, preventing potential residential isolation.

'The new railway would not be the massive structure effectively dividing our Parish in two that the original design would have been.'

Weston and Basford Parish Council

- 5.3.17 Hough and Chorlton Parish Council supports the proposal as they perceive that it would reduce cost, facilitate speed of construction, and mitigate the inconvenience on the environment and residents.

5.3.18 Comments on ecology and biodiversity

- 5.3.19 Some respondents support the tunnel extension due to a perceived reduction in impacts on wildlife, as a result of a decreased need for land and reduced noise and visual impacts. A couple of respondents feel the impact on wildlife needs to be a key consideration in the design refinement planning and construction processes.

'This area is host to a wide range of wildlife. Newts, Bats, Owls, Badgers, Foxes to name but a few. The impact on the natural environment would be huge and should therefore be a key consideration in this refinement proposal.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.20 The Environment Agency believes the design refinement may avoid the requirement for an inverted siphon at Basford Brook in Crewe. Therefore, they support this approach as they believe that an inverted siphon is likely to have a severe ecological impact on the brook. They suggest a number of additional design refinements to existing and proposed culverts, and the creation of wetlands and channels for mitigation and ecological enhancement. Suggestions are based on the presence of a legally protected species in the area of proposed culvert construction and the opportunity to support future fishery improvements.

'We believe a wide, open-span bridge over Basford Brook should be considered instead of a culvert to reduce the fragmentation of this important wildlife corridor. Consideration must be given to removing the old A500 culvert to open up this stretch of watercourse.'

Environment Agency

- 5.3.21 One respondent suggests that environmental enhancements should be made along the route, including the creation of wildlife corridors to help wildlife migrate to other areas.

5.3.22 Comments on health

- 5.3.23 One respondent supports the extension of the Crewe Tunnel as they perceive that it will then have less impact on Weston residents' quality of life.
- 5.3.24 One respondent queries the nature of materials expected to be stock-piled at the Newcastle Road facility. They are concerned that these could include dangerous and hazardous materials.

5.3.25 Comments on landscape and visual

5.3.26 Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals

- 5.3.27 A perceived reduction in impacts on the landscape and visual environment is the most prominent reason for supporting the extension of the Crewe Tunnel. One respondent expects it to reduce light pollution, which they say is already considerable from existing railway sidings.

'I think this is an excellent idea which shows consideration for residents South of Crewe. The tunnel will reduce the extra sound, air and light pollution.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.28 Several respondents, including Cheshire East Council, Crewe Town Council and Hough and Chorlton Parish Council, attribute the reduced visual impact to the decreased height of the line. Several respondents, including Weston and Basford Parish Council, attribute the reduced visual impact to the removal or reduced height of viaducts. Another respondent expresses that they will support the proposal if it allows for a significant reduction in the height of the viaduct.

'It is already going to be a blot on the landscape and if the extension of the Crewe Tunnel allows a very significant reduction in the height of the viaduct, I will be pleased to support the proposal.'

Individual submission

5.3.29 Reasons for not supporting and concerns about the proposals

- 5.3.30 One of the respondents who opposes the tunnel extension believes there would be an increase in light pollution.
- 5.3.31 One respondent argues that the tunnel extension is an unnecessary expense, which has little benefit apart from aesthetics, and therefore opposes the proposal.
- 5.3.32 A couple of respondents oppose the location of the South Crewe Auto Transformer Feeder Station due to visual intrusion.

'We have some concerns that these Design Refinement proposals do not go far enough. We would like consideration to be given to ... Removing and repositioning of the proposed South Crewe Auto Transformer Feeder Station away from Newcastle Road to a point either further north (closer to Crewe and power source) south (towards the main line power supplies) or East of the proposed HS2 development. This will remove a substantial visual intrusion from a residential, farming and rural area.'

Hough and Chorlton Parish Council

5.3.33 One respondent opposes the tunnel extension, as they believe it is providing an improvement for Chorlton at the expense of other villages. They feel that the proposed rail alignment changes and infrastructure refinements have a much wider impact on the open countryside. Additionally, they argue that the introduction of a satellite compound would be unwelcome in a farming community.

5.3.34 Other comments and suggestions

5.3.35 A couple of respondents believe that everything possible should be considered if it reduces the visual impacts on local villages.

5.3.36 One respondent feels that the more of the line that could be underground, the better it would be for the countryside and local communities.

5.3.37 One respondent believes that the tunnel extension must be considered in relation to the relocation of the IMD. They believe that if the IMD is relocated, there is opportunity to implement additional refinements to further reduce landscape impacts.

'If the IMD is re-located at Stone there is then significant opportunity to implement additional design refinements that will provide significant amenity mitigation for residents, further reduce landscape and ecology impact and provide further reductions to the HS2 project costs.'

CLlr Janet Clowes, Cheshire East Council

5.3.38 Crewe Town Council supports the design refinement, due to the reduced impact on existing freight and track maintenance sidings, which are important sources of local employment. Freightliner Group Limited notes that Basford Hall yard at Crewe is a base for 220 employees.

5.3.39 One respondent supports the design refinement as they perceive that it will enable Basford sites to fulfil their wider social and economic role, as per the emerging Local Plan of Cheshire East. They feel it will enhance the local positive benefits of HS2 coming to Crewe.

- 5.3.40 One respondent supports the tunnel extension as it would reduce disruption to businesses and residential properties in Crewe.
- 5.3.41 One respondent is concerned that the design refinement will impact on current plans for the Crewe main hub station, which they argue is essential for the area to benefit from HS2.

'Crewe main hub station is essential if HS2 is to proceed. This will allow the locality to benefit from the claimed benefits of HS2. This development, if it goes ahead will no doubt impact current plans.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.42 Several respondents support the reduced impacts on existing and new developments, including the Northern Gateway development zone. Cheshire East Council feels that, with the tunnel extended, the impacts on strategic development sites defined in the Council's emerging Local Plan Strategy will be reduced. This includes sites such as Basford West and Basford East which already have part or full planning permission.
- 5.3.43 One respondent believes the refinement undermines the Cheshire East Council local plan, raising concerns around housing developments already underway. Another respondent feels that blight on existing developments, that were ceased due to previous plans, needs to be resolved.

'Moving the Tunnel Portal south will reduce cost and impact on the Basford East and West sites and existing infrastructure (much of which is new) For example the A500 (Shavington By-Pass), Jack Mills Way and new housing development which is already under construction.'

Cllr Janet Clowes, Cheshire East Council

5.3.44 Comments on sound, noise and vibration

5.3.45 Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals

- 5.3.46 Reduced noise is a prominent motivation for supporting the extension of the Crewe Tunnel. A couple of respondents emphasise the benefit of reduced noise, in the context of considerable noise impacts from existing rail infrastructure.
- 5.3.47 Several respondents, including Cheshire East Council and Weston and Basford Parish Council, highlight the reduced noise impacts on local communities, such as Weston, Basford, Chorlton, Wychwood, and Hough.

'I support this change as it will reduce local noise levels and cause the least disruption to Weston.'

Individual submission

5.3.48 Some respondents feel that the extent of noise impacts is related to the height of the line into Crewe. They believe that the original route height and viaducts would have created extra noise nuisance, over a wider area given prevailing winds.

5.3.49 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns about the proposals*

5.3.50 Some respondents raise objections to other infrastructure features of the project due to noise. These include the location of the South Crewe Auto Transformer Feeder Station, the introduction of compounds and satellite compounds into farming communities, and moving the A500 viaduct south resulting in noise and vibration.

5.3.51 One respondent opposes the design refinement due to a perceived increase in noise impacts.

5.3.52 *Other comments and suggestions*

5.3.53 One respondent raised concerns regarding the noise level of the HS2 project. They believe that noise barriers will be constructed on viaducts, while embankments will have no noise protection. They request that the levels of lines be lowered as much as possible.

5.3.54 *Comments on traffic and transport*

5.3.55 *Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals*

5.3.56 Several respondents support the reduced impacts and disruptions to existing rail infrastructure and services. Crewe Town Council, Freightliner Group Limited, Network Rail and a few other respondents emphasise reduced disruption to freight and maintenance operations, particularly at the Basford Hall Sidings. Network Rail, Freightliner Group Limited and some other respondents support the refinement in light of reduced disruption to WCML services. A couple of respondents go on to say that they believe there would be a greater reduction of impacts and disruptions if in addition the IMD is moved to near Stone.

'The proposed change moving the Crewe Tunnel south by more than 2km is supported in principle to reduce disruption to WCML services and existing freight and maintenance operations.'

Network Rail

- 5.3.57 Some respondents support the tunnel extension as they feel it would reduce disruption to the road network and resulting traffic in and around Crewe. A few respondents support the tunnel extension as they say it will simplify or remove the need for altering the A500.
- 5.3.58 One respondent feels that the design refinement would take the tunnel off-line in relation to existing infrastructure. They believe this would be beneficial as the tunnel would only be required when the rest of the London-Manchester line commences construction north of Crewe. They suggest that tunnel boring machines from Phase 1 are used for the Crewe tunnel, which would not interrupt rail services at Crewe, including HS2 Phase 1 and 2a services.

5.3.59 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns about the proposals*

- 5.3.60 A small number of respondents argue that there will be increased traffic and disruption of roads, particularly during construction. By moving the tunnel portal, the focus of construction is expected to move with associated local traffic disruptions. One respondent suggests concentrating the main construction compound in Basford, which is more industrial with better road access, as well as relocating other construction activities.

'The concentration of the construction works in this area will lead to major local traffic disruption which will have to approach only from the west via Newcastle Road, through Hough, once Newcastle Road has been closed for the rail crossing.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.61 A couple of respondents state they cannot support the proposal if it affects the Crewe Hub proposal, which is important for further connections. They are concerned the design refinement will prevent construction of a possible hub station in Basford. One respondent is concerned that there is a lack of clarity as to the connection to the main network at Crewe. They feel the design refinement would be better than the previous design, if it enables a better connection into Crewe station.

'As the development of a Crewe Hub integrating HS2 with current WCML services has important implications for a direct or improved Liverpool to HS2 connection, we are concerned that this proposal will prevent construction of a hub station in the Basford Hall area - a proposal favoured by the promoters of the Crewe Hub scheme.'

20 Miles More

- 5.3.62 A small number of respondents express concern that roads entering and exiting Crewe are already busy and congested at peak times, and that the HS2 project should not add to that.

- 5.3.63 A couple of respondents express concern regarding the diversion and reinstatement of footpaths.
- 5.3.64 A few respondents are concerned about the perceived impact on transport and traffic in the following areas:
- the South Crewe Auto Transformer Feeder Station location, which could lead to disruption and traffic during construction and operation;
 - the temporary material stockpile on Newcastle Road being present for several years, which could lead to increased flow of activity;
 - the Chorlton Road diversion, which could lead to traffic and safety risks at the associated junction;
 - moving the A500 viaduct south, which could lead to disruption from construction vehicles; and
 - the satellite compound in Mill Lane, Blakenhall, which could increase congestion and safety risks, as there is currently no public transport for employees. The respondent says the area lacks footpaths and street lights, and roads are narrow, bending lanes. There are few places to pass and limited options for pedestrians and cyclists to keep clear of traffic.

5.3.65 Other comments and suggestions

- 5.3.66 Some respondents feel the tunnel extension must be considered alongside the other design refinements, especially the relocation of the IMD. They argue that if the IMD is relocated, no substantial alterations of the A500 and Weston Lane bridges would be needed. One respondent supports the tunnel extension, provided it does not compromise the establishment of a railhead and maintenance facility at Crewe. A few respondents oppose the proposal as they feel the original design is better suited to the facility being based at Crewe.

'The tunnel extension must be considered alongside the other two design refinements being consulted on, and the operation of the proposed Hub Station. For example, further significant improvements to the scheme south of Crewe could be achieved now that the tunnel portal has moved further south if the design change to relocate the Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD) is made. These include not having to realign the A500 and Weston Lane.'

Cheshire East Council

- 5.3.67 A few respondents, including Wybunbury Parish Council, suggest that further extension to the tunnel is considered. They believe that by moving the tunnel portal further south by a few hundred metres there would be no need to realign the A500, re-build Weston Lane Bridge, or close Casey Lane and Newcastle Road. This is anticipated to reduce disruption to residents.

5.3.68 One respondent is concerned that access roads to construction material storage facilities are not suitable for related traffic, especially as some are limited in terms of height and width.

5.3.69 Other comments

5.3.70 One respondent requests that to reduce impacts, an electric sub-station currently proposed on land opposite Bridge Cottage is moved to a site further south which is served by an overbridge.

5.3.71 Network Rail believes there will be no property issues in proposing a longer tunnel, it will not impact on the ownership of the tunnel any more than the previous design. They advise that amendments to existing infrastructure need to be Digital Railway compatible, in line with Network Rail Control Command and Signalling policy.

Chapter 6: Responses in answer to Question 2 - Connection Spurs South of Crewe

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This chapter provides a qualitative summary of responses to question 2 in the consultation response form, which asks about the connection spurs south of Crewe.

6.1.2 Question 2 asks:

‘This proposed change consists of moving the spur lines that connect HS2 to the West Coast Main Line (WCML) south of Crewe, further south and extending their length. Please give your views on this proposal, indicating whether or not you support the proposal together with your reasons’.

6.2 Overview of responses

6.2.1 Question 2 received 112 direct responses, however this chapter also covers issues raised by respondents that did not follow the structure of the consultation questions in their response, but were deemed relevant to the question.

6.2.2 A detailed quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue can be found in Appendix C of this report.

6.3 Discussion

6.3.1 This section provides a qualitative summary of the issues respondents raise in response to question 2. This is broken down into the following themes:

- General comments on the proposed changes to the spur lines that connect HS2 to the WCML south of Crewe
- Comments on each of the individual themes including:
 - agriculture, forestry and soils;
 - air quality;
 - community;
 - health;
 - landscape and visual
 - socio-economics;
 - sound, noise and vibration;

- traffic and transport; and
- water resources and flood risk.

