

HS2: Draft Environmental Statement for London – West Midlands

A Summary of Consultation Responses

September 2013

A report to HS2 Ltd

Prepared by Dialogue by Design

Dialogue by Design
252B Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8XG

Telephone: 020 7042 8000
Email: info@dialoguebydesign.com
Website: www.dialoguebydesign.net

Company registration no. in England and Wales: 3856988
VAT registration no. 123 4151 58

Chapter 6	Community forum areas	62
6.2	Euston . station and approach (CFA 1)	62
6.3	Camden Town and HS1 Link (CFA 2)	72
6.3	Primrose Hill to Kilburn (Camden) (CFA 3)	79
6.4	Kilburn (Brent) to Old Oak Common (CFA 4)	84
6.5	Northolt Corridor (CFA 5)	89
6.6	South Ruislip to Ickenham (CFA 6)	92
6.7	Colne Valley (CFA 7)	101
6.8	The Chalfonts and Amersham (CFA 8)	109
6.9	Central Chilterns (CFA 9)	118
6.10	Dunsmore, Wendover and Halton (CFA 10)	126
6.11	Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury (CFA 11)	134
6.12	Waddesdon and Quainton (CFA 12)	141
6.13	Calvert, Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Chetwode (CFA 13)	146
6.14	Newton Purcell to Brackley (CFA 14)	155
6.15	Greatworth to Lower Boddington (CFA 15)	159
6.16	Ladbroke and Southam (CFA 16)	165
6.17	Offchurch and Cubbington (CFA 17)	172
6.18	Stoneleigh, Kenilworth and Burton Green (CFA 18)	179
6.19	Coleshill Junction (CFA 19)	188
6.20	Curdworth to Middleton (CFA 20)	193
6.21	Drayton Bassett, Hints and Weeford (CFA 21)	198
6.22	Whittington to Handsacre (CFA 22)	203
6.23	Balsall Common and Hampton-in-Arden (CFA 23)	212
6.24	Birmingham Interchange and Chelmsley Wood (CFA 24)	219
6.25	Castle Bromwich and Bromford (CFA 25)	223
6.26	Washwood Heath to Curzon Street (CFA 26)	227
Chapter 7	Draft Code of Construction Practice	232
7.2	Overall comments , management principles and implementation	232
7.3	General requirements	238
7.4	Management and mitigation of specific issues	242
Chapter 8	Other sections of the draft Environmental Statement	256
8.2	Appendices	256
8.3	Map books	258
8.4	Glossary of terms	262

8.5	Other documents	262
Chapter 9	Other comments	263
9.2	Comments on the HS2 project	263
9.3	Other comments	265
Appendices		266
	Appendix 1 List of participating organisations	267
	Appendix 2 Organised submissions	273
	Appendix 3 Codes by theme and question	278

Glossary of terms and list of acronyms

Glossary of terms

Agri-environment Scheme: A mechanism by which landowners and other individuals and bodies responsible for land management can be incentivised to manage their land in a manner sympathetic to the environment.

Air Quality Management Area: If a local authority identifies any locations within its boundaries where the air quality objectives are not likely to be achieved, it must declare the area as an air quality management area. The local authority is subsequently required to put together a local air quality action plan.

Ancient woodland: Land that has been continually wooded since at least 1600.

Appraisal of Sustainability: An assessment of the impact of plans, policies and programmes from an environmental, economic and social perspective.

Aquifer: A rock formation that is sufficiently porous and permeable to yield a significant quantity of water to a borehole, well or spring.

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: Area designated under section 82(1) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 for the purpose of conserving and enhancing its natural beauty.

Balancing pond: Part of a drainage system that is used for temporarily storing flood waters.

Best and most versatile land: Land defined as grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification. This land is considered the most flexible, productive and efficient and is most capable of delivering crops for food and non-food uses.

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

Bund: An embankment which acts as a visual or noise screen.

Code of Construction Practice: A code of construction practice sets out the standards and procedures to which a developer or contractor must adhere in order to manage the potential environmental impacts when undertaking construction.

Community forum area: Defined areas along the proposed HS2 Phase One route (e.g. Colne Valley community forum area).

Cut-and-cover tunnel: A tunnel constructed by cutting a trench into the ground surface, constructing the tunnel within the trench and covering with the material that was excavated.

Cutting: Excavation of earth material to lower the ground level to allow the route to remain at the same level.

Dust: Particulate matter up to 75 micrometres in diameter.

Ecosystem: Biological community of interacting organisms (e.g. plants and animals) and their environment.

Electromagnetic interference: Disturbance that affects an electrical system due to magnetic and electric fields, electromagnetic induction or electromagnetic radiation emitted from an external source.

Embankment: Artificially raised ground, commonly made of earth or stone.

English Heritage: Executive non-departmental public body created under section 32 of the National Heritage Act 1983 to: Secure the preservation of ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England; Promote the

preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of Conservation Areas situated in England; and promote the public's enjoyment of, and advance their knowledge of, ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England and their preservation.

Environmental Impact Assessment: A process to systematically assess the potential environmental effects of proposed projects. EIA is a legal requirement for certain public and private projects in EU countries under Directive 2011/92/EU.

Environmental Statement: Suite of documents providing the necessary environmental information in respect of an EIA undertaken for a proposed project. It must include all information that is reasonably required to assess the potential environmental effects.

Excavated material: Soil and rock material that is removed from the ground during construction.

Exceptional Hardship Scheme: Compensation scheme introduced by the Government to assist those living on or close to the Proposed Scheme who, for reasons of exceptional hardship, need to sell their home but who cannot do so at a fair price because of HS2.

Fill: Material used to artificially change the elevation of existing ground levels.

Floodplain: Land adjacent to a watercourse over which water flows, or would flow but for defences in place, in times of flood.

Fragmentation (ecology): The breaking up of a habitat, ecosystem or land-use types into smaller parcels.

Future baseline: The situation that would prevail if a proposed development does not proceed. Predicted impacts are compared against this theoretical scenario.

Grade I building: A listed building of exceptional interest, sometimes considered to be internationally important.

Grade II* building: A listed building of particular importance, of more than special interest.

Grade II building: Nationally important buildings that are of special interest.

Green belt: A designation for land around certain cities and large built-up areas, which aims to keep this land permanently open or largely undeveloped.

Green spaces: Areas of natural or semi-natural land. For example, parks, gardens and woodlands.

Greenhouse gas: Atmospheric gases such as carbon dioxide, methane, chlorofluorocarbons, nitrous oxide, ozone, and water vapour that interfere with the earth's natural atmospheric exchange processes.

Groundwater: All water which is below the surface of the ground.

Haul roads: Temporary roads provided within the contractor's site area to allow for the movement of material around the site.

High Speed One: High speed rail link from St Pancras International station in London, to the Channel Tunnel (formerly known as the Channel Tunnel Rail Link).

High Speed Two: Proposed high speed rail line between London and the West Midlands (Phase One) and on to Manchester and Leeds (Phase Two).

High Speed Two (HS2) 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: Hybrid bills mix the characteristics of public and private bills. The provisions in a hybrid bill would affect the general public, but would also have particular effects on specific individuals or groups.

Infrastructure maintenance depot: Facility for the logistical support for the maintenance and repair of the railway.

Integrity (ecology): The ecological health of an area.

Listed building: A building of special architectural or historic interest. Listed buildings are graded I, II* or II, with Grade I being the highest. Listing includes the interior as well as the exterior of the building, and any buildings or permanent structures (e.g. wells within its curtilage).

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

Local wildlife site: Non-statutory sites of nature conservation value that have been designated 'locally'. These sites are referred to differently between counties with common terms including site of importance for nature conservation (SINC), county wildlife site (CWS), site of biological importance (SBI) and sites of metropolitan importance (SMI).

Main construction site: Strategic hubs for core project management (engineering, planning and construction delivery), commercial and administrative staff associated with the construction of HS2 Phase One.

Mineral safeguarding area: Areas defined by mineral planning authorities with known mineral resources that are of sufficient economic or conservation value.

National Trust: A UK conservation charity protecting historic places and green spaces.

Natural England: Body constituted under section 1 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (section 2(1)) to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Net: After all deductions have been made.

Nitrogen dioxide: A poisonous brown gas, often present in smog and car exhaust fumes. It is also an irritant to the respiratory system.

Non-technical summary: A report which briefly describes the main points discussed in an environmental statement in a clear manner without the use of technical language.

Nitrate vulnerable zone: Areas designated under the EU Nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC) in order to reduce the level of nitrates in surface and groundwater. Farmers with land in NVZs have to follow mandatory rules to manage nitrate loss from agriculture.

Overbridge: A bridge crossing over a transport corridor (e.g. a rail line).

Parapets: A barrier at the edge of a structure (e.g. a bridge).

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 and to the Channel Tunnel via HS1. Phase One includes stations at London Euston, Old Oak Common (West London), Birmingham Interchange (near National Exhibition Centre, Birmingham Airport) and Curzon Street (Birmingham city centre).

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.

Proposed Scheme: Proposed high speed rail line between London and the West Midlands (i.e. Phase One of HS2).

Public rights of way: A way where the public has a right to walk, and in some cases ride horses, bicycles, motorcycles or drive motor vehicles, which will be designated either as a footpath, a bridleway, a road used as a public path or a byway.

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

Restoration (ecology): The re-establishment of a damaged or degraded system or habitat to a level similar to its pre-degraded condition.

Risk assessment: An assessment of the likelihood and severity of an occurrence.

Rolling stock: Passenger or freight vehicles that operate on a railway.

Runoff: The flow of water over the ground surface.

Sand: A component of soil comprising particles of between 0.06mm-2.0mm in equivalent diameter.

Satellite construction site: Smaller in size than the main construction site, providing office accommodation for limited numbers of engineering/delivery staff associated with the construction of HS2 Phase One.

Saved policies: Policies within unitary development plans, local plans and structure plans that are saved for a time period during replacement production of local development documents.

Scheduled monument: Important sites and monuments that are given legal protection by being placed on a schedule by English Heritage.

Scoping: An initial stage in the EIA process to determine the nature and potential scale of environmental effects arising as a result of a development, and an assessment of what further studies are required to establish their significance.

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 that significance.

Severance: The act of severing a piece of land from a larger tract of land. For example, part of a field may become cut off from the rest of the field as a result of road or railway installations.

Site of Biological Importance: A non-statutory designation used by some local planning authorities to protect locally valued sites of biological diversity which are described as local wildlife sites by the UK Government.

Site of Special Scientific Interest: 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.

Soil compaction: Compaction of subsoil or topsoil, often due to trampling through the use of heavy construction machinery, preventing the passage of roots, air and water through soil.

Surface water: Waters including rivers, lakes, lochs, loughs, reservoirs, canals, streams, ditches, coastal waters and estuaries.

Sustainable drainage systems: Measures designed to control surface runoff close to its source, including management practices and control measures such as storage tanks, basins, swales, ponds and lakes. Sustainable drainage systems allow a gradual release of water and thereby reduce the potential for downstream flooding.

Topsoil: Upper layer of a soil profile.

Transport for London: A statutory body, created under section 154 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, with responsibility for London's transport system.

Tunnel boring machine: A machine that uses a boring mechanism to excavate tunnels.

Tunnel portal: Tunnel entrances and exits.

Underbridge: A bridge crossing under a transport corridor (e.g. a rail line).

Vent shafts: Ventilation and intervention shafts.

West Coast Main Line: Intercity rail line connecting London, Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool and Glasgow.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility: The likely (or theoretical) extent of visibility of a development, usually shown on a map.

Acronyms

AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
AoS	Appraisal of Sustainability
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
BAP	Biodiversity Action Plan
BMV	Best and Most Versatile
BPM	Best Practicable Means
CFA	Community Forum Area
CIRIA	Construction Industry Research and Information Association
CPRE	Campaign to Protect Rural England
CRAG	Chiltern Ridges HS2 Action Group
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice
Defra	Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DbyD	Dialogue by Design
DfT	Department for Transport
ELS	Entry Level Stewardship
EMR	Environmental Minimum Requirements
EMS	Environmental Management System
ES	Environmental Statement
EU	European Union
EWR	East West Rail
GCML	Great Central Main Line
GLA	Greater London Authority
HLS	Higher Level Stewardship
HOAC	Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre
HS1	High Speed 1
HS2	High Speed 2
HGV	Heavy goods vehicle
IMD	Infrastructure Maintenance Depot
LEMP	Local Environmental Management Plan
LGV	Light goods vehicle

LiDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
LWS	Local Wildlife Sites
MEP	Member of the European Parliament
MP	Member of Parliament
MSA	Mineral Safeguarding Area
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NEC	National Exhibition Centre or New Engineering Contract
NIA	Nature Improvement Area
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NTS	Non-Technical Summary
OCR	Optical Character Recognition
PRoW	Public Rights of Way
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SBI	Site of Biological Importance
SINC	Site of Importance for Nature Conservation
SMR	Scope and Methodology Report
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage Systems
TfL	Transport for London
WCC	Warwickshire County Council
WCML	West Coast Main Line
WHO	World Health Organisation
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility

Executive summary

0.1 Consultation process and analysis of responses

- 0.1.1 HS2 Ltd carried out a public consultation on the draft Environmental Statement (ES) for Phase One of HS2 between 16 May and 11 July 2013. Dialogue by Design, an independent contractor specialising in public and stakeholder engagement, was contracted to handle and analyse the responses. A total of 20,944 responses were received, of which 442 from organisations. The majority of responses were identified as organised submissions.
- 0.1.2 All responses received within the consultation period were processed and analysed by Dialogue by Design, making use of a bespoke database system and a coding framework agreed with HS2 Ltd. Comments made by respondents were coded in such a way that they could be considered in the context of the geographic area to which they are relevant as well as the environmental topic they address. The consultation summary report includes both an overview of the issues raised per environmental topic and an overview of the comments made for each of the geographic areas distinguished in the draft ES documentation.

Community Forum Areas

- 0.1.3 Many specific comments are made relating to anticipated localised impacts in the 26 Community Forum Areas (CFAs) for which reports are included in Volume 2 of the draft ES. These are summarised in detail in chapter 6 of this report; the executive summary is structured around environmental topics and highlights issues that are mentioned across CFAs.

0.2 General comments on the draft ES

- 0.2.1 Overall, respondents' comments on the draft ES often contain expressions of concern or dissatisfaction about elements of it. Many respondents combine comments about the draft ES with concerns about the wider HS2 proposals, sometimes questioning the benefits of the proposed scheme in light of its environmental impacts.
- 0.2.2 Comments about the quality or completeness of the information in the draft ES are made by many respondents. These include concerns about the baseline, the methodology, and the accuracy of data, as well as requests for greater detail. A number of respondents suggest they would need more adequate assessment data, including maps and photomontages, to be able to comment on particular elements of the draft ES.
- 0.2.3 Some respondents believe that proposed mitigation measures are insufficient to counteract the general environmental impact of the proposed scheme. Several respondents provide alternative or additional mitigation suggestions.

0.3 Draft Code of Construction Practice and construction issues

- 0.3.1 The potential impacts of construction works associated with the proposed scheme are mentioned as a concern by many respondents and in relation to all 26 CFAs. Generally, respondents often link construction to potentially negative effects on the natural environment, the built environment, and local residents as a result of, for example, increased traffic, air pollution or noise. Many respondents seek further reassurance or mitigation with regard to the anticipated impacts, with concerns about the duration and extent of local disruptions, particularly for the Euston and Camden area (CFAs 1-3).
- 0.3.2 Respondents also express concern about the implementation of the CoCP and emphasise the importance of monitoring compliance, with some suggesting that this should be carried out by an independent body and others requesting that HS2 Ltd works with the local community and/or local authorities in order to ensure the CoCP is adhered to.
- 0.3.3 Several respondents indicate that they are worried about the potential effects of an influx of construction workers on local communities.

0.4 Environmental topics

- 0.4.1 The sections below provide a summary of comments made in relation to the each of the environmental topics identified in the draft ES documentation.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 0.4.2 Comments about agriculture are more frequently made than comments about forestry and soils, and mostly in relation to rural CFAs. Many respondents express concern about the potential impact of the Proposed Scheme on agricultural land, and agricultural businesses. Respondents highlight the potential loss of farms and agricultural land, as well as the anticipated impact of severance and disruption on the viability of farming businesses along the proposed route.
- 0.4.3 There are several comments on proposed mitigation measures, with some respondents believing that more detail is needed and others expressing scepticism about their adequacy. One particular issue that respondents seek reassurance on is the proposed reinstatement of land and/or soil to its pre-construction condition.

Air quality

- 0.4.4 Respondents mostly comment on air quality in relation to the proposed construction, although it is sometimes mentioned in regard to the anticipated operation of HS2. Prominent concerns in respondents' comments include potential air pollution from construction traffic, excavation works and other construction activities. Respondents often emphasise the potential damage dust would cause to residents' health and well-being, as well as crops, livestock and the wider environment. Comments also highlight potentially detrimental cumulative air pollution impacts, referring to areas where other pollution sources are presently affecting air quality.
- 0.4.5 Several respondents believe that air quality assessments in the draft ES are inadequate or lacking detail, or that proposed mitigation measures would not be adequate, sometimes specifically mentioning the draft CoCP in this regard.

Community

- 0.4.6 The potential impact of the Proposed Scheme on local communities is a key concern across all CFAs. Many of the issues highlighted under other headings, including noise, traffic and socio-economic, are also relevant with regard to the community topic.
- 0.4.7 Respondents express concern about the potential disruption the proposed construction works would cause to local residents' lives, highlighting issues such as access to services, health and well-being. Demolition of, or damage to, properties is also mentioned frequently, amid a number of comments about compensation proposals.
- 0.4.8 Several respondents believe the assessment presented in the draft ES does not satisfactorily reflect issues discussed or agreed at Community Forum meetings. Some respondents suggest the establishment of a community fund as part of mitigation and compensation proposals.

Climate

- 0.4.9 Where respondents specifically comment on CO2 emissions and climate change in relation to the draft ES, they are generally sceptical about the presented assessment. Several respondents express doubt about the suggested effectiveness of HS2 in curbing carbon emissions, making comments about an anticipated increase in sustainability of other modes of transport and questioning the ability of HS2 to generate a modal shift from aviation to rail travel.
- 0.4.10 Other comments focus on the potential carbon footprint of HS2, including suggestions that the energy use of high speed trains would be considerable, and that the proposed construction works would imply a high level of carbon emissions.
- 0.4.11 Some respondents argue that a wider or more detailed assessment is needed; others comment on proposed mitigation measures, sometimes providing suggestions for further potential carbon reductions.

Cultural heritage

- 0.4.12 Respondents commenting on cultural heritage in relation to the draft ES most commonly highlight particular assets they think would be affected by construction works. Many designated as well as non-designated sites or buildings are specified by respondents, often in relation to damage or demolition associated with the Proposed Scheme. There are also various suggestions for the inclusion of assets in the ES documents, where these are not currently present.
- 0.4.13 Potential impacts that respondents think would be harmful to cultural heritage include visual impacts, damage resulting from construction activities, and effects of vibration on structures.
- 0.4.14 A small number of respondents make detailed comments on the assessment methodology or on the coverage of cultural heritage in the CoCP. Some make suggestions around dealing with archaeological remains.

Ecology

- 0.4.15 There are many comments on the topic of ecology, in particular with regard to rural CFAs, but also as part of comments on potential route-wide impacts. Generally speaking respondents register concern about the potential effects of the Proposed Scheme on habitats, species and/or designated areas.
- 0.4.16 Respondents believe the draft ES is insufficient in its acknowledgement of potential impacts on species and habitats, suggesting for example that ancient woodlands are undervalued or that potential acute impacts on local wildlife populations should be spelled out. These comments often accompany statements about the baseline assessment which respondents argue is incomplete. Many also argue that the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft ES are inadequate.
- 0.4.17 Where respondents concentrate on potential impacts on wildlife, bats and birds are most commonly mentioned- usually accompanied by a request for greater protection and/or mitigation.

Land quality

- 0.4.18 Comments about land quality are relatively scarce and tend to highlight possible contamination of land and water resources, mostly in relation to proposed construction activities.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 0.4.19 Comments about visual impacts of the Proposed Scheme are made in relation to all CFAs, with respondents often expressing concern about 'visual blight'. Many refer to particular proposed features such as viaducts and comment that these would negatively affect the settings or character of buildings, villages or towns, as well as views from properties and public rights of way. Some respondents suggest additional planting and landscaping to mitigate these possible impacts.
- 0.4.20 Potential visual impacts are particularly frequently discussed in relation to the Chilterns AONB, with many respondents worrying that the Proposed Scheme would change the tranquil character of the area, affecting the local tourism industry. Respondents believe a tunnel through the entire AONB would be required to mitigate these potential effects.
- 0.4.21 A number of respondents express dissatisfaction with the landscape and visual assessment in the draft ES, concentrating on the criteria to classify potential visual impacts, which they say are too strict, and on maps and photomontages, some of which they believe are inaccurate in their portrayal of visual impacts.

Socio-economics

- 0.4.22 Many respondents comment on the lack of assessment of potential socio-economic impacts in the draft ES and raise doubts about expectations or assumptions it expresses with regard to this theme, particularly in relation to potential employment effects. Respondents commenting on various CFAs express concern about the potential loss of local jobs associated with demolition of business properties and disruptions as a result of construction works. Some emphasise that the potential regeneration effects would benefit other areas or other business types than those affected.

- 0.4.23 Comments on socio-economics span both urban and rural communities. Potential impacts related to urban areas include disruptions to thriving activity clusters and the loss of land suitable for other developments; potential impacts on rural areas include reduced viability of agricultural businesses and a negative effect on tourism.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 0.4.24 Many respondents believe that the noise assessments in the draft ES are inadequate, with the most common concern being about time-average calculations, which respondents say is a misleading measure. Respondents also suggest potential impacts have been misrepresented in the noise contour maps. These comments are made in relation to all CFAs.
- 0.4.25 Comments about operational noise often highlight particular features or locations, including proposed viaducts and vent shafts. Several respondents have concerns about vibration in relation to proposed tunnels. A variety of additional mitigation measures are suggested, including double glazing for properties and screening, bunding or planting along the proposed route.
- 0.4.26 In addition to concerns about operational noise and vibration, many respondents express anxiety about noise and vibration from proposed construction works, particularly in relation to the Euston and Camden area (CFAs 1-3).

Traffic and transport

- 0.4.27 The great majority of comments on traffic and transport relate to local situations, generally in the context of concerns about the impact of construction vehicles on narrow or congested roads. Respondents associate these anticipated impacts with reduced access, extensive diversions and longer journey times. Wider potential community impacts are also discussed, including concerns about air quality, safety and the viability of businesses.
- 0.4.28 Among comments about mitigation there are various requests for changes to the proposed routing of construction vehicles as well as the use of temporary construction lanes. Several respondents suggest that the traffic assessment in the draft ES is inadequate.
- 0.4.29 Comments also include concerns about potential impacts of the Proposed Scheme on other transport systems and services, both during construction and once HS2 would be operational.
- 0.4.30 Another issue highlighted in comments relating to many CFAs is the anticipated impacts on footpaths and public rights of way. Respondents propose a range of suggestions to minimise these impacts.

Waste and material resources

- 0.4.31 Where respondents comment on waste and material resources they often concentrate on excavated materials. The most common concern relates to the transport of excavated materials. Respondents believe the draft ES lacks detail on this, and some highlight a desire for the transport to take place by rail where possible.
- 0.4.32 Another issue frequently discussed in relation to waste and material resources is the potential impact of stock piles, in particular as a source of dust. Respondents believe adequate mitigation would include covering stock piles, as well as locating stock piles away from vulnerable receptors.

Water resources and flood risk

- 0.4.33 Many respondents comment on water resources, specifying potential impacts on surface water as well as groundwater. Ecology and water quality are often emphasised in comments, with respondents expressing concern about possible impacts on water flows as well as sensitive aquifers, sometimes in relation to proposed excavations or tunnelling. Several ask for specific mitigation measures, or request further assessment of local impacts.
- 0.4.34 Respondents commenting on flood risk often state that the assessment in the draft ES is inadequate, highlighting a need for greater monitoring, mitigation or future-proofing.
- 0.4.35 Comments on proposed balancing ponds centre on their location and potential impact on views and land take.

Engagement

- 0.4.36 Where respondents comment on the consultation process they often argue that engagement with potentially impacted communities has been insufficient. Some respondents express dissatisfaction with the Community Forums, or their outcomes. The timescale of the consultation is mentioned in numerous comments, generally stating that respondents had insufficient time to study the documentation and provide a response. A few respondents express positive opinions about the consultation process, welcoming the opportunity to comment on the draft ES.

Chapter 1 About the consultation

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 HS2 Ltd was established in January 2009 to develop proposals for a new high speed railway between London and the West Midlands and to consider the case for high speed services to northern England and Scotland. HS2 Ltd produced its initial report to Government '*High speed rail - London to the West Midlands and beyond*' in December 2009. This report recommended a preferred route from London to Birmingham and to a junction with the West Coast Main Line just north of Lichfield, broadly following the same route as the currently proposed scheme. In March 2010 the Secretary of State presented his response to Parliament in the report '*High Speed Rail*' supporting the proposal for a Y-shaped route from London to Leeds and Manchester.
- 1.1.2 Public consultation in 2011 covered both the Government's high speed rail strategy and its preferred route for Phase One. In January 2012 the Secretary of State published the Command Paper '*Investing in Britain's Future – Decisions and Next Steps*'. The Secretary of State confirmed the Government's commitment to high speed rail as its strategy for meeting growing demand for travel, connecting urban centres, supporting economic growth and responding to climate change. The Command Paper published the Secretary of State's proposed route for Phase One of HS2 (London to the West Midlands). Work has continued since then, to arrive at the scheme presented in the draft Environmental Statement.
- 1.1.3 It is proposed that HS2 be developed in two phases. Phase One would link London, Birmingham and the West Coast Main Line north of Lichfield, extending for approximately 230km (143 miles). Phase Two would in due course extend to Leeds and to Manchester, with connections onto the West Coast Main Line south of Wigan and the East Coast Main Line south of York. Development of Phase Two is continuing and will be subject to separate consultations, environmental assessment process, Environmental Statement and a hybrid Bill at a later date. However, where necessary the environmental assessment for Phase One includes consideration of the effects of operating both phases of HS2.

1.2 Draft Environmental Statement

- 1.2.1 When the Government submits a hybrid bill to Parliament in late 2013, seeking powers to build a new high speed railway between London and the West Midlands it will be accompanied by a formal Environmental Statement (ES). The ES is being prepared in accordance with European legislation and Government guidance. It will provide Members of Parliament with information on all the significant environmental effects likely to result from HS2 Phase One so that they can be taken into account before Parliament decides whether or not to grant the powers to build the railway.
- 1.2.2 The ES will set out:

- A description of the scheme and how it was developed;
 - The alternatives that were considered;
 - Assessment of the likely adverse and beneficial environmental effects of the scheme; and
 - Proposed mitigation measures to manage or reduce likely significant effects.
- 1.2.3 As part of the mitigation proposals a Code of Construction Practice will be included in the ES documents. It sets out the requirements and procedures to protect residents, businesses and the environment adjacent to the construction sites.
- 1.2.4 HS2 Ltd has consulted on the draft ES in order to inform interested parties on the design of the scheme and the likely environmental effects with a view to completion of the formal ES. The draft ES is based on the best information available to date and the assessment of effects and conclusions will be updated to reflect further work and decisions between now and when the hybrid bill is deposited. This consultation may identify issues that result in changes being made to the design of the scheme or the proposals to mitigate significant adverse effects. These changes will be included in the ES to be submitted to Parliament.

1.3 The consultation process

- 1.3.1 The Draft Environmental Statement Consultation was launched by the Secretary of State for Transport on 16 May 2013, ending on 11 July 2013. The Government sought views on the environmental impacts assessed along the Phase One London to West Midlands line of route, as well as the measures identified for managing and reducing them with the following questions:
- **Question 1:** This question asked respondents to tick the CFA reports corresponding to the 26 smaller geographical sections of the line of route their comments apply to. Respondents were also presented with the option to tick Report 27 which relates to the whole route and describes the route-wide effects of the Proposed Scheme. If commenting on more than one report, respondents were asked to indicate clearly in their response the report to which their comments relate.
 - **Question 2:** This question asked respondents for their comments on Volume 1 of the draft Environmental Statement and the Non-Technical Summary.
 - **Question 3:** This question asked respondents for their comments on the draft Code of Construction Practice.

1.4 Consultation documents

- 1.4.1 HS2 Ltd and the Government produced a series of documents and maps to enable people to provide informed responses to the Draft Environmental Statement (ES) Consultation:
- A short **Guide to the Environmental Statement Topics**, providing a brief overview and description of the topic areas;
 - A **Glossary** of terms and abbreviations used across the documents;
 - A **Non-Technical Summary (NTS)**, providing a summary of the Proposed Scheme, the likely significant effects of the Proposed Scheme, both beneficial and adverse, and the means to avoid or reduce the adverse effects;
 - The main report consisting of two volumes:

- **Volume 1: Introduction to the draft Environmental Statement and the Proposed Scheme**, which provides an introduction to HS2, an overview of the hybrid bill process and the environmental impact assessment (EIA) methodology, an introduction to consultation and engagement, the main strategic and route-wide alternatives considered;
- **Volume 2: A total of 26 Community Forum Area Reports**, providing area-specific information on local environmental effects and route details and **Report 27: Route-Wide Effects**, which provides a summary of the significant environmental effects that would arise as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme;
- A series of 26 **Map Books**, including photomontages – one for every Community Forum Area;
- The **draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)** setting out the control measures and standards to be implemented;
- The **Sustainability Policy** setting out how the project supports Government goals;
- A consultation **response form**.

1.5 Public events

1.5.1 HS2 Ltd organised a series of 26 information events at community venues along the Phase 1 line of route. The events were intended as an opportunity for people affected by the proposals to view relevant maps and documents, and to speak with appropriately qualified members of staff about how the consultation proposals might apply to them. Advertisements were placed in local newspapers ahead of each event and in some instances radio and television interviews before or during an event raised general awareness among local communities. In total, there were over 5,300 visitors to the series of information events.

Table 1.1: List of information events

Date	Community Forum Area	Time
22/05/2013	Primrose Hill to Kilburn (Camden)	Events were open from 12 noon – 8pm on weekdays and 10am – 5pm on Saturdays.
23/05/2013	South Ruislip to Ickenham	
24/05/2013	Euston	
28/05/2013	Offchurch to Cubbington	
29/05/2013	The Chalfonts and Amersham	
30/05/2013	Central Chilterns	
31/05/2013	Waddesdon and Quainton	
01/06/2013	Coleshill Junction	
03/06/2013	Greatworth to Lower Boddington	
04/06/2013	Calvert, Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Chetwode	
05/06/2013	Balsall Common and Hampton in Arden	

06/06/2013	Castle Bromwich and Bromford	
07/06/2013	Curdworth to Middleton	
08/06/2013	Ladbroke and Southam	
10/06/2013	Stoneleigh, Kenilworth and Burton Green	
11/06/2013	Whittington to Handsacre	
12/06/2013	Washwood Heath to Curzon Street	
13/06/2013	Birmingham Interchange and Chelmsley Wood	
14/06/2013	Newton Purcell to Brackley	
15/06/2013	Kilburn (Brent) to Old Oak Common	
17/06/2013	Northolt Corridor/South Ruislip to Ickenham	
18/06/2013	Drayton Bassett, Hints and Weeford	
21/06/2013	Colne Valley	
22/06/2013	Camden Town/Euston	
24/06/2013	Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury	
29/06/2013	Dunsmore, Wendover and Halton	

Chapter 2 Participation

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 This section provides an overview of participation in the consultation. It covers response types as well as information about respondents.

2.2 Response channels

2.2.1 There were three ways to submit a response to this consultation, all of which were advertised on consultation material including the HS2 website. All response channels were free for respondents to use:

- A freepost address for letters and response forms;
- A dedicated consultation email address; and
- An online response facility allowing respondents to submit and edit their responses throughout the consultation period.

2.2.2 The online response facility and the email address (subject to the user's account settings) provided confirmation messages explaining that each response had been received by DbyD. Practical considerations prevented the use of confirmation messages for responses submitted in hard copy via the freepost address.

2.3 Response types

2.3.1 Responses were received in a number of different formats. Table 2.1 below describes these in more detail.

2.3.2 Table 2.1: Count of different response types

Response type	Count
Online response form Responses submitted via the response facility on the consultation website	566
Offline response form Completed response forms submitted by post or email	878
Letter or email Responses submitted by post or email not using the response form structure	1,309
Organised submissions Responses of which many identical or near identical copies were submitted	18,191
Total	20,944

2.3.3 In addition to the response types described in the table, DbyD also received other documentation that was classed as a null response. A total of 274 records were tagged in this way. Null responses include:

- Duplicate submissions;
- Responses to the Design Refinement Consultation;
- Responses that did not provide a name; and
- Documents that were not a consultation response, including general enquiries which were sent to HS2 Ltd to be processed.

2.4 Responses by question

2.4.1 Table 2.2 shows a count of how many respondents provided responses to each question. It also includes a figure for responses that included information in addition to question responses or which did not follow the consultation question structure. Respondents could answer one or more questions.

2.4.2 Table 2.2: Count of responses to each question

Question	Total count	Count excluding organised responses
Question 1: My comments with regard to the reports ticked above are:	1,931	(992)
Question 2: My comments on Volume 1 of the draft Environmental Statement and the Non-Technical Summary are:	1,121	(433)
Question 3: My comments on the draft Code of Construction Practice are:	1,076	(417)
Responses that did not directly respond to the question structure or added additional information.	19,098	(1,249)

2.5 Respondent types

2.5.1 For the purposes of reporting, respondents were classified by respondent type. A breakdown of these is given in Table 2.3 below. A list of organisations that submitted a response to the consultation is included in Appendix 1 – this list does not include organisations which have requested confidentiality.

Table 2.3: Breakdown of respondents by respondent type

Respondent type	Count
Organisation or representative, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Local authority (including Parish and Town Councils)</i> • <i>Member of Parliament</i> 	552
Individual	20,392
Total	20,944

2.6 Organised submissions

- 2.6.1 A total of 18,191 responses to this consultation are classified as organised submissions. Appendix 2 contains the text of a selection of different types of organised responses that have been recorded, to give some context to the type and content of organised responses, which made up a high proportion of the total responses.
- 2.6.2 The organised responses received include ten different types of postcards, letters and emails. The content of these responses is reported on in the relevant chapters of this report. Some of the organised submissions offered respondents an opportunity to add or append their own comments. Where respondents have done so, this has been coded and is also reported on in the relevant chapters of this report.

Chapter 3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

- 3.1.1 The consultation was owned and managed by HS2 Ltd. DbyD was commissioned to provide a consultation website and email address for the draft Environmental Statement (ES) consultation and to receive, collate and analyse responses to the consultation made via the website, email or the freepost address.
- 3.1.2 DbyD (www.dialoguebydesign.net) is a specialist company which works with many organisations in the public and private sectors to handle responses to large or complex consultations. 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).
- 3.1.3 This summary report does not make recommendations or interpret responses in any way. The purpose was to organise, analyse and report on what people said and provide results in a format that makes it easy to understand the issues raised so that it can be used by HS2 Ltd to inform the preparation of the formal ES for Phase 1 of the high speed rail network.
- 3.1.4 There were four distinct stages to the processing and analysis of the consultation responses:
1. Data receipt and digitisation of all submissions (section 3.2);
 2. The development of an analytical framework (section 3.3);
 3. The implementation of an analysis framework (section 3.4); and
 4. Reporting (chapter 4).