6.3.2 General comments on the proposed changes to the spur lines that connect HS2 to the WCML south of Crewe

- 6.3.3 Slightly more than half of the respondents who answered question 2, expressed a position on the proposed changes to the spur lines.
- 6.3.4 Thirty-seven respondents support the proposal, 10 support the proposal with caveats and 22 oppose the proposal. The caveats and reasons for supporting and not supporting the proposals are explored under the relevant themes below.
- 6.3.5 Cheshire East Council supports the design refinement as they perceive it to reduce related impacts, but retain the ability for HS2 trains to serve Crewe. They feel the connection between HS2 and WCML is essential, but must be achieved in a way which is as sympathetic to its surroundings as possible
- 6.3.6 Several respondents relate their position on the design refinement of the spur lines to the design refinement proposed for the IMD. Some are in favour of the IMD remaining at Crewe, and support or oppose the spur line refinements based on that. One respondent believes that if the IMD is relocated the spur lines are unnecessary. Cheshire East Council feels that changes to the tunnel and spur lines need to be considered in conjunction with the relocation of the IMD. They expect that this could allow for further improvements, reduced impacts and significant cost savings.
- 6.3.7 A few respondents, including Madeley HS2 Action Group, argue that if the HS2 and WCML connection is to be moved south, then it should be moved south of Baldwins Gate. They feel this would remove the need for expensive tunnelling and reduce permanent adverse effects on Whitmore and Madeley.
- 6.3.8 Some respondents feel that the reduced impacts of the design refinement are due to the fact that the spur lines are being moved to areas where there are fewer people to be affected.

'The proposed new location of the spur lines is more rural than the original site. This results in fewer people being able to see the embankments and viaducts on which they will run...'

Weston and Basford Parish Council

- 6.3.9 Several respondents took the opportunity to comment on the consultation process, the IMD design refinement, and/or the entire HS2 project. This is discussed under the relevant sections of this report.

6.3.10 Comments on agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.3.11 A small number of respondents oppose the design refinements of the HS2 spur lines due to loss of land and related detrimental effects on farming businesses. The respondents say they require as much agricultural land as possible to continue or expand their businesses. A couple of the respondents believe information is lacking as to why the existing WCML cannot be used, rather than undertaking construction on high quality agricultural land. One of the respondents is concerned that noise and disruption will impact livestock on land near construction and operation.
- 6.3.12 A couple of respondents, including Cheshire East Council, support the design refinements of the HS2 spur lines as they are now located in less densely populated areas, and therefore they feel they will have a lesser relative impact. They acknowledge, however, that it will still significantly impact some residents, farms, landowners, and businesses. They suggest that further improvements must be made for reduced impact and high quality mitigation. These should include appropriate financial and practical support for affected homeowners, farms and businesses.

'However, whilst it is encouraging to see that the most severely impacted areas are less densely populated, this junction will still have a significant impact on some residents. Where possible further improvements should be made to reduce its impact and high quality mitigation must be provided. Also, appropriate support must be provided by HS2 Ltd to homeowners, farms and businesses blighted by the scheme.'

Cheshire East Council

6.3.13 Comments on air quality

- 6.3.14 A couple of respondents are concerned about increased carbon emissions from heavy vehicles and dust throughout construction.
- 6.3.15 One respondent supports the design refinement being as far south as possible, to reduce pollution in Weston and Basford.

6.3.16 Comments on community

- 6.3.17 A few respondents oppose the design refinement due to perceived negative impacts on communities, during construction and operation. One respondent believes that moving the spur lines further south will intensify disruption and isolation for communities such as Yarnfield. A couple of respondents feel that the increase in disruption they will experience from the design refinement has not been considered. They request further information about how it was concluded that the refinement would reduce disruption during construction. One respondent feels the simplified link would make construction less disruptive and reduce impacts on local communities.

- 6.3.18 One respondent feels that amenity and environmental mitigation measures must be robust and effective in protecting affected rural communities.
- 6.3.19 Public Health England says that if their input on the working draft EQIA and EIA consultations is followed, then negative impacts on affected communities should be limited or mitigated. They feel this may be strengthened with a cumulative impact assessment and advise drawing on the expertise of local authority public health teams.
- 6.3.20 One respondent is concerned that given the nature of construction, the Newcastle Road stock-pile site will result in a flow of activity at night.

6.3.21 Comments on health

- 6.3.22 One respondent opposes the design refinement, as they are concerned about exposure to electromagnetic fields from high voltage cables close to their home. The respondent feels that their living conditions will be insufferable due to an industrial site surrounding their home, which is currently in an area with no noise or light pollution.
- 6.3.23 One respondent queries the nature of materials expected to be stock-piled at the Newcastle Road facility. They are concerned that these could include dangerous and hazardous materials.
- 6.3.24 The Inland Waterways Association feels that avoiding unnecessary changes to the road network is potentially beneficial to reduce disruption in people's lives in relation to their health and well-being.

6.3.25 Comments on landscape and visual

6.3.26 *Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals*

- 6.3.27 Reduced impacts on the landscape and visual environment is the most prominent reason given for supporting the changes to the spur lines, a few respondents highlight improvements for Chorlton. One respondent feels that the countryside should be respected and protected as much as possible.
- 6.3.28 Some respondents, including the Inland Waterways Association, Weston and Basford Parish Council, and Hough and Chorlton Parish Council, relate the perceived decrease in visual impacts as a result of this design refinement to reduced height of embankments and viaducts. A few of these respondents feel the height of the spurs will still have visual impacts, and one queries what mitigation options would be proposed.

'The November 2015 design was considered grossly intrusive in terms of the high level viaduct systems and the corresponding visual and noise impacts on both localities next to the lines and further afield by virtue of the unique topography of the landscape in this area...'

Cheshire East Council

6.3.29 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*

- 6.3.30 A few respondents are concerned about perceived visual impacts and light pollution, from both the lines and related infrastructure. One respondent queries the height of the line as it passes their property. They feel that trains will be visible, despite the presence of a landscaped mound.

'I'm not happy with the increase in noise & light pollution that will be incurred.'

Individual submission

- 6.3.31 One respondent feels that more consideration needs to be given to all who are affected, not just those affected by the spur lines at Crewe. They believe that, due to the reduced speed of trains at that point, special considerations are not warranted for houses that are already near the WCML. Other respondents believe that people in previously undisturbed countryside are being disadvantaged.

- 6.3.32 One respondent opposes the proposed location of the South Crewe Auto Transformer Feeder Station due to it spoiling the view from their property.

6.3.33 *Other comments and suggestions*

- 6.3.34 Betley, Balterley and Wrinehill Parish Council understands the need to relocate the spurs, but expresses concern about potential impacts on the Parish. They would like viaducts to be designed in a way that communities are not adversely affected by visual impacts. Hough and Chorlton Parish Council, whilst broadly in favour of the proposal, is concerned about the environmental impact of any development of road infrastructure that may be needed to build the proposed viaducts at Chorlton and Blakenhall.

- 6.3.35 A few respondents provide suggestions for mitigating visual impacts, including appropriate landscaping of embankments and viaducts, dense tree planting, and the continuation of a tunnel or green corridor.

'There are more residents living on the North side of the track in this area and moving the HS2 to the south of the track will have less of a impact especially if noise containment mounds and dense tree planting will be done to reduce the visual impact and noise transfer from both the west coast main line and HS2.'

Individual submission

6.3.36 Comments on socio-economics

- 6.3.37 A couple of respondents oppose the design refinement, due to detrimental effects on existing farming businesses. The respondents are concerned about the effect on their ability to continue or expand their businesses. One respondent expects the refinement will have a detrimental effect on their income and employment of staff.

'The proposed spur lines are a significant change from the previous proposed plans and we do not support them as a significant area of our prime farm land will now be taken and will result in a severe detrimental effect on our farm income and have knock on effect on the possible employment of part time staff.'

Individual submission

- 6.3.38 A couple of respondents, including Cheshire East Council, feel that some businesses will still be severely impacted. They suggest that the implementation of the design refinement must include appropriate support for those affected.
- 6.3.39 Crewe Town Council supports the relocation, partly as it believes it will reduce impacts on freight and track maintenance sidings which are important sources of local employment.
- 6.3.40 One respondent supports the proposal in the context of the Northern Gateway Development Zone as the catalyst for infrastructure led growth.

6.3.41 Comments on sound, noise and vibration

6.3.42 Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals

- 6.3.43 Reduced noise is a prominent motivation for supporting the design refinements to the spur lines between HS2 and WCML.

'I support the extension of the spur lines because it will mean less noise and disruption for local residents.'

Individual submission

- 6.3.44 Several respondents and a couple of local organisations highlight the reduced impacts on local communities of this design refinement, specifically Chorlton, Hough and Weston. A couple of the respondents assume the speed of the HS2 train would decrease sooner than in the previous plan and that would reduce the noise. One respondent supports the design refinement being as far south as possible, to reduce noise in local communities.

'I would support this proposal because I assume, the speed of the HS2 train would decrease sooner than the previous plan and would eliminate some of the level of sound issues involved at Hough and Chorlton.'

Individual submission

6.3.45 Some respondents, including the Inland Waterways Association and Weston and Basford Parish Council, relate the perceived decrease in noise to reduced exposure to and height of embankments and viaducts. A few expect that the high viaducts of the original plan would have allowed sound to travel much further, given local topography.

6.3.46 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns about the proposals*

6.3.47 Some respondents oppose the design refinement due to perceived noise impacts during construction and operation. One respondent expects heavy vehicles and industrial sites will create noise and vibration impacts, day and night, in rural areas where there is currently no noise pollution. They are concerned as there appear to be no noise barriers in front of the shunt line in the plans.

6.3.48 One respondent objects to the location of the South Crewe Auto Transformer Feeder Station due to anticipated noise and disruption during construction and operation.

6.3.49 *Other comments and suggestions*

6.3.50 Betley, Balterley and Wrinehill Parish Council understands the need to relocate the spurs, but are concerned about potential impacts on the Parish. They would like viaducts to be designed in a way that communities are not adversely affected by sound.

6.3.51 A couple of respondents, including Weston and Basford Parish Council, feel there will still be considerable noise impacts on local communities and that appropriate mitigation measures and good noise modelling is required. One respondent suggests that further noise reductions could be achieved with the use of noise containment mounds and dense tree planting. One respondent requests the continuation of the tunnel or a green corridor to mitigate impacts on Wychwood Park.

'It also means fewer people will be affected by the noise from the trains running on the embankments and viaducts carrying the spur lines. However, there will still be considerable noise generated and good noise modelling and appropriate mitigation measures will be required.'

Individual submission

- 6.3.52 One respondent believes noise mitigation has not been suitably addressed, with their property having been excluded from any considerations.

6.3.53 Comments on traffic and transport

6.3.54 *Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals*

- 6.3.55 Some respondents, including the National Council on Inland Transport, support the improved transition between HS2 and WCML, as they see it as more effective and efficient, and less complex and disruptive.
- 6.3.56 Some respondents, including Weston and Basford Parish Council, Network Rail, and Freightliner Group Limited, support the reduced impacts and disruptions to existing rail infrastructure and services. A few respondents, including Network Rail and Freightliner Group Limited, emphasise reduced disruption to freight and maintenance operations. One respondent feels that unless the majority of HS2 trains stop at the existing Crewe station with direct pedestrian access to WCML, they should not disrupt WCML services.

'We support the concept of diverting the western track of the WCML further to the west and the provision of two primarily freight tracks that would run parallel to and between the HS2 mainline and the existing WCML. This sounds like an effective way of maximising capacity by separating HS2 classic compatible services from freight services.'

Freightliner Group Limited

- 6.3.57 Network Rail anticipates that the design refinement should reduce future disruption connected with the Crewe Hub during construction. The National Council on Inland Transport supports the proposed design refinements at Crewe. They think that further design improvements and better optimisation of the Crewe station hub can still be achieved and make specific suggestions in this regard.
- 6.3.58 A few respondents support the design refinement as they feel there would be fewer changes to the road network, resulting in reduced cost and disruption. A couple of respondents support the design refinement as they feel that the affected roads are less busy than those nearer Crewe.

'Importantly the proposal removes the major disruption, both to the community and the railway system, associated with the changes to the A500 and Weston Lane road bridges.'

Individual submission

- 6.3.59 A couple of respondents support the design refinement as it accommodates appropriate electrification to allow trains to transfer between HS2 and WCML. One of these respondents feels it demonstrates a clear commitment to provide Crewe with HS2 services.

6.3.60 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns about the proposals*

- 6.3.61 A few respondents are concerned that there will be increased traffic and congestion, particularly during construction. A couple of respondents are concerned about the impacts of construction traffic and heavy vehicles using small or busy roads to access work sites and depots. Betley, Balterley and Wrinehall Parish Council makes a number of suggestions for mitigation measures.
- 6.3.62 A few respondents are concerned about the impacts and mitigation measures relating to the closure or realignment of particular roads, such as Den Lane, Chorlton Lane and Tittensor Road.

'Chorlton Road Diversion is objected to on the basis of the traffic that will now directly flow outside of the front of my property and the risk of incident / accident caused by the junction that will be installed.'

Individual submission

- 6.3.63 A couple of respondents, including 20 Miles More, oppose the design refinement as they believe it would impact on timetabling by reducing train speeds for a greater distance and increasing journey times. 20 Miles More is concerned about the implications for destinations further along the line, and believe this is motivation for a direct HS2 link to Liverpool. Freightliner Group Limited would like to understand, in terms of timetabling, what service options could be accommodated and how this could link to the release of capacity further south.

'Re-locating the connection between West Coast Mainline and HS2 would impact severely on Timetabling for West Coast as the speeds in this area are necessary to maintain timetabling.'

Individual submission

- 6.3.64 Network Rail is concerned that the junction layout has the potential to cause operational issues for future growth of the network.
- 6.3.65 One respondent objects to the location of the South Crewe Auto Transformer Feeder Station, due to perceived traffic impacts during construction and operation.

6.3.66 Other comments and suggestions

- 6.3.67 A couple of respondents are concerned about footpaths and bridleways. One believes that the effect on public footpaths was not clearly shown in the consultation documents. Hough and Chorlton Parish Council would like access to footpaths and bridleways to be maintained during and after construction. They argue that these would be the only link between the two parts of the Parish.
- 6.3.68 A couple of respondents are concerned about a lack of clarity on certain issues. One believes that the claim that HS2 trains will stop at Crewe needs to be clearly defined to demonstrate the best outcome. The Inland Waterways Association feels that the lack of a complete proposal for the WCML connections is unfortunate, but assumes the remaining details are feasible.

'3.3.8 says further work is needed on the detail of final connections to the WCML, which is unfortunate as a complete proposal is preferred. However IWA assumes these remaining details appear feasible otherwise this refinement would not have been proposed?'