3.2 Data receipt and digitisation

- 3.2.1 Submissions were received in a number of formats: online (response forms via the website), emails, paper response forms, letters or postcards. There were also variations to these formats such as filled out response forms with letters or reports attached. A high proportion (86%) of the responses received were identified as 'organised submissions' on the basis of identical or near identical wording to numerous other responses. Section 2.3 in chapter 2 provides an overview of the number of responses received by response type.
- 3.2.2 At the outset of the data processing stage, each response was assigned a unique reference number, scanned (if it had not been received electronically) and then saved with the reference number as the file name. An indication of the response type was recorded for each submission. Responses other than those submitted through the project website were processed by data entry staff in order to prepare them for import into the DbyD analysis database.

Responses via the website

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

Emailed responses

- 3.2.5 A consultation-specific email address operated for the duration of the consultation for respondents to submit in electronic format. At regular intervals, emails were logged and confirmed as actual responses (excluding junk or misdirected emails) and given a unique reference number and then imported into the data analysis system alongside paper responses as described below.

Paper response forms and letters received via the freepost address

- 3.2.6 A freepost address operated for the duration of the consultation for respondents to submit in hard copy. Upon receipt, letters, postcards and paper-based response forms were logged and given a unique reference number. These were then scanned in order to be imported into the response analysis systems.
- 3.2.7 At the data entry stage all printed submissions, other than organised responses, were transcribed using Optical Character Recognition (OCR) software, which can recognise printed text without the need for manual data entry. These files were then opened and reviewed by our transcription team which corrected any misrecognition. Handwritten responses were manually transcribed by data entry staff. The content of identical organised responses was imported into the database using an automated system, but contact details and any variations were manually captured by our transcription team.
- 3.2.8 The quality of the transcription process was then further controlled by a team of transcription supervisors who reviewed a percentage of the transcriptions and indicated their quality using a comprehensive scoring system, with quality scores informing whether further quality checks were required.

Organised submissions

- 3.2.9 It is common in high profile public consultations for interest groups to ask their members and supporters to submit responses conveying the same specific views. As a result the consultation received high numbers of identical or near identical responses, as specified in section 2.6 in the previous chapter. At the data handling stage, ten types of organised submissions were distinguished. Response numbers per type varied with as many as 6,152 of one type received or as few as 44 of another. Appendix 2 contains the text of a selection of the organised submission types that have been recognised.
- 3.2.10 Each submission was logged individually, assigned a unique reference number, scanned and categorised as an organised submission. These were then entered into the database, ensuring that any additional notes written on the response were also captured, before being imported into our analysis database.

Responses submitted to HS2 Ltd or DfT

- 3.2.11 Responses sent to HS2 Ltd, DfT, or Ipsos MORI (the company running the response analysis for the concurrent Design Refinement consultation) via email during the consultation period were transferred to DbyD via the specific consultation email address. DbyD also transferred any misdirected Design Refinement consultation responses received to Ipsos MORI. During the consultation period, any paper copies were transferred via recorded delivery. These were logged, checked to see if they were duplicates of responses already sent directly to DbyD and processed in the same way as responses received via the freepost address. Section 3.5 below provides more information on the concurrent Design Refinement consultation.

Anonymous submissions

- 3.2.12 In common with many statutory consultations, anonymous submissions were not taken into consideration and have not been included in the analysis that informs this report. This helps ensure the consultation findings are not skewed by views from multiple submissions from a single individual or organisation. Respondents using the online response form on the consultation website were required to provide a name and email address in order to respond. The paper-based response form indicated to respondents that they needed to provide a name to ensure the response would be included. Submissions by post were checked for the respondent's name and this was recorded accordingly. In cases where there was only a signature that could not be read, this was recorded with an editor's note and the response was included. Submissions by email were checked for the respondent's name and this was recorded accordingly. In cases where no name was provided, the email address details were used instead.
- 3.2.13 Any response that did not contain a name was logged, scanned and assigned the category 'No name provided'. There were 38 responses that did not contain a name; these were in a number of different formats including emails, letters, response forms and postcards. Anonymous responses were sent to HS2 Ltd for review.

Late submissions

- 3.2.14 The consultation period ended at midnight on 11 July 2013. With some exceptions detailed below, all responses received after that date were treated as late responses. These were not included in the analysis of responses by DbyD but were sent to HS2 Ltd for review.
- 3.2.15 To make allowance for potential delays with email systems all emailed responses received between 00.01 and 09.00 on 12 July 2013 were reviewed to check the time at which they were sent. If they were sent before the closing deadline they were accepted. After testing of the freepost service it was noted that the postmark on freepost items was up to two days after the actual posting date. Therefore, all responses with a postmark of on or before 13 July 2013, or other verifiable proof of postage before the deadline, were included in the analysis. Responses received with a postmark after 13 July 2013 were treated as late responses, not included in the analysis of responses by DbyD and sent to HS2 Ltd for review.

Verification of submissions

- 3.2.16 At the end of the consultation period once any misdirected responses were transferred to DbyD from HS2 Ltd, DfT and the company running the Design Refinement consultation (and any misdirected Design Refinement consultation responses were transferred from DbyD to Ipsos MORI), a duplicates check was carried out between these responses and those that had already been entered into the database. Where responses were exactly the same, one (or more if necessary) of them was removed and not processed.
- 3.2.17 On completion of digitisation, a number of checks were undertaken to minimise the number of 'duplicate' submissions sent by the same person in more than one format. For example:
- Where someone with the same name submitted more than one submission, any non-organised responses were checked to see if they were duplicates;
 - Where responses were exactly the same, one (or more if necessary) of them was tagged as a duplicate and not processed further.
- 3.2.18 Responses recorded as being from the same organisation were also checked to see if the same response had been sent in by different individuals from the same organisation.
- 3.2.19 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.
- 3.2.20 It is also important to note that although the verification process above will have identified and removed exact duplicate submissions sent by the same person in different formats, the process has not sought out small variations to submissions or registration details. It is therefore possible that a small number of responses have been considered more than once.

3.3 Development of an analytical framework

- 3.3.1 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 key themes and issues so that key messages as well as specific points of detail could be captured and reported.
- 3.3.2 The coding framework was developed by a team of senior analysts, reflecting the structure of the draft Environmental Statement (ES) documentation and the information needs of the environmental specialists within HS2 Ltd. The coding framework was developed to specifically capture comments' relevance to:
- The 11 environmental topics specified in most of the draft ES documents;
 - The 26 community forum areas (CFAs) distinguished in the documentation;
 - Any particular volume or section of the draft ES.
- 3.3.3 As part of the development of the coding framework there was ongoing liaison between DbyD and environmental specialists at HS2 Ltd in order to ensure that outputs of the analysis would be of the greatest use to HS2 Ltd, particularly with a view to informing further development of the (draft) ES. A three-tier approach was taken to coding, starting with high level themes, splitting into sub-themes and then specific codes. Table 3.1 provides a full list of the top level themes used and Table 3.2 provides an extract from the coding framework showing the use of themes, sub-themes and codes. The full coding framework is available in Appendix 3.

3.3.4 Each code is intended to represent a specific issue or argument raised in responses. The data analysis system allows the 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 language codes¹ as this allows analysts to suggest refinements and additional codes, and aids quality control and external verification.

Table 3.1 List of themes from coding framework

Theme
<p>Environmental themes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agriculture, forestry, soils ▪ Air quality ▪ Climate/greenhouse gas emissions ▪ Community ▪ Cultural heritage ▪ Ecology ▪ Ground settlement ▪ Land quality ▪ Landscape, visual, townscape ▪ Socio-economics ▪ Sound, noise and vibration ▪ Traffic, transport ▪ Waste and material resources ▪ Water resources and flood risk <p>Other themes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Forum Area reports ▪ Construction issues and Code of Construction Practice ▪ Design refinement ▪ Document references ▪ Engagement and consultation ▪ General comments on ES ▪ HS2 project ▪ Locations ▪ Other issues ▪ References ▪ Scheme features/infrastructure and alternatives

¹ 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, especially mathematical logic.

Table 3.2 Extract from the coding framework

<p>Landscape, visual, townscape (LV)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Character/vegetation - AONB-designated ▪ Character/vegetation - greenbelt-designated/green urban fringe ▪ Character/vegetation - landscape (countryside) ▪ Character/vegetation - other designated (e.g. Special Landscape Area) ▪ Character/vegetation - townscape/villagescape ▪ Character/vegetation - trees (not woodlands e.g. urban) ▪ Light pollution ▪ Other visual impacts (specific) ▪ Views from - general/unspecified ▪ Views from - ProWs ▪ Views from - residents/property ▪ Views from - transport (roads, etc) ▪ Visual impacts of mitigation ▪ Etc.
<p>Scheme features/infrastructure (FI)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FI - Connections - Heathrow link - concerns/oppose ▪ FI - Connections - Heathrow link - support ▪ FI - Connections - HS1 Link - concerns/oppose ▪ FI - Connections - HS1 Link - support ▪ FI - Connections - interface with other transport systems ▪ FI - Connections - Northern chord - design concerns ▪ FI - Connections - other airport links ▪ FI - Connections - Phase 2/northern connections ▪ FI - Tunnels - green tunnels/cut-cover - impacts/concerns ▪ FI - Tunnels - green tunnels/cut-cover - inadequate mitigation ▪ FI - Tunnels - green tunnels/cut-cover - other comments ▪ FI - Tunnels - green tunnels/cut-cover - request in specific area/extend ▪ FI - Tunnels - vent shafts - impacts/concerns ▪ FI - Tunnels - vent shafts - mitigation - suggestions ▪ FI - Tunnels/green tunnels - cost considerations ▪ Etc.

3.4 Implementation of the analysis framework

3.4.1 The consultation received many thousands of submissions and required a systematic approach by the team of analysts. The coding framework was developed centrally by senior analysts who each took responsibility for a comprehensive and consistent approach to a selection of CFAs and environmental topics. 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 to each of the consultation questions. Modifications to the framework, such as adding codes or altering themes, could only be implemented by senior analysts. The entire analysis team – through regular discussions – was encouraged to provide suggestions to senior analysts. This approach ensured that a large team of analysts operating across very large data sets was able to maintain a coherent and consistent approach to the application of the coding framework.

3.4.2 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, and very often did, receive multiple codes.

- 3.4.3 Where similar issues were raised or organised submissions were coded, a process was followed to ensure that these were coded consistently. The analysis database aids this process by automatically applying the same coding to responses that are entirely identical (on a question-by-question basis).
- 3.4.4 The quality of the coding was internally assured 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 (see 3.2.8-9). Anomalies in the approach to coding that were picked up through the quality assurance process resulted in review of that analyst's work and the codes applied.
- 3.4.5 HS2 Ltd carried out a separate and independent quality assurance exercise in order to gain assurances that the coding was accurate and reflective of the responses made to the consultation. HS2 Ltd performed this by coding a sample of responses drawn from across the different types.

3.5 Design Refinement consultation

- 3.5.1 Given that the draft Environmental Statement consultation and Design Refinement consultation ran concurrently and some overlap in responses was expected, it was agreed that DbyD would also analyse parts of responses submitted to the draft ES consultation which referred to the Design Refinement consultation. At the analysis stage, parts of responses mentioning the Design Refinement consultation were allocated a designated code (DE – Comments/submission) to specify this, and where appropriate other codes were applied too, so that issues raised with regard to Design Refinement were included in the analysis of responses, and reported on alongside comments on the draft ES.

Chapter 4 Reading the report

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 This report provides a summary of the responses to HS2 Ltd's draft Environmental Statement consultation for Phase One of High Speed Two (HS2) between London and the West Midlands. The consultation began on Thursday 16 May 2013 and closed on Thursday 11 July 2013. A total of 20,944 individuals and organisations responded to this consultation. The report summarises the issues raised by respondents and indicates where specific views are held by large numbers of respondents or by specific types of organisation. Of the total number of responses received, 18,062 were organised responses².

4.2 Numbers in the report

- 4.2.1 In reading this report and its appendices care must be exercised in attributing significance to the numbers of respondents reported as making a comment on a particular theme. Readers will recognise that this was an open and qualitative consultation process rather than an exercise to establish dominant views across a representative cross-section of the public. This is of particular importance given the very high proportion of organised responses. We have reported on both minority and majority views, occasionally indicating the number of respondents commenting on particular themes or geographical areas and summarising feedback from large and complex responses even if this does not resonate with the views of the majority of respondents.
- 4.2.2 When considering numbers reported in chapters 5 to 9 and Appendix 3, it is important to remember that the great majority of responses to this consultation consist of organised responses, and that this has a substantial impact on how often particular issues were mentioned in responses. This is not to say that organised responses are less valid or valuable than individual responses, but it should help the reader understand why some themes were discussed by very large numbers of respondents.
- 4.2.3 A substantial number of responses were made partly or entirely without reference to specific consultation questions. For the summary report we have integrated the points made in these responses into the chapters which cover the relevant themes or geographic areas.

² We use the term 'organised responses' (sometimes referred to as campaign responses) where there are consultation responses from a number of different respondents with identical or near-identical wording.

4.2.4 In this report we frequently present specific views or issues without indicating precisely how many comments were made containing this view or issue. This is in line with the nature of a consultation summary report, which needs to provide a balance between qualitative and quantitative findings. Detailed quantitative information is available in the appendices.

4.3 Structure of the report

4.3.1 Chapters 5 to 9 of this summary report are structured around reporting on comments concerning the community forum areas (CFAs), the topics presented in the Draft Environmental Statement Consultation documentation and the key documents themselves:

- **Chapter 5** provides a high level overview of comments on the main report (for example Volume 1 and the Non-Technical Summary), a brief overview of the environmental topics, route-wide comments and considerations, and comments on the consultation process;
- **Chapter 6** deals with comments on each CFA, in turn, with an overview of the comments and key topics concerning each CFA;
- **Chapter 7** covers comments on the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP);
- **Chapter 8** covers comments on other sections of the Draft Environmental Statement Consultation documentation such as the Sustainability Policy, Appendices and Map Books;
- **Chapter 9** covers additional comments: issues raised in responses that are not covered elsewhere in the report, which are primarily focused on the HS2 project overall.

4.3.2 We have included quotations from responses in these chapters to illustrate views discussed in the narrative. We have attributed names to quotations where these are taken from a response from an organisation. We have not attributed quotations from individuals other than indicating that they are from an individual's response or from multiple individuals to indicate an organised response.

4.4 Appendices

4.4.1 Appendices include a list of organisations that responded to the consultation (Appendix 1), an overview of organised submissions (Appendix 2), and a matrix 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 3).

Chapter 5 Overall comments

Introduction

- 5.1.1 This chapter provides an overview of comments relevant to the draft Environmental Statement as a whole or to any of the environmental topics within it. This is in contrast to chapter 6 where comments are summarised on the basis of the Community Forum Area (CFA) report that they are relevant to. Chapter 5 begins with a summary of overarching comments on the main report – Volume 1 and the Non-Technical Summary, as well as comments about the draft Environmental Statement which are general in nature – in section 5.1. This is followed by an overview of comments on each of the environmental topics (section 5.2). Comments specific to Report 27: Route-Wide Effects are captured in section 5.3, followed by comments on the consultation process in section 5.4.

5.1 Comments on the main report

Overview

- 5.1.1 Many respondents comment specifically on Volume 1 of the draft Environmental Statement (ES) and the Non-Technical Summary, or comment on the draft ES as a whole. Most commonly this includes specific suggestions, revisions or a perceived need to rethink the draft ES. There are also a high number of comments on mitigation, assessment or methodology, and the baseline of the draft ES.

General views on the draft ES, including Volume 1 and Non-Technical Summary

- 5.1.2 A large number of respondents suggest overall dissatisfaction with the draft ES, with several comments suggesting incompleteness or superficiality, as well as perceived inconsistencies or inaccuracies within the documentation. Some respondents argue that the information within the draft ES is already out of date.

“51m and constituent local authorities are well aware that HS2 Ltd has already developed or plans to develop alternative positions and proposals in a number of areas. As a consequence the public is seeing only a partial and limited picture and has no opportunity (at this stage) to respond about significant impacts (such as road closures or realignments).”

51m Alliance of 19 Councils

- 5.1.3 Many respondents contributing to the consultation through an organised response use the same phrase referring to the draft ES in the context of the overall HS2 project: *“I believe that even though the DES is superficial and incomplete the environmental cost of HS2 is too high and its [sic] time to think again”*.

- 5.1.4 A relatively small number of respondents express explicit support for the draft ES, or say that it is adequate. For example, these respondents say that the draft ES is thorough or well presented, or recognise it as a work in progress. Others attach caveats to their comments, which include reserving comment for the formal ES or further detail, awaiting the inclusion of cumulative impacts and more detail on mitigation, and stressing the need to listen to local people.
- 5.1.5 The small number of other comments on the overall approach of the draft ES include a request for a more holistic approach to be taken, as well as views that the draft ES is just a “snapshot” of environmental effects or “merely lists the scale of the project”.

Suggestions, revisions, and rethinks

- 5.1.6 Of the large number of respondents making suggestions about the draft ES or requesting that HS2 Ltd rethinks it, almost half provide a duplicate statement as part of an organised response as follows: *“Therefore I urge HS2 Ltd to ensure that the Environmental Statement produced later this year is both comprehensive and takes in to consideration these issues, and is followed by a rigorous formal public consultation process, with substantially more time allowed for communities to respond than given with this consultation”.*
- 5.1.7 Respondents also make a number of other more specific suggestions, including:
- Fuller or more detail on mitigation, noise calculations, and a number of other specific factors, features, and impacts.
 - Other specific inclusions, such as consideration of the benefits gained by operating at a reduced speed, and presenting carbon emissions in a timeline.
 - More detailed, accurate maps.
 - A full and detailed comparative assessment of alternatives (for example the range of options covering do-nothing, strategic, route-wide and local).
 - Clarification of which version of the Business Plan will be referred to in the formal ES and whether it is “still credible in supporting the vision for a transport system”.
 - More or better consultation to be carried out before or on the next version of the ES (see section 5.4 below).
 - A rethink of the overall scheme (see section 9.1 for a summary of comments on the HS2 project overall).
- 5.1.8 Some respondents observe that the proposals are not final or concern that full information is not provided; others highlight the need to ensure full and final information will be included in the formal ES, and suggest that more consultation or a better consultation process is needed (see section 5.4 for more specific comments on the consultation process).

Mitigation and compensation

- 5.1.9 A large number of respondents make general comments on mitigation and compensation. These respondents largely voice opinions that mitigation measures and compensation as currently detailed in the draft ES are either inadequate or incomplete, citing the need for more or better mitigation than is currently proposed, or the need for more detail on proposed mitigation measures. The majority of respondents making these overarching comments on mitigation use phrases contained within organised response templates, namely “[the draft ES] contains plans for mitigation far short of people’s expectations” and “please give lower speed, local alternatives and mitigation the priority they deserve”, or “your Draft ES fails to satisfy this community that the hugely damaging & potentially hazardous impacts have been properly assessed & will be appropriately mitigated”.
- 5.1.10 Many respondents give specific suggestions or lay out expectations for mitigation and compensation, for example in relation to specific effects, locations or receptors – these specific suggestions are discussed in other relevant sections of this report. More generally respondents say that they would like mitigation to follow best practice principles, be maximised, be fully costed, be assessed on a case by case basis and/or agreed with local communities or organisations, and draw learning from other similar projects.
- 5.1.11 Others discuss the need for ongoing monitoring and timely resolution of complaints or claims. A few others ask that HS2 Ltd takes on board points raised in community forums with respect to mitigation and compensation. Other specific suggestions include working with particular external organisations to determine suitable mitigation measures and reduce impacts, bearing in mind specific legislation such as the Human Rights Act 1998, considering greater use of tunnels along the route, and producing a comprehensive list of proposed mitigation measures linked to effects.
- 5.1.12 A relatively small number of respondents discuss the mitigation hierarchy, for example stating support for the hierarchy, asking that it be adhered to, highlighting the need for compensation where damage cannot be avoided, or expressing concern at a perceived over-reliance on the compensation step of the hierarchy.

“We demand HS2 Ltd, as far as possible, to avoid damage and minimise impacts through the design of the line, both vertically and horizontally. Impacts should be addressed through the use of supporting infrastructure and design elements (such as noise barriers). Where damage cannot be avoided, features should be repaired or reinstated where this can be achieved. Finally, only when these higher options have been explored, should compensatory measures be offered, such as biodiversity offsetting.”

Cheryl Gillan, Member of Parliament for Chesham and Amersham

- 5.1.13 Others question why some locations have, in their view, apparently higher levels of proposed mitigation than others for example due to the presence of significant assets.

“All locations are equally important and must command an appropriate, equal and fair level of mitigation.”

Individual

Draft Environmental Statement baseline

- 5.1.14 Many respondents comment on the draft ES baseline. The majority of these respondents comment that the draft ES “does not provide the required baseline data”; others assert that the baseline data is inadequate, with a commonly shared phrase across many of these responses being: “In practice the documents do not provide an adequate environmental baseline and fall short in a number of significant areas. My comments are applicable to all locations on the line”.

“Lack of baseline data and lack of information presented - the majority of critical baseline data that we understand to have already been collected such as noise levels and traffic flows has been omitted from the draft ES, resulting in us being unable to comment in any meaningful detail on the conclusions reached in the draft ES. Of more concern are cases where baseline data has not been collected, such as in the case of air quality.”

Northamptonshire County Council

“Warwick District Council would also like to challenge the accuracy of the baseline data utilised so far by HS2 Limited and questions both the depth and accuracy of data that appears in many instances to be based on incomplete field surveys and sources of literature that in many instances may be outdated and irrelevant to the current environmental position. It is imperative that any Environmental Statement is underpinned by a full and accurate picture of the current environmental position in order that the necessary scheme design and mitigation options are properly considered and targeted to achieve the best possible outcomes.”

Warwick District Council

- 5.1.15 Some respondents assert that the baseline data for certain areas was collected over a short period of time and in atypical weather conditions, as well as making references to inaccurate or incomplete mapping. Others question whether specific information or data was taken into account in baseline assessments, ask for the consideration of specific data in future assessments, or suggest ways in which the baseline should be used including in conjunction with the mitigation hierarchy discussed in 5.1.12 above.

“The ES should be used to, first, establish an environmental base line, and then to put in measures to negate or mitigate the impacts, as based on the stated hierarchy of HS2 actions. The very final, last resort, level of this supposedly sequential process, should only be financial redress if measures cannot be adopted to restore matters back to an environmental baseline. There appears to have been no serious attempt at this process in any way.”

Individual

Assessment and/or method

- 5.1.16 Several respondents talk about the assessment or methodology behind the draft ES, primarily expressing the view that it is incomplete or inadequate. Specific comments include assertions that:
- The assessment of environmental damage and how this balances against cost is unclear.
 - Important data, definitions, visuals, or other details are not included.
 - Use of terminology, numbers or mapping is inconsistent.

- Data is out of date.
- Assessment of significance is not clear, including consideration of contextual factors and cumulative effects.
- Certain effects are understated.
- Qualitative assessments are potentially misleading due to gaps in information.
- The draft ES should have been produced earlier in the HS2 process or consulted on later once more information was available.
- Modelling parameters should have been refined already.

“The draft ES states that a number of environmental topics require computer modelling to determine impacts and effects (such as noise, traffic and air quality) and, in some cases, the input parameters to the models will be refined as the Proposed Scheme is developed prior to the Hybrid Bill submission. There can be no doubt that the input parameters to the models should have been refined by the draft ES stage. It is clearly not possible to assess the likely significant environmental effects of the project without the refined models in place. Computational outputs will vary as the parameters are refined. The modelling outcome will be the part of the judgement base for the identification of likely effects and whether they are classified as minor, moderate or major. Decisions based upon these classifications will affect the quality of life of many individuals with an interest in land and property along the route.”

Buckinghamshire Councils

- 5.1.17 A number of respondents submit their views to the consultation based on a template from an organised response. These responses include the phrase *“your Draft ES fails to satisfy this community that the hugely damaging & potentially hazardous impacts have been properly assessed & will be appropriately mitigated”*.
- 5.1.18 Some respondents say that a process of independent review or assessment should be applied to the draft ES process, for example commissioning peer-reviewed research to feed into assessments, asking for expert advice on key issues, gaining external verification or audit of data, or seeking independent scrutiny of the draft ES or specific parts of it. Others discuss a desire for independent input into specific methodology such as the determination of ‘Best Practicable Means’, or into the monitoring and enforcement process for various environmental effects such as noise and air quality. A small number of respondents believe *“a full independent appraisal is needed to assess the potential impact of HS2 on the use of new technologies to access the nation’s energy reserves”*.

Documentation

- 5.1.19 A number of respondents comment on various aspects of the documentation provided as part of the draft ES. The primary issue for these respondents is that they feel the documentation provided was not detailed enough or lacked information and data with respect to certain issues. In contrast some respondents comment that there is a large amount of information within the draft ES which may be difficult for a layperson to understand or lengthy to read through. Others express positive views about the presentation of the draft ES.

“The draft ES is written in easy-to-understand language and we encourage the use of narrative to make clear what the significant issues and effects are, supported by tables. As explained above, we expect that the formal ES will present further reasoning behind the judgements.”

Natural England

- 5.1.20 A number of respondents also identify specific points within the documentation that they believe are wrong, or on which they would welcome further clarification. Other respondents comment on, among other things, perceived mismatches of information between different elements of the documentation, information they did not or could not find, information they feel did not make sense, and further information they would like to see, either in the form of text, data, images or maps.
- 5.1.21 The terminology used in the documentation receives attention from some respondents, who tend to request more precise definitions of specific words or phrases. Some others suggest that the draft ES documentation is misleading in its content or biased in the way it is presented or written, for example making the assertion that it assumes HS2 will go ahead or is written positively in favour of the Proposed Scheme.

Other comments

- 5.1.22 In responding to the overall draft ES, a very large number of respondents raise concerns about the overall environmental impact of HS2, referring for example to negative environmental impacts or concern that the Proposed Scheme would be “*bad for the environment*”. Many of these respondents comment using an organised response template.
- 5.1.23 Land acquisition is also an overarching topic receiving significant attention. Indeed, many respondents give the same comment in relation to land acquisition: “*Constructing a new railway capable of handling trains travelling at 400kph will require a significant landtake, severely damage irreplaceable ecosystems, sentence people and communities to years of construction disruption and cause permanent damage when it’s built*”.
- 5.1.24 Several respondents discuss the hybrid bill process. Aside from requests for specific issues to be included in the bill, many of these comments relate to the timing of the hybrid bill in relation to this and future consultation – see section 5.4 for more detail. Other comments include more detailed commentary on the bill process, for example its relationship with the production of the formal ES and its compatibility with the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive.
- 5.1.25 Other respondents discussing wider policy issues touch on concerns about the wider political process surrounding the HS2 project, including questions over how the Proposed Scheme would deliver against other policy areas or plans such as Biodiversity 2020, the National Policy Planning Framework, and the Natural Environment White Paper, or how it would comply with wider guidance such as that on noise from the World Health Organisation.

- 5.1.26 A number of respondents discuss various aspects of prioritisation within assessments, for example the need to take into account the value of the environment or landscape as part of a cost analysis, to consider both short and long term environmental costs, or to generally place more value on heritage or ecological aspects. Several others assert that more of an attempt should be made to examine cumulative effects within the draft ES. This includes the suggestion that, for example, adverse effects considered moderate in isolation could produce a more significant overall effect when combined, and that cumulative effects over time or with other existing infrastructure or plans should be given more attention.
- 5.1.27 A small number of respondents explicitly mention the Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS), often providing context for the discussion of topics such as climate, visual impact, and noise, for example concern that the sound study area has been reduced from 3km either side of the line in the AoS to 1km either side for the draft ES. A few respondents assert that the draft ES is based upon an AoS that was itself flawed due to being oversimplified, underplaying certain impacts or missing certain information. Another, however, supports the approach of basing further documents on the AoS. A small number of respondents reference a previous response to the AoS itself, questioning whether these responses have or will be taken into account.
- 5.1.28 Others talk about sustainability more generally, for example in relation to sustainable methodology or design for certain features such as drainage systems, or in relation to the overall desire to balance sustainability considerations across the HS2 project. The placement of the Proposed Scheme in the sustainable development Policy Framework area is questioned by at least one respondent, with others questioning the overall sustainability credentials of the project.
- 5.1.29 Other issues of general concern to respondents discussing the draft ES include overall operational impacts such as long-term effects on certain areas or ongoing maintenance impacts, as well as residual effects on properties or land holdings and ecological features. Comments on specific effects and locations are discussed in the relevant sections of section 5.2 and chapter 6. A few respondents ask that betterment- improvement works going beyond the mitigation of impacts- be undertaken in certain locations or as a general principle.

5.2 Overarching comments on Environmental Statement topics

Overview

- 5.2.1 This section provides a brief overview of comments made on the environmental topics outlined in the draft Environmental Statement (ES). For further and more detailed coverage of these topics see section 5.3 (Report 27), chapter 6 (covering all CFA Reports) and chapter 7 (the draft Code of Construction Practice).

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 5.2.2 A total of 610 respondents raise issues relating to agriculture, forestry and soils.
- 5.2.3 Many respondents are concerned about impacts on farming and agricultural land, disruption during construction and operation, and the effects this could have on the productivity and viability of farming. In particular there is concern about both loss of agricultural land and buildings, and the severance of land. Other concerns raised include the reinstatement of land, the impact of noise on animals, impacts on equestrian enterprises, and the effects of dust.

- 5.2.4 Some respondents make suggestions about compensation and mitigation, or comment that the proposals are currently inadequate. For example, one recommendation is to use bridges and access tunnels to ensure severed land remains accessible. The National Farmers Union comments that the mitigation measures lack sufficient detail for them to be confident that they *“will actually be practical on the ground”*.
- 5.2.5 A few respondents express concern about the impact that disruption to the agricultural sector could have on the local economy and employment. A few recommend conducting an assessment of the socio-economic impacts on agriculture.
- 5.2.6 A few respondents comment on aspects of the assessment they think are inadequate, or where further information or focus is needed. On a few occasions, respondents highlight inaccuracies in the draft documentation, for example indicating specific farms and land they believe could be affected by the Proposed Scheme but are missing from the draft documentation.
- 5.2.7 Some respondents express a wider concern relating to land being taken out of agricultural usage. They feel this might lead to a greater reliance on food imports.
- 5.2.8 Soil impacts are mentioned by a few respondents, with the focus on soil compaction. Some think it could be difficult to re-instate soils, or expect a commitment to be made to return land to its pre-construction quality. A local authority comments that principles in relation to soil mitigation should be applied to all open spaces and not just agricultural land.
- 5.2.9 Forestry is mentioned by a few respondents only, with comments focusing on the loss of forestry land and plantations, how this has been assessed and would be mitigated.

Air quality

- 5.2.10 There are 3,137 respondents who raise issues relating to air quality. This is a recurring theme across all community forum areas (CFAs), although the emphasis placed on the issue varies from one area to another.
- 5.2.11 Many respondents anticipate impacts on air quality during the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme, from construction traffic and sites, temporary road closures and diversions. A significant portion of these respondents are concerned specifically about dust from construction.
- 5.2.12 Many respondents view the air quality assessment provided in the draft ES as inadequate and lacking details, or highlight how it could be improved. Many comment that the air quality assessment takes into account sensitive receptors such as schools or wildlife habitats, includes a health impact assessment, accounts for cumulative effects, and assesses wider vehicular movements. A few respondents comment on the terminology used in the assessment, in particular the way in which impacts have deemed to be more or less ‘significant’.
- 5.2.13 Many responses include comments on air pollution mitigation and/or compensation measures. Specific suggestions include support for planting, landscaping and green infrastructure development, regular road-sweeping and water, and the provision of air filters and/or window and brick cleaning.

- 5.2.14 A number of respondents, referring to the CoCP, comment that monitoring and enforcement measures are needed to ensure compliance by the construction contractors with regard to air pollution impacts. Some state that monitoring should be independently enforced.
- 5.2.15 Respondents raise a number of other issues in their comments on air quality. For example, some express concern about the possible health impacts of increased air pollution, particularly in relation to children, disabled people, or those with chronic conditions such as asthma. Others comment on EU air pollution limit values, often expressing concern that the Proposed Scheme could exacerbate difficulties in meeting these, particularly in locations where they are already exceeded, such as some areas of London.
- 5.2.16 Some respondents express concern about air quality impacts during the operation of the Proposed Scheme, for example as a result of changes in road layout, increased congestion, or increased traffic flows to/from stations.

Climate

- 5.2.17 A total of 6,401 respondents raise the issue of climate change. The majority of these are part of an organised response which argues that HS2 would not reduce carbon emissions. Given that this is not a localised issue, it has only been covered in Report 27: Route-Wide Effects. Comments about this topic are summarised in section 5.3 (Route-wide considerations).

Community

- 5.2.18 A total of 11,545 respondents raise issues relating to communities. This theme appears across all CFAs, though the emphasis varies from one area to another.
- 5.2.19 Many respondents make broad comments about general community impacts, disruption, or negative impacts on quality of life. Some are concerned that the communities suffering most during the construction phase would not gain anything in return. A small number of respondents raise issues regarding community viability and splitting communities.
- 5.2.20 Many respondents comment on the baseline and assessment of community effects. Some comment generally that the assessment is inadequate or that the impacts on communities have been underestimated. Others suggest that the baseline includes errors or make specific suggestions for how to improve the assessment.
- 5.2.21 A large number of respondents comment on impacts to property. These are most often concerns about the proximity of construction sites and/or the high speed line to residential areas in general. Sometimes respondents refer to their own property, raising concerns about the demolition or loss of that property. More detailed concerns relate to the loss of social housing and structural impacts.
- 5.2.22 Many respondents are concerned about impacts on the property market and residents' ability to sell or rent their home. Respondents also discuss compensation, Compulsory Purchasing Orders and safeguarding procedures in general.
- 5.2.23 Many respondents comment in detail about particular groups which could be disproportionately affected by the route and its construction. The most frequently raised concerns relate to air quality and noise impacts on children or schools, older people and people who are disabled or ill. A few organisations discuss the importance of conducting an equalities and/or health impact assessment; one thinks there needs to be a section in the formal ES that deals specifically with health and wellbeing.

- 5.2.24 The impact on community facilities is another common concern, raised in relation to demolition or through impaired physical access. Facilities mentioned frequently include schools, shops, community centres, and sports and leisure facilities.
- 5.2.25 Respondents are concerned that the route and its construction could impede local communities' access to green and open spaces. This point is often connected with woodlands and the Chilterns AONB though some also mention parks, particularly in urban areas where green space is seen to be in short supply. Respondents are concerned about the loss of footpaths or public rights of way.
- 5.2.26 Some respondents express concerns about the potential cumulative impacts on communities and argue that this has been given very little consideration. For example, respondents in some locations argue that they suffer already from the impact of traffic noise and are concerned that the line would exacerbate this problem.
- 5.2.27 Many respondents comment on mitigation and/or compensation. They make specific suggestions for compensation relating to a wide range of receptors such as vulnerable groups, green spaces, footpaths and local amenities. A few respondents even see this as an opportunity to go beyond mitigation of impacts and ensure positive improvements to localities.

Cultural heritage

- 5.2.28 A total of 3,078 respondents raise issues relating to cultural heritage. Members of the public comment generally on loss of heritage assets such as listed buildings, archaeological sites and Conservation Areas, and often identify local sites of particular concern.
- 5.2.29 Many respondents comment on the assessment of heritage assets and on the impacts on these assets, saying, for example, that baselines are descriptive only and contain a number of inaccuracies, or that the value of some assets is underestimated. Some organisations are concerned that the focus on designated and non-designated assets is limiting, with requests that the definition be broadened to include assets such as museums. Others think that non-designated assets should be included in assessments.
- 5.2.30 A number of organisations comment on possible impacts on the setting of heritage assets and are concerned that this has not been properly assessed, for example questioning the use of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) particularly in crowded urban areas.
- 5.2.31 Some respondents are concerned about the potential impacts on registered parks and gardens, and others express concern about the removal of burial grounds.
- 5.2.32 A number of respondents suggest that HS2 should provide time and budget resources for preliminary archaeological investigation and ongoing monitoring or recording.

Ecology

- 5.2.33 A total of 18,514 respondents discuss ecological effects. The majority of these are part of organised responses which focus on ancient woodlands without referring to a specific CFA. Potential ecological impacts are also discussed widely in responses for more rural CFAs, with the Chilterns AONB receiving the greatest attention.

- 5.2.34 Many respondents comment on the ecology assessment. Some refer to ecological features which they believe have been undervalued, such as ancient woodlands, or highlight where further assessment is needed. A number of respondents feel that ecological surveys are incomplete or inadequate, particularly in relation to wildlife, with bats, barn owls and the great crested newt among the species mentioned.
- 5.2.35 Many think the mitigation proposals are inadequate or make suggestions for how particular ecological impacts could be better addressed. For example, a prevalent view is that the ancient woodlands are irreplaceable and their destruction cannot be adequately mitigated. On occasion, organisations ask that monitoring regimes be established to ensure the ongoing effectiveness of ecological mitigation.
- 5.2.36 Overall, woodlands are the most commonly discussed habitat, with respondents naming specific locations which they believe would be threatened, as well as making more general comments. There is widespread dissatisfaction with the approach to ancient woodlands, with a large number remarking that the draft ES fails to “*recognise the environmental importance and national significance*” of these sites.
- 5.2.37 Numerous references are made to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and other designated ecological areas, such as nature reserves and Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs), owing to concerns about land-take and impacts on habitats. Sometimes, when discussing impacts on designated sites, respondents refer to environmental legislation which they believe the Proposed Scheme is at risk of infringing.
- 5.2.38 Many respondents express concerns about wildlife, with several identifying habitat clearance and severance as a particular issue. A number of species are mentioned including bats, birds, mammals and invertebrates such as butterflies. Bats are thought to be especially vulnerable, because of likely impacts on their foraging and roosting behaviour. Impacts on birds are also mentioned. Responses from organisations are most likely to refer to particular species such as wetland birds and sparrows.
- 5.2.39 Occasionally, respondents – primarily organisations – refer to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Natural Environment White Paper guidance on net biodiversity loss and the precautionary principle when criticising ecological mitigation.

Land quality

- 5.2.40 There are 771 respondents who raise issues relating to land quality.
- 5.2.41 Respondents are concerned about the possible contamination of water resources, including surface and ground water. Many comment in general terms that insufficient consideration has been given to this risk. Specific comments focus on the possibility of water resources being polluted by run-off from spoil heaps or through the accidental spillage of oils or chemicals used during construction or operation, and the potential effects of contamination on aquatic habitats including SSSIs.
- 5.2.42 A number of respondents make comments on the possibility of land becoming contaminated. Some of these comments relate to the presence, assessment and management of potentially contaminated land along the proposed route. Others express concerns about the construction or operation of HS2 causing land contamination.

- 5.2.43 A number of respondents comment on land quality mitigation measures. These often relate to construction practices, for example suggestions regarding the method of storing oils, fuels and chemicals or of managing stockpile drainage. Comments sometimes relate to the risk assessment, monitoring or remediation of contaminated land.
- 5.2.44 A relatively small number of respondents raise concerns about possible impacts on mineral resources, such as sand and gravel deposits.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 5.2.45 A total of 16,997 respondents raise concerns relating to the landscape and visual assessment. The majority are part of organised responses which focus on the effect of HS2 on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). However, the topic is raised across other community forum areas (CFAs) too.
- 5.2.46 The Chilterns AONB landscape is the focus of most attention. Respondents commonly express fears that the Proposed Scheme could irrevocably change its character. Many refer to the protected status of this landscape, while some feel that the government is ignoring National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirements that a project must be in the national interest in order to bypass AONB planning guidance. Many argue the need for a bored tunnel through the whole of the area. Threats to specific green belts and other designation landscapes are discussed less frequently.
- 5.2.47 In addition to raising general concerns about the landscape and countryside, respondents discuss other visual impacts which are of concern. Such as impacts on views from properties, as well as the impacts of infrastructure, such as viaducts.
- 5.2.48 Many respondents raise concerns about the landscape and visual assessment, including a large number who believe that the draft ES underestimates the visual impact. A number of specific issues are raised about the landscape and visual assessment and documentation, for example several question whether the maps and photomontags offer realistic representation of the impacts on views.
- 5.2.49 Many respondents discuss mitigation measures. Planting and landscaping requests are numerous, as respondents discuss impacts specific to local areas. Occasionally, respondents express a preference for specific types of trees to be used during planting or specify that only native species be considered as mitigation. There is also support for greater use of tunnelling (bored and green tunnels) as mitigation against visual impacts.

Socio-economics

- 5.2.50 There are 9,496 espondents who raise issues relating to socio-economics. The majority of these are part of an organised response concerned about the impact HS2 would have on visitor numbers in the Chilterns.
- 5.2.51 The majority of responses dealing with this theme comment at a high level about potential impacts on businesses and job losses, particularly during construction. Many respondents are also concerned about possible impacts on tourism based businesses.
- 5.2.52 A number of respondents think that the assessment of socio-economic issues is inadequate. Linked to this is a concern that mitigation proposals have not been properly considered and that relocation of businesses could prove more difficult than anticipated by HS2 Ltd.

- 5.2.53 A number of respondents are concerned about the loss of land identified as potentially suitable for development, such as planned housing estates and “*employment land*”. A few also discuss regeneration considerations, particularly with respect to urban areas.
- 5.2.54 Many respondents challenge the job creation claims, stating that these would not go to local people or would only be temporary. A number of organisations make specific requests regarding provisions for local employment or supply chain activities.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 5.2.55 A total of 13,334 respondents discuss matters relating to sound, noise and vibration. The majority are part of an organised response and comment that the draft ES “*underplays the real noise and visual impacts of HS2*” without referring to specific CFAs. Amongst those respondents whose comments are not part of organised responses, the topic is of concern across all CFAs, though in some areas comments focus more on the construction phase whilst others are primarily concerned with operational impacts.
- 5.2.56 Many respondents comment on the sound, noise and vibration assessment with a number saying that they view this as inadequate or remarking on specific aspects which need improving. There is a sense of confusion and anxiety among respondents in relation to the noise contours; the overall impression is that the scale and scope of the noise impacts have been misrepresented in the contour maps. Many respondents express dissatisfaction with the time-average calculations and baseline data used to compile the noise contours.
- 5.2.57 Variations in airborne noise due to local topography and travelling wind is a fairly common concern among organisations and members of the public, with many requesting further assessment of operational noise impacts.
- 5.2.58 Respondents frequently raise concerns about noise and vibration impacts during construction. Many are worried about noise from construction sites and some suggest specific measures to control construction activities on weekends and at night. Many are apprehensive about increased noise levels resulting from construction traffic, to the detriment of nearby properties and the general amenity of surrounding areas. Noise and vibration from tunnel boring machines is also a concern for some.
- 5.2.59 Many respondents comments on sound, noise and vibration during operations and express general anxiety without going into specific details. Specific issues discussed include operational noise and vibration from the tunnels, vent shafts and portals and the pantograph. In some CFAs, viaduct noise is a prominent concern.
- 5.2.60 The World Health Organisation’s noise recommendations are often mentioned in conjunction with concerns about nighttime noise levels, as respondents feel this guidance has been ignored.
- 5.2.61 Many respondents are particularly concerned about the effects of noise on more vulnerable groups of society, including older people and children.
- 5.2.62 A number of respondents discuss specific impacts of noise and vibration on property. They raise concerns about structural damage, as well as the effect on property values and property saleability. Some respondents either request compensatory measures, or request that the thresholds for receiving such measures be lowered.

- 5.2.63 Many respondents discuss mitigation measures. Numerous comments are made about earthwork bunds and acoustic fences. Many respondents ask for more detail about mitigation proposals or make specific suggestions for noise abatement technologies. Various suggestions are also made to reduce the visual impact of noise mitigation.
- 5.2.64 Respondents also express concern about noise impacts on the behaviour of wildlife and the impacts of noise and vibration on various habitats, notably woodlands.

Traffic and transport

- 5.2.65 There are 5,155 respondents who raise issues relating to traffic and transport. This is a recurring theme across all CFAs, although the emphasis varies from one area to another. For example, comments relating to traffic congestion or public transport tend to come up more often in the relatively urban CFAs such as those in London, while comments about certain roads being unsuitable for construction traffic tend to come up more often in relatively rural CFAs, where roads are more commonly narrow or less-used.
- 5.2.66 A large number of respondents express concern about congestion or the impact on road users of construction requirements such as road closures, diversions, realignments and bridge construction works. These comments are often linked with other concerns, including the knock-on impacts of traffic on air pollution, businesses or schools or the role of public and stakeholder engagement in determining plans.
- 5.2.67 Many respondents comment on disruption or other impacts caused by construction and heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic, often expressing concern about the duration or timescale of construction. Comments often overlap with other issues of concern, such as noise and vibration, visual or landscape impacts, air quality, or safety.
- 5.2.68 Many respondents comment on issues of access to or from certain areas. One common concern here is the possible isolation of certain communities by the Proposed Scheme because of road, public transport and/or pedestrian closures and diversions.
- 5.2.69 Many respondents make comments about the traffic and transport assessment. Many view the assessment as inadequate or find it difficult to comment meaningfully, as the full assessment will not be made available until the formal ES is published. Some think the assessment should account for cumulative impacts and integrate with other areas such as the air pollution and noise assessments. Many also comment there should be further consultation once a more thorough assessment is completed.
- 5.2.70 Many respondents make comments that certain roads are unsuitable for use by construction and HGV traffic, for instance because they are too narrow. Associated concerns include the potential for increased traffic accidents and road deterioration.
- 5.2.71 Many respondents comment on traffic and transport mitigation measures, with many arguing that these measures are inadequate. Others make specific suggestions about local alternatives or access mitigation measures.
- 5.2.72 Respondents often express concern about impacts on other modes of transport such as buses, pedestrians, rail (including National Rail, freight, London Overground and London Underground), cyclists and taxis, as well as on parking.

- 5.2.73 A number of respondents express concern about emergency access, for example that emergency services vehicles could be delayed due to road closures and diversions.
- 5.2.74 A number of respondents are concerned about cumulative impacts on traffic and transport, particularly in areas with existing congestion or other planned projects.

Waste and material resources

- 5.2.75 A total of 3,611 respondents discuss waste and material resources.
- 5.2.76 The most prominent issue raised in relation to this topic is the management of excavated and demolition material from worksites. Most comments raise concerns about the transportation of material, the impact this could have on local roads, and the increased traffic that would result. There is also anxiety about potential noise from HGVs transporting materials.
- 5.2.77 A few respondents argue that the assessment of the effect of transporting excavated materials on the road network is inadequate and lacks detail on transportation plans, for example the number of lorry trips and the volume of material to be transported. A number of respondents would prefer these waste materials to be removed by more sustainable modes of transport so reducing the impact on local roads. Rail is mentioned most frequently, but canals are also recommended.
- 5.2.78 A few respondents offer ideas about how the excavated materials could be reused, with the primary suggestion being to construct mitigation measures such as earth banks.
- 5.2.79 There is some anxiety about the impact on air quality of stockpiles and transporting excavated materials, particularly in relation to dust levels. Suggestions on how to prevent this impact include locating stockpiles in remote locations and enclosing them.
- 5.2.80 A few local authorities discuss the management of contaminated materials. Some comments include requests for more information in the formal ES, for example on the destination of contaminated materials. Others request that notes associated with the transfer of contaminated and waste materials are submitted to councils for approval.
- 5.2.81 A number of respondents make other comments on the assessment of this topic. For example, more detail is requested on the disposal of waste materials and where they would be disposed of, including land-fill sites.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 5.2.82 There are 1,110 respondents raise issues relating to water resources and flood risk. This issue is a recurring theme across all CFAs, although the emphasis varies from one area to another. For example, comments on this topic are more frequent in responses from people in areas with a larger proportion of river and surface water coverage and/or sensitive aquifers, including the Chilterns, Colne Valley, Northamptonshire and Staffordshire
- 5.2.83 Many respondents are concerned about the impact on surface water, such as rivers, lakes and canals. Issues include potential impacts on water flows, water quality, or aquatic habitats during the construction or operation of the Proposed Scheme, such as the diversion of rivers or streams, the use of culverts, knock-on hydrological effects from tunnelling, structural damage to canals, or concerns about drainage on land affected by the Proposed Scheme. A number make specific suggestions for further assessment or mitigation measures.

- 5.2.84 Some refer to the Water Framework Directive and associated policies and plans, sometimes noting opportunities for water quality improvements in relation to the construction of the Proposed Scheme.
- 5.2.85 Many respondents are concerned about flood risk, for example where the proposed route passes through a flood plain. A number of respondents view the flood risk assessment as inadequate. Some comment on the need for appropriate flood risk mitigation measures or ongoing monitoring. Others say that it is important for proper engagement to take place with the relevant local flood authority.
- 5.2.86 Many respondents express concerns about impacts on groundwater, aquifers and hydrology, including the water table. A number state that it is important to consider fully the effects of tunnelling and excavation, particularly in potentially sensitive areas such as beneath the River Colne and through chalk aquifers.
- 5.2.87 Many respondents make comments on balancing ponds. Issues relate to their location, with some concerned about land-take, proximity to their property or their possible visual impacts. A number argue that the assessment does not include sufficient explanation of proposed plans for balancing ponds.
- 5.2.88 A small number of respondents comment on the water supply, with a few expressing concerns that impacts on the aquifer and water table could affect water abstraction, and others expressing concern about water utility diversions involved in construction.

5.3 Route-wide considerations

Overview

- 5.3.1 Report 27, found in Volume 2 of the draft Environmental Statement (ES), summarises the likely significant effects of the project on a route-wide basis.
- 5.3.2 The ES topic 'Climate' is discussed in Report 27 only and, unlike other ES topics, does not appear in CFA reports or other ES documents. For this reason, 'Climate' is the first topic to be discussed in this section and there is less focus on other ES topics.
- 5.3.3 While a number of respondents indicated in their response to Question 1 that their comments related to Report 27, the majority of these also tick one or more of the community CFA reports (1-26) and their comments on all chosen reports are often combined. For this reason only views which focus on specific environmental topics addressed in Report 27 are summarised below. Where Report 27 or route-wide effects are referred to in responses that did not follow the questionnaire structure, their views on these topics are also summarised in this section.
- 5.3.4 A few respondents make general comments about Report 27, for example that it is too generic or that it contradicts statements made elsewhere in the draft ES.

Climate

- 5.3.5 A total of 6,401 respondents raise issues and make suggestions relating to climate. A few refer specifically to the climate section (section 5) in Report 27; many others make comments without referring to specific draft ES documentation. A significant proportion of responses are part of an organised response.

- 5.3.6 On the whole, respondents commenting on climate make negative comments. The most common view is that the Proposed Scheme would not help to reduce carbon emissions.

“[the draft ES] Omits the inconvenient truth that HS2 won’t even reduce our carbon emissions.”

Individual

- 5.3.7 However, a very small number of respondents believe that HS2 could have a positive impact on climate change.

- 5.3.8 Some respondents refer to government commitments on carbon reduction and the Climate Change Act 2008 and comment on the relative ability of HS2 to help meet these targets. Others comment more broadly on current drives towards decarbonisation.

“... you cannot help the environment by creating yet another usage of energy. It can only increase the greenhouse gas emission. The way to achieve carbon emission targets is to encourage much greater use of remote working, tele-conferencing, and the multitude of national and global collaboration systems that are already extensively used by the lead adopters. Cancelling HS2 and funding this cause would be the right choice on sustainability grounds.”

Individual

- 5.3.9 Some comment on the assessment and methodology. Respondents state that the assessment does not include enough information on greenhouse gas emission and carbon emissions in particular, and does not adequately consider trends towards increased sustainability in other transport modes such as reduced emissions from cars.

- 5.3.10 Some express dissatisfaction regarding carbon assessment in the 2011 Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS) and the implication this has for ongoing assessment of climate issues. Some respondents are concerned the Proposed Scheme is being presented as ‘green’ when the AoS gave a carbon neutral conclusion to the project.

- 5.3.11 A common concern is the repercussions that construction would have for carbon emissions and a view that this has not been adequately reflected in the assessment.

“A glaring omission from the analysis on the carbon impacts of HS2 is seemingly no mention or account being given of the possible CO₂ arising from the impacts of the construction process.”

Cheryl Gillan, Member of Parliament

- 5.3.12 There is also concern about the impact of construction traffic on carbon emissions and whether this has been appropriately covered in the assessment. Other concerns regarding construction focus on the embedded carbon within construction materials.

- 5.3.13 A common issue raised by respondents concerned about operational phase carbon emissions is the level of energy consumption required by HS2 services. There is concern that high speed trains will consume more energy than conventional train types. A number of respondents also believe that the Proposed Scheme would result in increased travel.

“... the proposed line should not be reviewed as carbon reducing. Almost 90% of HS2 users will create more emissions, given the predicted number of brand new journeys (24%) and those switching from existing services (65%).”

HS2 Action Alliance

- 5.3.14 A number of respondents question the ability of the Proposed Scheme to affect modal shift, with aviation a particular concern. Some think it would be more sensible to invest in technologies that help reduce the need to travel.
- 5.3.15 Many respondents highlight the loss of woodland as a concern in relation to climate change mitigation. One organisation suggests that replacement planting should take account of this.

“Any compensatory woodland creation should, as far as possible ensure replacement of the carbon storage lost through the loss of woodland and associated soils.”

Forestry Commission

- 5.3.16 A few comment that greater work is required to adequately mitigate the carbon effects of the Proposed Scheme and some make specific suggestions.

“The approach to reduction of the Proposed Scheme's greenhouse gas footprint is under development'. The Board would expect a clear commitment to mitigation of green house gas production. It is insufficient and meaningless to state that the carbon footprint of the scheme would be minimised 'as far as practicable'.”

Chilterns Conservation Board

The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

- 5.3.17 The Chilterns AONB is discussed in section 2 of Report 27 and a number of respondents refer to it when discussing route-wide effects. The majority express general concerns about the potential impact on the AONB; their views are summarised under sections 6.8 to 6.10.
- 5.3.18 Some respondents, primarily organisations, specifically discuss the Chilterns AONB section of Report 27. A few of those welcome the inclusion of this designated landscape in the route-wide report, while also making suggestions as for improvement.

“We welcome Report 27's acknowledgement that the Chilterns AONB's 'overall landscape character is considered to be of national value', reflecting its national designation. We suggest it covers the condition and value of the landscape in greater detail, so that they are dealt with equally with character and tranquillity as per the SMR.”

Natural England

- 5.3.19 Most comments specifically addressing the Chilterns AONB section of Report 27 highlight issues or concerns. For example, a few are concerned that there is a lack of detail in this section and that the assessments relating to the area are not finalised yet. Others believe that the impacts on the Chilterns AONB are understated in section 2. In particular they disagree that there would be no significant noise impact on the area.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 5.3.20 A few respondents, mainly organisations, make specific comments on section 3 (agriculture, forestry and soils) of Report 27. Some organisations imply that the section is selective in terms of what it covers, commenting that it does not include the effect of severance on agricultural businesses or the potential for a reduction in farm productivity. Another respondent disagrees with the classification of the loss of agricultural land in Report 27 as not significant. Suggestions with regard to how the assessment could be improved include evaluating the socio-economic impact on the agricultural sector and including land managed under agri-environment schemes.

Air quality

- 5.3.21 A few respondents refer specifically to the air quality section (section 4) of Report 27. For example, one local authority comments that air quality has not been covered adequately in the route-wide report. Another respondent disagrees with the position outlined in section 4 that *“the effects on air quality would generally only be locally slight”* and argues that the wider impacts of excavated material movement by road would be significant on a route-wide basis. Another organisation believes the section is missing important details, for example about the impact of dust along the route. Another suggests ways the assessment could be improved, for example by not relying on existing monitoring network to determine future impacts of the proposals.

Community

- 5.3.22 Some respondents who indicate that their response to Question 1 is relevant to Report 27 express general concern about the negative impact the construction and operation of HS2 would have on people’s lives, their homes and the local environment along the route. The comments are summarised in section 5.2 and chapter 6.
- 5.3.23 A few respondents explicitly comment on the community section (section 6) of Report 27. For example, a few local authorities challenge the position expressed in section 6 that the impact on communities is of no more than local significance.

“The statement that “Impacts arising from both the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme are considered to be of no more than local significance.” fundamentally undervalues the impact this project will have on the day to day lives of communities. The statement is both unhelpful to the reader and dismissive of their concerns. It is the Council's view that more weight should be given to this issue in the Full ES.”

Warwickshire County Council

- 5.3.24 A few respondents discuss topics which have been omitted from the community section of Report 27. For example, a few comment on the importance of conducting a health impact assessment. Another organisation recommends there is a section in the formal Environmental Statement (ES) specifically dealing with health and safety.

“The health and wellbeing of residents in the communities all along the proposed HS2 route should be of paramount concern. HS2 Ltd has a duty of care. There should be a section in the draft ES that dealt specifically with health, wellbeing and safety.”

HS2 Action Alliance

Cultural heritage

- 5.3.25 The few members of the public who ticked Report 27 in response to Question 1 tend to express general concern about the impact of HS2 on designated buildings and only a few refer specifically to the cultural heritage section (section 7) of Report 27.
- 5.3.26 A few organisations challenge the statement made in section 7 that the impact on cultural heritage is only of local significance.

“This [the sentence in section 7.11 “These effects are considered to be of no more than local significance”] is at odds with the recognition of the sites as Grade 1 & II listed buildings and included on the Register of Parks and Gardens by English heritage - these are grades indicating national significance. We recommend that appropriate reappraisal of merit follows.”

National Trust

- 5.3.27 A few respondents highlight inaccuracies, and raise other concerns, relating to section 7 of Report 27. An organisation challenges statements in the section, for example the claim that no listed buildings would be demolished. Another criticism is that the setting of non-designated sites has not been included, which a few argue runs counter to the earlier HS2 Scope and Methodology Report. There is also a general concern that there is a lack of detailed analysis of the impacts on the historic environment.

Ecology

- 5.3.28 Most respondents who mention ecology having ticked Report 27 in Question 1 express general concerns about negative effects on wildlife and ancient woodlands.
- 5.3.29 However a few, comment specifically on the ecology section (section 8) within Report 27. For example, a few organisations are disappointed that the route-wide effects on habitats are not considered to be significant and argue that the importance of ancient woodlands is not currently reflected in Report 27. A few comments relate to the list included in section 8, with respondents highlighting particular species they feel have been omitted.
- 5.3.30 There is a concern that the ecology assessment is based on inadequate information and incomplete surveys. According to a few organisations, this lack of detail makes it hard for respondents to provide meaningful comments on route-wide effects. An opinion is expressed that surveys have not been conducted sufficiently early for the results to inform the design and mitigation measures, and that three years would be required to obtain accurate baseline data, rather than one. One organisation considers this to be a result of the Proposed Scheme being pushed through the consenting process too fast.
- 5.3.31 The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)’s biodiversity metrics are referred to by a few organisations when commenting on route-wide matters. There is support for the use of these metrics as a method for valuing habitats and calculating habitat compensation.

“Support for DEFRA Biodiversity Offsetting metrics being used as a method for valuing habitats affected by the scheme and using as a means to inform the amount of compensation required to proportionally offset the impacts identified. Also, use to ensure a consistent approach to compensation and to identify any significant route wide effects.”

Warwickshire Wildlife Trust

Land quality

- 5.3.32 A few respondents comment specifically on the land quality section (section 9) of Report 27, mainly highlighting omissions or specific topics that need to be covered in more detail. One organisation requests that the section is amended to include protected geological sites such as geological SSSIs. Another respondent also emphasises the importance of including non-statutory sites that are of local and regional significance.
- 5.3.33 One local authority focuses their comments on mineral resources. They believe that the sterilisation of important mineral resources needs to be considered as a potential route-wide issue. They recommend a detailed mineral assessment of the entire route to establish where there are permitted and potential mineral sites, and to assess the depth, quality and potential value of the mineral resources identified in those locations.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 5.3.34 Respondents who ticked Report 27 in response to Question 1 tend to express general concern about the possible impacts on the landscape, without referring to the section of Report 27 (section 10) which addresses landscape and visual assessment.
- 5.3.35 The few respondents who specifically mention section 10 of Report 27 tend to raise issues or concerns. One feels it has not been possible to make an informed judgement, or offer detailed comment on the landscape and visual assessment, due to inadequate detail in the report. Another organisation is particularly concerned that there are not deemed to be any significant route-wide effects on landscape and visual receptors arising from the Proposed Scheme, and comments that there is not an adequate explanation of how sensitivity with regard to the landscape has been derived. A few others mention planting mitigation from a route-wide perspective, for example an organisation requests more information of policies and proposals relating to the provision of planting mitigation.

Socio-economics

- 5.3.36 A few respondents, including organisations, challenge the figures in section 11 with regard to job losses. One respondent argues there is a lack of evidence to support the figures. A local authority comments that wider impacts on employment and business have not been considered, such as additional journey time and tourism impacts.

“The figure of only 2,190 potential job losses along the whole route is disputed by the Council. Greater empirical evidence is requested demonstrating the gains, losses and local impact by community forum area to prove this assertion.”

Warwickshire County Council

- 5.3.37 There is also concern amongst a few that the socio-economic section in Report 27 applies an overly optimistic “*top down*” approach. They comment that more evidence is needed regarding how figures have been derived to give the reader confidence.

“... The benefits projected seem very optimistic or illusory. Unbalanced use of socio-economic factors in an Environmental Assessment provides a fundamental source of bias.”

Individual

- 5.3.38 A few respondents comment on specific omissions and inadequacies in section 11. For example, a local authority argues that “*no attempt has been made to address the impact on the economy of the route as a whole*”. Another view is that the section is too narrow in focus, and needs to include the impact of HS2 on property values and loss of equity.

“There is no exploration of loss of personal value. The section concentrates on a narrow view of the socio-economics, that of the labour market. There is no quantification of loss of equity because of falling house prices as a result of property blight. This too is a major omission.”

HS2 Action Alliance

- 5.3.39 Another concern relates to a lack of analysis of the impact of HS2 on the local reputation of the Chilterns, and specifically the effect on the tourism sector, visitor numbers and related services at a route-wide level.
- 5.3.40 An organisation comments on the importance of including an assessment of how HS2 would impact on UK economic growth, including specific sectors such as technology, education and culture. While another respondent considers that section 11, on socio-economics, highlights how weak the economic case is for HS2.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 5.3.41 A number of respondents comment that section 12 (sound, noise and vibration) of Report 27 is inadequate and query the conclusions that have been reached. A few disagree with the statement that there would be no significant noise and vibration effects on a route-wide effect, particularly as the assessment is not yet complete.
- 5.3.42 An organisation challenges the construct of route-wide considerations and argues that cumulative effects need to be considered in this instance.

“It cannot follow that assessing the potential effects within CFAs prevents them becoming significant on a route wide basis. Indeed, there must be a cumulative effect. The concept of a route wide consideration of effects is a convenient construct. Noise is by definition an effect upon an individual and thus a local effect. HS2 is a project with a widespread geographical scope but that is made up of a large number of local areas.”

Buckinghamshire Councils

- 5.3.43 A number of organisations comment on the sound, noise and vibration assessment when discussing route-wide effects. Issues raised include the methodology, sound contour maps and peak noise levels (section 5.2).

Traffic and transport

- 5.3.44 Amongst those respondents who ticked Report 27 in Question 1, many express general worries about the possibility of increased traffic and disruption to roads without referring specifically to route-wide considerations (see section 5.2 and chapter 6).

- 5.3.45 The traffic and transport section (section 13) of Report 27 is explicitly mentioned by a few respondents, primarily local authorities. There is a concern that the assessment of traffic and transport impacts at a route-wide level will not be completed until the publishing of the formal ES and a desire is expressed for greater consultation on this topic.

“Paragraph 13.1.2 notes that the route-wide transport assessment is not yet complete. The County Council would have expected to have seen this information in the draft ES. The County Council expects to have further engagement with HS2 Ltd regarding the TA prior to the publishing of the formal ES.”

Northamptonshire County Council

- 5.3.46 A few organisations highlight other ways that section 13 of the route-wide assessment could be improved. For example, it should include a policy framework related to traffic and transport, which includes relevant national and regional policy and plans.
- 5.3.47 Another element of the assessment of effects at regional and route-wide levels of interest to local authorities is which transport networks and routes will be assessed; a comment is made that these should be identified in discussion with local authorities.

Waste and material resources

- 5.3.48 Only a few respondents comment on the topic of waste management in the context of route-wide effects. As the majority of comments are general in nature they are discussed in section 5.2 or chapter 6.
- 5.3.49 A few local authorities raise specific points about the waste and material resources section (section 14) of Report 27. For example, a few authorities comment that one of the limitations of the baseline data is that it is a number of years old; they go on to recommend the modelling of these figures to help forecast the current and future baseline. Another respondent is critical of the fact that Report 27 does not consider the effects of producing construction materials, and requests that the type and origin of materials be identified so that the environmental impacts can be fully assessed.
- 5.3.50 Another route-wide consideration relates to excavated materials. For example, a local authority comments there is a lack of detail about potential volumes and destinations of excavated materials, which means that the potential impacts of managing and transporting material have not been adequately considered in the draft ES.

Water resources and flood risk management

- 5.3.51 Only a few respondents, primarily organisations, specifically discuss section 15 of Report 27, which addresses water resources and flood risk management. General comments about water resources and flood risk management which do not refer explicitly to section 15 Report 27 are discussed in section 5.2 and chapter 6.
- 5.3.52 A few respondents make general comments about section 15 of Report 27, for example one organisation thinks that the section is incomplete and the precautionary principle should be applied. While the Environment Agency believes that greater emphasis should be placed on flood risk in the Report 27.

- 5.3.53 Specific comments on the assessment, from a route-wide perspective, include a request for pre and post development run off rates as part of the flood risk assessment and a concern that study work has been desktop based.

Other route-wide considerations

- 5.3.54 A few respondents raise other topics which they think require further consideration at a route-wide level.
- 5.3.55 Some comment there is a lack of assessment of cumulative impacts within Report 27. For example, the effect of locating the HS2 line in close proximity to other structures, such as existing railway lines and motorways.
- 5.3.56 Another issue raised by a few relates to a lack of assessment of the pressure to develop surrounding land as a result of the HS2 line. Some link this concern with a view that there would be increased pressure to develop green belts.

“There is no consideration of the wider impacts of HS2 on patterns of development and pressure to develop greenfield sites. In the case of the Old Oak Common station, this could be positive and lead to regeneration of brownfield sites. In relation to the Birmingham Interchange station, not only would this damage the Green Belt directly, it would significantly increase pressure to develop on it further.”

Campaign to Protect Rural England

- 5.3.57 A few respondents highlight other issues they believe require consideration at a route-wide level. These include the following: considering the impact of nighttime maintenance, discussing costs and operational issues involved in moving utilities, and focusing on high quality design for features such as viaducts.
- 5.3.58 A few others who comment on Report 27 or route-wide matters raise issues relating to the route of HS2, the number of stations and connections to other transport infrastructure. A few comment that an adequate assessment has not been provided for the choice of Route 3 over other routes. Others requests for more stops along the route and better integration with other infrastructure such as airports.
- 5.3.59 General comments about electromagnetic interference, including concerns about potential health issues, are raised by a few respondents. Specific comments include a recommendation from HS2 Action Alliance that electromagnetic interference should be assessed as a route-wide impact.

5.4 Comments on the consultation

Overview

- 5.4.1 This section summarises respondents' comments on the consultation process. Across responses to all consultation questions there are 6,716 comments about the consultation process, many of which are part of organised responses. These range from overall views on the process, through specific comments on materials or events, to requests or suggestions for future engagement.

The consultation process

- 5.4.2 Of the respondents who comment on the consultation process overall, most give negative feedback. Some of these respondents express their impression that the consultation is not being undertaken in a sincere manner, or that there has been a lack of adequate or honest consultation generally around the HS2 project. Some respondents say that the nature of consultation to date has been confusing.
- 5.4.3 A small number of respondents state that in their view the consultation process is unlawful, for example because it asks for responses to out of date or incomplete information, does not provide sufficient consideration of alternatives, or because they believe the overall decision to process with HS2 is unlawful.
- 5.4.4 Most respondents making negative comments about the consultation process emphasise specific issues such as the consultation timescale, with many suggesting there was insufficient time to respond to such a large amount of information. In addition, a number of respondents are concerned that any changes made in response to consultation feedback may not or cannot happen in time to reach the submission of the hybrid bill.
- 5.4.5 A number of others are concerned that consultation submissions will have little influence on the final outcome because they believe HS2 Ltd or the government will not actually listen to those who give their views. For example, respondents suggest that HS2 Ltd or the government will override public opinion with business or financial interest, that decisions have already been taken, that respondents in certain locations or those who oppose the Proposed Scheme will be listened to less, that the voices of an influential minority will outweigh the views of the majority, or that environmental considerations will not be properly considered.

“There is little confidence that the ES or comments on the ES will result in any significant change to any aspect of the alignment and design as HS2/DfT are giving environmental considerations a low weighting compared to cost and practicality (speed of build).”

Chilterns Conservation Board

- 5.4.6 There are several references to issues raised in response to previous consultations or at previous meetings which respondents think have not been satisfactorily resolved (including community forum meetings – see section 5.4.11 below for more detail on these comments).

“The City Council has made similar responses to the previous consultation on the HS2 proposals by the Department for Transport, although the City Council's concerns have not been satisfactorily resolved. City Council officers would welcome further discussions with HS2 Ltd on these points. If the City Council's concerns are not resolved, then the City Council will petition against the HS2 Hybrid Bill when it is put before Parliament.”