The Inland Waterways Association

6.3.69 Comments on water resources and flood risk

- 6.3.70 One respondent is concerned that the development would affect water levels and lead to increased flooding due to fields being taken out for construction.

6.3.71 Other comments

- 6.3.72 Some respondents support the design refinement as lines would move away from populated areas and they believe that impacts on recently constructed or currently being constructed housing developments would be reduced.

'The extension of the tunnel and moving of the spur lines that connect HS2 to WCML hopefully reduce the damaging impact on existing and new housing developments south of Crewe.'

Individual submission

- 6.3.73 A few respondents oppose the design refinement as they argue that it is going to negatively impact on their property value and financial security. One of these respondents believes that the property compensation scheme does not include properties affected by spur lines or shunt lines.
- 6.3.74 Network Rail expects that the realignment of the WCML will bring about certain property issues that will need to be managed.

Chapter 7: Responses in answer to Question 3 - Railhead and Maintenance Facility Near Stone

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This chapter provides a qualitative summary of responses to question 3 in the consultation response form, which asks about the railhead and maintenance facility near Stone.

7.1.2 Question 3 asks:

‘This proposed change consists of building a temporary construction facility (railhead) in-between the proposed HS2 route and the M6, with the potential that its use could then be changed to become a permanent maintenance facility. Based on the limited information available, please give your views on the potential change of use of the site to a permanent maintenance facility, as well as the railhead, indicating whether or not you support the proposal together with your reasons.’

7.2 Overview of responses

7.2.1 Question 3 received 299 direct responses. However, this chapter also covers issues raised by respondents that did not follow the structure of the consultation questions in their response, but were deemed relevant to the question.

7.2.2 A detailed quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue can be found in Appendix C of this report.

7.3 Discussion

7.3.1 This section provides a qualitative summary of the issues respondents raise in response to question 3. This is broken down into the following themes:

- General comments on the proposed railhead/permanent maintenance facility
- Comments on each of the individual themes including:
 - agriculture, forestry and soils;
 - air quality;
 - community;
 - health;
 - landscape and visual;

- socio-economics;
- sound, noise and vibration;
- traffic and transport; and
- water resources and flood risk.

7.3.2 General comments on the proposed railhead/permanent maintenance facility

7.3.3 A total of 137 respondents who explicitly expressed a position on the proposal are in favour of it, although another 18 respondents expressed support with caveats. A total of 278 respondents explicitly expressed their opposition to the proposals. In addition, many respondents expressed concerns about the proposals without explicitly stating their opposition to the proposals.

7.3.4 Many respondents express support for the proposed railhead/permanent maintenance facility. There are three overarching reasons. Firstly, some comment on the advantages of locating the railhead/permanent maintenance facility near Stone, for example its position midway along Phase 2a. Some also argue it makes logical sense to use the same location for both the railhead and the permanent maintenance facility, as it avoids the cost and environmental impacts of providing these facilities separately. Secondly, some focus on the benefits to Crewe, which was the location previously proposed by HS2 Ltd for the IMD. The third overarching reason for supporting the proposal to locate the permanent maintenance facility near Stone is that it would negate the need for maintenance loops at Pipe Ridware. These benefits are discussed and expanded under the themes below.

'By turning the temporary railhead into a permanent maintenance facility this would significantly reduce the cost of HS2 to the tax payer and reduce the environmental impact of providing the facilities separately. It would greatly reduce the environmental impact by not having to provide permanent maintenance loops at Pipe Ridware on the Fradley to Colton section of the line.'

Individual submission

7.3.5 A few respondents express support for the proposed railhead/permanent maintenance facility with caveats. For example, a few support the proposal to locate the railhead/permanent maintenance near Stone as long as Yarnfield Lane remains in operation.

'Based on the limited information available I would support the potential change of use the site to a permanent maintenance facility, as well as the railhead however this is on the condition that provision be made to keep Yarnfield Lane open, a temporary closure of the timeframe mentioned at the consultation even (3 years) would not be acceptable and would have significant impact on the village of Yarnfield and the residents in the surrounding villages and hamlets.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.6 Many respondents express their opposition to the proposals, or raise concerns about the proposals without explicitly stating their opposition. Many concerns relate to proposed alterations to the local road network and impacts associated with the railhead/permanent maintenance facility. Respondents concerns are summarised under the relevant themes below.
- 7.3.7 Some respondents express their opposition to the change of use of the site near Stone from a railhead to a permanent maintenance facility, because they are worried that the perceived disruption and impacts would continue indefinitely.

'To have to accept the presence of the railhead working for an approximate 7 year period is a blight on our future; to have it become a permanent facility operating 24/7/365 will devastate the local community because there will be no let-up in activity at the site with its associated noise and lighting, and it will be a permanent eyesore.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.8 Some respondents challenge the selection process that has led to the site near Stone being proposed for the railhead/permanent maintenance facility, and request that the decision is reconsidered. A few respondents think that options have not been fully explored and that insufficient information has been made available to determine whether there are other more suitable locations. A few comment that the proposed site was one of eight options considered by HS2 in the draft EIA Report and comment that site near Stone was the eighth in the list, indicating there may be other more suitable sites.
- 7.3.9 A few feel that too much emphasis has been placed on economic and business considerations, and not enough on the lives of people, the impact on local communities and the environment.
- 7.3.10 Some challenge why the location near Stone has been proposed when they believe it has similar issues to Crewe, such as residential areas nearby, an unsuitable road infrastructure, housing developments and environmental considerations.

'I feel the relocation of this is ill considered and simply moves the issues associated with such a facility from Crewe to Stone - despite Stone having no benefits whatsoever from the HS2 project.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.11 Some feel there must be other, more appropriate locations for the railhead/permanent maintenance facility, and make suggestions such as siting it on a brownfield site.
- 7.3.12 Some respondents are critical about the information that has been provided, or comment that more information is needed before they can express a position on the proposals.

'The authorities at this stage can neither support nor object to the proposals. Significantly more detail is required to assess the impacts on the Highways Network and surrounding communities, landscape, heritage and ecology.'

Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council

- 7.3.13 Some respondents argue that Crewe, the location previously proposed by HS2 Ltd, would be a more suitable location than the proposed site near Stone. In addition to benefiting from an HS2 station, they comment that it is already recognised as railway town by local residents and it has the associated infrastructure and workforce. A few also argue that there would be suitable brownfield sites in Crewe.
- 7.3.14 Some respondents took the opportunity to comment on the consultation process and/or the entire HS2 project. These are discussed under section 8.3.2.
- 7.3.15 Comments on agriculture, forestry and soils**
- 7.3.16 *Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals*
- 7.3.17 A few respondents support siting the railhead/permanent maintenance facility near Stone because it would prevent the destruction of agricultural land and farming in other areas. For example, a few respondents are concerned about the land-take that would be required to accommodate the reception tracks leading to an IMD at Crewe.

'Not having to accommodate tracks leading to the IMD would mean that the land-take on the approach to Crewe would be much less, thus impacting less on those people living along the route and retaining good agricultural land.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.18 Others are concerned about the impact siting maintenance loops near Pipe Ridware would have on open farmland, described by one respondent as Grade 2 agricultural land.
- 7.3.19 A few respondents support the proposal to site the railhead/permanent maintenance facility near Stone because they believe it is poorer quality agricultural land than the land south of Crewe.
- 7.3.20 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*
- 7.3.21 A few respondents are concerned that the proposal would result in the loss of productive farmland and directly affect farm businesses.

'I believe siting the Rail head at Stone will result in the loss of well over 30 acres of productive farmland.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.22 A response relating to one farm business explains that the Farm Impact Assessment was conducted before the railhead/maintenance facility were proposed near Stone, and therefore does not accurately reflect the impacts that the farm would experience.
- 7.3.23 One respondent argues that one site option has been rejected on the grounds that it would result in "loss of agricultural land" and "degrading of open rural landscape", when the same effects would be felt if the railhead/permanent maintenance facility is sited near Stone.
- 7.3.24 A few respondents mention the importance of effectively mitigating impacts on farms.
- 7.3.25 **Comments on air quality**
- 7.3.26 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*
- 7.3.27 Some respondents are concerned that the proposed railhead/maintenance facility would result in pollution, dust, debris, odours and reduced air quality. Respondents are worried this would occur during construction and continue 24 hours a day indefinitely if the facility becomes permanent.
- 7.3.28 In addition to concerns about pollution from the proposed railhead/maintenance facility, respondents are concerned about an increase in vehicle emissions, caused by longer car journeys, traffic congestion, HGVs and diesel trains delivering materials to the railhead.

- 7.3.29 Some are worried about the secondary implications of poor air quality on health. Please refer to the Health section at 7.3.70 below. Specifically, Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council comment that consideration should be given to potential health impacts on construction workers living in residential accommodation on site near to the M6 motorway. They request that consideration is given to siting an air quality monitor (PM10 and NOx) to measure the operational impact of the railhead in combination with the existing M6 motorway impact.

7.3.30 Comments on community

7.3.31 *Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals*

- 7.3.32 Some respondents argue that the site near Stone would be a more suitable location because it is bounded by the M6 motorway and the railway line, and would therefore be less disruptive to the local area.

'Relocation to Stone would allow traffic and material to be delivered by rail or directly off M6, rather than a rural location. Less detrimental to neighbourhood, as bounded by M6 and HS2. Certainly better for people of a country village.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.33 Some respondents support the relocation of the railhead/maintenance facility near to Stone because it would reduce the impact on communities south of Crewe. One respondent comments that it negates the need for railway lines south of Crewe, which would otherwise impact on a number of settlements including Basford, Weston, Chorlton, Hough, Shavington and Wychwood Park.
- 7.3.34 A few respondents comment that siting the railhead/maintenance facility near Stone avoids adverse impacts on new housing developments at Crewe, such as Basford East and West.
- 7.3.35 A few are concerned about the cumulative impact of siting the IMD at Crewe, and therefore support the proposal to locate the railhead/maintenance facility near Stone. A few comment that the area will already be changed considerably by the new rail network and associated works, and feel the facility would be "an additional toll" on the area. One respondent comments that the community is already affected by new infrastructure, such as housing developments.
- 7.3.36 A few respondents hope that relocating the IMD away from Crewe will remove the need for the location of the South Crewe Auto Transformer Feeder station on Newcastle Road.

7.3.37 Some respondents express a preference for siting the permanent facility near Stone because they believe it would negate the need for maintenance loops at Pipe Ridware. There is concern that if a maintenance loop is sited near Pipe Ridware it would negatively impact on a rural community.

7.3.38 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*

7.3.39 Several respondents who object to the proposals are concerned about the negative impact they believe it would have on local communities, such as Yarnfield, Walton, Stone, Cold Norton and Swynnerton.

7.3.40 Respondents also feel that local residents would suffer significant disruption during the construction period and worry that they would be permanently affected if the railhead becomes a maintenance facility. Some comment that it is unacceptable that local communities would have to bear the negative consequences of the railhead/maintenance facility without receiving any of the benefits.

'I want to state my objections to this proposal in the strongest possible terms as this will bring misery, disruption and inconvenience to Yarnfield and its residents with no benefit whatsoever to the local area and community.'

Individual submission

7.3.41 Respondents feel that Yarnfield village, which has been recognised in Best Kept Village awards, would become a less attractive place to live. They worry that the reasons people chose to live in the village, such as the peaceful countryside setting, would be compromised. There is also concern about the impact of the proposed works on other locations, such as Stone.

'Stone is a quiet canal/market town, whose character is totally inconsistent with either the demands placed by construction work or the longer term requirements of a maintenance depot.'

Stone Town Council

7.3.42 A few respondents are concerned that Cold Norton has been omitted from the documentation. These respondents believe that the settlement will be impacted and requires further consideration in the assessment.

7.3.43 If the proposal to close Yarnfield Lane were to go ahead, several respondents are concerned that access to and from Yarnfield village would be significantly affected. Yarnfield Lane is described as a "vital lifeline" used by Yarnfield and other rural areas to the west of the M6 motorway, to access services in Stone and beyond, such as work, shops, hospitals, GP services, child care facilities and schools.

- 7.3.44 Some worry that closing Yarnfield Lane would leave the village with only one access point in and out of the village. Some feel this could potentially be dangerous, for example if the road was blocked. Another concern is that the village would become isolated, which would be detrimental to its long-term viability. A few respondents are particularly worried about what effect the proposals would have on elderly and infirm residents of Yarnfield.
- 7.3.45 Some respondents are worried about the potential effect of the proposals on children living in Yarnfield and the surrounding area, and the schools they attend.
- 7.3.46 Some are concerned about the impact on Yarnfield's primary school, which is attended by 200 pupils and has plans for expansion. There is a concern that its future could be threatened if Yarnfield Lane is closed, because it would be less accessible to families living outside the village.

'The closure of Yarnfield Lane have a serious detrimental affect on the village school which draws many of its pupils from outside of catchment and these families are unlikely to choose to attend a school that is so very inaccessible.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.47 Concerns are also expressed about potential noise and pollution from the proposed railhead and the impact this could have on the children's education and health. A few respondents are concerned about children's road safety.
- 7.3.48 Respondents also comment that there would be significant difficulties accessing secondary schools and extracurricular activities in Stone, and the surrounding area, if Yarnfield Lane is closed. The closure would mean longer journeys and school days, affecting both pupils and parents.
- 7.3.49 Several respondents comment that Yarnfield is a growing community as a result of the new housing development at Yarnfield Park. A few comment that this growth will put further pressure on the local road infrastructure, as there will be more vehicles accessing the village. A few argue that residents would not have chosen to buy these properties, which are located in a peaceful setting, if they had been aware of the proposed railhead/maintenance facility at the time of purchase.
- 7.3.50 A few respondents criticise the design refinement strategy because they believe it has been based upon historic data which shows Yarnfield as a small village of a few domestic dwellings, rather than recognising the growth which has taken place in recent years. A few respondents comment that one of the reasons that the Crewe site was not deemed appropriate was because of a housing development, and reflect that housing developments would be affected in the Stone area too.

'One of the main reasons the railhead is being moved to Stone is the disruption it would cause if left situated at Crewe due to around 350 new home builds. The situation is no different in Yarnfield/Stone. I have just bought a new build on Yarnfield Park, where we have almost 300 new homes. What constitutes disruption for one, and none for the other?'

Individual submission

7.3.51 A small minority of respondents express concern that the railhead includes accommodation for 240 workers, and worries that this would put pressure on local services, such as health services.