Westminster City Council

- 5.4.7 The inclusivity of the consultation is questioned by some respondents, with comments over the – some say deliberate – complexity of the process and a perceived lack of inclusivity with respect to low-income households, disabled people, non-English speakers, and those with ill health, as well as respondents in rural areas and those with no internet access.

“While 'digital by default' may in normal circumstance be perfectly reasonable, for a scheme that has such a huge impact on people's lives, and particularly in the rural areas that HS2 has been deliberately designed to impact, it is hard to see how the consultation process passes Government requirements for 'rural proofing'.”

HS2 Action Alliance

- 5.4.8 Some respondents question the validity of the overall consultation process, for example by saying that it is not compliant with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive. Comments include reference to the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive and the Aarhus Convention, with a few respondents saying the draft ES consultation goes against the spirit of the Convention.
- 5.4.9 Other issues raised by respondents in relation to the overall consultation process include worries about the lack of – or request for – transparency, honesty, accountability, and openness. The cost of the consultation, either to respondents or to HS2 Ltd, is mentioned by a very small number of respondents.
- 5.4.10 Positive comments about the consultation process are given by a very small number of respondents, including general expressions of support, a recognition that HS2 Ltd was not obliged to consult on the draft ES, and satisfaction that affected parties are being given a chance to comment.

“...we as an Association are pleased those affected are finally being given a chance to comment on concrete proposals.”

Aylesbury Constituency Conservative Association

Community forum meetings

- 5.4.11 A number of respondents refer to specific community forum meetings. The most prevalent concern is that specific points raised and discussed at these meetings have been understated, poorly summarised, insufficiently responded to or not carried forward by HS2 Ltd, with some respondents referring specifically to the suggestion list developed by each forum and how these ideas have or have not been taken forward.

“Those who sat on Community Forums note significant inconsistencies between what was discussed and the outcome. The report gives the impression of having been created from behind a desk rather than on the ground.”

Individual

- 5.4.12 Some respondents say that the HS2 Ltd representatives at their forum meetings were not empowered to action or recommend any changes, that there is a lack of clarity over how the forums relate to other engagement activities, or question the overall value of the forums.
- 5.4.13 Other respondents suggest that specific local plans or features were disclosed late or only partly disclosed to forum meetings, or are concerned that community forums were not aware of some of the changes to the Proposed Scheme that are included in the draft ES. A few respondents point out commitments made in forum meetings that they believe have not been kept.

“Our public footpath where we walk with animals and children will be closed. [...] HS2 construction & traffic surrounds us we will have no alternative but to drive to a park to walk, yet the nearest park will also be devastated by HS2 showing yet another loss of amenities and enjoyment. We were promised at community forums that there would be no closure of public footpaths in our area.”

Individual

- 5.4.14 Some respondents suggest that local residents may be unwilling or unable to attend community forum meetings, or stress the importance of feeding information to local residents through these forums (with some referencing specific incidences where particular information was not provided) and listening to what people say at the forum meetings. There is also a request for any engagement outside of the community forum structure to be handled through a “*comprehensive standard format for recording and responding to key concerns of the community*”.

Consultation events

- 5.4.15 There are several specific comments referring to events held as part of the consultation. Some respondents express disappointment that in their view issues raised at the events were not captured or responded to adequately. Others present concerns about the perceived lack of time to digest material prior to events, short notice, poor or wrong advertisement, poor location, dissatisfactory format, events occurring too close to the consultation deadline, unsatisfactory interactions with HS2 Ltd representatives at events, or representatives’ lack of knowledge about specific issues.

“We have attended meetings to do with HS2 and when we put questions to the HS2 representatives we do not seem to have any real answers, or the answers are vague. This is not very helpful?”

Individual

- 5.4.16 Positive comments come from respondents who welcomed the opportunity to speak to HS2 Ltd representatives including engineers, and who say they had positive or helpful interactions with these representatives.

“As with previous exhibits/consultation displays it was well presented and the staff willing to spend time and explain various aspects of the presentation.”

Individual

Information provision

- 5.4.17 Several respondents express disappointment or concern at the way in which information has been disseminated during the consultation, for example stating that specific documents were sent out in an incorrect or untimely manner.

"I am disappointed by the failure of HS2 to deliver the timely and in some cases accurate information to individuals and public places. A number of my constituents were sent the wrong maps along with incorrect supplements which were requested in order to complete the consultation within the tight deadline. This added further and unnecessary delay and confusion for people wishing to make a response to the DES."

Christopher Pincher, Member of Parliament for Tamworth

- 5.4.18 Many of these comments see respondents asserting that some pieces of information only came to light partway through the consultation process, for example the specific impacts of newly proposed options or routing on certain locations and assets. Others note that the detail provided on specific environmental aspects in the draft ES is incomplete or still being assessed.

"...with the limited nature of the material presented, and in the absence of much baseline data and supporting surveys, the councils question whether the purpose of this consultation was to acquire as much information from the public, local authorities, other key organisations and technical experts to fill the omissions that are apparent in all volumes of the draft ES."

Buckinghamshire Councils

- 5.4.19 Some respondents make specific requests for more information or documentation relating to the Proposed Scheme, the draft ES, or the consultation, either for themselves or for wider public dissemination. Many of these respondents would like to have this additional information available prior to the completion of the formal ES. Others reference previous requests for information that have not been answered to their satisfaction.

Submitting comments: consultation website, materials and analysis

- 5.4.20 Several respondents comment on the website and consultation materials addressing issues such as the file size of electronic documents, access to the consultation website, limitations to the length and format for online responses, and the suggestion for additional documents they felt would have been useful.
- 5.4.21 A small number of respondents comment on the paper response form and the consultation questions, and suggest these could have been better. The process of analysing comments is also raised, with concern that this be undertaken thoroughly.

"My other concern is who is going to read, understand and implement the comments made by hundreds of people. We have been informed HS2 is in the national interest. We need to be sure that receipt of our concerns is acknowledged, they will be read by people who understand the things we are saying, not just a call centre operation, losing comments in the process. A daunting task that must be done with diligence."

Individual

Future and further engagement

- 5.4.22 A large number of respondents emphasise a need for further consultation, primarily on the formal ES, stating that there is a potential for significant changes from the draft version. Some comment that further consultation should be undertaken before the hybrid bill is submitted. Others stress that any future consultation on the formal ES should allow more time for people to respond.

“Part of this process is that an Environmental Statement must be deposited with the bill, and the public must have the opportunity to comment on that ES before the second reading. Recently, the Leader of the House announced that there would be a consultation of 8 weeks. [...] With the amount of data to be contained in the final ES, the consultation period is too short. In our opinion, it should be a minimum of 14 weeks.”

Individual

- 5.4.23 Several respondents urge HS2 Ltd to speak with affected communities, groups or organisations, with the majority of these citing a lack of comprehensive and targeted engagement or information giving so far, particularly at a local community level, and also with those who are socially or geographically isolated.
- 5.4.24 A number of respondents make requests for further detailed assessment and consultation on specific topics prior to the completion of the formal ES. Many respondents, including several organisations, request or expect that they will be further involved in relation to specific topics, or say that they are willing to continue to be engaged in the development of the ES.

“For the SSSIs listed above, Natural England (along with the EA where appropriate) will continue the positive engagement with HS2 Ltd to determine impacts and agree suitable mitigation for inclusion within the formal ES”.

Natural England

Chapter 6 Community forum areas

Introduction

- 6.1.1 This chapter provides a summary of the responses to the consultation that address specific community forum area (CFA) reports. There is one section for each CFA report, except for CFA report 27 (Route-wide impacts) which is discussed in chapter 5. The following 26 sections discuss each CFA in turn. Overview maps of the CFAs are included in the draft ES documentation.

6.2 Euston – station and approach (CFA 1)

Overview

- 6.2.1 This part of the Proposed Scheme – community forum area (CFA) 1 – comprises Euston Station and a 1.3 km section of the route from Euston Station north of the Euston Road to the Park Street Tunnels, where Parkway crosses the existing railway. This area is adjacent to Primrose Hill to Kilburn (CFA 3) to the immediate north-west and Camden Town HS1 Link (CFA 2) to the north. CFA 1 is entirely within the London Borough of Camden. It lies at the south-eastern end of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.2.2 There are 734 respondents explicitly addressing Euston station and approach (CFA 1) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 1, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 1 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.2.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 1 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 1.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.2.4 Many of the comments made in relation to CFA 1 address broader issues covering CFAs 1, 2 and 3. Respondents do not always specify which of these three areas they are addressing, but address all three together. These issues are discussed in full in this section of the report. Sections 6.2 and 6.3, dealing with CFA 2 and CFA 3 respectively, frequently make reference to the issues discussed in this section, to avoid unnecessary duplication.
- 6.2.5 Many respondents argue that construction works associated with the Proposed Scheme would have a combined effect across a large area of inner London, encompassing parts of CFAs 1, 2 and 3. These respondents often suggest that due to the closely interrelated nature of the road network, it is impossible to accurately address the impact on traffic in these areas in isolation from one another.

- 6.2.6 Similarly, the additional strain that these proposals would place on underground and overground rail services, and the impact of station closures associated with the works, is something that many respondents see as affecting large parts of North London, rather than specific CFAs.
- 6.2.7 Some respondents argue that there is a current shortage of accommodation in North London, and especially within the borough of Camden. They see the proposed demolition of dwellings, and especially lower priced accommodation as worsening the issue.

Overarching issues for CFA 1

- 6.2.8 The most widely discussed issue in this area is the proposed loss of housing, and the associated forced removal of residents. Particular issues that respondents discuss in relation to this include the effect that this would have on the individuals involved, the effect on the nature of the community, and proposals for mitigation.
- 6.2.9 A related issue is the effect that respondents believe the Proposed Scheme would have on the character of the area. Concerns include the effect of demolition of listed and culturally important buildings, which are frequently described as integral to the character of the area.
- 6.2.10 Concerns about the effects of construction work and associated traffic is another widely discussed issue. Issues raised include the anticipated effect that construction and associated additional traffic would have on people's health and lifestyles, and potential impacts of construction works on journey times locally.
- 6.2.11 Many respondents also express concern about a loss of businesses in the area resulting from construction and demolition works.
- 6.2.12 Many respondents also express concern about the potential impact of the proposed construction works on Euston Station. There are concerns that building works could disrupt current services, and that disruption around the station building would affect access to the station and increase local traffic. The Greater London Authority makes detailed comments on the draft ES, covering all of the themes discussed below in some detail. The response highlights a number of areas where the Authority believes additional assessment is required, where it thinks relevant information is missing and where it suggests additional mitigation arrangements are needed.
- 6.2.13 The response submitted by the Environment Committee on behalf of the London Assembly also goes into significant detail addressing all of the topic areas discussed below. A very detailed response was also received from the London Borough of Camden.

Community

- 6.2.14 A large number of consultation responses referring to CFA 1 voice concerns about the loss of property and/or homes. The areas which receive most widespread attention in relation to housing loss are Park Village East, Regents Park, and Regents Park Estate.

6.2.15 One reason cited by respondents for their opposition to the proposed destruction of housing is the negative impact they say this would have on the current housing shortage in London Borough of Camden, and in London more generally. Many respondents are concerned that the wider housing shortage means that it is unlikely that suitable replacement accommodation would be available, especially for residents who wish to remain in Camden.

6.2.16 Respondents also express concerns about the effect of relocation on individuals. Some respondents, including Euston community forum, draw attention to groups of people who they think would be particularly vulnerable to the effects of relocation, with many expressing their concerns about the impact on elderly residents. Some argue that older people would find it difficult to carve out a new life for themselves elsewhere. Others argue that it is unreasonable to ask older people to move if they have lived in an area for a long time, in some cases all their lives.

“Many tenants who lived here are too old to start again.”

Individual

6.2.17 Another commonly mentioned group are the council tenants of Regents Park Estate. Respondents say residents of council housing are particularly vulnerable due to their limited financial resources. Some respondents add that the estate also houses a number of tenants who have poor mental or physical health.

“The HS2 link will destroy the homes of a significant number of Camden's residents on the Regent's Park Estate. These people are in a terrible position, facing the prospect of being thrown out of their community and homes. The majority are far from healthy and have few resources to fall back on.”

Individual

6.2.18 A few respondents highlight children as a group that would be particularly vulnerable to the effects of relocation.

6.2.19 The London Borough of Camden, among other respondents, expresses concern about the relocation of residents as a result of proposed demolitions and argues that this would break up closely knit communities.

6.2.20 A number of respondents discuss the importance of appropriate compensation and mitigation for residents forced to move house, including for those who are leaseholders, or only renting property in the area. A common suggestion in respondents' comments is the need to guarantee like-for-like replacement accommodation within the local area for those who want it. Some respondents suggesting this argue that it is unacceptable to force people to move away from their community, especially if they have roots there such as children attending local schools. A related suggestion is for suitable replacement accommodation to be made available at the beginning of the construction period, rather than later on.

6.2.21 A few respondents express particular concern about the effect that the proposals would have on the wellbeing of children living in the area. Their concerns include the loss of green spaces for children to play in, disruption to schools, and the effects of increased air pollution, which some respondents argue would make it unsafe for children to play outside. The most commonly mentioned school is the Maria Fidelis School, which some respondents, including the London Borough of Camden, think would be affected particularly severely.

“The noise and increased traffic will last for my children's entire childhood”

Individual

- 6.2.22 Some respondents express concern about the possible impact of the proposals on local residents' health and quality of life. The impact of dust from construction works on people's health is mentioned as a major concern; for example, some respondents mention that they or their children are asthmatic. The effect of sleep disturbance and associated health impacts due to construction noise also concern some respondents. Others express concerns about the potential stress and psychological impacts of continuous unwanted noise in the daytime.
- 6.2.23 A few respondents, including Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee, are concerned that some residents would have limited access to their homes during construction works. They emphasise that this must never be the case, and that access routes must be maintained at all times.
- 6.2.24 There are some concerns about damage to local buildings due to activities associated with the proposed project, such as subsidence caused by tunnelling works. Respondents also raise concerns about the damaging effect of vibrations from construction work and heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic on buildings. A few respondents think the age of many of the houses in the area, and their weak foundations, could make them particularly vulnerable to these issues.

Socio-economics

- 6.2.25 Most comments on socio-economic topics are part of responses focussing on the London Borough of Camden generally, with little distinction being made between CFAs 1, 2 and 3. Where specific locations within CFA 1 are mentioned these have been highlighted; otherwise this section covers comments with relevance to CFAs 1, 2 and 3 combined.
- 6.2.26 Many respondents discuss the loss of local businesses associated with the proposed developments. Businesses on Drummond Street are most commonly mentioned, but many comments also refer to wider impacts of construction on local businesses, such as customers being deterred by construction activities in the area. Many respondents think that the feared loss of businesses would have knock-on effects and disperse certain communities.

“I quail for the Indian restaurant owners who have established themselves in the Drummond St. area for example. Their treatment is appalling but worse, an Indian 'village' with its rich curry smells, tourists and small businesses will be swept away.”

Individual

- 6.2.27 Many respondents who address socio-economic issues are concerned that mitigation plans for affected businesses and regeneration of the area would be inadequate. A few respondents comment on what they see as a lack of plans to relocate affected small businesses. Respondents also express concerns that new businesses moving in to the area as a result of regeneration activities and expansions to Euston Station may be large chains rather than independent businesses.

“Opportunities for developers should not be at the expense of the existing Community. The community are very happy with the shops and businesses it has already, and very distressed to be losing some as a direct result of HS2”

Individual

- 6.2.28 Other respondents express concern about the potential loss of local jobs due to the demolition of business premises and disruption to local trade. A few go on to argue that any new retail job opportunities at the station would be of lower quality than the jobs which would be lost, and would therefore be inadequate as replacements.
- 6.2.29 A view commonly expressed in responses concentrating on CFAs 1, 2 and 3 is that the local communities would face lengthy disruption with no benefits to the area. Some of these respondents believe that the proposed regeneration plan for the area would not be effective. Others comment that previously considered local regeneration alternatives would have been preferable to those proposed in current plans. There is a perception among respondents that there would be little or no new jobs or infrastructure developments that would benefit Camden residents.
- 6.2.30 A couple of respondents make comments in favour of the proposals, agreeing that the development would bring additional jobs to the area. A handful of respondents argue that while they think HS2 may create jobs overall, the benefits would not be felt by Camden residents.
- 6.2.31 The potential impact on property values and saleability is mentioned as a concern by a number of respondents. Many of these refer to properties across a wider area than those expected to be compensated. Respondents' main concern is the devaluing of properties that are likely to be affected by construction works, either directly or indirectly (for example through increased traffic) and the difficulty of selling these properties due to uncertainty about the extent to which they would be affected.
- 6.2.32 Some respondents suggest improvements to mitigation and compensation arrangements. Only those comments directly relating to CFA 1 are reflected here. Among those discussing compensation, there is widespread concern that property values in the Euston Station area would be severely affected by the construction work, but that these effects would cover a much wider area than would be compensated. Many of these respondents think that the direct monetary compensation arrangements should be made available to more home owners and tenants. Some respondents believe that mitigation work (such as installing double glazed windows to keep out noise) should be paid for by HS2 Ltd over a much wider area within CFA 1. Some respondents, including organisations such as Regents Park Ward, Regents Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee and the HS2 Euston community forum, argue that current mitigation proposals are wholly inadequate, and need to be significantly rethought. Some respondents, including the Transport Salaried Staff's Association, think that the socio-economic assessment of the Euston area is not sufficiently comprehensive.

“The draft ES does not deal with these issues in the depth that is required 40 Melton Street (Network Rail), 22 Melton Street (Grant Thornton) and the Association's office at 10 Melton Street all receive part line mentions (final part of paragraph 10.5.7) despite the fact that hundreds of jobs are located at these buildings. Three hotels in the area and Wolfson House (UCL) all receive greater mentions (in paragraphs 10.5.5 and 10.5.6).”

Transport Salaried Staff's Association

Air quality

- 6.2.33 A number of respondents raise concerns about the effect of the Proposed Scheme on air quality in the area. This includes general comments which argue that additional pollution in the area is unacceptable. More specific comments are discussed below.
- 6.2.34 Some respondents emphasise the effects of construction activities on air quality, particularly around dust affecting people's health, and drifting into their homes. Respondents are also worried about air pollution from construction-related traffic.
- 6.2.35 A few additional concerns are raised about pollution that the Proposed Scheme would bring to the area once the line is operational. Respondents believe that further air pollution could result from additional taxis and buses needed to bring increased numbers of people to and from Euston Station. The response submitted by the Environment Committee on behalf of the London Assembly goes into some detail on this issue:

“The proposed scheme will mean that children will no longer be safe to play outside due to the dust created during construction and the pollution from the trains thereafter.”

Individual

- 6.2.36 Some respondents refer to existing pollution problems in the London Borough of Camden. A few of these mention already high levels of NO₂, or comment that parts of the borough are Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). There is concern that the Proposed Scheme would exacerbate such issues, or would undermine current plans to improve air quality in the area. Euston Road is often mentioned in relation to current air pollution.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.2.37 A number of respondents are concerned about noise, especially during the construction works. While comments generally focus on the construction work itself, some respondents also express concern about the effects of related activities, such as HGV movements. Some respondents say that night time and weekend work would be particularly disruptive due to its effect on local residents' sleeping patterns and leisure activities.

“The Draft Environmental Statement fails to consider the substantial negative effects on residents of Drummond Street and the surrounding streets from noise and vibration caused by construction work on Euston Station at night and at weekends.”

Individual

- 6.2.38 A few respondents are concerned about the effect of noise on the working or learning environment in local businesses and schools. Some refer to the negative impact of distracting noises on children's education.

“The draft ES has not taken account of the full range of impacts, such as noise, dust and vibration, that will have an effect on schools across the borough and consequently on the levels of educational attainment.”

Individual

- 6.2.39 Noise and vibration are also mentioned in relation to proposed tunnels, with respondents expressing concern about impacts on the properties under which the tunnels would run. Some of these respondents are concerned about noise levels once train services operate on HS2, while others are worried about long term subsidence effects due to vibrations.
- 6.2.40 A number of respondents discuss the need for mitigation in relation to noise and vibration. Many of these think that more comprehensive plans to protect residents from noise are needed. Such plans, they argue, should include measures such as property noise insulation, double glazing and noise barriers, and should apply to more houses than the current proposals indicate, including those further away from the route, but still affected by noise, and houses that are on HGV traffic routes that would be affected for a period of time.
- 6.2.41 A few respondents ask for more comprehensive information to be made available on the expected levels of noise and some argue that more baseline noise data needs to be gathered.

Traffic and transport

- 6.2.42 The impact of construction traffic on the area is frequently emphasised in respondents' comments. Most are concerned that these extra vehicles would add to congestion in what respondents describe as an already busy road network. Some respondents argue that increased congestion across Camden (CFA 1, 2 and 3) is likely to have knock-on effects across North London. Specific roads that respondents are worried about include Cobourg Street, Arlington Road, Inverness Street and Euston Road.
- 6.2.43 Some respondents are concerned that road closures would make accessing certain locations more difficult, or increase their personal journey times because they would need to make detours. Particular roads mentioned in these comments include Cobourg Street, Hampstead Road, Eversholt Street, Mornington Street, Park Village East, and Stephenson Way. This last road is described by The Royal College of Ophthalmologists as a principal access route.
- 6.2.44 Another issue that several respondents comment on is the potential impact on traffic flow of the proposed demolition and reconstruction of bridges, such as Granby Terrace and Mornington Street.
- 6.2.45 Several respondents comment that the project would continue to cause traffic problems beyond construction, due to the increased bus and taxi use around Euston Station. The response submitted by the Environment Committee on behalf of the London Assembly raises concerns about the impact if additional rail users on the local vehicle, cycle, and pedestrian infrastructure, and argues that the increased numbers would have a very significant impact on the area. Camden Council shares these concerns:

“Camden Council would like to highlight that it is critical that adequate capacity is provided at Euston Station in advance of the implementation of Phase 1 of HS2 (the proposed scheme), including not only the concourse and underground services, but the public realm and pedestrian network around the station, as a significant number of HS2 passengers will use this area plus continue their onward travel by foot. Furthermore, there would be a significant increase in demand for bus facilities which will require significant investment through the proposal.”

Camden Council

- 6.2.46 Some respondents who make comments relevant to CFAs 1, 2, and 3 are worried that increased levels of construction traffic would make the roads more dangerous, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists, but also for other road users. Suggestions include training for HGV drivers in driving safely in domestic neighbourhoods, cycle lanes remaining open, and provision for pedestrians to cross roads safely in areas in which traffic flows are increased.
- 6.2.47 The impact on bus routes is a concern for a few respondents. It is important to them that these are minimally affected by the proposals.
- 6.2.48 Some respondents comment on operational capacity issues and the interface with other transport networks at Euston Station, notably the effect of increased congestion on London Underground services (especially at peak times), but also other rail, road, pedestrian and cycling connections. Several respondents, including the London Borough of Camden and the Greater London Authority, support commitment to the construction of the proposed Crossrail 2 project, which they think would alleviate increased pressure on transport links at Euston. Some respondents voice concern about the additional impact that future associated station upgrade work would have on their lives.
- 6.2.49 A few respondents believe that it would be preferable for construction and waste materials to be transported by rail or canal in order to minimise the impact on road traffic. The London Borough of Camden argues that such options should be used wherever possible and should have been investigated more thoroughly as part of the draft ES.
- 6.2.50 Some respondents, including the London Borough of Camden and the Greater London Authority, make comments about the methodology for the transport impact assessments. These respondents often state that current levels of assessment are inadequate, and that until the final assessment is published in the formal ES, there is not sufficient information for them to meaningfully comment. Some respondents make similar remarks about the assessments of cumulative effects, which respondents think need more detail. The London Borough of Camden, for example, requests that assessments of traffic and transport impacts are conducted jointly for CFAs 1-3 due to expected interaction between the impacts on these areas.
- 6.2.51 In other comments respondents suggest that the formal ES should explicitly address knock-on effects between traffic and other topics, and assess the impact of increased traffic on noise, air quality and other environmental aspects.

“It is considered that a detailed Transport Assessment is required as part of the formal ES, to ensure that the proposed construction works can be accommodated safely and within the operational capacity of the local highway network, without causing congestion, delays and significant disruption to local businesses and nearby residents.”

University College London

Cultural heritage

- 6.2.52 Some respondents comment on the potential impact of the Proposed Scheme on listed buildings in CFAs 1, 2 and 3, stating that some of these would be demolished or risk incurring damage from tunnelling and other construction works.
- 6.2.53 Of particular concern to many respondents, including English Heritage, is the potential negative effect on properties at Park Village East. Some respondents think that the draft ES underestimates the impact on these properties. For example, respondents specify that the listed status of buildings could obstruct proposed soundproofing measures such as double glazing, and that this is not noted in the draft ES. A few respondents are concerned about how listed buildings are represented on the relevant map, and argue that each listed building should be marked separately to better illustrate the extent of potential impacts.
- 6.2.54 The Royal College of General Practitioners seeks assurance that its Grade II* listed headquarters would be minimally impacted by the proposals, which it argues would involve significant disturbance very near to their premises.
- 6.2.55 Some respondents express concerns about other, non-listed, heritage assets. For example English Heritage argues that St James’s Gardens and the associated burial ground are more valuable than the draft ES indicates, even though they are not listed.

“Other examples of significant historic buildings in the vicinity of Euston Square should be mentioned including the pair of lodges, LNWR War Memorial, Friends House, Euston Fire Station and St Pancras Church.”

Greater London Authority

- 6.2.56 A few respondents, including the Greater London Authority, think that a more thorough baseline assessment needs to be carried out on the area and that this should include a comprehensive list of all Grade I and Grade II listed buildings.
- 6.2.57 Additional areas and places which respondents are concerned about include Mornington Terrace, The York and Albany, North Gower Street and Drummond Street. An example of a specific concern is potential damage to cellars located under North Gower Street as a result of increased HGV traffic.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.2.58 Some respondents voice concern about the impact of the proposals on green and open spaces around Euston. The temporary or permanent loss of these spaces is regarded as a detrimental impact on local ecology as well as visual beauty. Specific places mentioned include public gardens such as Euston Square Gardens and St James's Gardens. A few respondents specifically mention the value of open space for children. A small number of respondents add that they are concerned about the possible loss of mature trees in these parks.
- 6.2.59 Several respondents think that HS2 would negatively affect the character of the parts of London it passes through. Some respondents who discuss this issue are primarily concerned about the effects of the construction phase, such as “ugly” scaffolding structures. Others are more concerned about the longer term effect of putting a new high speed railway through this area, stating that it would not be in fitting with the character of the area and would detract from its charm.

“None of the photomontages show that the works proposed for the new bridge works show any sympathy with the existing streetscape. All the bridge supports are blank concrete structures, for example. The existing bridges etc. are an integral part of Camden Town’s appeal and brand, and its sense of place.”

Elm Village Tenants and Residents Association

Other issues

- 6.2.60 A number of respondents express a preference for the terminus to be located at Old Oak Common rather than Euston, in order to avoid the negative effects on the Camden area. Additional alternatives, each mentioned by a small number of respondents, include making use of Paddington or Stratford International.
- 6.2.61 A number of respondents express reservations about the redevelopment of Euston Station and the “latest proposals”, and express the view that previous proposals would have been better for the area. Some prefer the double deck station design, while others, including Railfuture, prefer the ‘Euston Cross’ design. Euston community forum argues that the current proposals for station design represent the “worst possible option”. Euston Area Plan’s submission contains detailed reference to design aspects of the proposals. As part of this, they suggest their own proposals for the design of Euston Station to maximise benefits to the area, which mainly focus on economic factors. The Greater London Authority and the London Borough of Camden also make detailed comments on the design of the station, and make specific comments about issues such as ‘green infrastructure’, improving access arrangements and including cycle parking.
- 6.2.62 Some respondents think that the entirety of the route in this CFA should be placed in a tunnel to minimise disruption.
- 6.2.63 Northamptonshire County Council is concerned that modifications to Euston Station would negatively affect the conventional rail links to Northamptonshire. They seek assurances that this would not be the case, and expect to see more detailed information on this in the formal ES.

- 6.2.64 Some organisations, including the Greater London Authority and the Environment Agency, are concerned that work on Euston Station could increase the risk of flooding in the area. They seek assurance that this risk is appropriately mitigated.
- 6.2.65 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topics of agriculture, ecology, and land quality, explicitly in relation to CFA 1.

6.3 Camden Town and HS1 Link (CFA 2)

Overview

- 6.3.1 The Camden Town and HS1 Link community forum area (CFA) extends from York Way (the A5200) in the east to Regent's Park Road Bridge in the west. The Proposed Scheme is approximately 2.2km in length in this CFA and mostly would be provided along the disused railway formation of the existing North London Line. The link with HS1 is located to the east of York Way in the London Borough of Islington. However, other than the physical connection to HS1 and minor track works, there would be no construction to the east of York Way and all other works in this part of the Proposed Scheme are entirely within the London Borough of Camden.
- 6.3.2 A total of 742 respondents explicitly address the Camden Town and HS1 Link (CFA 2) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 2. Some also refer to specific sections of the CFA 2 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.3.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 2 report are summarised below by topic. Many of the comments made in relation to CFA 2 address broader issues covering CFA 1, 2 and 3. Issues which are shared with these other areas are only briefly mentioned in this section of the report, and are discussed fully in section 6.1.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.3.4 See section 6.1.4-7 for cross-cutting issues relevant to CFAs 1, 2 and 3.

Overarching issues for CFA 2

- 6.3.5 A key issue for respondents commenting on this area is the loss of housing, and the associated forced removal of residents. Specific issues discussed include the impact on individuals, the effect on the wider community, and proposals for mitigation.
- 6.3.6 A related issue is the effect that the Proposed Scheme would have on the character of the area. Respondents' concerns include the effect of demolition of listed and culturally important buildings, which are often described as integral to the character of the area.
- 6.3.7 The expected negative effects of construction work and associated traffic is another widely discussed issue. Respondents' concerns include the effects on people's health and lifestyles, and the impact the construction works would have on journey times locally.

- 6.3.8 Many respondents also express concern about a loss of businesses in the area resulting from construction and demolition works. Camden market is highlighted as an important tourist destination, and some respondents are concerned that the market would attract fewer visitors due to the intrusion of construction work, and closures of certain parts of the market. Broad concerns about the impacts of the HS1 link cover many of the topic areas below.
- 6.3.9 The Greater London Authority makes detailed comments on the draft ES, covering all of the themes discussed below in some detail. The response highlights a number of areas where the Authority believes additional assessment is required, where it thinks relevant information is missing and where it suggests additional mitigation arrangements are needed.
- 6.3.10 The response submitted by the Environment Committee on behalf of the London Assembly goes into significant detail addressing all of the topic areas discussed below. A very detailed response was also received from the London Borough of Camden.

Community

- 6.3.11 Around a third of all respondents addressing CFA 2 express concern about the demolition and loss of property in the area. Many of these respondents argue that the demolition of houses and the forced relocation of residents is unacceptable. Respondents often cite this as the primary reason for their opposition to HS2. Some respondents also discuss more specific issues. A common concern is that the demolition of property would exacerbate what respondents describe as the current shortage of housing in the borough of Camden and in London more generally. Some are concerned that due to the housing shortage, it would not be possible to relocate displaced residents within the area. Some respondents emphasise that it would be inappropriate to relocate residents who have lived in the same place for a long time.
- 6.3.12 In addition to the figures discussed above, an organised response was submitted, expressing concerns about the perceived negative effects of property loss, with an emphasis on the uncertainty of current re-housing proposals.
- 6.3.13 There are widespread concerns among respondents that the proposed construction of HS2 would break up communities in Camden. There are particular concerns about residents being forced to leave, but respondents also believe other factors such as road closures could have a divisive effect on the area. Respondents discussing these issues often describe the community in Camden as being particularly diverse and close-knit.
- 6.3.14 A number of respondents voice concern about disruption to the community caused by construction works. Some of these comments are discussed below under 'transport', but not all respondents who speak of disruption to the community give specific examples.
- 6.3.15 Some respondents are worried about the expected loss of green spaces in the area, including Camden Gardens.

“Taking our precious green spaces without definite written plans for replacement is unacceptable. Requiring others for 10 years for construction works is equally unacceptable. 10 years is an entire childhood.”

Individual

- 6.3.16 A small number of respondents express their concern about the expected closure of Ivy House Dental Practice, sometimes adding that other practices in the area may not have spare capacity.

Socio-economics

- 6.3.17 Comments about socio-economic issues are broadly similar to those discussed in relation to CFA 1. Many respondents discuss issues affecting CFA 1, CFA 2, and CFA 3 without distinguishing between these areas. These issues are discussed in detail in section 6.1, and cover topics such as the effect of the Proposed Scheme on house prices and the potential loss of local businesses and jobs. Issues discussed here are those that relate specifically to CFA 2.
- 6.3.18 Some respondents raise concern about the effect that the proposed plans would have on the viability of Camden Market and Camden Town as a tourist destination. One concern is that increased difficulty in accessing the market during the construction period would negatively affect visitor numbers. Another concern is that construction activities would significantly impact the character of the area, making it less desirable to travel to. A few respondents argue that the duration of disruption over a number of years would cause permanent damage to the market as stallholders move elsewhere, to the detriment of the market’s reputation.

“Camden Council is concerned that the impacts on Camden Markets have been hugely underestimated. The proposed works would affect the main entrances to Camden Lock, Stables and Hawley Wharf markets are shown in the map book as a construction compound. The viability of the entirety of the markets is therefore at risk. This needs to be cross referenced with the socio-economic assessment and considered a priority for mitigation.”

Camden Council

- 6.3.19 A couple of respondents believe that there would be long term effects of increased train traffic through the market and town centre, affecting the enjoyment of visitors due to noise and visual impact.
- 6.3.20 The effect that HS2 would have on proposed regeneration works at Hawley Wharf, and the associated new school is mentioned by some respondents, who express concern that these works would become non-viable if HS2 were to go ahead. Some comment that the school is “*much needed*”. The London Borough of Camden is among those commenting that the effect on Hawley Wharf has not been recognised in the draft ES.

- 6.3.21 Respondents also comment on the impact the proposals would have on a number of businesses and cultural ventures in this area. Comments from local ventures suggest that their location and setting are important to the success and continuity of their activities, and that relocation may lead them to close down, resulting in a loss of jobs as well as community facilities. Some respondents express particular concern about the effect of the Proposed Scheme on businesses associated with the Elm Village estate. Camden Council outlines a number of community facilities that it is concerned would be affected, including the Roundhouse performance art space.

Traffic and transport

- 6.3.22 As discussed in section 6.1 above, some respondents are concerned about the impact of the project on roads across CFAs 1, 2, and 3 – many of which respondents say are already congested. Comments discussed here are those relating specifically to CFA 2.
- 6.3.23 A number of respondents who discuss traffic issues across Camden are particularly concerned that there might be gridlock or severe disruption in areas included in CFA 2. This includes a large number of comments that are part of an organised response.
- 6.3.24 Specific roads about which respondents express concern in CFA 2 include Kentish Town Road, Jeffrey's Street, and Hawley Road.

“Whilst some disruption will be unavoidable a proper assessment of how you can keep transport accessible and moving is essential. Even with a single lane closure around Camden Town we can experience significant tail backs in and around the Camden Town transport node with roads blocked from Camden Road back to Chalk Farm Station, Kentish Town Road, Mornington Crescent and Holloway Road.”