7.3.52 Comments on cultural heritage

7.3.53 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*

7.3.54 A few respondents are concerned about the potential impact of the proposals on the cultural heritage of the area, for example Swynnerton Conservation Area and listed buildings.

7.3.55 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council comment that the northern portion of the proposed facility is approximately 1.6km away from a Scheduled Iron Age hillfort at Bury Bank. They comment that the depot's lighting scheme must not impact upon the setting of this heritage site. They also request that Historic England is consulted.

7.3.56 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council also explain that there may be unrecorded archaeological remains in the area; this is because late prehistoric stone tools have been recorded nearby at Cold Norton Farm.

7.3.57 Comments on ecology and biodiversity

7.3.58 *Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals*

7.3.59 A few respondents comment that locating the railhead/permanent maintenance facility near Stone would help to protect wildlife in other areas, for example at Pipe Ridware.

7.3.60 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*

7.3.61 Respondents refer to the proposed location of the railhead/maintenance facility near Stone as a greenfield site and worry about the impact on local wildlife and the loss of habitats.

7.3.62 Several respondents are worried that it would have a detrimental effect on local wildlife, such as owls, buzzards, bats, great crested newts and badgers. Chebsey Parish Council provides details of where barn owls and bat habitats can be expected.

'The area of the proposed railhead has breeding buzzards, there are owls feeding, which means there is a vibrant rodent population and supporting infrastructure all of which will be lost.'

Individual submission

7.3.63 Some respondents worry about the potential loss of habitats, including wetlands, grasslands, hedgerows, woodlands and ponds, and their importance to wildlife. A few respondents mention specific local wildlife sites, such as High Low Meadows. One respondent explains that there are local wildlife sites within 1km of the proposed site.

7.3.64 *Other comments and suggestions*

7.3.65 A few organisations focus their comments on the importance of fully assessing the environmental impacts of the proposals and developing mitigation measures.

7.3.66 Staffordshire Wildlife Trust explains that they would not have an issue with the design refinement in terms of ecology, as long as damage to important habitats is avoided as far as possible, and mitigation and compensation can provide a net gain to biodiversity in the area.

7.3.67 The Environment Agency comments that care should be taken in relation to works to watercourses as they may be important habitats/spawning grounds for fish and other species.

7.3.68 Natural England comments that it does not appear that the proposed route changes (either design refinement 1, 2, or 3) would impact on any Natura 2000 sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, protected landscapes or National Trails. However, they add that if the changes are incorporated within the final design, HS2 should fully assess their impacts on the natural environment as part of the EIA process.

7.3.69 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council discuss the impact on Poolhouse Site of Biological Importance and make suggestions with regard to mitigation measures.

7.3.70 **Comments on health**

7.3.71 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*

7.3.72 Some respondents express general concern that the health and wellbeing of residents would be affected by the proposals.

- 7.3.73 Some respondents are worried about the implications of decreased air quality on the health of local residents, in particular, on older residents and children who attend Springfields Primary School. A few respondents worry that potential air pollution could affect the health of residents with pre-existing health conditions, such as asthma.

'I object to the planned proposal to construct a railhead at Stone on the basis of health (I have chronic asthma which was adversely impacted by pollution in London meaning I had to relocate to Stone).'

Individual submission

- 7.3.74 A few respondents are worried about the potential impact on the mental health of local residents, for example as a result of feeling isolated. Others are concerned that increased congestion and longer journeys would result in feelings of stress and frustration.
- 7.3.75 Some respondents are concerned that their quality of life would be reduced as a result of noise, pollution, disruption, congestion and property impacts.
- 7.3.76 A few respondents comment on the importance of effective mitigation and question how HS2 would effectively manage potential impacts (e.g. pollution and reduced air quality) so that residents' health, wellbeing and quality of life is not affected.
- 7.3.77 Comments on landscape and visual impacts**
- 7.3.78 Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals**
- 7.3.79 A few respondents express support for the location near Stone because of the perceived visual impact the IMD would have had on Crewe. A few respondents specifically express concern about light pollution, commenting that many properties in Crewe - existing and planned - would have been affected.
- 7.3.80 A few feel that the Stone area is better suited because it is located on a site that would be landlocked between HS2 and the M6 motorway. A few comment that it is further away from residential areas.
- 7.3.81 Others comment that the proposals would reduce the environmental impact on Pipe Ridware, because it would negate the need for maintenance loops in this area. Some argue it would allow the viaduct and the track at Pipe Ridware to be lowered from the currently proposed height of 16 metres above ground, thereby lessening the visual impact.

7.3.82 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*

- 7.3.83 Many respondents are concerned about light pollution from the railhead/permanent maintenance facility, with some worrying that it would occur 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. A few explain that it is a rural area, with minimal lighting, which would mean that the facility's lighting would be more noticeable. A few feel it would be difficult to mitigate this impact, because of the scale of the facility.

'You've chosen an area of tranquility to impose a noisy, light pollution inducing structure.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.84 Many respondents are concerned about the visual impact the proposed railhead/maintenance facility would have on the landscape. They feel it would be out of character with the surrounding area, which is described as beautiful rural countryside. Some argue that the development would be visually intrusive, given the layout and scale of the development, and would have a significant impact on the landscape character of the area. There is concern that it would be clearly visible from local settlements. While the design shows the site as being lower than surrounds, some are concerned that the facility would be on elevated land. A few respondents characterise the potential impact as an industrial blight on the landscape and are concerned the landscape would be changed forever.

'Such a facility "would be inappropriate" as it will be out of scale with the surrounding landscape, and a completely incongruous element in the countryside and that, by definition, would be: "harmful to the Greenbelt".'

Individual submission

- 7.3.85 Some respondents comment that one of the reasons they chose to live in the area was because of the countryside and the beautiful landscape. They worry this would be spoilt if the facility is built.
- 7.3.86 A couple of respondents argue that the landscape and visual assessment does not accurately reflect the impact the proposals would have on the landscape in the vicinity of Yarnfield.
- 7.3.87 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council comment on the potential impact on the Staffordshire Plain Settled Farmlands and make suggestions with regard to design and mitigation.

7.3.88 Comments on land quality

- 7.3.89 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council comment that where there is potential for a permanent maintenance facility, proper consideration should be given to handling and storing potentially contaminating mobile materials such as oils/fuels/lubricants and dusts arising from maintenance operations.

7.3.90 Comments on socio-economics

7.3.91 *Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals*

- 7.3.92 A number of socio-economic reasons are given for supporting the proposal to locate the railhead/maintenance facility near to Stone as opposed to Basford, south of Crewe.
- 7.3.93 Some respondents comment on the socio-economic importance of residential and business development sites in Crewe South, such as the Basford sites, which they believe would be negatively impacted if the IMD was located at Crewe. Weston and Basford Parish Council, Cheshire East Council and others compare the number of jobs that will be created by the Basford West business development site with the number that would be created if the IMD was located south of Crewe. They argue that the IMD at Crewe would create significantly less employment opportunities than the Basford West development, and for this reason support the relocation of the facility away from Basford in Crewe to near Stone. A few respondents comment on other benefits that they believe the Basford West development will bring to the Crewe, Cheshire and beyond, such as road improvements.

'I support this proposal because: More jobs will be created by the Industrial site planned for Basford West, in the Cheshire East Local plan, than would be created by the new Maintenance depot.(IMD)'

Individual submission

- 7.3.94 A couple of respondents including Cheshire East Council also raise issues relating to the safeguarding zone at the Basford site, commenting that it has already blighted prospective occupiers and impacted the delivery of the scheme, and request that the safeguarding direction is removed as soon as possible.
- 7.3.95 A few respondents welcome the proposals because of the impact they believe locating the IMD at Crewe would have had on the existing rail infrastructure, including Basford sidings, freight operations and Network Rail operations.
- 7.3.96 A few respondents support the location of the railhead/maintenance facility near Stone because they argue it would generate local jobs.

- 7.3.97 One respondent would like to see a local economic spin off from the railhead, for example a percentage of local firms being used during construction, a percentage of local people being employed and local apprenticeships. Another respondent suggests working with local educational institutions to provide apprenticeships for local young people.
- 7.3.98 One respondent argues that the area should benefit from local infrastructure improvements as a consequence of locating the facility near Stone and recommends a strategic review of local infrastructure.
- 7.3.99 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*
- 7.3.100 Some respondents are concerned about the impact the proposals would have on the local businesses and the vibrancy of Yarnfield and Stone. A few comment that Yarnfield's village shop, pub and post office would suffer a loss of trade as a result of the closure of Yarnfield Lane.

'As the owner of a local business for the past 30 years I know and speak to many of the other business owners and members of the community all of whom are adamant that they do not want this development and the problems it brings with it.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.101 A few respondents comment on the importance of Yarnfield Park Conference Centre from a socio-economic perspective. Compass Group explains that it employs close to 150 people and hosts over 50,000 guests per year. They are concerned that the closure of Yarnfield Lane would significantly impact their business, because the Centre would become less accessible.
- 7.3.102 They also explain that one of the main reasons clients choose Yarnfield Park is the peaceful surroundings. They are concerned that their position in the conference market would be undermined if this was to change because of noise and disruption during construction.
- 7.3.103 Some respondents express concern about the impact of the proposals on the Wellbeing Park, which is home to Stone Dominoes Football Club and Academy 4 Wellbeing. A few comment that the facility attracts over 80,000 visitors per year. In addition to the concern that the facility would become less accessible, a few are concerned that the proposals could jeopardise the Park's viability. A few also comment on the importance of the Wellbeing Park's health programmes and the role it plays in encouraging sport.
- 7.3.104 A few respondents challenge whether local people would benefit from the employment generated by the proposals. A few argue that workers will be from outside the area because there would not be the employment demand, or appropriate skill base, in the local community.

- 7.3.105 A few respondents comment on locations where there are plans for housing developments. A few respondents, including Stone Town Council, comment that the proposals would encroach onto land earmarked as a strategic development, for example a location for 500 houses in the Walton area. A few worry that a planned housing development along the B5026 would open onto a route used by construction traffic.
- 7.3.106 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council comment that it is unclear why the approved housing development at Yarnfield and those with planning permission in Walton (Stone) have not been referenced in the documentation. They comment that this should be addressed and impacts fully assessed in any future documentation.
- 7.3.107 A few others are concerned that employment benefits to the Crewe area would be lost if the railhead/maintenance facility is moved to near Stone.

7.3.108 Comments on sound, noise and vibration

7.3.109 Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals

- 7.3.110 A few respondents express support for the proposals because of the noise that would be experienced if the IMD was located in Crewe. A few respondents comment that many people would be adversely affected, as the Basford West site is a built-up area with new housing developments.

7.3.111 Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals

- 7.3.112 Noise pollution from the railhead/maintenance depot, and the impact it would have on the quality of life of the residents of Yarnfield and Stone, is a major concern for the majority of respondents.
- 7.3.113 Some worry it will be a continuous problem, occurring 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. One respondent comments that even though they were assured at the Yarnfield consultation meeting that the work would take place from 8am to 6pm, they are worried that if the railhead becomes permanent, it would operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, as stated in the Alternatives Report.
- 7.3.114 Some describe the area as peaceful and tranquil, or relatively quiet. Others comment that the local area is affected by noise from the M6 motorway, with some adding that the impact varies depending on the wind direction. A few are critical that the assessment has not taken into account the combined effect of noise from the M6 motorway and railhead/maintenance depot.

'In the long term, my greatest concern is noise and possibly light pollution. At night, traffic on the M6 motorway is clearly audible from within my home; the railhead facility will be much closer and due to its very nature, likely to be busy at night.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.115 A few respondents worry about noise from diesel trains using the Norton Bridge to Stone railway line, which they believe will be used to deliver materials to the railhead/maintenance depot.
- 7.3.116 Noise from construction traffic is also of concern to some respondents, for example along the Eccleshall Road. A few also argue that vibration from construction traffic could damage properties.
- 7.3.117 A few respondents are concerned about the impact of vibration from construction traffic on properties near to construction routes.

7.3.118 *Other comments and suggestions*

- 7.3.119 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council comment that the proximity of the site to the M6 motorway is likely to mean that ambient noise levels are already high and additional noise from the proposed facility may be masked. However, they add that it will be necessary to demonstrate that the combined effect of noise from the M6, local highway network and the existing railway taken together with noise from the site does not increase noise at the nearest noise sensitive receptors.
- 7.3.120 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council also request that a full noise assessment of the railhead becoming a permanent facility is undertaken.
- 7.3.121 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council also comment on the importance of protecting workers located at the site from unacceptable noise levels.

7.3.122 **Comments on traffic and transport**

7.3.123 *Reasons for supporting and benefits of the proposals*

- 7.3.124 Several respondents support the proposal to site the railhead/maintenance facility near Stone because of its position near to the M6 motorway and the existing rail infrastructure, which they believe would minimise disruption on more minor roads in the local area.
- 7.3.125 Respondents also comment that the site is well placed being near the midway point of Phase 2a, thereby helping to facilitate construction and maintenance activities both north and south. A few comment that this would reduce construction time, costs and the inconvenience to residents during construction. Freightliner Group Limited comment on the pivotal role that rail freight could play in supporting the construction of HS2, for example bringing in materials and removing waste.

- 7.3.126 Some respondents comment that locating the IMD at Crewe would involve significant infrastructure reconfiguration, which will be avoided if the railhead/maintenance facility is located near Stone. For example, if the IMD is no longer located in Crewe, there would no longer be a need to realign the A500, close the newly opened Jack Mills Way or re-build the Weston Lane overbridge. It is argued this would mean less disruption for communities during construction and reduced costs.

'Locating the IMD at Basford West will require significant major infrastructure re-configuration (the A500, the loss of the newly opened Jack Mills Way and the re-build of the Weston Lane overbridge. This highways infrastructure is essential in realising the economic potential and road connectivity of the areas south of Crewe to the M6 and beyond. - Re-locating the IMD to Stone effectively negates the need to lose (re-build) vital existing road infrastructure.'

Cllr Janet Clowes, Cheshire East Council

- 7.3.127 Some respondents support the proposal to site the permanent facility near Stone, as it negates the need for maintenance loops at Pipe Ridware which they argue does not have the local road infrastructure to support the development. Comments include that the local roads are unsuitable for the maintenance loops, for example they are poor quality, winding, narrow lanes, with limited places to pass and numerous potholes.