Individual

- 6.3.25 The impact of road closures due to construction work is commented on by many respondents, including several members of the public whose views are summarised by the Camden Liberal Democratic Party in their consultation response (supported by 188 signatures). Proposed works on the eight bridges within the area are another common concern, with many respondents expressing concerns about the potential associated disruption to traffic flow. The Canal and River Trust highlights the damaging effect of construction traffic going over two bridges owned by the Trust: Camden Street Bridge, and Camden Road North Bridge. More generally, the Trust emphasises that any modifications to bridges should not be detrimental to the ability of river traffic to use the waterway.

“HS2 proposes to replace EIGHT of the bridges across our roads to the north of Camden Town. [...] The disruption will be ENORMOUS and will go on and on and last for eight years from January 2017. We’ve all seen what minor works to water mains on Camden Road, for example, caused in March. But we’re being told the impact of each bridge’s replacement, which will take three months, won’t add more than a couple of minutes to our journeys. Who are they kidding? This will delay EVERYONE whose journey crosses Camden Town, including Overground train users.”

Individual

- 6.3.26 Additionally, the prevalence of one-way streets in Camden is mentioned as an issue by some respondents, who are concerned that finding alternative routes when roads are closed can be difficult, especially for those who do not live in the area.

“We have tortuous one - way systems making it difficult even with local knowledge to find alternative routes and disperse. Adding to this existing situation by closing roads, lanes, increased lorries, works traffic will cause intolerable jams and pollution.”

Individual

- 6.3.27 As discussed in more detail in section 6.1, a few respondents are worried that increased levels of construction traffic would make the roads more dangerous, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists, but also for other road users.
- 6.3.28 Some respondents are concerned about the impact of the proposals on current overground rail services. One worry is that works on the North London Line would affect services in and out of Camden which are used by local residents. Some respondents add that reliance on rail services is likely to be increased by the proposed works affecting road access, which would amplify the effect of any rail disruption. Another concern is that additional passengers from HS2 could overload current services in the area. Islington Council makes detailed comments on the effect that the proposals would have on passenger rail capacity throughout North London.
- 6.3.29 Camden Town District Management Committee (responding on behalf of various tenant and residents’ associations) wonders whether the disused South Kentish Town station could be reopened during the construction phase to mitigate some of the traffic problems. They also think that Camden Town underground station is likely to be redeveloped as a consequence of the proposals, but are worried that the effects of this are not mentioned in the draft ES.
- 6.3.30 A few respondents mention that the five-way junction where Hawley Road, Camden Street and Jeffrey’s Street join Kentish Town Road was an accident blackspot before the temporary closure of Jeffrey’s Street. They think that it may therefore be unwise to use Jeffrey’s Street for construction traffic.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.3.31 As discussed in section 6.1, many residents express concerns that HS2 would negatively affect the character of the parts of London through which it passes. Some respondents add that parts of CFA 2, including Camden Town and Camden Market, have a unique charm that would not be in keeping with the proposed plans.

"I do not believe that it is appropriate for HS2 trains to travel on a viaduct through densely packed streets full of Georgian and Victorian terraces."

Individual

- 6.3.32 Some respondents are particularly concerned about the visual impact on the Victorian bridges which cross Regent's Canal, which they see as integral to the character of the area, adding that modifying them would detract from the unique character of Camden.

"There is no reference to the significance of Camden Town as one of London's top visitor destinations attracting thousands visitors each week from across the globe. The Council considers that major bridge works to Camden Town's iconic bridges will have severe effects on the ability of the Town Centre to function and remain viable."

Camden Council

Cultural heritage

- 6.3.33 As discussed above, some respondents comment on modifications to the Victorian bridges in the area.

- 6.3.34 A few respondents are concerned about the effect that the use of Jeffrey's Street by construction vehicles would have on the listed buildings there. Specific concerns include vibrations causing structural damage to fragile buildings, traffic disturbing the quiet character of the street, and that the road is unsuitable for heavy vehicles because of cellars beneath it.

"Jeffrey's Street cannot possibly be used as a shortcut for lorries carrying materials for HS2. It is a very narrow road, with fragile and old Georgian houses on each side."

Individual

- 6.3.35 English Heritage is concerned that the Grade II* Listed building, Camden Roundhouse, is not mentioned in the CFA report.

- 6.3.36 A few respondents mention specific buildings and bridges which they are concerned would be negatively affected. These include Camden Road Station and the North London Railway's 1850 brick viaduct. The Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society makes comments about a few bridges in the area, including some suggestions to mitigate impacts of the Proposed Scheme.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.3.37 Concerns about the effects of sound on local people are as discussed in section 6.1. Most respondents consider CFAs 1, 2, and 3 together in relation to these issues. The main areas of concern are the effect of noise on residents' quality of life and health, and the damaging effects of vibrations on older buildings.

"[...] as I approach 70 the prospect of a 10 year construction period makes it likely that I will never again enjoy the currently tranquil corner I currently occupy."

Individual

“The prospect of being surrounded by noise from weekend possessions on the Camden Road Station viaduct, week day congestion from construction traffic on Jeffrey’s Street and the aggravated travelling conditions resulting from road and rail closures is deeply depressing.”

Individual

- 6.3.38 A small number of respondents, including Elm Village Tenants and Residents Association, are further concerned that cumulative effects (such as more than one train passing at once) could drive sound levels much higher than suggested in the draft ES. Some respondents highlight that they are already experiencing noise from other train routes.

Air quality

- 6.3.39 Concerns about the effects on air quality are as discussed in section 6.1. Most respondents considered CFAs 1, 2, and 3 together in relation to these issues. Their main areas of concern are the health effects of pollution and dust caused by construction work as well as pollution associated with the functioning of HS2 once it is complete.

Other issues

- 6.3.40 Many respondents argue that the link to HS1 should be placed in a tunnel to minimise the impact on the surrounding area. Some respondents question whether this possibility has been given enough consideration, and argue that the human cost to Camden residents should be given as much weight as the financial cost of tunnelling.

“[...] the obvious mitigation option to tunnel the short distance from Primrose Hill to St Pancras is not considered (apparently only on the grounds of cost) a clear admission that to cheapen the project, the environmental burden will be offloaded onto Camden residents. Instead of a true High Speed link offered by the tunnel and minimal environmental impact to Camden, a self evident piece of inadequate infrastructure is proposed failing in virtually all respects to contribute to a sustainable high speed network.”

Individual

- 6.3.41 Some respondents are specifically opposed to the current plans for the HS1 link. According to a few respondents the proposals for this section of track are inadequate with regard to capacity. Freightliner Group thinks that the current proposals may have a significant knock-on effect on freight capacity on the West Coast Mainline and North London Line.
- 6.3.42 As discussed in section 6.1, a number of respondents commenting on CFAs 1, 2, and 3 would prefer the terminus to be located at Old Oak Common rather than Euston Station.
- 6.3.43 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topics of agriculture, ecology, land quality, and water resources and flood risk assessment, explicitly in relation to CFA 2.

6.3 Primrose Hill to Kilburn (Camden) (CFA 3)

Overview

- 6.3.1 The Primrose Hill to Kilburn (Camden) community forum area (CFA) covers a 3.6km section of the Proposed Scheme running in twin bore tunnels between CFA 4 (Old Oak Common) and CFA 1 (Euston Station). It also includes the 2.7km single bore tunnel between CFA 4 (Old Oak Common) and CFA 2 (HS1 Link). This area lies wholly in the London Borough of Camden. The route passes to the south of Camden Town and the north of Primrose Hill and St John's Wood. The CFA is bounded by Camden Parkway in the south and Kilburn High Road in the west.
- 6.3.2 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the Primrose Hill to Kilburn (Camden) (CFA 3) report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs, and an outline of the key issues for CFA 3.
- 6.3.3 There are 574 respondents explicitly addressing the Primrose Hill to Kilburn (CFA 3) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 3, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 3 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.3.4 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 3 report are summarised below by topic. The majority of the comments made in relation to CFA 3 address broader issues covering CFA 1, 2 and 3. Issues which are shared with these other areas are only briefly mentioned in this section of the report, and are discussed in full in section 6.1.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.3.5 Cross-cutting issues relevant to CFAs 1, 2 and 3 are discussed in detail in 6.1.

Overarching issues for CFA 3

- 6.3.6 A number of respondents mention disruption caused by construction work as a concern.
- 6.3.7 Respondents are also worried about noise from high speed trains running underground once the Proposed Scheme is operational.
- 6.3.8 The impact of noise and traffic disruption is commonly linked to specific communities, such a Primrose Hill.
- 6.3.9 The visual and environmental impacts of vent shafts on nearby communities are of concern to some respondents.
- 6.3.10 The Greater London Authority makes detailed comments on the draft ES, covering all of the themes discussed below in some detail. The response highlights a number of areas where the Authority believes additional assessment is required, where it thinks relevant information is missing and where it suggests additional mitigation arrangements are needed.
- 6.3.11 The response submitted by the Environment Committee on behalf of the London Assembly also goes into significant detail addressing all of the topic areas discussed below. A very detailed response was also received from the London Borough of Camden.

Community

- 6.3.12 Few respondents separately discuss community impacts which relate to CFA 3. Rather, most of these are considered for CFAs 1, 2 and 3 together and reported in section 6.1. In summary, the main issues respondents identify in this context are: the expected loss of accommodation and business premises across Camden; the impact of disruptions caused by construction traffic on the functioning of the community; and the need for appropriate compensation for these effects. Primrose Hill is specifically mentioned in a number of comments. Some respondents are concerned the area would be significantly affected by construction traffic; some highlight residents' uncertainty about the level of disruption that trains passing through tunnels would cause. A few respondents also specifically mention Kilburn. A handful of these argue that very little mitigation is proposed for this area, which is considered a significant oversight.
- 6.3.13 A number of respondents voice concern about possible damage to properties and buildings as a result of tunnelling works, most commonly referring to structural damage due to subsidence. Some respondents raise concerns about the impact of vibrations from the tunnelling machines.
- 6.3.14 Similarly, some respondents believe continued structural damage may occur due to vibrations from passing trains once the Proposed Scheme is operational.
- 6.3.15 A few respondents propose that the tunnels be built under land that is already owned by railway companies. Many of these respondents argue that there are overground tracks very near to the proposed route, which the tunnel could follow. This point is sometimes made generally, and sometimes specifically in relation to tunnels under Gloucester Avenue, which runs parallel to a section of railway.

“[...]make a very slight deviation of the propose rail track so you can tunnel underneath the existing railway line next to our buildings and avoid the danger to our blocks, even though the disruption and noise while you tunnel will be disruptive in the extreme, but would be short term.”

Darwin Court Residents and Leaseholders Association

- 6.3.16 Burnham Tenants and Residents Association is particularly concerned about the effect that tunnelling activities might have on the tower blocks associated with Chalcots Estate, which they say are at risk of incurring damage or even collapsing due to a possible lack of structural integrity. They request a full risk assessment to be carried out on these buildings, or for the tunnels to be diverted away from them.
- 6.3.17 A handful of respondents are concerned that cumulative effects with existing projects in the area would mean that disruption times would be longer than proposed.
- 6.3.18 Alexandra and Ainsworth Tenants and Residents Association is concerned that the location of the proposed Alexandra Place vent shaft would make current proposals for regenerating the Alexandra and Ainsworth estate impossible to achieve, and would negatively impact on the Alexandra Road Conservation Area. The London Borough of Camden shares these concerns, and adds that this estate is Grade II* listed. The Greater London Authority also comments on the impact of the Alexandra Place vent shaft:

“The Formal ES should also make every effort to avoid the loss of the community facilities detailed in the Draft ES on the impact of the Alexandra Place Vent Shaft. A 1 km walk to alternative facilities is considered significant by the GLA and TfL and should be re-provided if the loss can not be avoided.”

Individual

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.3.19 Respondents’ primary comments on sound, noise and vibration are shared with CFAs 1 and 2 and are discussed in full in section 6.1. Issues include the negative effect of construction noise on quality of life, the impact of noise on institutions such as businesses and schools, and the need for effective mitigation arrangements to minimise noise disruption.
- 6.3.20 Respondents making specific comments relevant to CFA 3 often highlight their worries about the effect of tunnelling works and operation, such as structural damage caused by ground subsidence and vibrations, as discussed in section 6.3.16 above.
- 6.3.21 Noise is also mentioned by some respondents, with a small number arguing that additional assessment is required to determine the noise levels that the trains would produce.

Traffic and transport

- 6.3.22 General concerns about the impact of construction work on traffic and transport links in the borough of Camden are as discussed in section 6.1. Issues highlighted include the disruptive effects of road closures, delays caused by additional construction traffic in an already busy area, and the increased strain on local roads once HS2 is operational.
- 6.3.23 Respondents express specific concern about the impact of construction traffic on Adelaide Road. Some argue that the road is too narrow and some believe it is too busy to be used as a designated route for construction traffic, with respondents suggesting that this would have severe implications for traffic flow in the area.

“My main concern is with much increased congestion along Adelaide Road. Busy at the best of times, it cannot take 100s of construction trucks all day. Bus routes will be affected as also pedestrian flow.”

Individual

- 6.3.24 West Hampstead Gardens and Residents Association express concerns about increased traffic in St John’s Wood, West Hampstead, and South Hampstead, as well as the effects of road closures in these areas.

Landscape and visual assessment, and Ecology

- 6.3.25 A proposed vent shaft in the Adelaide Road nature reserve is the subject of several comments, with respondents, including Camden Council, expressing concern about the effect that it would have on views within the reserve, and views of the reserve from the surrounding area. Respondents value the nature reserve for its positive impact on the wider area and think that this would be compromised if the vent shaft were built. Camden Council adds that the reserve is used by community groups, including local primary schools, as well as the public. The Council suggests that a turf roof and walls would mitigate the visual impacts caused by the shaft.
- 6.3.26 The Camden Railway Heritage Trust expresses anxiety that the vent shaft would obstruct views to the Grade II* listed Primrose Hill Tunnel East Portals.
- 6.3.27 The response from Adelaide Local Nature Reserve details a number of important species living in the reserve. It also suggests there are errors in the draft ES in relation to the reserve. Its main concern is that the vent shaft site should be located outside of the actively managed part of the reserve, and it proposes some mitigation arrangements to minimise the impact on wildlife.
- 6.3.28 The Greater London Authority is opposed to the vent shaft taking up nature reserve land. It says it understands that alternative sites have been identified, and expects them to be included in the formal ES.

Cultural heritage

- 6.3.29 The English Folk Dance and Song Society is concerned that Cecil Sharp House, its Grade II listed headquarters, is not mentioned in the draft ES, despite its close proximity to the proposed route. They request all possible mitigation to avoid the noise of trains impacting on their musical activities, and wish to be included in the baseline noise level survey. A handful of other respondents also mention Cecil Sharp House as an important location that needs to be protected.
- 6.3.30 West Hampstead Gardens and Residents Association emphasises that Swiss Cottage Library is an important piece of architecture, and argues that better mitigation arrangements are needed to ensure that it does not come to harm.

Socio-economics

- 6.3.31 General comments about socio-economic issues for the borough of Camden are discussed in section 6.1. Issues respondents mention include: the impact of the proposals on local businesses through disruption of local traffic; demolition of premises and accompanying noise; the impact of the proposals on house prices and saleability; and the need for appropriate mitigation of these issues.
- 6.3.32 Camden Council makes detailed comments on socio-economic issues relevant to CFA 3, including concern about the impact on low-cost business spaces such as those on Loudoun Road.

“The Council would like to stress that the low cost work units such as those at Loudoun Road provide much needed low cost start up space for businesses, a resource which is scarce in Camden.”

Individual

Air quality

6.3.33 There are few comments about air quality specifically relating to CFA 3. These include concerns about the impacts of dust and air pollution for the wider area, which are discussed in section 6.1.

6.3.34 A small number of respondents are worried about pollution escaping from the vent shafts.

“My main concern is about the air shafts that will disperse dust and debris into my neighbourhood can we expect more nasal and chest complaints which we will be able to trace directly to the polluted air being expelled out.”

Individual

Other issues

6.3.35 A few respondents, including Darwin Court Residents Association, express concerns about the way that the consultation process has been handled in this area (more general comments about the consultation process are addressed in section 5.4). Some respondents say that they were given very short notice (“24 hours”) and incomplete information about the consultation event in this area; others say that they were not informed of the process, or that publicity was insufficient.

“I was recently informed by my local councillor that there was some consultation going on in respect of the environmental impact of the construction on my area. I was disappointed that despite your sending me a letter saying that you had an interest in my property and requesting that I fill out a lengthy form, that you had not taken the trouble to involve me in this consultation. It is clear that being around 50m from the proposed shaft on Adelaide Road, I am going to be severely impacted by this project and it would have been very easy for you to have made the effort to contact me directly.”

Individual

6.3.36 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topics of agriculture, land quality, and water resources and flood risk assessment in relation to CFA 3.

6.4 Kilburn (Brent) to Old Oak Common (CFA 4)

Overview

- 6.4.1 This area extends from Kilburn High Road in the east to Park Royal Road in the west. It lies partly within the London Borough of Brent, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, the City of Westminster, the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham and the London Borough of Ealing. The adjacent community forum areas (CFAs) are Primrose Hill to Kilburn (CFA 3, to the east) and the Northolt Corridor (CFA5, to the west). The area covers a section of the Proposed Scheme that is approximately 5.4km long and is entirely in tunnel, running east to west between Kilburn and North Acton. Kilburn, Kensal Rise and Kensal Green lie to the north of the Proposed Scheme and West Kilburn to the south.
- 6.4.2 There are 130 respondents explicitly addressing the Kilburn (Brent) to Old Oak Common (CFA 4) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 4, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 4 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.4.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 4 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 4.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.4.4 Although some respondents do discuss CFA 4 alongside other CFAs, they do not specifically raise issues that relate to CFA 4 and adjacent CFAs.

Overarching issues for CFA 4

- 6.4.5 The most commonly raised issue in relation to CFA 4 is the proposed closure of Old Oak Common Lane. Many respondents identify this road as an access route they frequently use, for example to get to amenities in East Acton. Others, including respondents indicating that they live on Old Oak Common Lane or the nearby Wells House Road, are concerned that they would have limited access to and from their houses.
- 6.4.6 Some respondents are concerned about the visual impact of the vent shaft at Salisbury Road, and the effect that the vent shaft would have on development plans for the area.
- 6.4.7 A number of respondents who indicate they live in the area around Old Oak Common Lane mention health issues which make them particularly vulnerable to local impacts associated with the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.4.8 The authorities of all London boroughs mentioned in paragraph 6.4.1 above comment in some detail on the effects of the proposed route within their boundaries.
- 6.4.9 The Greater London Authority also submits a detailed response, which includes comments relating to many of the issues raised below.
- 6.4.10 Wells House Road Resident Association makes detailed comments about the the expected impacts of the proposals on their street; the same is true for Kensal Triangle Residents Association, and The Island Triangle Residents Association.

Traffic and transport

- 6.4.11 A high proportion of those respondents making comments relevant to CFA 4 discuss the impacts of the proposed closure of Old Oak Common Lane. Respondents' main concern is the impact the closure would have on residents' daily lives, particularly with regard to accessing amenities in East Acton. A number of respondents mention that local residents also use Old Oak Common Lane to commute to work, to take children to school, and to access Wormwood Scrubs for recreation purposes.

"Access to schools including Old Oak Common, East Acton and Chiswick - any diversions caused by the closure of Old Oak Common Lane would add up to an hour each way to school journeys and would be potentially dangerous for schoolchildren during winter months when sunrise and sunset times are later and earlier respectively"

Various respondents, including Wells House Road Residents Association

- 6.4.12 A number of respondents indicate that some local residents have health concerns and disabilities requiring them to have easy vehicular access to local GP surgeries or hospitals, and worry that the proposed closure of Old Oak Common Lane would seriously affect this.

"From my own point of view, the proposed developments and planned closure of Old Oak Common Lane will have really disastrous consequences. I am a diabetic and not young. I need access to the buses to get to my doctor and Hammersmith Hospital."

Individual

- 6.4.13 Access to Wells House Road is an important issue for some respondents. Concern is raised in a number of comments that residents would lose access to their houses, while others discuss the possibly severe impacts that this would have on day-to-day activities. Respondents emphasise it is imperative that a way is found to maintain some access at all times.
- 6.4.14 A number of respondents express concern about the loss or diversion of bus routes, especially route 228. This route is seen as a lifeline for many residents in the area of Old Oak Common Lane and Wells House Road as it allows them to access basic facilities such as shops, places of worship and healthcare services. Many respondents highlight that they are frail or have disabilities, which causes them anxiety about their ability to walk to relocated bus stops. Some comment on the potential loss of access to other bus services as a result of the Proposed Scheme, mentioning routes 7, 70, 95, 238, 283, 260, and 727 as specific concerns.
- 6.4.15 Respondents think the proposed closure of Old Oak Common Lane would also impede residents' access to other forms of public transport, in particular East Acton and North Acton stations.

"There must be access to East Acton at all times (and I don't mean via the A40) and I need a bus stop closer than east Acton bus station. I moved here less than a year ago for bus service (228) and local station (East Acton) and the park. Please do not cut off every reason that I moved here. - I do not wish to move out, but I won't be able to get to work."

Individual

- 6.4.16 Several respondents argue that the potential impacts of proposed road closures would be exacerbated by a lack of suitable detour routes or alternative public transport options, especially for local journeys. Some respondents argue that the roads which would be used as alternatives to Old Oak Common Lane, such as Victoria Road and the A40, are already congested, and would become even more so if Old Oak Common Lane were to be closed. Some also suggest that the necessary detours are unsuitably long for residents who do not drive a car.

"I would like to add that, with the above closure of Old Oak Common Lane, an obvious consequence of this would be traffic being diverted to surrounding areas (scrubs lane, harrow road, Victoria Road as well all surrounding side roads). The impact of which will be daily traffic congestion. When there has been traffic accidents and subsequent road closures in the past, the whole area is often gridlocked."

Individual

- 6.4.17 Some respondents discuss options to mitigate the impact on traffic and transport in the area. Views on proposed shuttle busses are mixed, with some respondents in favour, while a few others say that they are not suitable as a replacement. There are some comments emphasising a need for late night services to accommodate residents' varied work patterns and lifestyles. Some respondents suggest additional mitigation for vulnerable residents, for example grocery deliveries or minicab transport to nearby transport hubs.

"East Acton is where I do my shopping. I work in Chancery Lane doing admin and I get to work by taking the 228 to East Acton & the central line. I don't get home until 10pm and I would not be safe walking around the area at that time. I would need transport to take me to North Acton for work & cabs or a shuttle bus for all my things in East Acton. I live alone and would be scared of all the changes. I do not want to lose the home I love but would need help with travel during the road closure."

Individual

- 6.4.18 A small number of respondents discuss the impact that the proposed closure would have on emergency service response times due to detours or access difficulties.

"[...] this would also have an impact on emergency services gaining access to the area. I can tell you this from experience as I'm a fire officer for the London Fire Brigade."

Individual

- 6.4.19 Another location that is subject of a few comments about impacts on traffic and transport is the area surrounding the proposed vent shaft at Salusbury Road. Respondents' concern is that construction traffic would add to existing congestion, with specific mention of Kilburn Lane and Harrow Road.

- 6.4.20 Chiltern Railways comments that proposed modifications to parts of the Acton Northolt Line would affect rail services in Northwest London, emphasising that this line is used to support other rail services.
- 6.4.21 A number of respondents suggest that HS2 should connect with other transport networks such as Crossrail and Overground services including the Great Western Main Line. Some respondents also comment on local connectivity, for example improvements to roads, or improving pedestrian and cycling connections to Old Oak Common Station.

“Not providing an Overground station at Old Oak Common will undermine the case for HS2 by leading to excessive crowding at Euston.[...] In addition, TfL are disappointed that no provision is being made at Old Oak Common for a Crossrail 1 link to the WCML.”

Greater London Authority

Cultural heritage

- 6.4.22 The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea expresses concern about the impact on Kensal Green Cemetery as well as a large number of listed buildings and assets associated with the site, including two chapels, and various tombs, walls and structures.
- 6.4.23 A few respondents highlight the importance of minimising impact on the Old Oak Lane Conservation Area.
- 6.4.24 Westminster City Council comments on the impact of the section of the route on listed buildings and residential properties in the Queens Park area. It argues that many of these buildings have structural problems that might be exacerbated by the Proposed Scheme, and that by slightly realigning the tunnel under existing railways, this risk could be minimised.
- 6.4.25 Some respondents mention other specific buildings they believe should be protected from possible impacts including IBM's listed 'Tetris A40' building.

Socio-economics

- 6.4.26 Some respondents are concerned about a perceived lack of compensation arrangements, and highlight the impact that the Proposed Scheme would have on their lives. These comments are often associated with concerns about the closure of Old Oak Common Lane.
- 6.4.27 A few respondents express concern that HS2 would have a negative effect on the value of their houses.
- 6.4.28 Some respondents are concerned about the impact the proposed Salusbury Road vent shaft would have on Brent Council's proposed commercial and residential development in the area. Brent Council makes detailed comments and argues that the shaft would make their current plans impossible, requiring them to compromise on their vision for the area. Queens Park Area Residents Association echoes these concerns and requests that regeneration of the area is included in HS2's proposals.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.4.29 The visual impact associated with the proposed vent shaft at Salusbury Road is of concern to some respondents, including Westminster City Council and Brent Council.

“The location of the ventilation shaft is within the town centre and will be extremely visible, therefore we recommend the level of effect to residential receptors is classed as major adverse.”

Brent Council

- 6.4.30 A couple of respondents comment on the construction and design of Old Oak Common Station. They hope that it would be in keeping with the character of the area, and minimally disruptive.
- 6.4.31 A few respondents commenting on different areas included in CFA 4 request that whatever construction work takes place, every effort is taken to ensure that the area is left as green as possible.

Air quality

- 6.4.32 Respondents commenting on air quality often highlight health problems such as asthma, and express concern that these could be exacerbated by dust and pollution associated with construction and excavation works.

Community

- 6.4.33 Echoing comments discussed in the section on traffic and transport above, respondents regard the anticipated closure of Old Oak Common Lane as potentially divisive, with concern that residents living north of the road would be cut off from the community's centre in East Acton. Similarly, some respondents highlight that road closures may isolate residents of Wells House Road. Some emphasise that local communities include many vulnerable residents whose lives would be severely affected by the disruptions.

“Wells House Road is a road full of elderly and vulnerable people, many of whom have lived there all their lives, much longer than my 17 years. They and I would find the proposed work on Old Oak Common lane troubling, and who in their right mind at a certain age will trust to walk through the proposed pedestrian tunnel at night. Please think about this.”

Individual

- 6.4.34 Wormwood Scrubs is seen by respondents as a key community facility and described as the only easily accessible green area for many local residents. Respondents voice concern that the anticipated closure of Old Oak Common Land would reduce the accessibility of Wormwood Scrubs.
- 6.4.35 Another recreational amenity that respondents mention is the playground at the junction between Midland Terrace and Victoria Road. A number of respondents emphasise the need to maintain access to the playground for local residents and their children.
- 6.4.36 A few respondents, including the Island Triangle Residents' Association, emphasise that the formal ES should include specific information with regard to impacts on the Island Triangle, an area including Old Oak Lane, Goodhall Street, Stephenson Street, Crewe Place and Stoke Place.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.4.37 A few respondents are concerned about structural impacts on local properties due to vibrations from tunnelling activities, especially near the Salusbury Road Vent Shaft.

Other issues

- 6.4.38 A few respondents ask for more detailed information on alternative options for the proposed route, including the location of the proposed vent shaft at Salusbury Road.

“Deciding that the vent should remain at Salusbury road location simply because of the duration of the build is insufficient. [...] Full analysis of all available options to be provided and detailed reasons for why each one is discounted as an alternative must be provided.”

Individual

- 6.4.39 Some respondents express dissatisfaction at the late publication of changes to the plans for this CFA, and argue that HS2 Ltd has made insufficient attempts to communicate information to residents likely to be affected.

“Insufficient time and information to prepare a considered response. The information received from HS2 is misleading and not in the least transparent particularly in light of the late communication with regard to the closure of Old Oak Common Road and in particular with regard to the communications regarding LAND TAKE in Wells House Road arriving through the door the evening before the response is due.”

Individual

- 6.4.40 One respondent also draws attention to the travellers on Old Oak Common Lane, who, they say, have not been consulted about the proposals.
- 6.4.41 There are a few comments about the proposed use of rail to transport construction materials and excavated material to and from Old Oak Common. While some respondents support this idea as being preferable to using roads, others raise concern about the possible noise impacts from passing trains.
- 6.4.42 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topics of agriculture, ecology, land quality, and water resources and flood risk assessment, explicitly in relation to CFA 4.

6.5 Northolt Corridor (CFA 5)

Overview

- 6.5.1 The Northolt Corridor community forum area (CFA) covers an 8.6km section of the Proposed Scheme in the London Borough of Ealing. The London Borough of Brent and London Borough of Harrow lie adjacent to the route. The route extends from Park Royal Road Bridge in the east, to a point near Rabourne Drive in the west.
- 6.5.2 There are 60 respondents explicitly addressing the Northolt Corridor (CFA 5) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 5, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 5 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).

- 6.5.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 5 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 5.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.5.4 Some respondents are concerned that the proposal to tunnel the route through the whole of this CFA means that more excavated material would need to be removed at Ickenham (CFA 6). They are worried that the additional vehicles required for this would increase the pressure on traffic in the area. See section 6.6 for more detail on this issue.

Overarching issues for CFA 5

- 6.5.5 A high proportion of the respondents discussing CFA 5 are supportive of the proposal to place this section of the route in a tunnel.
- 6.5.6 There are some concerns about the effect of the tunnelling activities on local traffic, specifically in relation to activities associated with removing waste material.
- 6.5.7 Northolt Village Residents' Association makes detailed comments on many aspects of the proposals. While the Residents' Association is opposed to HS2 in general, it is supportive of the proposal to tunnel through this section of the route.

Traffic and transport

- 6.5.8 Several of the respondents discussing CFA 5 cite the impact of construction activities on road traffic as a particular area of concern. This is most commonly discussed in relation to heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) removing waste material from tunnelling activities, but a few respondents also worry about the impact of workers travelling to the construction sites.

"I live on the Perivale exit (of the A40) and am hoping this area will not become congested by lorries and other work vehicles looking for an alternative route to Westgate. The roads here are quite narrow and congested due to the numerous car garages located on Bideford Avenue and I do think large vehicles would get stuck and cause traffic if they try to use this route."

Individual

- 6.5.9 A small number of respondents believe that more information is required about the effect that the Proposed Scheme would have on road traffic within this CFA. Key questions include which roads would be used, and whether there would be any temporary road closures.
- 6.5.10 A couple of respondents mention that additional traffic is likely to be a particular issue during peak times, and emphasise that road traffic in the area is already congested. The roads mentioned include Channel Gate Road, Hangar Lane, the A40 and Stephenson Street.
- 6.5.11 Network Rail is worried that the location of the proposed vent shafts might impact on the operation of the current Acton and Northolt rail line. They expect information about this to be included in the full ES. North Ealing Against HS2 is also keen that the Proposed Scheme should not impact on conventional rail services.

Waste and material resources

- 6.5.12 Comments about the removal of waste material are closely related to concerns about the impact of this activity on road traffic, as described above.
- 6.5.13 Many respondents who discuss traffic concerns advocate increased use of alternatives to road transport for the removal of waste. Most favour rail transport and a couple of respondents question whether canals might also be useful.
- 6.5.14 A couple of respondents express concern that using rail to remove excavated material would affect capacity on the rail network. Chiltern Railways says that capacity improvement works may be needed on existing rail infrastructure to respond to this need.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.5.15 A small number of respondents raise concerns about noise and vibrations caused by trains running through the tunnel, and the impact that this would have on daily lives.

“Paragraph 11.5.5 refers to potential construction noise or vibration impacts [...] It is vital that these impacts are given full consideration in the ES and that suitable details on properties at risk along with associated mitigation measures are set out.”

Ealing Council

Air quality

- 6.5.16 The London Borough of Ealing is concerned that dust and fumes associated with construction should be controlled as much as possible.

Other issues

- 6.5.17 A high proportion of the respondents discussing CFA 5, including the Greater London Authority, North Ealing Against HS2, Hanger Hill (East) Residents' Association, and Northolt Village Residents' Association, are supportive of the proposal to place this section of the route in a tunnel. Some accompany their support for the proposed tunnel with the caveat that they oppose HS2 more generally.

“I don't think HS2 should be built at all, but am relieved a tunnel is granted for Ealing – Northolt”

Individual

- 6.5.18 While no respondents explicitly oppose the proposal to tunnel this section of the route, a few respondents express concerns about the proposed vent shafts in the area. A small number are concerned about their visual impact (specifically the Mandeville Road shaft), with some also expressing concern over loss of property at Mandeville Road. Some respondents say that alternative locations for vent shafts were not adequately assessed in the draft ES.

“The situation of the Northolt gives cause for concern as, contrary to what we would told at the last Forum meeting it would seem to be quite intrusive in the area and we would urge that every effort is made to screen this from the near housing and also clarification over the fate of the two houses in Mandeville Road.”

North Northolt Neighbourhood Watch and Residents Association

- 6.5.19 A small number of respondents say that the vent shafts would be minimally disruptive, and that they are happy with the solution.
- 6.5.20 A couple of respondents, including North Ealing Against HS2, question the need for the Mandeville Road vent shaft and note its proximity to the Greenpark Way shaft.
- 6.5.21 A few respondents request more information regarding infrastructure associated with the Proposed Scheme. One respondent questions whether there are sufficient escape routes in case of a fire in the tunnel. Another asks about the mechanical ventilation equipment in the vent shafts, and questions at what times it would operate and how much noise it would make. The Greater London Authority questions whether tunnelling under the Grand Union Canal would damage the canal and cause flood risk. The Canal and River Trust shares this concern, and agree that appropriate mitigation is necessary.
- 6.5.22 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topics of agriculture, community, cultural heritage, ecology, land quality, landscape and visual assessment, socio-economics, and water resources and flood risk assessment in relation to CFA 5.

6.6 South Ruislip to Ickenham (CFA 6)

Overview

- 6.6.1 The South Ruislip to Ickenham community forum area (CFA) covers a 6.7 km section of the Proposed Scheme in the London Borough of Hillingdon (LBH). The route extends from a point to the south of Rabournmead Drive in the east to Harvil Road in the west. This area is predominantly suburban in character in the east and becomes more rural north and north-west of Ickenham.
- 6.6.2 There are 2,514 respondents explicitly addressing the South Ruislip to Ickenham (CFA 6) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 6, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 6 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.6.3 In addition to individual responses described above, there is also an organised template response submitted by approximately 2,400 respondents. This response relates to CFAs 6 and 7, and the content is described below.
- 6.6.4 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 6 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 6.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.6.5 In addition to the respondents who submitted individual responses, approximately 2,400 people submitted a response based on a template. This organised response relates to both CFAs 6 and 7. These responses argue that the draft ES is inadequate for CFAs 6 and 7. They disagree with the assessment methods and mitigation measures proposed, and express general concern about the impact on local communities and the environment. The organised responses make particular comments on the traffic, noise, vibration and socio-economic assessments included in the draft ES. They believe it lacks baseline data on noise and traffic, and voice disappointment about the consultation process, the community forums, and the extent to which HS2 Ltd consulted on and listened to local views.
- 6.6.6 A number of respondents discuss issues for a section of the route including CFA 6 but encompassing other CFAs. Some respondents discuss issues relevant to CFA 6 but also including CFAs 5 and 7. Several of these respondents comment on the proposed tunnelling of the route through Northolt and into CFA 6. Respondents tend to be in favour of the tunnelling, but often question why the proposed tunnel could not be extended beyond Ickenham and into the Colne Valley. Arguments for tunnelling through the Colne Valley are discussed in more detail in section 6.7. Some respondents ask for more detail on plans for the proposed tunnelling. Others express concern about the impact of the proposed Northolt tunnel on Ickenham, particularly due to traffic impacts on local roads from lorries transporting the excavated material from the proposed tunnel. Several of these respondents advocate transporting this material by rail rather than via roads which they say are already congested.

Overarching issues for CFA 6

- 6.6.7 The issues most frequently discussed in responses referencing this CFA are around the impact of construction and operation on local communities. There are concerns about disruption and noise caused by construction works, and beyond the construction period, by the trains themselves. Respondents express anxiety about what they think is a large number of construction sites (13) proposed for the area. Many respondents are concerned about the additional traffic caused by heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) associated with the construction work. As noted above, a number of respondents would favour extending the tunnel beyond Ickenham and into the Colne Valley.

Traffic and transport

- 6.6.8 The impact of the additional traffic caused by HS2 construction works is the most cited issue from respondents commenting on this CFA. Respondents are anxious about increased pressure on already congested local roads due to HGVs associated with the development. Station Approach, West End Road, Ruislip High Street/ Ladygate Lane, West End Road, Breakspear Road and Ickenham Road are mentioned as particularly busy local roads which respondents believe would be unable to support the additional traffic.

“I cannot see how you think you can have 1000 lorry movement a day on roads already jammed at rush hour.”

Individual

"I am extremely concerned that the volume of HGV traffic through West Ruislip and Ickenham during the construction of HS2 will completely paralyse an already congested road network in this area."

Individual

- 6.6.9 Several respondents note that Breakspear Road, Ruislip High Street and Ladygate Lane are unsuitable for use by HGVs owing to width and headroom issues. This issue is currently subject to discussion with the London Borough of Hillingdon. Ruislip Chamber of Commerce voices its concern about the impact of the additional traffic on Ruislip High Street, and state that the draft ES should have included a traffic assessment on the High Street.
- 6.6.10 A number of respondents are particularly concerned about the proposed closure of Chalfont Lane, which they indicate is an important commuter route. Hertfordshire County Council calls for plans to maintain a route along or parallel to Chalfont Lane, in order to minimise adverse effects on commuter traffic.
- 6.6.11 A few respondents comment on dangers associated with increased traffic, particularly around schools.

"HS2 need to seriously, and urgently, consider the implications of increased traffic movements during the long construction period. At peak periods residents already experience gridlock, especially on Ladygate Lane where children are at school and many people have no alternative but to use this road to get to work. During these times movement of vehicles is reduced to a single lane ... It is inevitable that the children will be subject to extreme danger from the volume of traffic."

Individual

- 6.6.12 As mentioned above, some respondents raise concerns about the additional traffic caused by the need to transport extracted material from the Northolt tunnel.
- 6.6.13 A number of suggestions are made for mitigating the impact on traffic, for example by building a temporary road from Breakspear Road along the east of the Chiltern Line to give access to the site and bypass residential areas. Several respondents think that construction lorries should not be allowed to pass through the village of Ickenham. Other respondents emphasise that traffic should be reduced by using existing railway lines as much as possible to transport the materials needed for construction as well as excavated material from tunnelling. The Ruislip Residents Association advocates building a temporary railhead between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South, connected to the West London freight route in order to transport excavated material by rail rather than road, a view which is echoed in comments from other respondents. However the Environment Committee on behalf of the London Assembly notes that this would require trains running through the night when tracks are unused, adding to noise levels.
- 6.6.14 Several respondents argue that compensation should be given to local home-owners whose house values might be affected by the construction works and congestion.
- 6.6.15 A number of respondents are critical of the traffic assessment made for the draft ES in this CFA.

“The clear local view is that the plans have been drawn up with insufficient knowledge of existing traffic conditions on the key roads. The simplest thing that I can say is that the current plans have been misjudged and are unsustainable.”

Nick Hurd, Minister for Civil Society and Member of Parliament for Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner

- 6.6.16 Several respondents suggest that the traffic assessment is inadequate or out of date, and does not accurately reflect patterns of road use in the area.
- 6.6.17 An organised response raises concerns about traffic, particularly the impact of HGVs associated with construction on already congested local roads. It also suggests information provided in the draft ES is inaccurate, noting that the traffic information does not include excavated material from the proposed tunnel, additional mileage due to diversions and worker traffic movements. This organised response also raises concerns about disruption, congestion and delays on local roads, and particular concern about the impact on emergency service routes.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.6.18 The sound levels of both the construction works and the trains themselves are another concern for respondents commenting on CFA 6.
- 6.6.19 There are particular concerns around operational and construction noise associated with tunnel portals at Tilehouse Lane and West Ruislip.
- 6.6.20 A number of respondents emphasise the existing noise levels from the Chiltern Main Line, M40 and other existing transport routes. There is resentment from some respondents about the cumulative noise in what they say has in the past been a quiet residential area. Some residents believe that the additional impact of HS2 on noise levels would be unacceptable.

“I have chosen to live in Ickenham because it is lot quieter than Heathrow Airport where I have worked for 45 years. Now as I am about to retire I can look forward to being subject to having a High Speed Railway a couple of hundred yards from my backdoor and garden operating 17 hours a day.”

Individual

- 6.6.21 A number of comments are made about the construction and operational noise contour maps. Several respondents are critical of the provision of predicted average sound levels, rather than an indication of the actual noise level of the trains. Some comments suggest that these average sounds levels are misleading because they factor in noise levels when trains are not running, and therefore do not accurately reflect the noise made by trains as they pass. There are also a number of comments expressing disappointment that HS2 Ltd could not provide requested baseline data on noise levels at community engagement forums. The organised response specific to the Ickenham and Colne Valley area challenges the noise contour maps provided, which, it argues, does not conform to standards of best practice recommended by the World Health Organisation and the European Union.

- 6.6.22 A number of suggestions are made for mitigating the additional noise levels. Some respondents suggest measures such as a high fence of sound insulating material close to the line, along with trees and shrubs to absorb sound and reduce visual impact. Other respondents argue that residents should be compensated for noise levels, with one respondent adding that the level of noise deserving compensation has been set too high.

Community

- 6.6.23 Various potential impacts on the local community are identified by respondents. Several respondents register their concerns about the effect on Ruislip Gardens Primary School. Most of these respondents are concerned that access to the school would be impacted as a result of construction work, and that single lane traffic at Ladygate Lane would create difficulties for commuting teachers. Ruislip Gardens Primary School voices its concern about the impact on traffic, both in terms of access to the school and the health effects of additional pollution on pupils.

“Noise and air pollution does not seem to have been properly taken into consideration. There are serious health implications associated with particulates from HGV diesel and construction dust. We would be particularly concerned about the effects on vulnerable young children and those who already suffer with allergies and asthma.”

Individual

- 6.6.24 Several respondents mention concerns about the impact of additional traffic on the emergency services. It is suggested that additional road congestion as a result of the construction could impede ambulances and fire engines, leading to delays in emergency situations. Other respondents express concerns about access to the local crematorium.
- 6.6.25 A number of respondents are concerned about the restriction of access to Ruislip Gardens Estate. They believe that the construction work would be detrimental to the estate by obstructing access to local shops and amenities, as well as impeding council-run services such as Meals on Wheels, and local community groups such as the Scouts and Brownies.

“I am very concerned at the local impact that HS2 will have on Ruislip Gardens. The noise, traffic, disruption will have a detrimental impact on all local residents, school children and businesses. It may affect access to our roads for emergency services, affect kids getting to school and nursery, of which there are several, and many other services and people may be disrupted including Meals on Wheels, and also the local wildlife. I have two young children and am also worried about the air quality and health problems such as asthma”

Individual

- 6.6.26 A number of respondents are worried about access issues to The Greenway, a residential road close to the proposed tunnel portal. Several respondents feel that compensation ought to be offered to people living on this road.
- 6.6.27 Some respondents mention the potential impact on specific local facilities or amenities. Several are concerned about the effect on Ruislip Golf Course losing two holes during construction. Others say that the temporary closure of Ruislip Rifle Club due to anticipated construction work would be of concern to them. Several respondents mention the effect of the green areas to the north and south of the HS2 line.

“(B)oth green areas are a major informal recreational amenity and widely recognised as one of the attractions of the area. It includes the Ruislip Golf course and is very heavily used by a mixed bag of walkers, nature-lovers, blackberry pickers and children just kicking balls around or playing in the River Pinn.”

Individual

- 6.6.28 A number of respondents suggest measures to mitigate the impact on local amenities. Several argue that HS2 Ltd should finance the relocation of local amenities.

“Apart from the loss of these popular facilities during the construction period it is more than likely that they will not reopen on completion of the work. HS2 should be liaising with the Council and the site operators to provide alternative venues elsewhere before construction commences to ensure these important Borough facilities can continue to operate uninterrupted. After all why should the users of these facilities have to sacrifice their enjoyment for this project?”

Individual

Socio-economics

- 6.6.29 A few respondents believe that construction work would have an adverse effect on local businesses and industry.

“At a time when businesses are struggling anyway, many shops and businesses on the proposed routes will suffer a dramatic fall in customers since few will attempt to drive there when congestion will be so bad. Most of these businesses will have disappeared before the work is completed, leaving the surrounding neighbourhood in a far worse state than before.”

Individual

- 6.6.30 Ruislip Chamber of Commerce expresses concerns about the impact of traffic on local businesses on Ruislip High Street. They write that the additional traffic associated with construction would be liable to “*bring the High Street to a complete halt*”, and “*could ruin people’s livelihoods*”.
- 6.6.31 Other respondents think the draft ES should have assessed the impact on the local economy and potential job losses. The London Borough of Hillingdon suggests there are discrepancies in the presentation of potential job losses on the site wide assessment (Report 27), and in the CFA specific report, and asks for a more consistent and reliable assessment of economic impact. The organised response specific to the Ickenham and Colne Valley area also voices concern about job losses, which it argues have not been properly assessed.

Cultural heritage

- 6.6.32 Several respondents discuss the potential impact on the cultural heritage of the area.

- 6.6.33 A few local organisations voice concern about the impact on archaeological sites in the area. Ruislip Gardens Primary School voices concern about “impacts (on) important cultural sites, such as archaeological remains and registered scheduled monuments.” The London Borough of Hillingdon notes that there is “*archaeological evidence of an Iron Age to Romano-British settlement that may extend into the permanent land take or temporary land take*”, and expresses concern that the impact on such archaeological remains has not been properly assessed.
- 6.6.34 Other respondents are worried about the possible destruction of local listed buildings, particularly Brackenbury House on Breakspear Road South.
- 6.6.35 Several organisations disagree with the assessment of the impact on local cultural heritage. Some, including the London Borough of Hillingdon and Nick Hurd, the Minister for Civil Society, believe there is inconsistency in the report, which states that there would be no long-term residual effects on cultural heritage, but also says that Dews Farm and archaeology on the route would be demolished or destroyed. The London Borough of Hillingdon suggests an assessment methodology is lacking in the draft ES, and calls for more clarity on how impacts on local heritage have been assessed.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.6.36 Few respondents specifically discuss the impacts on agriculture. However, a few respondents note that several local farms, namely Priors Farm, Oak Farm, Gatemead Farm, Brackenbury Farm, Harvil Farm and Cophall Farm, would be affected by the plans.
- 6.6.37 Several respondents, including the London Borough of Hillingdon, disagree with the assessment of agricultural impact.

“The Council is unable to comment on the Agriculture and Forest chapters in much detail, because the quality of information in these chapters is so poor. The information presented contains too many gaps and there is an element of flippancy regarding the impacts. There is no assessment, simply a description of the impacts. This is not in compliance with the EIA Regulations”

Individual

- 6.6.38 Similarly John Randall MP suggests the draft ES lacks detail on agricultural impacts and requests assurances that agricultural land would be restored after construction.
- 6.6.39 Other comments include a perceived lack of proposed mitigation for farms affected by HS2 construction works, a perceived lack of engagement with local farmers, and a suggestion that the socio-economic assessment should address the impact on farming.
- 6.6.40 Hertfordshire County Council emphasises the importance of rehabilitating land for agricultural use after construction.

“(T)he County Council would strongly request that the land is not just reinstated after construction but enhanced to provide the best use of land, largely agricultural, and landscaped appropriately. The County Council is happy to work with HS2 Ltd to this end, providing it incurred no costs”

Individual

- 6.6.41 However, other respondents are sceptical about the mitigation offered by restoration.

“Farmland will never be as good once ‘restored’ following construction. The affected fields will be much smaller, and divided by railway, access roads, balancing ponds, cuttings, embankments and new watercourses.”

Individual

Air quality

- 6.6.42 A number of respondents raise concerns about the effect of construction works on air quality, with pollution caused by increased traffic and particularly HGVs mentioned as a specific concern.

“There will be heavy air pollution from diesel fumes and particulate matter. With 800+ lorry movements a day on both Harvill Road and Breakspear Road South and heavy construction machinery, nitrous oxide and carbon monoxide and other harmful gases will also rise, and we will be less than 300 metres from their source”

Individual

- 6.6.43 Other respondents add that as well as the pollution from HGVs and light goods vehicles (LGVs) they anticipate additional air pollution from exhaust fumes caused by a build-up of diverted traffic.
- 6.6.44 Several respondents mention that they have children who suffer from asthma, and that they are worried about the impact of the additional pollution. A number of respondents note that the proposed route for construction traffic passes several schools, and raise concerns about the impact of air pollution on the health of local school children.
- 6.6.45 Several respondents argue the draft ES should have included an analysis of projected air pollution effects in the area. The Environment Committee on Behalf of the London Assembly states the draft ES should have provided an analysis of expected emissions, current pollution levels or analysis of traffic flows and congestion effects, and suggests that this lack of detailed analysis undermines the validity of the mitigation measures proposed.

Water resources and flood risk

- 6.6.46 Various respondents comment on the proposed diversion of Ickenham stream (a canal feeder to the River Pinn), with the Environment Agency, London Wildlife Trust, and the London Borough of Hillingdon among those commenting.

“The proposed diversion of the Ickenham Stream must be carried out in close liaison with the Environment Agency, and meet best practice in line with similar works demonstrated in the London Rivers Action Plan”

Individual

- 6.6.47 The London Borough of Hillingdon comments on the effects of the proposed diversion of Ickenham Stream described in the draft ES, arguing that it provides insufficient information to justify the conclusions presented. Several organisations are concerned that the proposed diversion of Ickenham Stream could heighten flood risk in the area, and emphasise a need for more investigation of the potential impacts and mitigation options.
- 6.6.48 A number of respondents raise concerns about heightened flood risk in other areas as a result of the construction work. Several respondents mention flood risk at Breakspear Road, an area prone to flooding. Others are concerned about the floodplain around Ruislip Garden. The River Pinn, Ruislip Lido and Newyears Green Bourne are also mentioned in relation to potential floods. A number of organisations and individuals call for a more thorough and detailed assessment of flood risks.

Land quality

- 6.6.49 Few respondents comment specifically on the impact on land quality. However, some respondents suggest that the removal of top soil and compaction of earth by heavy machinery at construction sites may lead to water contamination as surface water contaminated with pollutants flows into the River Pinn, instead of being absorbed into the soil.
- 6.6.50 The Environment Agency also notes the likelihood of encountering contaminated soils, and suggests that the formal ES should identify sites for the treatment of such soils.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.6.51 Several respondents are concerned about the visual impact of construction and the rail line itself upon the area. Hertfordshire County Council registers its concern about the visual impacts from public rights of way and highways, both during and following construction.
- 6.6.52 A few respondents are worried about the effects of light pollution during construction.

“At night there is little light pollution at present. This will change dramatically with a very large area of security lighting. Moderation of the effects of this can not go very far without destroying its security function.”

Individual

Waste and material resources

- 6.6.53 The most frequently cited issue around waste and material resources is the transportation of excavated material from tunnelling and concerns that this would add to the levels of traffic on the roads. Opinions about levels of traffic and arguments for the transportation of excavated material by rail are discussed in the section on transport and traffic, above.

Ecology

- 6.6.54 A few respondents and organisations make comments about the ecological impact of the proposals.
- 6.6.55 The London Borough of Hillingdon disagrees with plans for habitat creation associated with the diversion of Ickenham Stream in the southern part of West Ruislip Golf Course. They argue that the information provided is insufficiently detailed, and suggest maps should have been provided. They also argue that ‘partial’ mitigation for the loss of wildlife habitats in Ickenham Stream is not acceptable.

6.7 Colne Valley (CFA 7)

Overview

- 6.7.1 The Colne Valley community forum area (CFA) covers approximately 6km of the Proposed Scheme in the London Borough of Hillingdon and the South Buckinghamshire, Chilterns and Three Rivers District Councils. The area extends from Harvil Road in the south, over the Colne Valley lakes to the M25. The Proposed Scheme would pass through the parishes of Denham and Chalfont St Peter. The area also includes land within the Greater London Authority and Hertfordshire County that is not defined by parish boundaries.
- 6.7.2 There are 2,550 respondents explicitly addressing the Colne Valley (CFA 7) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 7, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 7 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.7.3 In addition to individual responses described above, there is also an organised template response submitted by approximately 2,400 respondents. This response relates to CFAs 6 and 7, and the content is described in section 6.6.
- 6.7.4 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 7 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 7.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.7.5 See 6.6 for details of the organised response relevant to CFAs 6 and 7.
- 6.7.6 A small number of respondents discuss issues or observations relating to a section of the route including CFA 7 and adjacent CFAs, rather than just for CFA 7. Comments spanning CFAs 5-7 tend to welcome the Northolt Tunnel, but request that consideration be given to extending it further through CFAs 6 and 7. Comments spanning CFAs 7 and northwards along the route (for example up to CFA 9, 10 or 11) tend to express concerns over Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), sometimes suggesting that tunnelling should extend across the whole of the area.

Overarching issues for CFA 7

- 6.7.7 Comments addressing the CFA 7 report often focus on two key features of the Proposed Scheme in this area: the Colne Valley Viaduct and the Chiltern Tunnel Portal.

- 6.7.8 Comments about the proposed viaduct, including those from Buckinghamshire Councils, tend to concentrate on the impacts on views from the surrounding area – much of which is designated – as well as general noise disturbance and habitat destruction.
- 6.7.9 The Chiltern Tunnel Portal attracts attention due to concerns about construction traffic, earthworks, impacts on views due to embankments and cuttings, and road diversions.
- 6.7.10 Specific issues receiving attention include impacts on designated areas and species, as well as concern about the proposed closure of Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre (HOAC).
- 6.7.11 In addition to the respondents who submitted individual responses, approximately 2,400 respondents submitted a response based on a template. The organised response relates to both CFAs 6 and 7. See section 6.6 for a more detailed outline of the key messages from these respondents.

Ecology

- 6.7.12 Several of the respondents discussing CFA 7 mention ecological impacts as a particular area of concern, primarily in relation to specific designated areas and species.

“The assessment of temporary and permanent damage to the Mid Colne Valley SSSI underestimates the impact on birds from construction activity, and the impact of noise of the trains on over-wintering and breeding colonies of birds. Birds will either get used to the trains or move elsewhere, with a dramatic impact on the SSSI.”

Individual

- 6.7.13 Of the respondents who express such concerns, a number mention protected water habitats such as Korda Lake and Broadwater Lake, Savay Lake and the Mid Colne Valley SSSI, which they emphasise are home to numerous wetland birds, water voles, amphibians, fish and invertebrates; the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) provides a case study entitled *“disturbance and fragmentation impacts on birds at Mid Colne Valley SSSI”*. The impact of supporting piers for the proposed Colne Valley Viaduct is a particular issue for some respondents, for example the RSPB expresses concern over the impact of the piers on bird populations. The London Wildlife Trust suggests greening measures such as bat and bird boxes, as well commenting that the Colne Valley supports a significant population of Daubenton’s bats, protected under European law.
- 6.7.14 A few respondents, including Ruislip Woods Trust and the Woodland Trust, discuss impacts on woodland habitat. Comments include support for replanting and translocation as mitigation for the clearance of vegetation within the Mid Colne Valley SSSI, and a request that similar measures be employed for Ranston Covert Wood.

- 6.7.15 On the topic of ecological mitigation, respondents assert that there is a need for further assessment of threatened habitats and species in order to enable a more complete suite of mitigation measures. More specifically, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust, and Hearts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust, contend that the ecological surveys of the Mid Colne Valley SSSI have been insufficient, referencing a number of Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs) or specific species that have not been included in the baseline. Others criticise the baseline figures particularly for the absence of fish surveys and the undervaluation of terrestrial invertebrates and plants (which are categorised as being of district or borough interest). Assessment of habitats in relation to viaduct construction and flood risk more generally are also discussed in detail by a small number of respondents.

Community

- 6.7.16 One of the most prevalent concerns for respondents with respect to CFA 7 is the temporary closure of Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre (HOAC) and the severance of Harefield Lake, with some requesting that HS2 finances the permanent relocation of the centre.
- 6.7.17 Nick Hurd, Member of Parliament for Ruislip, Northwood and Pinner, echoes these concerns, as well as drawing attention to the range of concerns of local residents within the Colne Valley area.
- 6.7.18 Several respondents raise the issue of access to nature more generally, or specifically in relation to proposed closures or diversions of the footpaths and public rights of way which traverse the area. Others comment on the visual and noise impacts on people's enjoyment of other popular routes such as the South Buckinghamshire Way and the Old Shire Lane.
- 6.7.19 Other issues discussed by some respondents include the impacts of construction on communities and property, for example of tunnelling activities on the nearby Tilehouse Lane or reference to the number of proposed construction sites in the area, as well as general concerns about noise and wellbeing. Some respondents express concern over perceived threats to the recreational use of the Grand Union canal, for example due to impacts on mooring and marina facilities.

Traffic and transport

- 6.7.20 Respondents frequently discuss proposed diversions and modifications of roads, anticipating increased levels of congestion on preferred routes, and voicing associated concerns about prolonged local journey times and restricted access. Some respondents would like more clarity over expected traffic increases related to the transport and disposal of excavated materials, or confirmation that transportation of these materials by rail has been considered where possible. Others say that the traffic assessments used for this area are out of date.

- 6.7.21 There are particular fears among respondents that congestion would increase on the A412, as heavy goods vehicle (HGVs) and light goods vehicles (LGVs) accessing a construction site via the M25 South would make heavy use of this road. The proposed temporary closure of Chalfont Lane is also expected to be problematic, with some respondents including Hertfordshire County Council urging that a route parallel to Chalfont Lane be maintained during construction. Respondents also worry about the diversion of Tilehouse Lane and Rickmansworth Bridleway 004, to the west of a proposed overbridge, owing to safety concerns for cyclists, walkers and horse riders. Other specific diversions are of concern due to potential ecological impacts.

“Do not place a new access road from Chalfont Lane to Hornhill, but use existing roads. This will destroy BoCC3 Red Listed Skylark and Yellowhammer breeding territories, therefore I urge you to reconsider the construction of any of these extra roads and make use of existing ones.”

Individual

- 6.7.22 The Highways Agency makes specific comments on a range of transport issues for CFA 7, including noting that permitted working hours on the M25 are overnight rather than 8am to 6pm, questions over why temporary slip roads are needed on the M25, lack of clarity over the impact of construction traffic on the M25, and potential transport impacts from utilities diversion. Chilterns Conservation Board adds that the construction of slip roads onto the M25 *“will be likely to lead to significant amounts of congestion and consequent impacts on air quality, at least locally”*.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.7.23 The likelihood of permanent impacts on the views of the Colne Valley Regional Park is mentioned by some respondents, including the Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company. The Park is also the subject of a small number of organised responses (separate to those mentioned above), which envisage *“reputational damage”* that could discourage visitors and harm tourism. This organised response refers, indirectly, to the green belt status of the Colne Valley and identifies additional visual impacts from construction sites as well as embankments and cuttings approaching the Chiltern Tunnel Portal.
- 6.7.24 Chilterns Conservation Board and the London Borough of Hillingdon both question the landscape impact assessments for this area, for example citing a number of landscape character areas suffering major adverse impacts during construction, or referencing Hillingdon’s Landscape Character Assessment. Respondents also cite the impact of the disposal of excavated material on nearby landscape as a specific concern.
- 6.7.25 Some respondents, including Hertfordshire County Council, are concerned about views from specific footpaths and public rights of way being permanently compromised. Others believe that the impacts on views from residential areas and footpaths have been underestimated and request sympathetic design of the viaduct in order to lessen visual intrusion, or query the plans for specific footpath diversions.

“Bridleway between shire lane and the A412. Permanent diversion should be shortened by moving tilehouse lane road bridge further west and increasing the angle of the new southern link to the bridge by cutting directly across from the existing junction with the Shire Lane. This bridleway need not be temporarily closed during construction as it does not run directly across the Chiltern compound – the permanent diversion can be set up immediately that works start in this area.”

Iver and District Countryside Association

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.7.26 A number of respondents express particular concerns regarding noise impacts. Operational sound levels and frequency, and construction noise are mentioned as specific concerns. Several respondents mention permanent or long-term impacts of noise on quality of life, woodland, overwintering birds, public rights of way, Colne Valley Park, HOAC, waterways and other specific locations.

“The suggestion that the Centre could, once the aqueduct is completed, resume its former role is naive and cynical. The forecasted Day time 60-65 db and Night-time 50-55db levels will be totally incompatible with an educational centre where training and audible instruction in potentially dangerous environments, ie water and high level climbing, is required to be totally free of distraction and intrusive noise. The sound levels alone increases the risk of young people drowning because they would be unable to hear instruction from staff, and similarly on high level equipment, ambient noise levels would prevent ground-based instruction to be given.”

Hillingdon Arts Association

- 6.7.27 There are calls for further or better mitigation measures (for example higher acoustic fences) and compensation from a few respondents. Some respondents disagree with the noise modelling in relation to CFA 7, citing for example the use of average noise rather than peak noise levels, “crude” modelling of mitigation, inaccuracy of barrier heights in the picture, inaccurate noise modelling, lack of consideration of cumulative effects (for example since the M25 widening), lack of empirical data on vibration (construction and operation), lack of local baseline data, and underplaying of the impacts of noise.

Water resources and flood risk

- 6.7.28 Various aspects of water resources and flood risk are mentioned by several respondents with respect to the CFA 7 report. This includes concern over the lack of information on water resources and flood risk overall. Specific comments on flooding include concerns that the risk of groundwater flooding is ignored, or that there may be increased risk in particular areas already prone to flooding. Other comments include an observation that the drainage system is not yet designed, making it impossible to assess its effectiveness and a comment over the lack of detail on viaduct design and thus lack of knowledge of its potential effects on flood risk.

- 6.7.29 Some respondents specifically comment on the proposed diversion of the River Colne, with concern that this would be permanent rather than temporary, that it is not clear whether the diversion would impact the road network, and that there needs to be baseline information on water quality for the river prior to any activity. A small number of respondents believe the proposed viaduct piers may damage the canal and towpath. Other respondents are concerned about lakes in the area, specifically that the HOAC lake would be unusable, and that the drainage of the Colne Valley lakes would impact on wildlife.
- 6.7.30 Possible impacts on the water levels in the valley – with the underlying geology characterised by one respondent as a valuable chalk stream – and concern over the lack of detail of mitigation are mentioned by respondents, as is the risk of polluting a significant supply of groundwater.

“The impact on groundwater cannot be underestimated. The South East of England is short of water, and 22% of London's water comes from the Colne Valley. Any risk of pollution of groundwater carries both an economic and a social risk.”

Individual

- 6.7.31 A few respondents discuss the need to mitigate against any pollution of water sources in the Colne Valley CFA. Another respondent asks for the formal ES to provide clarification on the reasoning behind “curtailment of abstraction” in this area.
- 6.7.32 One respondent expresses satisfaction with the initial scoping for flood risk and commitment to sustainable drainage techniques. Another mentions the need to take account of Water Framework Directive targets for Chilterns water bodies, including the River Misbourne and groundwater.

Air quality

- 6.7.33 Some respondents comment that the air pollution from construction works and traffic would worsen the air quality in the CFA 7 area. Some of these respondents refer to cumulative effects with air pollution from existing infrastructure such as the M25 and Heathrow Airport. Others express specific concern about dust from tunnelling and removal of excavated material.

Cultural heritage

- 6.7.34 A relatively small number of respondents mention specific heritage assets in CFA 7 as part of their response. One of these is the Savay listed building, with respondents including the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society expressing concern that its setting would be compromised by the proposed viaduct. Another is Hawtrey's Pit, which respondents describe as a potentially important heritage site at Harefield Moor. One respondent requests that HS2 await the results of English Heritage's application to classify the pit as a scheduled monument before moving forward with the Proposed Scheme. Others mention the cumulative effects of construction and operation on the historic environment, or point out specific listed churches or homes likely to be impacted by the route.

"I live in a grade II listed barn conversion which is in close proximity to the proposed viaduct at Denham Green. I strongly object to the statement in the report that "the existing historic landscape of the area has already been compromised by gravel extraction, the M25 and power transmission lines and no significant effects are anticipated." I would anticipate that having a train passing every few minutes high in the sky in view of my house, amplified by the water under the viaduct WILL have a significant impact on myself and my neighbours."

Individual

Socio-economics

- 6.7.35 Respondents make a range of comments on how the Proposed Scheme would affect socio-economic factors within CFA 7. Some mention the lack of detail on specific localised effects, while others are concerned that socio-economic impacts have been underestimated.
- 6.7.36 A variety of concerns are expressed regarding specific impacts of the Proposed Scheme, for example access to amenities such as schools and hospitals, the risk of local shops or businesses being cut off during construction, specific impacts around HOAC as a key visitor location, and impacts on fisheries. The impact on the number of leisure visitors due to disruption of the Colne Valley Park is another specific concern.

"5.5.6 indicates that due to the size of the park the impact will not be significant. However, this underestimates the premium that must be placed on continuous belts of land of high ecological value from both a wildlife and leisure perspective."

Individual

- 6.7.37 Respondents also mention mitigation and compensation, for example the expectation that any adverse business impacts would be mitigated.

Land quality

- 6.7.38 There are a few comments relating to a perceived lack of detail or specific wording around land quality with respect to CFA 7. One respondent comments on the need to apply the precautionary principle to potential fluid leakages from trains; another comments on various aspects of contaminated land, for example stating that there is a need for adequate monitoring and mitigation procedures, as well as suggesting that the potential to disturb contaminated land is wider than the report suggests.

"9.1.1 This paragraph is misleading as it indicates that the potential threats from disturbing contaminated land are only relevant to a small localised area. However, a number of sites are located above groundwater source protection zones and/ or bedrock aquifers and therefore pose a potential wider issue. By stating that 'migration is unlikely to lead to any regional effects', this is underemphasising the topic."

Buckinghamshire Councils

- 6.7.39 Three Rivers District Council comments on the potential interaction between minerals planning applications and HS2.

“TRDC is currently considering its response to the minerals planning application submitted to HCC for gravel extraction from the site at Pynesfield. This proposal directly impacts on the route of HS2, since part of the application site is on the line of the proposed rail route. The Council understands that the HS2 team has objected to the Pynesfield development and seeks clarification that this objection is binding.”

Three Rivers District Council

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.7.40 Comments relating to agriculture within this CFA focus on farmland, with several respondents expressing concern over the loss of high quality farmland, or questioning whether local farmland and farming businesses would recover, for example following the direct impacts of earthworks, the planting of screening, and the introduction of balancing ponds. The response from the London Borough of Hillingdon suggests that HS2 has failed to collect adequate information on the farms that would be impacted in this area.

Waste and material resources

- 6.7.41 Comments regarding the assessment of waste and material resources include an observation that no assessments of secondary impacts of excavated materials and waste appear to have been carried out, and a request for baseline modelling on commercial, construction and demolition waste to be worked into the formal ES.
- 6.7.42 There are a number of comments on stockpiles and excavated material, for example queries over where this material is going, worries about the number and size of stockpiles, as well as questions and concern over how much excavated material would be created. Some respondents worry about the perceived use of Colne Valley as a “*dumping ground*” for excavated material from the surrounding tunnelling work.
- 6.7.43 Other comments on waste include a statement that the area’s past use for gravel extraction should not be a justification for damaging the landscape further, a challenge to the assumption that excavated material would be used as fill, and concern that more detail on mitigation measures for excavated material is needed. A small number of respondents ask that stockpiles avoid floodplains or areas at risk from surface water, while others request that contaminated material is stockpiled separately. There is also a request from one respondent to know where potential crushing or screening works might happen.

Other issues

- 6.7.44 The response from the Greater London Authority, and that of the Environment Committee on behalf of the London Assembly, outline overall expectations for the formal ES in relation to CFA 7, including integrated mitigation measures and more detailed impact assessments across a range of topics, as well as other specific points such as the treatment of designated assets and formal diversion strategies for specific bus routes.
- 6.7.45 Safety issues related to Denham Airport and the need for related risk assessments are mentioned as a particular consideration by one respondent.

“The draft COCP makes no reference to airports and contains no measures to reduce potential impacts. There should be a reference to the fact that the CAA requires that areas up to 1000m from runways should be assessed to examine hazards and options for rescue. The viaduct would be within 1000m of the runway at Denham Airport. HS2 Ltd has not examined the hazard and has not considered the implications for rescuing aircraft occupants or train occupants after an accident.”

Bickerton's Aerodromes Ltd

- 6.7.46 The potential provision for a Heathrow spur tends to be a source of anxiety for the relatively small number of respondents who mention it, including Buckinghamshire Councils, as these respondents believe that the uncertainty surrounding these plans would further blight the area. Others express views for or against the spur more generally.

6.8 The Chalfonts and Amersham (CFA 8)

Overview

- 6.8.1 The Chalfonts and Amersham community forum area (CFA) covers an approximately 11.2km section of the Proposed Scheme as it passes through the Chiltern District in the county of Buckinghamshire. The area extends from the M25, east of Chalfont St Peter in the south-east, to the junction of the A413 and Mop End Lane in the north-west. It includes land within the parishes of Chalfont St Peter, Chalfont St Giles, Coleshill and Amersham. The route through this area would be entirely in deep twin-bore tunnels with three associated ventilation and intervention shafts (vent shafts).
- 6.8.2 There are approximately 6,000 respondents explicitly addressing the Chalfonts and Amersham (CFA 8) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 8, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 8 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.8.3 Comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 8 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 8.
- 6.8.4 Responses relating to this CFA include two organised responses, one of which addresses the entire Chilterns area, and one of which is specific to CFA 8. These organised responses are discussed in section 6.8.9 below.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.8.5 Some respondents who refer to CFA 8 also discuss other CFAs, particularly CFAs 9 and 10. CFAs 8-10 make up the wider Chilterns area, and some respondents focus on the Chilterns as a whole, rather than on individual CFAs. These responses often focus on issues to do with the protected status of the landscape as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Many respondents state their opposition to the construction of HS2 across the AONB, and question the legitimacy of the Proposed Scheme potentially breaching the area's protected status.