7.3.128 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*

- 7.3.129 Several respondents express significant concerns about the impact the construction of the proposed railhead/maintenance facility would have on the local road network in Stone, Yarnfield and beyond.
- 7.3.130 A large proportion of respondents either explicitly express their opposition to the proposed closure of Yarnfield Lane or raise concerns. Yarnfield Lane is described as a critical route to and from the village of Yarnfield, and the main route used to access Stone and the major road networks nearby, including the M6 motorway. Many argue that it would put considerable strain on the local road network, affecting Yarnfield and surrounding communities such as Walton, Stone and Swynnerton.

'The proposed closure of Yarnfield Lane is completely unacceptable and would have a huge negative impact on the local community.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.131 Some comment that the area already suffers from congestion hot spots, which they argue would be exacerbated by the closure of Yarnfield Lane, for example, the junction of Eccleshall Road B5026 and the A34 (Walton roundabout), which a couple of respondents comment is near or at capacity.

'With the closure of Yarnfield Lane either semi permanently or permanently this is going to push the majority of the traffic down the Eccleshall Rd to Walton Island. This location is already congested and adding the traffic from Yarnfield and outlying areas will cause nothing short of Gridlock for the island which feeds back into the town, affecting the one way system and back out the other side towards the A51 Lichfield Rd and also the A520 Longton Rd.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.132 Some respondents explain that they have already experienced the frustration of long delays on local roads as a result of construction projects, such as the Norton Bridge project and motorway bridge repairs. A few respondents comment that road closures associated with these projects lasted a few weeks, as opposed to the closure of Yarnfield Lane which would last for years.

- 7.3.133 There are a number of factors which respondents feel need to be factored into the traffic assessment. These include visitors travelling to the Wellbeing Park and Yarnfield Conference Centre for events; workers travelling to/from the railhead/maintenance facility during peak hours; and the effect on the local road network when the M6 motorway is blocked. Some also comment that additional traffic will be generated by new housing developments. A few feel that the expected growth in the area has not been adequately factored into HS2's impact assessments.

'The additional traffic generated by all the new homes alone will render all your traffic/impact assessments worthless!'

Individual submission

- 7.3.134 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council query the reliability of HS2's traffic count data, commenting that it may have been affected by road works. They also request a full assessment of the Walton roundabout.

- 7.3.135 Respondents argue that travelling via alternative routes to reach Stone would be a significant inconvenience and result in increased journey times. This would impact on residents, commuters, businesses, visitors and school children. Some argue that the extra time spent travelling would have a financial impact on local people, for example as a result of having to pay for additional petrol.

'I live in Yarnfield and as such use Yarnfield Lane to commute to work each day. The closure of this lane at anytime will add time and miles onto my daily commute, costing my money and most importantly time.'

Individual submission

7.3.136 Several respondents are concerned that as a result of the closure of Yarnfield Lane, it would take longer for emergency vehicles to travel to and from Yarnfield village, which could potentially put lives at risk. Another worry is how emergency vehicles would reach Yarnfield if the one route in and out of the village became blocked, for example as a result of a fallen tree or accident.

7.3.137 Highways England explains that Yarnfield Lane provides an important emergency turn-around facility for Highways England's Traffic Officers and emergency services due to the length of the M6 motorway between junctions 14 and 15. They explain that it is essential that this ability for emergency vehicles to pass between M6 Northbound and Southbound carriageways, without detour or delay, is maintained at all times during both the construction and operation of the proposed facility.

7.3.138 Some respondents raise specific concerns about the construction traffic and HGVs. Respondents argue that roads surrounding Yarnfield are not suitable for construction traffic, for example because they are narrow and often without pavements. Some specifically say that Yarnfield Lane is unsuitable for HGVs because it is narrow, with overhanging trees, has no footpath and has a weight restriction of 7.5T. There are also concerns about noise, vibrations and air pollution from construction vehicles, and the safety of children and pedestrians due to some roads not having pavements.

'The thought of all these heavily laden Lorries going up and down the road causing pollution and congestion to say nothing of safety concerns is a real danger.'

Individual submission

7.3.139 Some respondents argue that the local road network around Yarnfield would not be able to cope safely with the increase in traffic generated by the road closure and construction works, and are worried about an increased risk of accidents. There is concern about the safety of motorists and non-motorised road users, including pedestrians, school children, cyclists, and horse riders.

'As a member of Staffordshire Fire and Rescue, I believe the road network surrounding the village of Yarnfield cannot cope safely with such an increase in traffic and am concerned for the safety of motorists and pedestrians alike.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.140 Some refer to specific sections of the local road network where there could be an increased risk of accidents, for example, the junction of Yarnfield Lane and the A34, High Lows Lane in Yarnfield, the junction where Yarnfield Lane joins Meece Road and the Walton roundabout.
- 7.3.141 A few comment on road safety on the M6 motorway. A few are concerned that the lights from the railhead/maintenance facility may distract drivers. Highways England comments on the importance of designing out this risk, particularly as the facility is adjacent to a section of the M6 that is unlit. Highways England also comments on the importance of securing materials that are stored at the railhead against wind borne effects. Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council are concerned about increased turning movements at junctions 14 and 15 of the M6.
- 7.3.142 A few respondents comment on the disruption of the closure of Yarnfield Lane would have on public and school buses, resulting in lengthy diversions and longer journeys.
- 7.3.143 A number of respondents are concerned about the potential closure of footpaths.
- 7.3.144 *Other comments and suggestions***
- 7.3.145 Different views are expressed about the idea of having a direct access point from the railhead/permanent maintenance facility to/from the M6 motorway. Some argue that there must be direct access to the M6, so the impact of construction traffic on the local road network is minimised. A few think this access point should be made permanent, so that the local area and local people can benefit from it too.
- 7.3.146 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council request discussions with Highways England and HS2 Ltd about the potential for a full junction with the M6 motorway, which they believe would facilitate further economic development and address road safety concerns.

'The authorities would prefer to see the delivery of a full standard motorway junction onto the M6 to service the proposed facility, which after the completion of HS2 construction can form a permanent feature of the highway infrastructure, and would provide the opportunity for further economic development in the area.'

Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council

- 7.3.147 A few respondents however urge caution if developing a new access point to the M6 motorway. One respondent comments that this stretch of the motorway is often closed due to incidents and is concerned that an access point would increase the number of accidents.

7.3.148 Highways England comments that new accesses are not normally granted on motorways, because they have the potential to impact on the Strategic Road Network's (SRN) ability to fulfil its function of facilitating the safe and effective movement of goods and services. However, they explain that there is an exception when access is for maintenance compounds, although it would need to be designed so that it is only used by traffic destined for the facility and access for employees on the site would have to be from the local road network. They comment that policy approval would be needed from the DfT and from a technical perspective the design would have to fully comply with Highways England's standards in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

7.3.149 A few respondents suggest traffic and transport mitigation measures. For example, one respondent comments that a new or temporary road across the M6 motorway would need to be delivered as a minimum to prevent communities from being cut off for a prolonged period. Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council request the continued operation of Yarnfield Lane throughout the operation of the maintenance facility whether it is temporary or permanent.

7.3.150 Comments on water resources and flood risk

7.3.151 *Reasons for not supporting and concerns with the proposals*

7.3.152 A few respondents comment that the site of the proposed railhead/maintenance facility is a flood-plain, which floods regularly and provides flood attenuation. A few are concerned that disturbing the flood-plain could cause flooding in Yarnfield, which is already an issue for the village.

7.3.153 A few comment that local roads are prone to flooding, such as Eccleshall Road, Yarnfield Lane and Meece Road.

7.3.154 A few respondents, including Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council, comment that the site lies in proximity to Filly Brook. One respondent comments that there must be robust pollution measures in place to prevent it from becoming polluted.

7.3.155 *Other comments and suggestions*

7.3.156 The Environment Agency explains that under the Water Framework Directive, no permanent deterioration of a water body is permitted. It goes on to provide further information on what is required. For example, they emphasise the importance of protecting watercourses that flow onto/within or out of the proposed site.

7.3.157 Other comments

7.3.158 Some respondents worry that there would be a loss in property values, and difficulties selling properties. A few comment on the importance of full compensation.

Chapter 8: Responses which did not address the consultation questions

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 This chapter provides a qualitative summary of responses to the Design Refinement consultation that do not directly address any of the three consultation questions, including comments on the HS2 project as a whole and the consultation process.

8.2 Overview of responses

8.2.1 A total of 286 respondents did not structure their response according to the consultation questions. However, where these respondents raised issues relevant to the consultation questions, these have been reported on in the appropriate chapters above.

8.2.2 A detailed quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue can be found in Appendix C of this report.

8.3 Discussion

8.3.1 This section consists of two subsections relating to themes arising that do not directly address the consultation questions. These themes are:

- comments on the consultation process; and
- overall comments on the project and the proposed route.

8.3.2 Comments on the consultation process and communications from HS2 Ltd

8.3.3 Several respondents, including Stone Town Council and Chebsey Parish Council, express concerns about perceived consultation communication issues in relation to Design Refinement 3. They comment that local residents became aware of the consultation process through other members of the public instead of through HS2 Ltd’s official channels (detailed above at section 1.2).

‘I am very angry about the lack of consultation on this project. I have only just found out about it from a leaflet produced by a local resident. How I am expected to present an articulate counter argument when I have not even had the chance to examine the proposal in detail.’

Individual submission

- 8.3.4 Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council comment that they have been contacted by a number of residents, Parish Councils and community groups who felt that the consultation had not covered all affected communities and insufficient detail was provided on the proposals.
- 8.3.5 A few respondents comment that the proposal to site the railhead/permanent maintenance facility near to Stone came as a “complete surprise” and are critical that such a significant change has been proposed at what they believe to be a late stage in the design process.
- 8.3.6 Several respondents, including Lord Stafford’s Estates, link this lack of awareness with concerns about the timescale of the consultation, arguing that once they had found out about the consultation they had limited time to reply.
- 8.3.7 A few respondents go further to suggest that these perceived issues with the consultation process may become the subject of a legal challenge.
- 8.3.8 A couple of respondents, including Chebsey Parish Council, suggest extending the line for future mailings of consultation documents to two kilometres.
- 8.3.9 Several respondents have more general concerns that their views are not being considered or factored into HS2 Ltd’s decision-making process.

‘I feel that as a village we have been totally disregarded and ignored.’

Individual submission

- 8.3.10 A few respondents request an additional extended consultation process to allow all residents to submit their thoughts.
- 8.3.11 Similarly, some respondents suggest a second consultation once they have received more information or when the refinements are confirmed. A few comment on the importance of this taking place prior to any approval being given to the scheme. Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council are concerned that there may not be further consultation prior to the deposit of the Phase 2a hybrid Bill. They argue that this would not be acceptable given it is potentially a major development for Staffordshire for which very little detail has been provided, and request a further opportunity to consult prior to Bill deposit. They are concerned that changes may be made, such as a greater amount of land taken, as the project is considered further. One respondent also suggests that an independent third party run the consultation.
- 8.3.12 In contrast, a few respondents make positive comments about the consultation process. Cheshire East Council comments that HS2 Ltd has gathered feedback from their councillors. Other respondents appreciated the usefulness of staff at community events.

'Thank you for the consultation evenings and your kind and helpful staff. Thank you also for the opportunity to respond.'

Individual submission

- 8.3.13 Several respondents make specific personal requests, such as a visit to their property, confirmation of receipt and that their comments will be listened to.
- 8.3.14 Some respondents specifically request community events at Hill Ridware Village Hall while one respondent suggests an event in Stone. Some of these respondents comment that not everyone has transport to access other villages nearby. A few respondents request more maps and documents at events for the public.
- 8.3.15 A few respondents express concerns that the events were too focused on the positive aspects of the scheme or that staff were not able to answer their questions. One respondent also comments that residents from Chebsey were not initially offered a meeting with HS2 Ltd, but had to request a meeting.
- 8.3.16 Several stakeholders including Wybunbury Parish Council, Highways England, Springfield First School, Cheshire East Council and Network Rail request further discussion with HS2 Ltd over the concerns and opportunities they identified. Staffordshire Wildlife Trust suggests HS2 Ltd liaise with Stone Town Council to carry out neighbourhood planning. One respondent was concerned that Stone Town Council was not warned in advance about the railhead, while another commented that the Friends of Stone Railway Association were not informed about the consultation. Cheshire East Council and 20 Miles More request the decision to be made on the site of the new railhead to reduce property blight.
- 8.3.17 Some respondents believe that outdated Ordnance Survey maps have been used in the consultation documents. Respondents specifically highlight that since these maps were developed the number of houses in Yarnfield has increased significantly. Several comment that this will affect the assessment of impacts on the area.

'Old OS maps have been used for the images of Yarnfield village which suggests HS2 planning was not fully conversant with the size of Yarnfield and the effect the proposed Railhead would bring.'

Individual submission

- 8.3.18 Several respondents are concerned that they have only been provided with an aerial view of the proposed railhead. They request a visualisation of the railhead to give them a greater idea of how it may look. Staffordshire Wildlife Trust highlights several perceived issues with the presentation of habitats on HS2 Ltd's documentation. They comment that habitat creation areas are shown on existing woodlands and that if the railhead is made permanent then the habitat reinstatement shown would not happen.
- 8.3.19 A small number of respondents express concern about the maps not showing how landowners will access isolated pockets of land. A couple of respondents believe that the number of proposed tracks and the length of tracks at the railhead are understated. They comment that reception sidings, turnback sidings and access lines are not shown on the maps provided. One respondent is concerned that Cold Norton is not shown on the maps provided despite being 400m from the proposed route.
- 8.3.20 In addition to comments on the maps, some respondents comment on a perceived issue with the documentation: that it lacks clarity on whether the railhead will be permanent or temporary. Respondents argue that this affects their ability to respond effectively to the consultation.

'The construction railhead is proposed during the construction phase only - but potential for permanent maintenance facility is also highlighted. Leaving the reader confused as to exactly what is being proposed and consulted on.'

Individual submission

- 8.3.21 A few respondents had issues with technological aspects of the consultation. This includes issues with registering on the webform, the structure of the webform and the length of the consultation email address.

8.3.22 Overall comments on the project and the proposed route

- 8.3.23 Some respondents express general opposition to HS2. The most commonly given reasons include the perceived limited journey time reduction, future increases in remote working and accusations that the Proposed Scheme is a vanity project.

'I would urge you to think again before any more money is wasted on a scheme that the majority of people do not want at any price.'