“It is necessary for the Government to demonstrate that any project of this kind is in the public interest before the restraints implicit in the legislation covering Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be set aside. The Government has failed to demonstrate any such overriding importance with the claimed economic advantages widely challenged and disputed.”

Individual

- 6.8.6 Others respondents voice anxiety about the impact of HS2 on the AONB landscape, and advocate a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns, should the project go ahead. There is a particular emphasis on the need for tunnelling in CFA 10; this is discussed in more depth below. HS2 Action Alliance argues that the option of a fully bored tunnel has not been properly considered. Many of the respondents who advocate tunnelling emphasise that a bored tunnel would be a last resort rather than a satisfactory solution, reiterating their opposition to HS2 running through an AONB.

“The fact that the Chilterns AONB is of national importance has not been properly taken into account, nor has its legally protected status. The impact on the AONB landscape, ancient woodland and ecosystem is unacceptable and would be so detrimental nationally that the only way to protect it would be to provide a fully-bored tunnel right through the Chilterns from the M25 to the other side of Wendover, outside the AONB. I urge you to do this.”

Individual

- 6.8.7 There are also concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the A413. Again, this is an issue which cuts across CFAs covering the Chilterns. The impact of construction traffic in CFA 8 is discussed in more detail below.

Overarching issues for CFA 8

- 6.8.8 A number of issues are raised frequently in relation to CFA 8. The issue that attracts most comments is that of traffic: numerous respondents express concerns about local roads seeing increased traffic as a result of expected construction traffic. There are concerns about the impact on air quality, noise and road access caused by increased traffic. Noise caused by tunnel boring activities is another concern raised in many responses. Respondents are also concerned about the possible impact on the tourism industry in Amersham and the wider AONB, suggesting that the area would attract fewer visitors due to disruption caused by construction work. Other respondents raise questions about the impact on local waterways and water habitats, particularly the impact on ground settlement at the Misbourne Valley aquifer.
- 6.8.9 There are two organised responses relating to CFA 8. The first is a response highlighting issues relevant to the Chilterns as a whole, submitted by approximately 6,000 respondents who advocate tunnelling through the area to lessen the visual impact on the countryside. The second is a more detailed response which is specific to CFA 8 and submitted by 15 respondents. It comments that elements of the draft ES are inadequate, mentioning the noise, visual and CO₂ assessments in this regard, as well as the mitigation measures proposed. It expresses concerns about HS2’s environmental impact in the area, including land-take and ecological impacts. It also makes specific comments about the impact of HS2 in CFA 8, which will be discussed under the relevant headings below.

Traffic and transport

- 6.8.10 A number of concerns about the impact of construction on traffic in the area are cited by respondents. Some respondents mention their concerns about the increase in traffic in general terms, while others highlight more specific problems with increased traffic on particular roads or routes.
- 6.8.11 Chalfont St Peter Parish Council raises concern about the anticipated increased traffic and proposed diversions during the construction period. The Council disagrees with plans to divert traffic along Chalfont Road, Hornhill Road and Woodland Road, arguing that these routes are already over-used and lack the capacity for substantially increased traffic. The Council suggests an alternative route using the A413, A40 and A412, though also notes that these routes are already subject to considerable congestion. Concerns are also raised about projected increases in traffic of 30% on Joiners Lane, Denham Lane and Chesham Lane, with the Council writing that *“this is an unacceptable increase along these residential roads and an alternative route must be considered”*.
- 6.8.12 Buckinghamshire Councils argues that Lower Bottom House Lane is too narrow to serve as a construction route and also highlights potential safety and access issues for public right of way users (for example cyclists, walkers and horse riders).
- 6.8.13 Several respondents, including Buckinghamshire Councils, mention that Whielden Street, the location of Amersham Hospital, is already congested, and argue that construction heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) should avoid using this route. There are also concerns that vibrations caused by HGVs on this road could cause damage to delicate hospital equipment such as MRI machines.
- 6.8.14 Several respondents, including Chalfont St Peter Parish Council, strongly oppose the proposed closure of Chalfont Lane, which they say is an important commuter route. Section 6.7.21 discusses these comments in more detail.
- 6.8.15 A number of respondents indicate they are concerned about additional traffic on the A413. It is argued by various participants that the A413 between Chalfont St Peter and Amersham is already heavily congested at peak times and does not have the capacity to absorb additional traffic. Other residents think that the road is dangerous, and express concern that additional HGVs would increase accidents and pose dangers to local schoolchildren.

“The A413 is already a dangerous road with a higher than average number of accidents. There are hardly any suitable crossing points and with increased traffic volume, we will experience major difficulty getting from one side of the village to the other.”

Individual

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.8.16 A number of respondents register concerns about noise levels, both during the construction process, and from the high speed trains themselves. Respondents also mention concerns about the additional noise caused by traffic transporting excavated material from the proposed tunnel excavation. One respondent adds that material removed from the tunnel would require crushing before it could be transported, and that the area proposed for the crushing and storage of material removed from the Amersham Access shaft is immediately adjacent to the Chilterns Crematorium and Garden of Remembrance.

“In 2012 the Crematorium was responsible for 3178 cremations, all of which would for within HS2 operating hours and which would be effected by the work in progress.”

Individual

- 6.8.17 Many respondents are critical of the methods used to predict and illustrate noise levels caused by the trains themselves. These respondents tend to argue that average noise levels are misleading, stating they do not represent the actual noise levels caused by the trains, as the predicted noise level is reduced by averaging it against times when no trains are running.

“Noise levels have been aggregated and averaged. Anyone can see that the true impact of a train travelling through pristine countryside is not an aggregate but the maximum volume of sound at the time of a passing train travelling at 125 mph.”

Individual

“Noise that comes and goes, like train noise, is more intrusive than a constant level of noise, like traffic. The impact of noise on rights of way and is not properly considered and the effects on wild life are not recognised.”

Individual

- 6.8.18 Several respondents ask to be provided with more accurate information about the predicted noise levels for trains when passing. Others ask for more detailed information about mitigation methods to reduce noise from the trains, such as sound barriers. Several respondents are unhappy with the absence of baseline noise information in the draft ES, and request that it is provided in the formal ES.
- 6.8.19 One organised response expresses concern about noise and vibration from tunnel and vent shaft construction, and disagrees with the way this has been assessed. It also raises concerns about the impact of operational noise and vibrations on properties near tunnel portals and vent shafts. It suggests there may be structural damage to properties due to tunnel boring, and comments that the potential for this should have been assessed more adequately in the draft ES.

Community

- 6.8.20 Several respondents comment on the impact of construction works on Amersham residents' quality of life. There are particular concerns about road congestion from diverted traffic, and the presence of HGVs and light goods vehicles (LGVs) increasing noise and polluting air.
- 6.8.21 A number of comments are made about the impact of construction work on various health facilities in the local area. Some respondents, including Buckinghamshire Councils, raise specific concerns about Amersham Hospital, which, it is suggested, may encounter air quality and vibration impacts from construction traffic on Whielden Street. As mentioned above, some respondents are worried that vibrations caused by HGVs on this road could cause damage to delicate hospital equipment such as MRI machines. Other respondents make similar comments about the impact on the National Centre for Epilepsy on Chesham Lane, which they assert is home to the most sensitive MRI scanner in the country. Some express concern about potential impediments to accessing the major hospital in the area for Accident and Emergency, and particularly about increased traffic on the A413, which respondents describe as a single carriageway road being on an emergency 'blue light route' leading to the hospital. Buckinghamshire Councils registers strong concerns about the impact of the Proposed Scheme on Woodland Park, a care home located 300 metres from the line, and emphasise that these impacts must be assessed fully.
- 6.8.22 Chalfont St Peter Parish Council comments on the potentially negative impacts on two local schools, a primary school and nursery, located on Denham Lane. They point out that the proposed route from the Chesham Lane shaft passes both schools, as well as the National Centre for Epilepsy. They emphasise that the road is already heavily congested, particularly at school drop-off and pick-up points, and generally has cars parked along it associated with the school. These concerns are echoed by local residents. The Council adds that: "*construction lorries in this vicinity will have a severe impact in terms of pupil and patient safety and the condition of the roads*".

Socio-economics

- 6.8.23 A number of respondents discussing CFA 8 express concern about the impact on the local tourism industry, with several arguing that the draft ES fails to take this impact into account.

"Visitors are completely ignored. HS2 Ltd should have carried out a Visitors Survey but have not. People come to this area in their thousands every year for multiple purposes including visit Roald Dahl's grave - not mentioned – have tea at the Church, walk and cycle along the Rights of Way ... HS2 Ltd should carry out a Visitors' Survey and assess the impacts of HS2 in the light of the AONB's contribution to the government's sustainable tourism and health agendas."

Individual

- 6.8.24 A common concern is that walkers and cyclists may be deterred from visiting Old Amersham and Amersham station, as the cumulative effect of noise, traffic and visual intrusion reduces the amenity of the area.

“Amersham station is a key entry point for walkers in the Chilterns and Amersham Old Town also benefits from staying visitors. Visitor numbers will be seriously affected by noise, traffic and visual impact during the construction of the Amersham ventilation shaft, the tunnel entrance at nearby Mantles Wood and hugely intrusive work in the neighbouring Central Chiltern... Destruction of the Chiltern landscape, and noise, will continue to deter visitors once HS2 is in operation.”

Individual

- 6.8.25 Additionally, some respondents mention anxieties about potential loss of local jobs associated with reduced numbers of visitors. A number of respondents argue the draft ES should have taken the impacts on local jobs into account, or made viable suggestions for the relocation of local businesses which would be affected by the construction work. Buckinghamshire Councils expresses concern that construction and additional traffic would have serious consequences for local retail.

“The A413 is the main route accessing the villages of Chalfont St Peter, Chalfont St Giles and the town of Amersham. Prolonged periods of congestion, noise, dust and scarred landscape will likely discourage visitors and will have a detrimental effect on the vitality and viability of these retail centres. This is not acknowledged by the draft ES and no mitigation and compensation has been suggested”

Individual

- 6.8.26 The organised response expresses concern about the impact on tourism in the Chilterns, especially in Amersham, due to visual impact and increased noise and traffic impacts both during construction and operation.

Cultural heritage

- 6.8.27 Several respondents mention potential impacts on listed buildings and Conservation Areas. There are particular concerns about a Grade 2 listed granary attached to Upper Bottom House Farm. Some organisations are concerned about the visual impact on the granary due to the proposed vent shaft. A specific concern is that the settings of Shardeloes Kitchen Garden and Kennel Farm (both listed structures) would face impacts from the proposed vent shaft and tunnelling.
- 6.8.28 Some respondents mention the impact the Proposed Scheme would have on local archaeological remains, such as Roman remains at Mantles Farm and Shardeloes, and Grim’s Ditch, a Bronze or Iron Age earthwork. Several respondents say there are inaccuracies in the draft ES relating to these archaeological sites, and express concerns that sites would be damaged or destroyed by construction works.
- 6.8.29 Several respondents argue the draft ES lacks detail about the impact of construction on the cultural heritage of the area.
- 6.8.30 Other respondents suggest the proposed mitigation measures are insufficient, with several calls for a more detailed account of mitigation measures in the formal ES.

Ecology

6.8.31 Various ecological concerns are raised in relation to this CFA. A number of respondents suggest the ecological studies carried out are incomplete and based on too short a time period to be meaningful. Several respondents assert that ecological assessments are recommended to be carried out over a minimum of three years, and note that the assessment included in the draft ES took place in under a year. Others argue that mitigation measures proposed in the draft ES are insufficient, and call for more detailed proposals to mitigate the ecological impact of construction works.

6.8.32 Several local organisations make specific comments about ecological impacts on certain places within this CFA. Buckinghamshire Councils voices concern about potential impacts on Bow Wood, Brentford Wood, Turners Wood, Wheatley Wood and Shardeloes Lake.

6.8.33 Several respondents voice concerns about the impact on local woodland. It is emphasised that, as the woodland affected is classified as 'ancient woodland', replanting it would not be a substitute.

"The Department for Transport have made much in the media of their actions in drawing up a landscape plan for HS2, which proposes the planting of 4 million native trees to create new habitats for wildlife and flora and offset some of the carbon impacts from construction. These new trees, although welcomed, can never compensate for the loss of ancient woodland which, by its very nature is irreplaceable."

HS2 Action Alliance

6.8.34 A number of respondents express concerns that the River Misbourne and Shardeloes Lake have yet to be assessed for ecological impacts, and that no mitigation has been proposed.

"You don't seem to be able to guarantee that we won't lose the river Misbourne, so what will be done about this lovely river?"

Individual

6.8.35 Several respondents discuss the impact on the Misbourne Valley chalk stream. These respondents emphasise that chalk streams are ecological features of international significance, and should be recognised as such in the formal ES.

"The intention to drill through the chalk strata is likely to cause untold damage to already endangered aquifers which supply the water supply to the area and also to nearly a quarter of London."

Individual

6.8.36 A number of respondents voice their concerns about the impact on local wildlife. Some mention the adverse impact on wildlife in general, while others make specific comments on the potential impacts on certain local species. A number of respondents believe that rainbow trout, which breeds in local water habitats, could face threats from the Proposed Scheme. Other respondents, including Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust, voice concerns about the impact on the local bat population.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.8.37 A large number of those commenting on CFA 8 are concerned about the visual impact on the Chilterns AONB. Many of these responses address CFAs 9 and 10 as well, with respondents questioning the legitimacy of HS2 breaching the Chilterns' protected status as an AONB.

"Why designate an area, and give it the protection as being of outstanding natural beauty and then proceed to damage it for future generations?"

Individual

- 6.8.38 Buckinghamshire Councils expresses concerns about the impacts of road widening at Lower Bottom House Lane (as a construction access route to a proposed nearby vent shaft) on the settings of the nearby listed granary (discussed above under Cultural heritage) and other listed agricultural buildings.
- 6.8.39 A number of respondents discuss the mitigation measures proposed in the draft ES, with several believing that the proposed measures are insufficient, or even actively harmful in altering the landscape of a protected area.

"It is proposed to 'mitigate' the effects of HS2 by 're-shaping' the landscape in the form of embankments, tree plantings etc. This is deplorable in a protected landscape and displays astonishing insensitivity and arrogance."

Individual

- 6.8.40 Other respondents request more extensive mitigation to protect the landscape, or ask for measures to protect the visual quality of certain areas. Chalfont St Peter Parish Council requests landscaping to mitigate the potential impacts of the proposed vent shaft on views from Chesham Lane.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.8.41 A number of respondents express concerns that assessment of the impacts of construction on local water sources in this CFA has been insufficient. Buckinghamshire Councils writes that assessment of impacts on the River Misbourne and Shardeloes Lake has been inadequate, and call for a more rigorous assessment to be included in the formal ES. The Council also request more detail about a proposed road overbridge for Bottom Farm House Lane (which would be upgraded for the Proposed Scheme).
- 6.8.42 Buckinghamshire Councils also expresses concerns that flood risks have been inadequately researched for the draft ES. They particularly advocate further assessment of flood risk at Chalfont St Peter, while another respondent claims that there have been issues with sink holes in this area.
- 6.8.43 Several respondents express concern about the impact of construction on ground water levels, associated with risks of the River Misbourne flooding. Buckinghamshire Councils points out that there has been no detailed modelling of groundwater in the area, and question the assertion that there would be a negligible effect on groundwater flows. A number of respondents recommend that the aquifer underlying the Misbourne Valley be assessed further. The Chilterns Conservation Board raises concerns about the impact on the River Misbourne from tunnelling activities, and argues that not enough is being done in terms of mitigating risks to flow and chalk stream bed from ground settlement.

- 6.8.44 Several respondents are unhappy about the introduction of balancing ponds, for example arguing that these would be “*unsightly and intrusive features*”. Many of these respondents oppose these balancing ponds being introduced in the draft ES without having been discussed in the community forum meetings.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.8.45 Several respondents mention that some local farms would be affected by loss of agricultural land, and are sceptical about mitigation measures proposed in the draft ES.
- 6.8.46 Natural England calls for a thorough assessment of the potential impact on agriculture, forestry and soils, the projected loss of agricultural land, and wider environmental impacts.
- 6.8.47 The Chilterns Conservation Board voices concerns that a loss of land and fragmentation of farmland could threaten the sustainability of a number of local farm businesses. The Board argues that the agricultural assessment included in the draft ES is overly simplistic and omits important farming activities in the area. They call for a detailed agricultural assessment to be included in the formal ES.

Air quality

- 6.8.48 Several respondents express concern about the effects on air quality of pollution caused by construction work and additional traffic. There are particular concerns about air quality around the Amersham Hospital, and several respondents call for specific mitigation measures to ensure that air quality is not compromised in this area.
- 6.8.49 Dust levels from construction work are a particular concern to respondents. Several organisations, including the Amersham Action Group, say that the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) should have included a site-specific dust assessment. The Environment Agency states that a clear approach for dust suppression in the Chilterns must be included in the formal ES. One organised response also argues that there is a lack of dust assessment provided in the draft ES.

Ground settlement

- 6.8.50 A few respondents make comments about the potential impacts of ground settlement caused by construction. Buckinghamshire Councils expresses concerns about ground settlement caused by vibrations, and the potential damage caused to buildings as a consequence. They emphasise that this is a particular concern in regards to heritage assets, which they say frequently have minimal foundations or non-standard construction. In particular they are concerned that Shardeloes Grade II* registered park and Grade II listed kitchen garden are at risk from ground settlement.
- 6.8.51 Some respondents mention the potential effects of ground settlement on ground water and flood risks.

Other issues

- 6.8.52 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topic of land quality, explicitly in relation to CFA 8.

6.9 Central Chilterns (CFA 9)

Overview

- 6.9.1 The Central Chilterns community forum area (CFA) covers a section of the Proposed Scheme approximately 6.1km in length in Chiltern District, where it passes to the east of Little Missenden and Great Missenden. It extends from the junction of the A413 with Mop End Lane in a north-westerly direction and finishes at Leather Lane. The area includes land within the parishes of Little Missenden and Great Missenden.
- 6.9.2 There are approximately 6,000 respondents explicitly addressing the Central Chilterns (CFA 9) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 9, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 9 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.9.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 9 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 9.
- 6.9.4 A number of respondents refer collectively to CFAs 8-10, which make up the wider Chilterns area, and make comments relating to the entire Chilterns. Some of these issues are discussed in section 6.8, and will not be reiterated in detail in this section.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.9.5 See section 6.8 for issues relevant to CFAs 8, 9 and 10.

Overarching issues for CFA 9

- 6.9.6 The issue most frequently mentioned by respondents commenting on CFA 9 is the Chilterns' status as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Many respondents express anxiety about the impact on the landscape, or question the legitimacy of the proposals in breaching the area's protected status. This is discussed in more detail in the previous section.
- 6.9.7 There are also various socio-economic concerns in relation to this CFA. A number of respondents mention concerns about the potential impact on Great Missenden, and particularly the loss of tourist revenue in the area.
- 6.9.8 Many respondents express their worries about the impact on South Heath from the construction and operation of the proposed green tunnel. A number express a preference for bored tunnelling beyond South Heath to Leather Lane or Wendover, in order to avoid impact on Mantles Wood and Sibley's Coppice, as well as Grim's Ditch.
- 6.9.9 As discussed in the previous section, responses relating to CFAs 8-10 include an organised response submitted by approximately 6,000 respondents advocating tunnelling through the area to lessen the visual impact on the countryside.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.9.10 Many respondents express concern about the effect of the Proposed Scheme on the rural landscape.

“This area is the heart of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and therefore needs special consideration whenever planning/development issues arise. It comprises rich woodland and farmland, interspersed with small village communities that attract thousands of visitors every year, who come to enjoy the peace and beauty that this area provides.”

Individual

- 6.9.11 Respondents emphasise that the landscape would be irreparably damaged by the construction and operation of the HS2 line.
- 6.9.12 A number of respondents are sceptical about the assessment offered in the draft ES, with many arguing that the impact on the Chilterns AONB would be more pronounced than is suggested in the draft ES. The Chilterns Conservation Board questions the methodology employed by HS2 Ltd to investigate visual intrusion and proposes an alternative approach based upon the topography of the AONB.
- 6.9.13 Respondents suggest a number of mitigation measures to minimise the impact on the area. The most frequently suggested measure is a bored tunnel across the whole of the Chilterns area. Many respondents argue that the proposed tunnel emerging in South Heath does not extend far enough, and should be continued across the Chilterns in order to preserve the landscape.
- 6.9.14 Many of these respondents refer to Chiltern Ridges HS2 Action Group (CRAG) proposals to extend the bored tunnel to Leather Lane or Wendover, and emphasise their support for these measures.
- 6.9.15 The Chilterns Countryside Group and the Chesham Society believe the assessment should have included the option to extend the bored tunnel beyond South Heath, in order to mitigate the impact on the AONB. They argue that the assessment of this option is based on an unsubstantiated assertion that it would not be economically viable, and request that HS2 Ltd re-assess the option to extend the tunnel. The Chilterns Countryside Group also requests an analysis of mitigation options for the AONB that incorporates monetisation of all environmental and socio-economic costs to the Chilterns.
- 6.9.16 Other mitigation measures are also proposed by respondents. For example, the Chilterns Conservation Board advocates the widening of footpaths and farm track bridges in order to allow vegetation to grow, so that visual impacts on public right of way users can be reduced.
- 6.9.17 Several organisations refer to specific views which they think would be severely impacted by the Proposed Scheme, namely from properties on Bullbaiters Lane and Hyde Heath Road and from public rights of way.

Ecology

- 6.9.18 Ecological concerns are common within comments relevant to this CFA. A number of respondents make general comments about the effect on environment and wildlife within the AONB.

“There will be no satisfactory remedy for this type of loss, and mending and patching will do little to hide a massive and permanent scar across such an important area of the south east of England. This is probably the nearest and best example of real ‘countryside’ to London, and a gem of a green lung in an increasingly overcrowded country. Considerable farmland will be permanently lost, and certain farms will be ‘cut through’ by the line”

Individual

- 6.9.19 There are particular concerns about the loss of ancient woodland at Sibley’s Coppice and Mantles Wood. Many respondents reject plans to mitigate impacts through planting, which they consider to be inadequate. Several emphasise that ancient woodland cannot be replaced with newly planted trees.

“Ancient woodland is irreplaceable. Nothing can mitigate for the loss of some our most important biodiversity and cultural habitats. Ancient woodland is an important national resource. Any loss or damage should be recognised as a significant national loss”

Individual

- 6.9.20 Respondents also express concern about construction impacts upon Havenfield Wood, Farthings Wood and Hedgemoor Wood. Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust argues that impacts on these areas have not been considered, and request further mitigation measures for Farthings Wood and Hedgemoor Wood.
- 6.9.21 As discussed in the above section, several respondents commenting on Mantles Wood and Sibley’s Coppice advocate a bored tunnel in place of a green tunnel as alternative mitigation. This suggestion is consistent with CRAG proposals.
- 6.9.22 Other respondents express concerns about the impact on a variety of Chilterns habitats, including areas of hedgerow, farmland and chalk land.
- 6.9.23 Many respondents are concerned about the impact of construction on local wildlife. Some respondents state that the wildlife assessments are incomplete, and emphasise the needs for further surveys of various species. Several note the presence of a pipistrelle bat colony, which they fear would be destroyed by the proposed vent shaft and substation below Hyde Heath. These respondents emphasise that pipistrelle bats are a protected species, and say that the ES must include mitigation measures through relocation. Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust note the absence of baseline data on breeding birds (including barn owls), reptiles, the great crested newt and hazel dormouse. Chilterns Conservation Board is among the organisations disagreeing with the wildlife assessment, calling for a more thorough and detailed ecological assessment as part of the formal ES.
- 6.9.24 Many respondents believe a fully bored tunnel extended beyond South Heath towards Wendover would lessen the ecological impact of the project and go some way towards mitigating the effects of construction on local wildlife. Other suggested measures to minimise the detrimental impact on local wildlife include a recommendation from the Chilterns Conservation Board to widen footpaths and farm track bridges to provide more crossing points for deer and badgers.

- 6.9.25 An organised response expresses concern about potential impacts on the River Misbourne. It identifies threats to the rainbow trout and various water birds, as well as alleged hydrological risks associated with the surrounding chalk terrain.

Traffic and transport

- 6.9.26 The impact of the Proposed Scheme on traffic is a concern to many respondents making comments relevant to this CFA. Some make general comments about the impact of increased traffic in the area, while others discuss the effect on specific roads or routes. Many respondents believe the assessment included in the draft ES is based on an insufficient road traffic study, meaning that the routes proposed are flawed and unsustainable.
- 6.9.27 Many respondents are concerned about the inclusion of Potter Row in the construction traffic route. They consider Potter Row to be an unsuitable road for construction traffic, owing to the number of intersections with public rights of way and associated safety concerns. Several respondents request a temporary construction route from the A413 to the crossing at Leather Lane, which would avoid use of Potter Row.
- 6.9.28 Respondents also raise questions about the suitability of Chesham Rd, Kings Lane and Frith Hill for use by heavy goods vehicles (HGVs). Some express concern about additional congestion on the A413. Others are worried about the use of Hyde Heath Road by construction traffic.

“Hyde Heath road is very narrow and regularly used by cyclists and horse riders – using this road would contravene any bone-fide risk assessment.”

Individual

- 6.9.29 Respondents express concerns about safety due to additional traffic on this road, as it passes the local Common and primary school. Several respondents ask what safety measures would be introduced to protect children and other road users.
- 6.9.30 There is concern among a number of respondents about the potential impacts on road and public right of way users, as a result of diversions and changes in use of local traffic routes. There are also some concerns about the likely impacts on local cycling routes, for example on Frith Hill.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.9.31 A significant proportion of respondents making comments specific to CFA 9 focus on the noise assessment included in the draft ES. Many disagree with the assessment. Respondents suggest that noise impacts in the AONB have been misrepresented, with several respondents commenting upon damage to the ‘tranquillity’ of the area, which they think ought to be captured in the assessment. The Chilterns Conservation Board attempts to define the properties of tranquillity in their response, while Buckinghamshire Councils discusses approaches to assessing impacts on tranquillity in the Chilterns AONB.
- 6.9.32 As is the case in comments relating to other CFAs, a number of respondents argue that the predicted noise levels provided in the draft ES are misleading as they refer to average noise levels rather than the actual volume of passing trains.

“The noise maps are based on average DBA. Thus they do not reflect the impact of each train passing. Tranquillity will be impacted on a far greater scale than indicated in the report. The description of the route through CFA 9 and 10 as ‘medium’ tranquillity patently misrepresents the large areas near the route, which are truly quiet.”

Individual

- 6.9.33 Many respondents express general concerns about noise and vibration. Others make reference to issues unique to a particular location, such as impacts from the tunnel portals and local construction traffic. Some respondents mention impacts on public right of way users, wildlife, historic buildings and structures. The Roald Dahl Museum and Story Centre in Great Missenden expresses concern that their Countryside Trail and Village Trail would be adversely affected by noise levels.

Air quality

- 6.9.34 A number of respondents express fears about a deterioration of air quality as a result of heavy construction traffic. There are particular concerns about pollution from increased traffic on the A413, B485, King's Lane, Hyde Heath Road, Potter Row and Leather Lane. Several respondents believe that the impact on air quality has been understated in the draft ES, with one respondent writing that “[the] claim that impact on air quality on A413, B485, King's Lane, Hyde Heath Road, Potter Row and Leather Lane will be negligible is risible”. Respondents also express concern about increased pollution levels in South Heath and Little Missenden, due to predicted increases of congestion in these areas.
- 6.9.35 There are concerns among respondents that the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) does not contain sufficient mitigation measures to minimise pollution during construction. Several organisations express scepticism about the measures proposed.

“It is not credible to state that all potential effects in terms of air quality and land contamination arising from construction can be effectively managed under provisions in the CoCP; or that no significant, air quality or water quality effects will arise from the operation of the HS2 services”

Individual

- 6.9.36 Other respondents express concerns about dust associated with stock piles located south west of South Heath. Several respondents ask that sheeting be used on site to lessen risks to nearby properties.

Waste and material resources

- 6.9.37 A number of respondents think the draft ES should have provided more detailed information on how excavated material would be used or transported. Several note that the traffic data supplied in the draft ES does not account for HGVs transporting excavated material, and therefore conclude that the number of HGVs is likely to be greater than suggested in the draft ES.

- 6.9.38 Several respondents emphasise the importance of monitoring the quality of excavated material before transportation. One respondent writes: *“Moving large amounts of excavated spoil from one location to elsewhere creates the risk of moving contamination into a previously clean area; leading to the change in a local ecosystem”*, and expresses concerns that *“there are no assurances given that the monitoring the quality of ANY imported spoil will be undertaken.”*
- 6.9.39 Others express concern about stockpiles of excavated material being located close to their property. There are particular concerns about the proposed 4-metre-high stockpile on Frith Hill Farm which is in close proximity to Cudsens Court. Several organisations argue that this would pose a health hazard to residents due to the excessive dust produced.

Socio-economics

- 6.9.40 One of the concerns most frequently raised in relation to this CFA is the potential impact of HS2 on the local tourism industry.

“Many thousands of people come to our villages and countryside to walk, cycle and to relax. In particular, The Chilterns have always provided a close, convenient and affordable break from London city life. Our village, Little Missenden, is often full of such people - walking, cycling, visiting the Saxon church and simply enjoying a drink in one of the pubs. They can ramble through ancient woodland, watch red kites and let their kids play safely in the playground. This is replicated right across the area - it is very precious and cannot be returned once lost. How many of these people will want to come when high speed trains cut through The Chilterns?”

Individual

- 6.9.41 Many respondents suggest that noise, disruption and marred landscapes caused by construction work and then by the train line itself would be likely to undermine tourist enjoyment of the area, and damage the local tourism industry.
- 6.9.42 Other respondents including some local organisations raise concerns about the impact road diversions and closures would have on businesses in Great Missenden, as these are expected to limit access from South Heath and other nearby communities. Chilterns Countryside Group presents survey data from Great Missenden, which shows that retail businesses anticipate losing revenue due to the construction and operation of HS2 deterring visitors. Although survey data for Chesham is not provided by Chilterns Countryside Group, they suggest businesses in that locality would be similarly affected. The Chilterns Conservation Board says the draft ES inadequately represents potential job losses caused by the project:

“It is regrettable that reference is made to employment opportunities but there is no acknowledgement of employment losses. An Environmental Statement needs to be a balanced, objective technical document.”

The Chilterns Conservation Board

- 6.9.43 The Chilterns Conservation Board emphasises that the formal ES must include an assessment of the impact of road closures on the local economy.

- 6.9.44 Chesham Town Council expresses scepticism about the job creation prospects offered by HS2, and argue that construction would instead damage the local economy by causing job losses in the tourism sector, which, they emphasise, accounts for nearly 10% of employment in Buckinghamshire:

“We think it unlikely that that HS2 would provide significant employment opportunities for our people. Rather we believe that it would prove a blight on the local economy. The Chilterns attract some 55 million leisure visits a year. But will walkers and cyclists still wish to come in such numbers while HS2 is being built, or indeed afterwards? We very much doubt it”

Chesham Town Council

Community

- 6.9.45 Various comments are made relating to the potential impact on the local community within this CFA. Respondents express concerns about the detrimental impact on local schools, health facilities, sports and leisure facilities and other amenities.
- 6.9.46 Some respondents say they are concerned about construction traffic impacts on school routes in Hyde Heath and Great Missenden. Some are worried about the increased congestion at school drop-off and pick-up points, and the ability of teachers, parents and pupils to access the school; others express concerns about children’s safety around heavy traffic.
- 6.9.47 There are also concerns that links between local villages would be severed during construction. Several respondents note that the area is comprised of a number of towns and villages connected by lanes and small roads. They argue that closure of these roads could make access between villages difficult. Some respondents express fears that links between South Heath and Great Missenden would be severed during the construction of the proposed green tunnel, owing to road closures and diversions. Similar concerns are raised in relation to Chesham. Chiltern Countryside Group claims that the viability of this community is influenced by trade with Great Missenden and Prestwood, which connect with Chesham via the B485, and express concerns that such trade would be compromised by closed, congested or diverted traffic routes.
- 6.9.48 A number of respondents express concern about the potential for emergency services to be impeded by increased or diverted traffic in the area.
- 6.9.49 Several respondents mention the potential loss of amenities in South Heath, such as the Weights and Measures Gym and a local pub and restaurant.

“Annie Bailey's public house on the B485, Weights and Measure Gym and other properties on Frith Hill will also be demolished or affected, effectively destroying the community of South Heath.”

Individual

- 6.9.50 One respondent expresses concern about the potential for an increase in crime, writing “*It has been proved that whilst construction is taking place on a project like this that local crime goes up*”. The respondent questions whether any policing measures have been proposed to deal with a potential rise in crime.

Cultural heritage

- 6.9.51 Respondents raise various concerns about the impact of the Proposed Scheme on a number of heritage sites in this area.
- 6.9.52 Several respondents, including Great Missenden Parish Council, comment on the partial destruction of Grim's Ditch, a scheduled ancient monument. Respondents describe this as unacceptable and one respondent writes "*the destruction of part of Grimm's ditch, an ancient monument, should not be allowed under any circumstances*". Several respondents argue that additional tunnelling could and should avoid this impact.
- 6.9.53 Various issues relating to the assessment of impacts on Shepcotts, Shepcotts Cottage and Hyde Farm are discussed at length by Buckinghamshire Councils. A number of mitigation measures are proposed for minimising the impact on these structures.
- 6.9.54 Several respondents are concerned about the impact of construction traffic on Chapel Farm, another listed building on Hyde Lane.
- 6.9.55 There are concerns about the impact on St Peter and St Pauls church, a listed building in Great Missenden, which is also expected to incur impacts from construction traffic.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.9.56 Several organisations express concerns about the agricultural impacts of construction and operation of HS2 in CFA 9. Buckinghamshire Councils comments on operational impacts on horses and livestock at Hyde Farm, which runs equestrian activities.
- 6.9.57 A few respondents, including the Chilterns Conservation Board, believe that the diversion of Chesham Lane across land owned by Middle Grove Farm would permanently impact agricultural and community activities.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.9.58 Comments relating to water features mostly highlight the proposed introduction of balancing ponds. These are largely seen as an invasive 'alien feature' in the AONB. Several respondents emphasise that there would be no need for them if bored tunnelling were applied across the Chilterns. The Chilterns Conservation Board suggests that the environmental impacts of balancing ponds should be subject to specific assessment. The Environment Agency writes that if the ponds are to be introduced, they should be lined to reduce ground contamination risk.

Other issues

- 6.9.59 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topic of land quality, explicitly in relation to CFA 9.