Individual submission

- 8.3.24 Swynnerton and Chebsey Parish Councils question whether HS2 is an appropriate use of public money. Jeremy Lefroy MP does not oppose increased rail capacity, but questions the need for high speed services in a relatively small country.
- 8.3.25 Several respondents suggest alternatives to the Proposed Scheme such as improving existing rail infrastructure. One local example respondents give is extending the platforms at Stone station to accommodate trains to Euston. Other respondents suggest non-rail alternatives such as funding the NHS, education or broadband internet.
- 8.3.26 In contrast, several respondents support the proposed route. Crewe Town Council and Cheshire East Council both comment on the opportunities for economic growth following a hub station in the town. Freightliner supports the extension to Crewe for a different reason, avoiding potential impacts on rail capacity at Handsacre Junction.

'Expediting Phase 2 to Crewe is key to overcoming the capacity constraint at Handsacre Junction caused by HS2 trains rejoining the classic network which would potentially restrict freight growth. This consultation reaffirms the aspiration for Phase 2a to become operational one year after the opening of Phase 1, which we strongly support.'

Freightliner Group Limited

- 8.3.27 Some respondents express support for the Proposed Scheme in general but with specific caveats around impacts on the local areas. These perceived impacts are discussed in Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

Appendix A Participating organisations and elected representatives

A1 Table A2, starting on the next page, lists the names of all the organisations which submitted responses to the consultation. They are listed by sector, and alphabetically within each sector. Organisations have not been listed if they indicated that their response should be treated as confidential. It cannot be fully assured that all organisations have been accurately categorised as not all respondents classified themselves. Categorisation of responses was carried out separately from coding and does not affect the way in which coding is carried out. The potential sectors are listed below in Table A1.

Table A1: Respondent sectors

Sector
Members of the public ¹
Academic (includes universities and other academic institutions)
Action groups (includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals)
Businesses (local, regional, national or international)
Elected representatives (includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors)
Environment, heritage, amenity or community groups (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 groups (includes chambers of commerce, trade unions, political parties and professional bodies)
Statutory agencies
Real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisations (includes transport bodies, transport providers, infrastructure providers and utility companies)
Other
Prefer not to say

¹ Members of the public are not included in the following table

Table A2: Respondents

Action groups
20 Miles More
Joint Action Group (JAG) of Kings Bromley Stop HS2, Ridwares Against HS2 & Colton Against HS2
Madeley HS2 Action Group
Businesses
Bromley Hayes Cattery
Dean Lewis Estates Limited
Freightliner Group Limited
G Baskerville & Co
Taylor Wimpey UK Limited
Wardell Armstrong
Elected representatives
Sir William Cash, MP for Stone
Cllr Janet Clowes, Cheshire East Council
Jeremy Lefroy, MP for Stafford
Cllr Jeremy Pert, Stafford Borough Council
Environment, heritage, amenity or community groups
Canal and River Trust
Grosvenor & Gresty Brook Medical Centres
The Inland Waterways Association
Springfields First School
Staffordshire Wildlife Trust
Local government
Betley Batterley and Wrinehill Parish Council

Chebsey Parish Council
Cheshire East Council
Crewe Town Council
Eccleshall Parish Council
Hough and Chorlton Parish Council
Kings Bromley Parish Council
Lichfield District Council
Staffordshire County Council and Stafford Borough Council
Stone Town Council
Swynnerton Parish Council
Weston and Basford Parish Council
Wybunbury Parish Council
Real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations
Lord Stafford's Estates
Statutory agency
Environment Agency
Highways England
Natural England
Public Health England
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation
National Council on Inland Transport
Network Rail
TSSA Crewe & Cheshire General Branch

Appendix B Detailed methodology

Data receipt and digitisation

- B1 All submissions were scanned and securely held before being entered into a specially designed database so that each response could be read and analysed (by assigning codes to comments).
- B2 Submissions were received in a number of formats: online response forms (via the webform); paper response forms, letters and emails. There were also variations to these formats, such as completed response forms with letters or reports attached.
- B3 At the outset of data processing, each response was assigned a unique reference number, scanned (if it had not been received electronically) and then saved with its reference number as the file name. Responses other than those submitted through the project webform were processed by data entry staff in order to prepare for import into the Dialogue by Design analysis database.
- B4 For submissions containing images, maps and other non-text content, a reference to a PDF version of the original submission was made available to analysts, so that this information could be viewed when necessary.

Responses via the webform

- B5 Online submissions were captured via the consultation webform and then imported into the analysis database on a regular basis throughout the consultation period.
- B6 While the consultation was open, webform users were able to update or amend their submissions. If a respondent updated their submission, this was imported into the analysis database with a clear reference that it was a 'modified' submission. If the original submission had already been analysed, an analyst would review it and revise the coding as required.

Responses received via email

- B7 A consultation-specific email address operated for the duration of the consultation. At regular intervals, emails were logged and confirmed as real responses (i.e. not junk or misdirected email), given a unique reference number and then imported into the data analysis system alongside paper responses, as described below.

Responses received via the Freepost address

- B8 A Freepost address operated for the duration of the consultation for respondents to submit hard-copy consultation responses. Upon receipt, letters and paper-based response forms were logged and given a unique reference number. They were then scanned and imported into the data analysis system.
- B9 At the data entry stage, all printed submissions, were transcribed using optical character recognition software, which can recognise printed text without the need for manual data entry. Each of these files was then opened and reviewed by our

transcription team in order to correct any misrecognition. Handwritten responses were typed into the database by data entry staff.

- B10 The transcription process was quality controlled by a transcription supervisor, who reviewed a percentage of the transcriptions and indicated their quality using a comprehensive scoring system. The transcription quality score is a ranked scale, differentiating between minor errors (such as insignificant typographical errors), and significant errors (such as omitted information or errors that might cause a change in meaning).
- B11 The quality control process involved a random review of each team member's work. At least 5% of the submissions they transcribed were reviewed by response type. In cases where a significant error was detected, the quality control team reviewed 10% of the relevant team member's work on that response type. If a second significant error was detected, the proportion reviewed was raised to 100%.

Responses submitted to HS2 Ltd or the DfT

- B12 HS2 Ltd and the DfT took reasonable measures to ensure that responses mistakenly sent to their offices rather than to the advertised response channels were transferred to Dialogue by Design via the specific consultation email address.

Late submissions

- B13 The consultation period ended at 23:45 on 7 November 2016. Dialogue by Design received eight hard copy responses and six email responses after the deadline. These responses were stored securely but not processed or analysed.

Verification of submissions

- B14 At the end of the consultation period, once any misdirected responses had been transferred from the DfT and HS2 Ltd to Dialogue by Design, a duplicates check was carried out on responses entered into the database. Where responses were exactly the same, one (or more if necessary) was removed and not processed.
- B15 If responses were recorded as being from the same organisation they were also checked to see whether the same response had been sent by different individuals from the same organisation.
- B16 Although the verification process identified and removed exact duplicate submissions sent by the same person in different formats, the process did not seek to remove identical submissions from different respondents.

Development of an analytical framework

- B17 In order to analyse the responses, and the variety of views expressed, an analytical or coding framework was created. The purpose of the framework was to enable analysts to organise responses by themes and issues, so that key messages as well as specific points of detail could be captured and reported on.

- B18** The process of developing the framework for this consultation involved a team of Dialogue by Design senior analysts reviewing an early set of responses for each consultation question and formulating an initial framework of codes. At this point Dialogue by Design discussed the initial framework with representatives from HS2 Ltd and the DfT. Their feedback was used as part of the finalisation of the coding framework.
- B19** A three-tier approach was taken to coding, starting with high-level themes, splitting into sub-themes and then specific codes. Table B1 provides a full list of the top-level themes used and Table B2 provides an extract from the coding framework showing the use of themes, sub-themes and codes. The full coding framework is available in Appendix C.
- B20** Each code is intended to represent a specific issue or argument raised in responses. The data analysis system allows the senior analysts to populate a basic coding framework at the start (top-down) whilst providing scope for further development of the framework using suggestions from the analysts engaging with the response data (bottom-up). We use natural language² codes since this allows analysts to suggest refinements and additional issues, and aids quality control and external verification.

Table B1 *List of themes from coding framework*

Theme
Community areas
Consultation process
Design and route
General
Impacts
Locations
Other
Q1 - Crewe Tunnel Extension
Q2 - WCML connection spurs south of Crewe
Q3 - Railhead and potential maintenance facility near Stone

Table B2 *Extract from the coding framework*

² Natural language is typically used for communication, and may be spoken, signed or written. Natural language is distinguished from constructed languages and formal languages such as computer-programming languages or the 'languages' used in the study of formal logic.

Theme	Sub-theme	Code
Impacts	Agriculture, forestry and soils	Assessment
		Impact
		Mitigation
	Air quality, dust and dirt	Assessment
		Impact
		Mitigation
	Community	Access issues
		Assessment
		Crime/safety/personal security
		Facilities/healthcare
		Facilities/housing development

Implementation of the analysis framework

- B22 The coding framework was developed centrally by senior analysts. Other members of the analysis team were then familiarised with the detail of the coding framework, so they could start applying codes to individual responses. Modifications to the framework, such as adding codes or splitting themes, could only be implemented by senior analysts, although analysts were encouraged to provide suggestions.
- B23 The application of a code to part of a response was completed by highlighting the relevant text and recording the selection. A single submission could receive multiple codes. All responses to the consultation questions, as well as responses that did not directly address the consultation questions, were coded using the same framework.
- B24 The quality of the coding was internally checked by the senior analysts. The team of senior analysts reviewed a percentage of the other analysts' work using a similar approach to that described above for the transcription stage. Anomalies in the approach to coding that were picked up through the quality checking process resulted in review of that analyst's work and the codes applied.
- B25 HS2 Ltd carried out a separate and independent quality assurance exercise to assure themselves that the coding was accurate and reflective of the responses made to the consultation. HS2 Ltd performed this by checking a sample of responses and providing

feedback to Dialogue by Design. Dialogue by Design responded to this feedback and applied any necessary changes to the coding.

Appendix C Codes by theme and by question

- C1 The analysis of consultation responses was carried out using a coding framework consisting of 10 themes containing 419 codes, of which 234 refer to specific locations mentioned by respondents. The themes and codes are listed below in Table C1 and Table C3 respectively. Table C2 shows key acronyms used within Table C3.
- C2 Table C3 provides an overview of the number of responses to which each code was applied within each consultation question. Some themes and a number of codes were created specifically for one consultation question, others were applied across multiple consultation questions.
- C3 For reference, a total of 572 responses were received to the consultation.
- C4 The column 'Total' in Table C3 provides the number of submissions to which that code was applied, not the total number of times the code was applied (e.g. if one submission has a code applied to its response to Question 1 and to Question 2, it is only counted once for the 'Total' column).

Table C1 *Coding framework themes*

Theme
Consultation process (CP)
Design and route (DE)
Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EA)
General (GE)
Impacts (I)
Locations (LO)
Other (OT)
Q1 Crewe Tunnel Extension (Q1)
Q2 Connection spurs South of Crewe (Q2)
Q3 Railhead and maintenance facility near Stone (Q3)

Table C2 *Key acronyms*

Key Terms	
CA	Community Area
CT-05-101 (example)	Reference to HS2 construction map
IMD	Infrastructure maintenance depot
PRoW	Public Right(s) of Way
RW	Volume 3: Route-wide effects

Table C3 *Count of comments per code per question³*

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
Consultation process					
CP - Consultation - comment	~	~	~	3	3
CP - Consultation - criticise	5	2	37	49	88
CP - Consultation - suggestion	2	4	24	87	114
CP - Consultation - support	1	1	1	2	4
CP - Documentation - criticise	~	1	21	6	28
CP - Documentation/maps - criticise	~	~	9	16	25
CP - Events - comments	~	1	12	1	14
Design and route					
DE - Oppose Pipe Ridware depot	~	~	20	44	64
DE - Oppose previous design	1	2	~	2	5

³ The full text of the consultation questions can be found in Chapter 2, Table 2.4.

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
DE - Oppose proposals/route	2	1	7	12	21
DE - Prefer previous design	5	6	10	4	21
DE - Support proposals/route	~	~	~	6	6
DE - Auto transformer feeder station	2	1	~	1	3
DE - Boreholes/geology	~	~	~	1	1
DE - Bridge/overbridge	2	~	13	4	19
DE - Compounds	1	~	1	3	5
DE - Connections	2	2	14	5	22
DE - Costs - cost savings/benefits/positive	5	1	18	19	39
DE - Costs - cost savings/too much focus/concerns	3	1	4	9	15
DE - Costs - too expensive	4	~	~	~	4
DE - Cuttings and embankments	~	~	~	3	3
DE - Design/mitigation suggestions	16	14	53	27	91
DE - Drainage and watercourse realignment	~	~	~	3	3
DE - Electrification/power system	~	1	~	~	1
DE - Height of line	8	6	22	65	96
DE - IMD (preliminary) options appraisal/options	~	~	3	~	3
DE - IMD Crewe location benefits/support	7	5	44	29	74
DE - IMD Crewe location concerns/oppose	2	~	29	7	37
DE - IMD other comments/suggestions	6	2	37	35	77
DE - IMD Safeguarding Area	~	~	~	3	3

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
DE - IMD siting/design/assessment process	~	~	4	9	13
DE - IMD Stone location benefits/support	5	1	49	87	135
DE - IMD Stone location concerns/oppose	3	4	90	74	171
DE - IMD temporary vs permanent	~	~	48	30	77
DE - Journey times/service frequency	~	1	~	1	2
DE - Maintenance loops	~	~	~	11	11
DE - Material stockpile	1	1	~	~	1
DE - Proximity to populated area	1	~	10	6	17
DE - Route location	1	1	10	10	22
DE - Satellite station	~	~	~	6	6
DE - Spur lines	~	7	1	1	9
DE - Stations (including hub)	11	7	~	2	14
DE - Train speeds	~	~	~	2	2
DE - Transfer Node	~	~	~	1	1
DE - Tunnel portal	7	~	~	3	10
DE - Tunnel/green tunnel	17	4	7	3	27
DE - Viaducts	14	7	9	26	51
Environmental Impact Assessment Report					
EA - Alternatives Report - alternatives - suggestions	1	~	2	1	4
EA - Alternatives Report - options - challenge process/proposal	~	~	1	1	2

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
EA - Alternatives Report - options - information inadequate	~	~	2	~	2
EA - Alternatives Report - rail alternatives/Atkins - high cost option/option 1	~	~	~	2	2
EA - Assessment - criticise	~	~	10	~	10
EA - Assessment - criticise/inadequate	~	~	~	3	3
EA - Assessment - suggestion/other comments	~	~	2	5	7
EA - Comments - CA Reports	~	~	~	1	1
EA - Comments - Non-Technical Summary	~	~	~	2	2
EA - Further information/detail requested	~	~	~	6	6
General					
GE - Alternative suggestions	1	2	15	20	35
GE - Decision-making process	~	~	~	1	1
GE - General opposition (HS2)	10	8	31	58	96
GE - General support (HS2)	~	~	3	7	9
GE - General support (HS2) with caveat	1	~	2	3	6
Impacts					
I - Agriculture, forestry and soils	5	5	27	70	101
I - Agriculture, forestry and soils - assessment	~	2	~	1	2
I - Agriculture, forestry and soils - mitigation/compensation	~	4	2	5	10
I - Air quality, dust and dirt	6	3	61	62	130

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
I - Air quality, dust and dirt - assessment	~	~	~	1	1
I - Air quality, dust and dirt - mitigation	~	~	~	3	3
I - Community - assessment	~	~	3	12	15
I - Community - mitigation/compensation	2	2	1	15	20
I - Community - access issues	4	2	46	46	94
I - Community - crime/safety/personal security	3	1	4	8	15
I - Community - cumulative impact	1	~	19	17	37
I - Community - facilities - healthcare	~	~	9	6	15
I - Community - facilities - housing development	11	1	93	35	130
I - Community - facilities - leisure facilities	1	~	28	16	45
I - Community - facilities - other	2	~	13	9	23
I - Community - facilities - places of worship	~	~	1	1	2
I - Community - facilities - residential	~	~	~	1	1
I - Community - facilities - schools/educational	3	2	44	30	77
I - Community - fly tipping	~	~	~	5	5
I - Community - general/disruption/viability	6	3	55	30	91
I - Community - growth/development plan	3	2	7	16	26
I - Community - isolation	4	2	33	27	62
I - Community - no benefit/cost vs benefits	1	4	52	47	103
I - Community - recreation/local amenity/open space	~	~	~	4	4

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
I - Construction - mitigation	1	~	~	4	5
I - Construction - disruption	13	16	34	28	81
I - Construction - earthworks	~	~	7	1	8
I - Construction - general	2	~	~	~	2
I - Construction - length of time/duration	3	1	8	4	15
I - Construction - local experience	~	~	23	36	59
I - Construction - mitigation	~	~	13	~	13
I - Construction - workforce/contractors	1	~	9	13	23
I - Construction - working hours/operations	1	2	~	15	17
I - Cultural heritage	~	~	~	8	8
I - Cultural heritage - assessment	~	~	~	2	2
I - Cultural heritage - mitigation	~	~	~	1	1
I - Ecology and biodiversity	6	~	58	58	121
I - Ecology and biodiversity - assessment	~	~	4	3	7
I - Ecology and biodiversity - mitigation/compensation	1	~	3	6	10
I - Ecology and biodiversity - woodlands	~	~	~	8	8
I - Equality - general/fairness	1	2	15	15	32
I - Health/wellbeing - assessment	~	~	~	2	2
I - Health/wellbeing - mitigation/compensation	~	~	~	1	1
I - Health/wellbeing - air quality	~	~	9	9	18

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
I - Health/wellbeing - electromagnetic fields	~	1	~	1	2
I - Health/wellbeing - general	1	4	15	19	37
I - Health/wellbeing - peace/tranquillity/quality of life	3	1	37	24	64
I - Health/wellbeing - pets/animals	~	~	~	5	5
I - Health/wellbeing - stress/anxiety	~	~	14	14	28
I - Impacted groups - children/young people	3	1	40	36	78
I - Impacted groups - disabled people	~	~	3	~	3
I - Impacted groups - impaired accessibility	~	~	~	3	3
I - Impacted groups - landowners	1	1	~	5	7
I - Impacted groups - older people/vulnerable	~	~	18	22	40
I - Impacted groups - other	~	~	3	~	3
I - Impacted groups - residents/local people	9	10	60	53	124
I - Impacted groups - respondent's circumstances/property	7	6	64	54	123
I - Impacted groups - specific health and wellbeing conditions	~	~	2	3	5
I - Land quality	~	~	~	3	3
I - Land quality - assessment	~	~	~	1	1
I - Landscape and visual - assessment	~	~	~	2	2
I - Landscape and visual - mitigation/compensation	1	6	4	22	32
I - Landscape and visual - environment/general	30	21	114	121	262

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
I - Landscape and visual - land take (brownfield/greenfield)	3	5	40	22	65
I - Landscape and visual - light pollution	6	4	120	94	215
I - Property - assessment	~	~	~	2	2
I - Property - mitigation/compensation	~	3	10	15	27
I - Property - land/assets	~	~	~	2	2
I - Property - loss of housing	1	~	1	3	5
I - Property - other property impacts	~	3	1	6	10
I - Property - value/ability to sell/blight	8	5	95	69	169
I - Socio-economic - assessment	~	~	~	3	3
I - Socio-economic - mitigation/compensation	~	2	6	1	8
I - Socio-economic - effects on existing businesses/livelihoods	3	5	48	36	87
I - Socio-economic - general	3	~	11	5	17
I - Socio-economic - opportunities	5	~	19	12	34
I - Sound, noise and vibration	24	23	151	133	304
I - Sound, noise and vibration - assessment	~	~	1	4	5
I - Sound, noise and vibration - mitigation	2	6	4	11	22
I - Traffic and transport - assessment	~	~	3	10	13
I - Traffic and transport - mitigation/compensation	3	4	59	40	103
I - Traffic and transport - bridges	3	1	4	~	7
I - Traffic and transport - construction traffic	3	2	56	67	127

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
I - Traffic and transport - emergency services	1	1	70	51	121
I - Traffic and transport - existing rail infrastructure	14	13	17	10	43
I - Traffic and transport - journey times/commuting	1	1	27	39	67
I - Traffic and transport - non-motorised users	1	~	11	11	23
I - Traffic and transport - PRoW/footpaths	2	2	3	1	8
I - Traffic and transport - public transport	~	~	10	15	25
I - Traffic and transport - road safety	5	2	55	55	112
I - Traffic and transport - roads - economic implications	~	~	19	17	36
I - Traffic and transport - roads (congestion/closure etc.)	24	17	210	174	403
I - Traffic and transport - waterways	~	1	~	~	1
I - Waste and material resources	~	~	5	9	14
I - Waste and material resources - mitigation	~	~	~	2	2
I - Water resources and flood risk	~	1	19	15	35
I - Water resources and flood risk - assessment	~	~	~	1	1
I - Water resources and flood risk - mitigation	~	~	2	5	7
Locations					
LO - Alleyne's Academy	~	~	1	1	2
LO - Baden Hall	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Baldwins Gate	~	3	1	1	4
LO - Bamford	~	~	1	~	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Bar Hill	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Bar Hill Tunnel	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Barlaston	~	~	1	2	3
LO - Barthomley	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Basford	7	4	14	8	27
LO - Basford Brook	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Basford Junction	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Basford maintenance depot	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Basford sidings	3	~	~	~	3
LO - Beech	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Betley	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Birmingham	~	~	2	3	5
LO - Blakenhall	1	1	~	~	2
LO - Blithbury	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Bourne Brook	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Bromley Hayes Cattery	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Brookhouse Farm	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Burton-on-Trent	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Bury Bank	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Carlisle	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Chebsey	~	~	1	7	8

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Cheshire	~	~	2	2	4
LO - Cheshire East	~	~	5	2	6
LO - Cheshire Plain	1	1	~	~	1
LO - Chorlton	6	11	4	3	17
LO - Cold Meece	~	~	11	6	17
LO - Cold Norton	~	~	6	7	13
LO - Cold Norton Farm	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Colton	~	~	13	5	18
LO - Colwich	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Congleton	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Creswell	~	~	1	2	3
LO - Crewe	13	11	96	59	159
LO - Crewe hub station	2	2	~	~	3
LO - Crewe South	~	~	17	~	17
LO - Crewe station	2	3	~	~	5
LO - Crewe Tunnel	1	~	~	~	1
LO - CT-05-201	~	~	~	1	1
LO - CT-05-202	~	~	~	2	2
LO - CT-05-221	~	~	~	1	1
LO - CT-05-222	~	~	1	1	2
LO - CT-05-223	~	~	~	1	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - CT-05-225	~	~	~	1	1
LO - CT-05-226	~	~	~	1	1
LO - CT-06-222	~	~	1	~	1
LO - CT-06-223	~	~	~	1	1
LO - CT-06-225	~	~	~	1	1
LO - CT-06-238	~	1	~	~	1
LO - CT-06-239	~	~	1	~	1
LO - CT-10-112	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Darlaston Grange Farm	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Darlaston Pool	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Eccleshall	~	~	22	15	37
LO - Etruria	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Filly Brook	~	~	4	3	7
LO - Filly Brook Viaduct	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Fradley	~	~	19	5	24
LO - Fradley Wood	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Gonsley Green Farm	~	2	~	1	2
LO - Grange Farm	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Great Haywood	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Hanchurch Crossroads	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Handsacre	~	~	~	2	2

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Harecastle Tunnels	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Hatton	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Haywoods	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Heath Farm	1	1	~	~	1
LO - High Lows Meadow	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Higher Den House and Barn	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Hill Ridware	~	~	~	32	32
LO - Hill Ridware Village Hall	~	~	~	19	19
LO - Hough	4	4	3	2	8
LO - Isaak Walton Golf Club	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Keele	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Kidsgrove	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Kings Bromley	~	~	2	9	11
LO - Lakesedge	~	~	1	2	3
LO - Lea Valley	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Lichfield	~	~	2	6	8
LO - Little Bridgeford	~	~	4	~	4
LO - Liverpool	~	~	1	~	1
LO - London	~	~	5	10	15
LO - Macclesfield	~	~	2	1	3
LO - Madeley	2	3	2	3	9

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Manchester	~	~	1	4	5
LO - Manor Hill First School	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Market Drayton	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Marsdon	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Meaford	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Meece Road	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Meece Valley	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Micklow House Farm	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Micklow Wood	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Mill Meece	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Mount Pleasant	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Nantwich	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Newcastle Bridge	1	~	2	1	3
LO - Newcastle-under-Lyme	~	~	10	3	13
LO - North Staffs Hospital	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Norton Bridge	~	~	40	28	68
LO - Oakhanger Hall	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Pipe Ridware	~	~	22	84	106
LO - Pipe Ridware Village Hall	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Pirehill First School	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Pool House Farm	~	~	~	1	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Pool House Wood	~	~	2	~	2
LO - Potteries	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Richard Crosse Primary School	~	~	~	1	1
LO - River Lea	~	~	~	1	1
LO - River Trent	~	~	2	1	3
LO - Road - A34	2	~	86	54	141
LO - Road - A34 Barlston roundabout	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - A34 Walton roundabout	~	~	~	5	5
LO - Road - A500	13	1	23	10	36
LO - Road - A500 bridge	5	~	~	~	5
LO - Road - A5013	~	~	3	~	3
LO - Road - A51	~	~	23	15	38
LO - Road - A513	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Road - A515	~	~	~	3	3
LO - Road - A518	~	~	1	1	2
LO - Road - A519	~	~	2	1	3
LO - Road - A520	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Road - A53	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - A531	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - B5014	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Road - B5026	~	~	20	20	40

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Road - B5027	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Road - Back Lane	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - Casey Lane	4	~	4	~	7
LO - Road - Checkley Lane	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Chorlton Lane	~	1	2	1	4
LO - Road - Chorlton Road	1	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Common Lane	~	~	1	5	6
LO - Road - Crawley Lane	~	~	~	4	4
LO - Road - Crewe Road	~	~	1	3	4
LO - Road - Croatia Lane	~	~	2	~	2
LO - Road - Crotia Mill Lane	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - David Whitby Way	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - Dawson Lane	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Road - Den Lane	~	4	3	~	6
LO - Road - Eccleshall Road	2	~	56	33	90
LO - Road - Higher Den Lane	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Highlows Lane	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Road - Jack Mills Way	1	~	7	3	10
LO - Road - Junction 14	~	~	7	~	7
LO - Road - Junction 15	~	1	6	~	7
LO - Road - Lane End Court	~	1	~	~	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Road - M1	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - M6	1	~	100	99	199
LO - Road - Manor Road	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - Meece Road	~	~	9	5	14
LO - Road - Mill Lane	1	1	2	~	4
LO - Road - Moor Lane	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - Moss Lane	~	~	2	~	2
LO - Road - Nantwich Road	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Road - Newcastle Road	7	1	6	~	12
LO - Road - Newlands Lane	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - Norton Road	1	1	2	~	2
LO - Road - Pipe Lane	~	~	2	2	4
LO - Road - Pirehill Lane	~	~	1	6	7
LO - Road - Quintons Orchard	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Road - Shaw Lane	~	~	1	4	5
LO - Road - Snape Hall Road	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - Stab Lane	~	1	~	5	6
LO - Road - Stonyford Lane	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Road - Tittensor Road	~	1	2	7	9
LO - Road - Tixall Road	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - Walton roundabout/junction	~	~	11	~	11

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Road - Waybutt Lane	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Weston Lane	3	~	7	3	11
LO - Road - Whitgreave Lane	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Road - Yarnfield Lane	3	4	136	118	254
LO - Royal Stoke Hospital	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Rugeley	~	~	~	3	3
LO - Sandyfarm	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Scholar Green	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Scythe Cottages	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Shallowford	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Shavington	1	~	2	~	3
LO - Silverdale Colliery	~	~	1	~	1
LO - South Cheshire	~	~	4	~	4
LO - South Crewe	1	~	~	~	1
LO - South Crewe Auto Transformer Feeder Station	1	1	~	1	2
LO - Springfields First School	1	1	7	5	12
LO - Stableford	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Stafford	~	~	34	18	51
LO - Stafford County Hospital	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Staffordshire	~	~	18	24	42
LO - Stockwell Heath	~	~	1	3	4

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Stoke-on-Trent	~	~	21	11	32
LO - Stone	13	4	189	187	378
LO - Stone Business Park	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Stone Dominoes Football Club	~	~	13	6	19
LO - Stone Golf Course	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Stone Railway	~	~	6	~	6
LO - Sutch Farm	1	1	~	1	1
LO - Swynnerton	~	~	38	32	70
LO - Tamworth	~	~	~	2	2
LO - The Filleybrooks	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Tittensor	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Trent and Mersey Canal	~	~	~	3	3
LO - Trent Valley	~	~	3	2	5
LO - Trentham	~	~	~	1	1
LO - University Hospital	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Walton	2	~	27	27	55
LO - Walton Heath Farm	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Walton Priory	~	~	~	3	3
LO - Wedgwood	~	~	1	~	1
LO - West Coast Mainline	11	17	17	23	55
LO - Weston	6	4	3	2	11

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
LO - Weston Lane Bridge	4	1	~	~	5
LO - Whitgreave	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Whitmore	~	3	~	1	4
LO - Whitmore Heath	2	~	~	~	2
LO - Whitmore South	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Whitmore Wood	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Wolstanton	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Woodend Common Barn Farm	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Woore	~	1	~	~	1
LO - WR-01-207b	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Wrinehill	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Wybunbury	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Wychwood	1	2	1	~	2
LO - Wychwood Park	1	4	2	~	5
LO - Yarlet	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Yarnfield	8	2	141	105	250
LO - Yarnfield North embankment	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Yarnfield Park	~	~	34	16	50
LO - Yarnfield School	~	~	5	~	5
LO - Yarnfield Sports Centre	~	~	5	3	8

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
Other					
OT - Context to organisation/response	~	2	1	44	46
OT - Level of public opposition	1	~	4	4	9
OT - No comment	20	25	2	3	32
OT - Quote documentation	~	~	~	4	4
OT - Refer to attachment	3	1	22	18	36
OT - Refer to HS1	~	~	~	1	1
OT - Refer to Hybrid Bill	~	2	1	7	9
OT - Refer to other stakeholder/organisation	~	~	3	9	12
OT - Refer to previous consultation	~	~	~	1	1
OT - Refer to previous report	2	2	~	~	3
OT - Reference HS2 documentation	~	1	20	16	36
Q1 Crewe Tunnel Extension (Q1)					
Q1 - Further information requested	5	~	~	~	5
Q1 - Not affected by proposal	6	~	~	~	6
Q1 - Oppose proposal	11	~	~	3	12
Q1 - Support proposal	36	~	1	8	43
Q1 - Support proposal with caveat	8	~	~	~	8
Q2 Connection spurs south of Crewe (Q2)					
Q2 - Further information requested	~	5	~	1	6
Q2 - Not affected by proposal	~	5	~	~	5

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.73)
Q2 - Oppose proposal	~	22	~	2	22
Q2 - Support proposal	3	28	~	6	37
Q2 - Support proposal with caveat	~	9	~	1	10
Q3 Railhead and maintenance facility near Stone					
Q3 - Further information requested	~	~	21	8	29
Q3 - Oppose proposal	7	1	174	105	278
Q3 - Support proposal	1	~	51	88	137
Q3 - Support proposal with caveat	~	~	12	6	18

Appendix D Glossary of terms

Amenity - The benefits of enjoyment and well-being that are gained from a resource in line with its intended function. Amenity may be affected by a combination of factors such as: sound, noise and vibration; dust/air quality; traffic/congestion; and visual impacts.

Atkins Report – A report by Atkins commissioned by the DfT in May 2015 to design and assess potential alternatives to building HS2 Phase 2a.

Auto-transformer feeder station - Permanent compounds located next to railway lines. They contain equipment that enables electrical power to be transferred between the National Grid network and the rail line.

Biodiversity - The variety of life in the world or in a particular habitat or ecosystem.

Culvert - A large pipe or small underbridge carrying a watercourse under a road or railway.

Cumulative - A combination of effects. The EIA Scope and methodology report for HS2 Phase 2a defines a cumulative effect as “incremental effects that result from the accumulation of a number of individual effects, either caused by the Proposed Scheme (intra-project effects) or by other existing and/or approved projects which would be under construction at the same time as Phase 2a or built later (inter-project effects).”

Design Refinement consultation – A consultation to inform the Secretary of State’s decision on the next stage of design for the Phase 2a route, based on the views of those individuals and organisations who expressed their opinions on the three design refinements.

Embankment - Artificially raised ground, commonly made of rock or compacted soil, on which a new railway or road is constructed.

High Speed Two (HS2) - Proposed high speed rail line between London and the West Midlands (Phase One) and on to Manchester and Leeds (Phase Two). Phase 2a consists of the section between the West Midlands and Crewe.

High Speed Two Limited (HS2 Ltd) - The company set up by the Government to develop proposals for a new high speed railway line between London and the West Midlands and to consider the case for new high speed rail services linking London, northern England and Scotland.

Hybrid Bill - Public Bills change the law as it applies to the general public and are the most common type of Bill introduced in Parliament. Private Bills change the law only as it applies to specific individuals or organisations, rather than the general public. Groups or individuals potentially affected by these changes can petition Parliament against the proposed Bill and present their objections to committees of MPs and Lords. A Bill with characteristics of both a Public Bill and a Private Bill is called a hybrid Bill.

Information events - a series of events at community venues along the Phase 2a line of route between 30 September and 19 October 2016 to provide members of the public an opportunity to view relevant maps and documents, and to speak with appropriately qualified members of staff about how the proposals might apply to them.

Impact - Changes to the environment that have the potential to occur as a result of the construction and/or operation of the Proposed Scheme.

Infrastructure maintenance depot (IMD) - A facility providing logistical support for the maintenance and repair of the HS2 railway track and associated infrastructure (excluding trains).

Inverted siphon - A form of culvert used on level ground where the water level has to be lowered to pass under the Proposed Scheme, other railways or a road access.

Local planning authority - The local authority or council that is empowered by law to exercise planning functions.

Local wildlife site (LWS) - A non-statutory site of nature conservation value that has been designated 'locally'. These sites are referred to differently between counties. Common terms including site of importance for nature conservation, county wildlife site, site of biological importance, site of local importance and sites of metropolitan importance.

Listed buildings - Buildings of international or national importance classified in three grades. Grade I, Grade II and Grade II*.

Maintenance loop - Additional track that will run for a short distance alongside the main HS2 rail line. The loops will be used for the storage of maintenance trains during operation. They will also provide a safe stopping location for any HS2 train that develops a fault.

Mitigation - The measures put forward to prevent, reduce and where possible, offset any adverse effects on the environment, individuals and communities.

Ordnance Survey - The national mapping agency for Britain.

Overbridge - A bridge crossing over a transport corridor such as a railway line.

Phase One - Phase One of the proposed HS2 network, a high speed railway between London and the West Midlands with a connection via the West Coast Main Line at conventional speeds to the North West and Scotland.

Phase Two - Phase Two of the proposed HS2 network extends the high speed railway beyond the West Midlands to Manchester and Leeds with connections to conventional railway lines via the West Coast and East Coast Main Lines.

Phase 2a - The section of the Phase Two route between the West Midlands and Crewe. It will include a connection with Phase One at Fradley, to the north-east of Lichfield, and a connection with the WCML south of Crewe.

Proposed Scheme - Proposed high speed rail line between the West Midlands and Crewe (i.e. Phase 2a of HS2).

Public right(s) of way (PRoW) - A highway where the public has the right to walk and, depending on its class, use for other modes of travel. It can be a footpath (used for walking only), a bridleway (used for walking, riding a horse and cycling), a restricted byway (as a bridleway, but use by non-motorised vehicles also permitted) or a byway that is open to all traffic (include motor vehicles).

Railhead - A site at strategic locations along the route with connections to the National Rail network. They will be used as the delivery location for bulk rail-borne materials, such as ballast, rails and sleepers.

Receptor - A component of the natural or built environment (such as a human being, water, air, a building or a species) affected by an impact of the construction and/or operation of a proposed development.

Safeguarded area - An area of land subject to a Safeguarding Direction, meaning Local Planning Authorities are required to consult with Government before determining planning applications affecting any land within it, except where that type of application is exempted.

Satellite construction compound - A compound that is smaller in size than the main construction compounds. Satellite construction compounds provide office accommodation for limited numbers of staff involved in the construction of the Proposed Scheme. Welfare facilities for staff are also provided.

Setting (cultural heritage) – The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive, negative or neutral contribution to the significance of an asset and may affect the ability to appreciate it.

Siding - A section of track forming a branch off the main railway line. A siding can be used to store a train, or to allow trains to reverse and enter the main railway line running in the opposite direction from which they entered the siding.

Site of biological importance (SBI) - A non-statutory designation used by some local planning authorities to protect locally valued sites of biological diversity described as local wildlife sites by the UK Government.

Site of special scientific interest (SSSI) - Area of land notified by Natural England under Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as being of special interest due to its flora, fauna or geological or physiological features.

Strategic Road Network (SRN) - The network of motorways and major trunk roads in England.

Tunnel portal – Tunnel entrances and exits.

Viaduct - A type of bridge composed of a series of spans, used to carry roads and railways across valleys or other infrastructure.

West Coast Main Line (WCML) - Inter-urban rail line connecting London, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool and Glasgow.

Working Draft Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) Report - This report presents baseline information gathered to date, and reports the potential equality effects of the Proposed Scheme and any proposed mitigation, based on the information available at the time. This was consulted on to inform the development of the scheme and the EQIA report.

Working Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report consultation – A concurrent consultation to inform the formal Environmental Impact Assessment Report to form part of the hybrid Bill deposit, based on the views of those individuals and organisations who expressed their opinions on the Working Draft EIA report.

Appendix E Equality and Diversity monitoring

- E1 As part of the consultation, respondents were asked to complete an equalities and diversity monitoring form through the consultation webform or on a printed response form. For confidentiality and data protection purposes, these forms were collected separately from consultation responses.
- E2 It is also important to note that this consultation ran at the same time as two other consultations, Working Draft EQIA Report Consultation and Working Draft EIA Report Consultation, and that some respondents could have completed only one equalities and diversities monitoring form despite submitting to multiple consultations. As a result of these factors, the equalities and diversity monitoring forms of all three consultations have been analysed together and reported on in each Consultation Summary Report.
- E3 The forms did not ask for contact details and therefore cannot be linked to individual consultation responses. For this reason we are also unable to confirm with certainty that those who completed the diversity form also responded to the consultation. Completing the form was voluntary. We received 361 diversity monitoring forms, compared to 1139 consultation responses across the three consultations. For these reasons the results presented below are only indicative and do not fully represent a complete description of respondents. In addition, as respondents often partially filled out the form, not every table below will total 361.
- E4 Where no respondents selected one of the given options on the form, it is not displayed in the results. A copy of the paper response form, which includes all possible options for each question, can be found in Appendix F. A breakdown of the results is presented below:

National identity

Question 1 asked 'How would you describe your national identity?'

National identity	Count of responses
British	255
English	86
Scottish	1
Welsh	1
Other	1
Prefer not to say	5

The respondent who selected 'Other' identified as Irish.

Ethnicity

Question 2 asked 'How would you describe your ethnicity?'

Ethnicity	Count of responses
Asian - Chinese	1
Asian - Indian	2
White - English	314
White - Irish	1
White - Northern Irish	1
White – Scottish	4
White – Welsh	5
Other mixed background	1
Other white background	4
Prefer not to say	18

Among the four respondents who selected other white background, two identified as British, one as Danish and one as Isle of Man. The respondent who identified as other mixed background did not further specify their answer.

Disability

Question 3 asked 'Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?'

Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?	Count of responses
Yes	18
No	253
Prefer not to say	21

Among the 18 respondents who answered yes to this question, 10 further specified their disability as mobility, seven as a hearing impairment, three as a visual impairment, two as mental ill health and one as a manual dexterity impairment. Some of these respondents specified more than one of these disabilities.

Gender

Question 4 asked 'What is your gender?'

Gender	Count of responses
Female	185
Male	148
Prefer not to say	12

Religion and belief

Question 5 asked 'What is your religion or belief?'

Religion or belief	Count of responses
Christian	206
Hindu	2
None	84
Prefer not to say	48
Other (please specify)	4

Of the four who answered other, one identified as Bahá'í, one identified as atheist and two did not specify their other religion or belief.

Marriage and Civil Partnerships

Question 6 asked 'Are you married or in a civil partnership?'

Married or in a civil partnership	Count of responses
Yes	264
No	65
Prefer not to say	21

Age

Question 7 asked 'What is your age?'

Age	Count of responses
Under 16	1
16-24	1
25-29	14
30-34	16
35-39	26
40-44	11
45-49	30
50-54	29
55-59	24
60-64	48
65+	96
Prefer not to say	27

Sexual orientation

Question 8 asked 'What is your Sexual Orientation?'

Sexual Orientation	Count of responses
Bisexual	2
Heterosexual / straight	278
Prefer not to say	57

Appendix F Equality and Diversity monitoring form



High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement Consultation **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.

September 2016

Page 1 of 4

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 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 this consultation. This summary will not identify individuals who have provided information.

Please complete the information below and return this form with your response, either by email to DesignRefinement2a@dialoguebydesign.co.uk or by post, using the Freepost address below.

FREEPOST DESIGN REFINEMENT 2A

Please note: no additional address information is required and you do not need a stamp. Please use capital letters.

Q1. How would you describe your national identity?

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

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 (please specify) _____	

Black

<input type="checkbox"/> African	<input type="checkbox"/> Carribean
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Black background (please specify) _____	

Mixed ethnic background

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

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"/> Other White background (please specify) _____		
<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say		



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

The Equality Act 2010 defines a disabled person as someone with a physical or mental impairment, which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on the person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer not to say

Into which category or categories does your disability fall?
(please tick as many as apply)

☐ Hearing impairment ☐ Mobility ☐ Speech impairment
☐ Visual impairment ☐ Mental ill health ☐ Manual dexterity
☐ Learning difficulties (where a person learns in a different way i.e. someone who is dyslexic) ☐ Prefer not to say
☐ Other (please specify) _____

Q4. What is your gender?

☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Prefer not to say

Q5. What is your religion or belief?

☐ Buddhist ☐ Christian ☐ Hindu
☐ Jewish ☐ Muslim ☐ Sikh
☐ None ☐ Prefer not to say
☐ Other (please specify) _____

Q6. Are you married or in a civil partnership?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Prefer not to say

Q7. What is your age?

☐ Under 16 ☐ 35-39 ☐ 55-59
☐ 16-24 ☐ 40-44 ☐ 60-64
☐ 25-29 ☐ 45-49 ☐ 65+
☐ 30-34 ☐ 50-54 ☐ Prefer not to say

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	

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 1998.