6.10 Dunsmore, Wendover and Halton (CFA 10)

Overview

- 6.10.1 The Dunsmore, Wendover and Halton community forum area (CFA) comprises an approximately 8km section of the Proposed Scheme passing through the parishes of The Lee, Wendover and Ellesborough within the districts of Chiltern, Wycombe and Aylesbury. The boundary between Wendover/The Lee parishes and Great Missenden parish forms the southern boundary of the study area. The boundary between Ellesborough and Stoke Mandeville parishes forms the northern boundary.
- 6.10.2 There are approximately 6,000 respondents explicitly addressing Dunsmore, Wendover and Halton (CFA 10) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 10, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 10 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.10.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 10 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 10.
- 6.10.4 Many respondents who discuss this CFA also discuss other adjacent CFAs, particularly CFAs 8 and 9. CFAs 8, 9 and 10 make up the wider Chilterns area, and a number of respondents made comments about the Chilterns as a whole, rather than about individual CFAs. Many of these issues are discussed in sections 6.8 and 6.9 and will not be reiterated in depth in this section.

Shared issues with other CFA reports

- 6.10.5 See 6.8 for issues relevant to CFAs 8, 9 and 10.

Overarching issues for CFA 10

- 6.10.6 As discussed above, the issue most frequently discussed in relation to this CFA is the Chiltern's status as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Many respondents advocate tunnelling through the area to the north of Wendover in order to mitigate visual and ecological impacts on the AONB landscape.
- 6.10.7 The proposed Wendover viaduct also attracts a large number of comments, primarily from respondents expressing concern about noise and visual impacts caused by construction and operation of the viaduct. Comments relating to the viaduct are discussed in more detail below, in relation to specific impacts.

- 6.10.8 There are two organised responses submitted in relation to CFA 10. One is a Chilterns-wide organised response (relating to CFAs 8-10), submitted by approximately 6,000 respondents advocating tunnelling through the area to lessen the visual impact on the countryside. The other is an organised response specific to CFA 10 and submitted by approximately 500 respondents. This organised response gives overall negative feedback on the draft ES suggesting that respondents were not provided with sufficient information to make the consultation process meaningful. It argues that should the project go ahead, there must be a bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns and past Wendover as minimum mitigation. It also requests that the proposed Wendover green tunnel be lengthened at both ends and that the height and efficiency of the viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean be increased to mitigate noise impacts. It asks that the Bacombe Lane and South Street junction be retained, to ensure access to Bacombe Lane, and requests new cricket facilities for Wendover Cricket Ground. It makes several suggestions for mitigation measures, including design of proposed infrastructure sympathetic to the local area, and specific measures to mitigate the impact on local woodland and wildlife.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.10.9 Concern about the visual impact on the AONB landscape is one of the most prominent themes in comments relevant to this CFA.
- 6.10.10 Respondents express particular concerns about the anticipated visual impact of the proposed viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean.

“The huge concrete bridge at Small Dean is completely out of character in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I did not find a picture of the proposed viaduct at Wendover Dean, but can only imagine it will be worse because it is higher up”

Individual

- 6.10.11 Some respondents express scepticism about the images of the viaducts provided in the draft ES. A number of respondents feel that they offer an unrealistic depiction, and that the viaducts would be much more prominent than the draft ES suggests.

“Inadequate information is provide(d) about the new height of installations and a lack of meaningful rendering of the local visual impact. These should be meaningful representations of what the local community will see, not distant glances. I live near the line, not at the top of a hill miles away from the line.”

Individual

- 6.10.12 The Chilterns Conservation Board requests that viaducts and bridges are designed sympathetically in order to “blend in” to the surrounding landscape as far as possible.
- 6.10.13 A number of respondents raise concerns about the impact on views of the Chilterns AONB. There are particular concerns about the obstruction of views from Bacombe Hill across the AONB. The Chilterns Countryside Group expresses concern that the disruption of these views would harm the tourist trade in Wendover. The Chilterns Countryside Group is also concerned about the impact of the proposed Wendover green tunnel on views from bridleways traversing the Bacombe Hills, as well as views from public rights of way, including cycle paths, overlooking the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts.

- 6.10.14 Respondents also raise concerns about the impact on Coombe Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a National Trust site. Some respondents argue that the assessment of noise and visual impacts has been inadequate here.
- 6.10.15 A number of mitigation measures are proposed by respondents to minimise the visual impacts on the AONB. The most commonly suggested measure is a fully bored tunnel extending across the CFA and to the north of Wendover. However, other mitigation measures are also proposed. Wendover Parish Council asks for additional planting to shield views from the Coombe and Bacombe Hills.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.10.16 Many respondents raise concerns about noise levels caused by construction work, and beyond the construction period, by the trains themselves. Comments include concerns about the impact of noise on the community, particularly due to trains running early in the morning and late at night.

“I am deeply concerned at the impact of noise on the community, both construction noise and more particularly operational noise once the line is built. Starting to run services from 5am is much too early - residents' health will suffer from lack of sleep with trains running from 5am-midnight.”

Individual

- 6.10.17 Several respondents also allude to the potential health impacts of excessive noise saying for example that “effects of raised noise levels on people's mental and physical health, both during and after construction, must have consideration”.
- 6.10.18 There are also some specific concerns about the effect of construction and operational noise on local institutions. A couple of respondents note that there is a special needs school (Wendover House School) in close proximity to the proposed line through Wendover, and express concerns about the effect of noise levels on pupils. There are also some comments about the impact on Wendover Church, a venue which respondents say is used for regular music events.
- 6.10.19 Respondents raise particular concerns about noise from the proposed viaducts. David Lidington, Member of Parliament for Aylesbury, writes that residents of Dunsmore and Wendover Dean are chiefly concerned about noise from the proposed viaducts. He states that his constituents have expressed disappointment that HS2 Ltd has decided not to enclose the viaduct as it passes between Wendover Dean and Small Dean. A number of other responses echo this sentiment. The Chiltern Countryside Group also expresses concerns about noise from the viaducts affecting public rights of way.
- 6.10.20 As is the case in comments related to other CFAs, a number of respondents argue that the predicted noise levels provided in the draft ES are misleading as they refer to average noise levels rather than the actual volume of passing trains.

6.10.21 Several respondents advocate the use of the most advanced sound absorption measures possible to mitigate the effect on the local community. One respondent advocates that cuttings should have vertical sides lined with sound absorption materials, or lined vertical sides topped with sound absorption fencing. Respondents generally do not believe that bunds are an acceptable substitute for these measures, and there is concern about the visual impact of bunds on the local countryside.

Community

6.10.22 A number of organisations raise concerns about potential detrimental impacts on the local community in this CFA. Some think that construction and operation of HS2 would lead to a serious deterioration in the quality of life of residents in what is a “*predominantly rural and tranquil area*”. Several respondents believe that the draft ES does not adequately assess or address the impact on the local community.

“There does not appear to have been any survey carried out by HS2 Ltd regarding the detrimental impact of construction and the running of up to 36 trains per hour on the local community”

Individual

6.10.23 Several respondents mention the Wendover Cricket Ground, which would lose land in the proposed plans. Many of these respondents, including David Lidington MP and Buckinghamshire Councils, argue that HS2 Ltd must find an alternative location for the cricket ground. Wendover Parish Council suggests alternative sites within the CFA which could be offered to Wendover Cricket Ground as compensation.

6.10.24 Several respondents, including the Wendover Society, raise concerns about the impact on St Mary’s Church of noise and disturbance from the green tunnel portal.

“Within the Wendover area ... St Mary's Church, which has been a foundation of the community for the last 700 years, and based on current projections would not remain as a suitable venue for weddings, funerals, with the expected passby noise levels on the Small Dean Viaduct”

Individual

6.10.25 A number of comments are made relating to the impact on The Lee, a village within the CFA, which, respondents argue, faces disproportionate impacts from construction traffic and general disruption.

6.10.26 Several respondents refer to the impact on local footpaths and public rights of way. There is particular concern about the Ridgeway footpath, which, respondents suggest, would face access issues, and if it were to remain accessible would suffer from noise and visual impacts.

6.10.27 A number of respondents raise questions about eligibility criteria for compensation, and are concerned that Wendover residents would not be able to apply for compensation before the line becomes operational.

Socio-economics

- 6.10.28 Comments made about the socio-economic impacts of construction and operation of HS2 in this CFA generally express similar concerns to those raised in relation to the Chilterns AONB and emphasise the detrimental impact on the tourist industry, and potential job losses resulting from this. Several respondents argue that the draft ES should have included a more comprehensive assessment of the socio-economic impacts of construction and operation of HS2.
- 6.10.29 These concerns are sometimes associated specifically with the Wendover Dean viaduct, which some respondents fear could seriously affect tourism in the area.
- 6.10.30 One respondent cites a study made by Tourism South East which estimates that the Chilterns AONB received over 55 million leisure visits in 2007, and asserts that tourism would be severely reduced by the impacts of construction traffic and the obstruction of views.
- 6.10.31 The Chilterns Countryside Group argues on the basis of their survey of Great Missenden that there would be significant impacts on businesses in Wendover, owing to shrinking tourism and severance from neighbouring villages and communities.
- 6.10.32 Again, many respondents advocate strongly for a fully bored tunnel through the CFA, to minimise the impact on the landscape and consequently on the tourism industry.

Ecology

- 6.10.33 There are a number of ecological concerns raised in relation to this CFA.
- 6.10.34 Respondents are particularly worried about the proposed destruction of part of Jones Hill Wood, an area of ancient woodland. Several respondents emphasise that planting new trees cannot compensate for the loss of ancient woodland.

“Have you no understanding of the concept of Ancient Woodland - another rare habitat? It is defined as trees at least 400 years old. YOU CANNOT TRANSPLANT THESE TREES”.

Individual

- 6.10.35 Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust requests more detail about mitigation proposals for the impact on woodland, and state that they would accept no net loss of habitat. They argue that any habitat lost must be fully mitigated and compensated using Defra biodiversity guidelines.
- 6.10.36 Several respondents are also concerned about the impact on Weston Turville Reservoir, an SSSI. Some comment that a reduction in ground water could disturb the ecological balance of the reservoir, which could have national implications. One respondent notes that monitoring is the only mitigation measure proposed for the SSSI, and emphasises that mitigation measures need to be more detailed and extensive. The respondent adds that there must be detailed contingency plans for mitigation measures should a change in groundwater levels be found to affect the reservoir. Buckinghamshire Councils also advocates mitigating the impact on the SSSI through engineering and hydrology.

- 6.10.37 Respondents express a number of concerns about the impact on local species, particularly bats, badgers and water voles. Several organisations, including Buckinghamshire Councils and the National Trust, comment on the lack of assessment of the impact on the local wildlife population. Others argue that mitigation measures for the resiting of species are insufficient, saying that relocating species in new habitats is unlikely to be successful.
- 6.10.38 Many respondents suggest that a bored tunnel would be the most effective and appropriate way of minimising the ecological impact of the project.
- 6.10.39 As is the case in comments made in relation to other CFAs, a number of respondents disagree with the ecological impact assessment included in the draft ES. Several argue that an ecological impact assessment must be carried out over a minimum period of three years in order to be meaningful and highlight that the assessment on which the draft ES is based took place over less than a year. These respondents believe that this undermines the conclusions drawn about environmental impact and appropriate mitigation measures in the draft ES.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.10.40 A number of respondents express concerns about the impact of construction works on farmland. Several note that the draft ES proposals involve the loss of 2,000 hectares of grade 2 agricultural land, and the loss of two farms.
- 6.10.41 The realignment of Bacombe Lane is referred to by a small number of respondents as involving an unnecessary use of viable farmland.
- 6.10.42 A small number of respondents comment on the proposed demolition of Durham Farm to make way for the viaduct, and argue that a bored tunnel would avoid this impact.
- 6.10.43 The Chilterns Conservation Board argues that the study area used to determine agricultural effects in the draft ES is insufficient to extrapolate meaningful conclusions from as it is based only on a 200m wide corridor. They also request that noise and dust impacts on livestock be considered as part of the agricultural assessment.
- 6.10.44 Chiltern Countryside Group comments on land-take and recommend compensation for landowners for the reduction in available agricultural land during construction and operation.

Cultural heritage

- 6.10.45 Several comments are made about the impact on cultural heritage sites in this CFA. As mentioned above, there are concerns about the impact on St Mary's Church, a Grade 2 listed building in Wendover, which would be affected by disruption from the green tunnel portal. Buckinghamshire Councils comments that impacts on the setting of this building have not been adequately assessed, and call for a more thorough assessment of the listed structure.
- 6.10.46 Several respondents mention the impact on archaeological remains in the area. A moated site at Grove Farm, and Roman Villas at Wellwick Farm, Nash Lee Farm, and Coneycroft Farm are all mentioned as sites of archaeological interest which would be destroyed by construction.
- 6.10.47 Several organisations, including Buckinghamshire Councils, claim that Wendover Conservation Area has been ignored by the draft ES, and should have been included in the list of specific heritage assets which would experience significant impacts during construction.

Traffic and transport

- 6.10.48 There are a number of concerns raised about the impact on traffic caused by construction work. Some respondents make general comments about the detrimental impacts of increased traffic on local roads, while others refer more specifically to the impact on certain roads or routes.
- 6.10.49 Several respondents, including some organisations, comment on the proposed utilisation of Potter Row as a construction traffic route, often saying this is unacceptable, as they consider the road too narrow to support heavy traffic. A number of respondents suggest that construction traffic on Potter Row would be dangerous, as it is used by cyclists, riders, and walkers, serves as a school bus route, and intersects with several public rights of way.

“Potter Row and Kings Lane are used by walkers, horse riders and cyclists. Potter Row acts as the connection for 3 footpaths which cross it and 2 other footpaths which meet it. Apart from a significant loss of amenity to the users of such rights of way there is significant risk of injury/loss of life from the use of Potter Row as a construction traffic route, and, additionally, Potter Row is a school bus route dropping off children along the road. Potter Row and Kings Lane are effectively, for the size of construction vehicles that would use it, a single track road”

Individual

- 6.10.50 Rocky Lane is also frequently cited by respondents as inappropriate to serve as a construction route – like Potter Row, it is considered to be too narrow for use by heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).
- 6.10.51 A number of respondents suggest an alternative construction route, replacing or enhancing Leather Lane and running directly from the A413. They think this would avoid the use of Potter Row as well as Rocky Lane. Another suggestion made by some respondents is to build a temporary construction traffic road from the A413 up to the HS2 route in order to avoid Potter Row.
- 6.10.52 Wendover Parish Council argues that in the baseline provided in the draft ES, public right of way usage has been underestimated. They suggest that the baseline needs to be amended to take public right of way usage into account. They also recommend improvements to various footpaths, bridleways and cycleways in the area, which they believe would improve connectivity and safety.
- 6.10.53 Several respondents, including The Lee Parish Council and the Chesham Society, express concerns about access to The Lee village. The Lee Parish Council expresses concerns that traffic displacement from the A413 would cause major delays and impede the village's accessibility.
- 6.10.54 Several respondents advocate upgrades to Small Dean Lane, Grove Farm access road and Ellesborough Road as part of mitigation measures.
- 6.10.55 A few respondents comment on the impact of construction traffic on air quality, with some people raising concerns about the effects on people with health issues such as asthma.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.10.56 Wendover Parish Council says that the draft ES does not acknowledge potential impacts on water resources in CFA 10. They are particularly concerned about impacts from the proposed green tunnel upon the Wendover Arm Canal and its feeder springs. They also raise concerns about the potential impact on Weston Turville Reservoir SSSI, as they expect the water table to be affected by construction work.
- 6.10.57 Respondents express concerns about the visual impact of balancing ponds. For example David Lidington MP argues that HS2 Ltd should have discussed the proposed balancing ponds in the community forums, and states that many of his constituents are unhappy that they were not given the opportunity to discuss the balancing ponds before they were included in the draft ES. He emphasises the need for the formal ES to set out clearly the case for balancing ponds, to justify the assertion that the water would not be polluted, and to include evidence of measures to ensure that any pollution is stopped from affecting groundwater.

“My constituents have pointed out to me that not everyone is aware that balancing ponds are required for projects like HS2 and even if HS2 Ltd were not able to inform people of their location they could have told people that they would be needed.”

David Lidington, Member of Parliament for Aylesbury

Air quality

- 6.10.58 Several respondents raise concerns about the impact on air quality caused by construction work, particularly the additional HGV traffic on the roads, and high levels of dust caused by excavation.
- 6.10.59 Buckinghamshire Councils makes a number of comments relating to air quality. The Council argues that the draft ES does not address air quality impacts adequately and that formal ES must include measures for air quality *'offsetting'*, such as green roofs, green walls, and trees that trap or remove air pollutants.

Waste and material resources

- 6.10.60 Several respondents note that the draft ES does not explain what would happen to excavated material in this CFA, and add that the traffic assessment does not account for additional vehicles necessary for transporting excavated material. Several call for a more detailed account of plans for excavated material to be included in the formal ES.
- 6.10.61 One respondent is concerned about a proposed storage location for excavated material close to Coombe Hill SSSI, arguing that this would not be an appropriate location.

Other issues

- 6.10.62 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topic of land quality, explicitly in relation to CFA 10.

6.11 Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury (CFA 11)

Overview

- 6.11.1 The Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury community forum area (CFA) covers an approximately 10.5km section of the Proposed Scheme in the district of Aylesbury Vale, in the county of Buckinghamshire. The area extends from approximately 700m east of the A4010 Risborough Road, south of Stoke Mandeville, to approximately 200m south of the A41 Bicester Road near Cranwell Farm. It includes land within the parishes of Stoke Mandeville, Stone with Bishopstone and Hartwell, Quarrendon, Fleet Marston and Waddesdon.
- 6.11.2 There are 116 respondents explicitly addressing Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury (CFA 11) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 11, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 11 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.11.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 11 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 11.

Shared issues with other CFA reports

- 6.11.4 There appear to be no shared issues between the CFA 11 report and other adjacent CFA reports.

Overarching issues for CFA 11

- 6.11.5 One of the most frequently cited issues for respondents commenting on this CFA is the impact of construction traffic on local roads. There are concerns about additional congestion in the area, particularly on roads leading into and out of Aylesbury, and the knock-on effect on local business. There are also a number of comments relating to plans to realign several major roads in the area, including the A418 and the A4010, with many respondents concerned that this would involve additional disruption.
- 6.11.6 Respondents frequently express concern about the impact construction and operation of HS2 would have on noise levels. A number of respondents believe the noise assessment provided in the draft ES is inadequate, particularly in regards to additional noise levels from construction and operation of the proposed maintenance loop between Nash Lee Road and Risborough Road.
- 6.11.7 Several local cultural heritage sites, including Hartwell House and St Mary's Church, receive a number of mentions.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.11.8 Concern about noise levels caused by the construction and operation of HS2 is one of the issues most frequently raised by respondents commenting on this CFA. A number of respondents note that noise is already an issue in this area, which contains the largest urban centre after London and Birmingham to be affected by the line. There are particular concerns about additional noise caused by the proposed maintenance loop between Nash Lee Road and Risborough Road, with a number of respondents expressing concerns that maintenance work utilising the loop would take place overnight, disrupting the sleep of local residents.

“What additional measures will be put in place to deal with the new construction impacts of the proposed Maintenance Loop, with its extra operating hours, and noisier freight equipment?”

Individual

- 6.11.9 Respondents identify Stoke Mandeville as a place particularly at risk of incurring noise impacts, as it is located between two railway lines, a maintenance loop and a new overbridge. Several residents are of the opinion that the area would be disproportionately affected by HS2.

“Should this development go ahead, dwellings in Nash Lee Lane will have Trains thundering to the left of us (main line) Trains thundering to the right of us (HS2) Trucks roaring in front of us (Diverted new access road for Nash Lee Lane and Nash Lee Road, busy road that leads to the bypass) and RAF tug planes flying above us. I think I will say no more other than dreams of a happy retirement have just gone straight out of the window.....is this fair????”

Individual

- 6.11.10 As in comments made with regard to other CFAs, many respondents are concerned that the noise assessment provides average noise levels rather than the peak noise of trains passing, saying this is misleading. David Lidington, Member of Parliament for Aylesbury, writes that he, along with many of his constituents, is disappointed by the lack of information on noise levels contained in the draft ES.

- 6.11.11 Other respondents are sceptical about the accuracy of the assessment, with several commenting that the noise assessment does not take wind direction into account.

“In the assessments that have been made I cannot find any reference to prevailing wind conditions. For us the prevailing wind comes from the direction of the proposed line. Clearly this will have an impact on noise and pollution (dust etc) during construction and when trains are running”

Individual

- 6.11.12 Several respondents comment that there is insufficient specific assessment of the noise levels from construction and operation of the maintenance loop contained in the draft ES.

- 6.11.13 A number of respondents discuss the use of barriers for mitigation of noise levels. They often argue that noise mitigation is more important than visual mitigation, and would prefer higher barriers to minimise noise levels.

- 6.11.14 Some respondents commenting on this CFA are concerned about the possibility of the bored tunnel through the Chilterns being extended beyond Wendover, as this would move the tunnel portal, and its associated noise impacts, into CFA 11.

Traffic and transport

- 6.11.15 The impact on traffic is another issue raised by many respondents and organisations commenting on this CFA. Some respondents make general comments about the additional traffic on roads in the local area, and raise concerns about the impacts for local residents in terms of congestion, health and safety. Others discuss the impact on particular roads, or suggest that proposed sections of the construction traffic route are inappropriate for substantial additional traffic and use by heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).
- 6.11.16 Several respondents are concerned about the impact of additional traffic on local schools. One respondent notes that Stoke Mandeville village alone has three schools, one a special needs school, a play group, and an older people's community centre within a mile of the proposed construction route.

"The schools account for some 1,500 students. In the case of the Special Needs school, many are brought by taxi from a wide area, exposing them to additional traffic impacts and safety risks."

Individual

- 6.11.17 A number of respondents discuss the proposed realignment of A418 and its impacts on Hartwell House. There are concerns that the realignment of this A-road would have adverse effects on Hartwell House, which is a Grade 1 listed building, and the wider Hartwell House Estate. Concerns about the impact on Hartwell House and Estate are discussed in more details below (cultural heritage).
- 6.11.18 As well as the potential adverse impact on Hartwell House, several respondents are concerned about disruption or demolition of the current A418.

"The way from Stone & Hartwell to Aylesbury are the most beautiful of all roads going into Aylesbury. A delightful road lined with a listed ancient wall and large mature trees. Along this piece of road are 3 very lovely houses, built for the courtiers of Louis 18 when in exile at Hartwell House. It is a well used road by cars etc but also by walkers and bike riders, being one of Aylesbury's cycle tracks. Glebe House is a listed building and it would be extremely sad if this was demolished. The road should not be moved and lovely trees felled either"

Individual

- 6.11.19 Several respondents ask whether the realignment of the A418 would include replacing the cycle way which currently runs alongside the road. Others question whether a foot or cycle bridge would be built to connect the two sections of the A418 bisected by HS2.
- 6.11.20 A number of respondents express concerns about the realignment of A4010 overbridge and associated impacts such as noise, visual intrusion and demolition of buildings and gardens.

"Diverting the A4010 over the railway will have a disproportionately adverse impact on our property. This is already a very busy road with a full range of vehicles using the road. Putting in a bridge of this elevation will add to both the visual and noise impact. So for us it's not just the railway and its construction and operation but also the impact of a realigned road. We will have both the visual impact of the road and the additional noise created by vehicles, including HGVs, driving over a bridge"

Individual

- 6.11.21 David Lidington MP notes that proposed construction works would involve cutting across three of the main access roads into Aylesbury: the A413 at Wendover, A4010 at Stoke Mandeville and A413 Oxford Road near Sedrup. He expresses concern about the impact on local businesses and asks for mitigation measures to minimise the impact on traffic accessing these businesses.
- 6.11.22 Stone, Bishopstone and Hartwell Parish Council expresses concern about the anticipated increase in traffic in Stone, which would become a main construction traffic route along the A418 from the M40.
- 6.11.23 A proposal to provide Stoke Mandeville with a bypass is supported by some respondents. Respondents argue that this would have associated benefits of giving direct road access to maintenance loops and better access for emergency services.

Air quality

- 6.11.24 Some respondents, including Buckinghamshire Councils, raise concerns about the impact of additional traffic on air quality in the area. Buckinghamshire Councils states the draft ES should have properly assessed the impact on air quality and associated health risks caused by additional traffic and HGVs.

“Section 4 does not portray the chronic effects dust and air quality reduction will have on many people with breathing difficulties in South Aylesbury and on young children and families in Fairford Leys from dust, construction diesel fumes and also mud which should be included in Chapter 5.”

Individual

- 6.11.25 The Chilterns Conservation Board comments on the assessment of impacts on air quality, arguing that the assessment “is extremely brief and provides no meaningful information on methodology, receptors assessed, the study area or how significance is to be assessed”.

Socio-economics

- 6.11.26 As discussed above, several respondents express concerns about the impact of additional traffic on access roads into Aylesbury on local businesses.

“All three of these roads [the A413 at Wendover, A4010 at Stoke Mandeville and A413 Oxford Road] are very busy and congested at peak hours with long queues into and out of the town being routine. A very large number of businesses depend on both staff and customers being able to get access to their premises. [...] HS2 Ltd should plan its construction work carefully to limit as much as is possible the adverse economic impact that construction will have”.

David Lidington, Member of Parliament for Aylesbury

- 6.11.27 The Chilterns Conservation Board calls for a full assessment of the socio-economic impact of HS2 on the area, particularly the impact on employment opportunities and existing businesses.
- 6.11.28 A few respondents mention that property in the local area has been devalued by the proposals.

“As an 80 year old living in my 5 year old house built for my retirement this is the last thing I need close to my doorstep in the later years of my life! One is trapped in that the project has devalued my house to an extent that it cannot be sold; indeed local estate agents claim little if any interest by potential buyers.”

Individual

Cultural heritage

- 6.11.29 A number of respondents express concerns about the impact of construction and operation of HS2 on local cultural heritage sites.

“It is vital that HS2 Ltd seeks to maintain the heritage of the local area as much as possible. Local people should not be expected to live with both HS2 Ltd and the destruction of local history as well.”

David Lidington, Member of Parliament for Aylesbury

- 6.11.30 As discussed above, there are particular concerns among respondents about the impact of the realignment of the A418 on Hartwell House. The National Trust, which currently leases the building from the Ernest Cook Trust, describes the likely adverse impacts on the listed buildings and surrounding historic parkland, concluding “*we are confronted with a set of long term / permanent and cumulative effects on cultural heritage (a consequence of noise and landscape) and on fauna (fragmentation of habitat)*”. The National Trust advocates either a fully bored or green tunnel to minimise the impact on Hartwell House and the surrounding estate. Many respondents, including Coldharbour Parish Council, express their support for the National Trust’s recommendations.
- 6.11.31 There are also a number of comments on St Mary’s Church, a Grade II* listed medieval building. Several respondents note that the proposed route of HS2 crosses the site of the former church, and are express concern about the destruction of this heritage site. Stoke Mandeville Parish Council states that it would expect, as minimum mitigation, a number of measures to preserve remains and artefacts from the site, including the removal of memorials to an appropriate consecrated site in consultation with the local community, and, where possible, surviving families.

Community

- 6.11.32 Respondents' comments on the impact of HS2 on the local community include concerns about the impact on residential properties, disruption of a number of local facilities, and the impediment of footpaths and public rights of way.
- 6.11.33 Many respondents express concerns about the impact on residential properties in this CFA. David Lidington MP notes that the line passes particularly close to properties on Nash Lee Lane and Nash Lee Road, and expresses his concern and disappointment that no specific mitigation or compensation has been proposed for residents.
- 6.11.34 Stone with Bishopstone and Hartwell Parish Council is concerned about the impact of HS2 on the villages of Stone, Bishopstone, Sedrup and Upper and Lower Hartwell. They argue that the draft ES does not provide sufficient mitigation measures for these villages.

- 6.11.35 The Ernest Cook Trust notes that Fairford Leys and its facilities are absent from the draft ES section on Notable Community Facilities, and thinks these should be added to the formal ES.
- 6.11.36 Several respondents are concerned about the impact on Aylesbury Park Golf Course, which would lose land under the proposals. One respondent describes the Club as *“a wonderful amenity to the communities locally, and a pleasant green space between Hartwell and Aylesbury”*. The Ernest Cook Trust calls proposals to relocate part of the golf course to the south of the A418 *“economically unsound”*, and argues that alternative mitigation measures need to be discussed.
- 6.11.37 Several respondents express concerns about the proposals' impact on the Buckinghamshire Goat Centre.

“While it is stated that there is no land take planned for the Buckinghamshire Goat Centre, it is not stated whether there could be disturbance to the livestock or to visitors which would make the operation of the centre unviable.”

Buckinghamshire Councils

- 6.11.38 Buckinghamshire, Milton Keynes and West Middlesex Area of the Ramblers' Association expresses concerns about the obstruction of local public rights of way, and suggests a number of mitigation measures.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.11.39 A number of respondents discuss the visual impact of the Proposed Scheme on the area. There are particular concerns about the visual impact of the maintenance loop, and the additional light pollution associated with it.
- 6.11.40 Several respondents, including Stone, Bishopstone and Hartwell Parish Council, are concerned about the visual impact of the Marsh Lane overbridge. The Parish Council expresses concerns about the height of the overbridge, and ask for any mitigation measures to reduce its visual impact.
- 6.11.41 Others are concerned about the impact of the proposed viaduct at Fairford Leys. Some say that photomontages provided are unrepresentative of the actual visual impact on the area.

“The views under represent the starkness of HS2, as trees will be lost for decades that currently break up the lines of sight. The document under states impacts”

Individual

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.11.42 Several organisations express concerns about the impact of the Proposed Scheme on local agriculture.

“Like the whole HS2 scheme, this section is destructive of our natural environment & of prime farmland. Specifically, it will destroy the working farm I live on, Nash Lee Farm - which does not even warrant a mention in the so-called 'Agriculture' section of your Draft Environmental Statement”

Individual

- 6.11.43 The Ernest Cook Trust emphasises that it is essential that the farms to the north and south of the A418 are able to operate efficiently and economically both during the construction phase and once the line becomes operational.
- 6.11.44 Stoke Mandeville Action Group opposes construction of the maintenance loop between Nash Lee Road and Risborough Road, arguing that this would involve the loss of viable agricultural land.
- 6.11.45 Stone with Bishopstone and Hartwell Parish Council expresses its support for the views and recommendation of Buckinghamshire Councils and the National Trust for mitigating the impacts on agriculture and forestry.

Ecology

- 6.11.46 A few respondents mention the potential ecological impacts of construction and operation of HS2. Coldharbour Parish Council asks for ecological mitigation measures such as new habitats for at-risk fauna, new woodland planted using native species, and wildlife crossings across the route to mitigate the loss of hedgerow.
- 6.11.47 The Environment Agency states that surveys must be carried out on ponds between Lower Hartwell and Putlowes Farm to establish the presence (or otherwise) of protected species such as the great crested newt, in order to inform mitigation measures.

Land quality

- 6.11.48 The Environment Agency suggests that there may be contamination associated with some of the sites where demolition is proposed, including Hartwell Depot and two associated outbuildings. They ask for further assessment of these sites before the commencement of any construction work. They also express concerns about contamination at the Old Brickyard and former Hartwell Landfill, suggesting further investigation and the monitoring of groundwater in the area.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.11.49 Several organisations, including the Aylesbury Park Golf Club, express concern about the impact of construction work upon the River Thames.
- 6.11.50 A few respondents raise concerns about the potential for increased flood risk, particularly in Fairford Leys, an area prone to flooding.
- 6.11.51 Several respondents are unhappy about the visual impact of the proposed balancing ponds in the area.

Waste and material resources

- 6.11.52 A few respondents discuss the disposal of waste materials. Some are unhappy about a perceived lack of detail about waste disposal in the draft ES. One respondent writes that the draft ES *“does not detail or characterise properly the impacts of earth removal, dumping and dust and mud impacts on Coldharbour Lane, the golf club, house, lanes and on crops and pastures”*.

Other issues

6.11.53 One or two respondents ask for a station at Aylesbury as part of the Proposed Scheme.

“Please, if you must stick to this route, can we have a station at Aylesbury? We would love to have the benefit of high speed rail. As things are proposed, we will have to hear and see this service, but get no advantage whatsoever”

Individual

6.12 Waddesdon and Quainton (CFA 12)

Overview

- 6.12.1 The Waddesdon and Quainton community forum area (CFA) covers approximately 10km of the Proposed Scheme in Aylesbury Vale District, from just south of the A41 Bicester Road to the north-western tip of Sheepphouse Wood, south-west of Calvert. The area includes land in parts of the Waddesdon, Quainton, Grendon Underwood and Calvert Green parishes.
- 6.12.2 There are 60 respondents explicitly addressing Waddesdon and Quainton (CFA 12) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 12, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 12 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.12.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 12 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 12.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.12.4 A small number of respondents discuss issues or observations for a section of the route including CFA 12 and adjacent CFAs, in particular CFA 13. These comments often focus on the Calvert Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD). This structure is situated within CFA 13, but some respondents express concern that parts of CFA 12 would also experience noise and visual impacts such as light pollution and traffic congestion due to its close proximity. Plans to relocate the FCC Environment (the waste operator for the Calvert landfill site) sidings at Calvert landfill sites to new location at School Hill are also a shared issue, owing to potential impacts on Sheepphouse Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which spans CFAs 12 and 13.

Overarching issues for CFA 12

- 6.12.5 Responses including comments relevant to CFA 12 are often supportive of the idea of lowering the alignment of the route or extending the proposed cutting to beyond Quainton and Sheepphouse Wood SSSI, saying this would reduce noise, visual, ecological and traffic impacts in the area.

“We envy our neighbours in Waddesdon where the village is largely protected by a cutting. A cutting south of Quainton village and through to Calvert will do much to alleviate the damage to the village road system, noise and damage to wildlife such as the Bechstein’s Bat.”

Quainton Parish Council

Ecology

- 6.12.6 Several respondents comment that the area contains several designated sites which would be affected by the Proposed Scheme, including Grendon and Doddershall Meadows Local Wildlife Site (LWS), Grendon and Doddershall Wood SSSI, Sheephouse Wood SSSI, and Finemere Wood SSSI.
- 6.12.7 Several respondents express concern about the associated impacts on wildlife, including bats, birds, and butterflies. Some respondents are concerned specifically about impacts on protected species, including Bechstein’s Bat and the Black Hairstreak Butterfly.
- 6.12.8 Some respondents express concern about wildlife habitat loss, for example that mitigation measures like bunds might require additional land-take.
- 6.12.9 Others discuss the risk of habitat severance, for example that the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme would interrupt migration routes between Sheephouse and Doddershall Woods.

“Within this Community Forum we have serious concerns regarding the impact on a number of sites, particularly Grendon and Doddershall Meadows LWS, Sheephouse Wood SSSI, and Finemere Meadows (part of Finemere Wood BBOWT reserve), and on the populations of individual species, notably Bechstein's and other bats. First and foremost every effort should be made to Avoid impact on habitats and species through engineering. For unavoidable impacts, the highest quality of Mitigation and Compensation is needed, combined with Enhancement.”

Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust

- 6.12.10 A few respondents comment that the ecological assessment provided is inadequate and that further surveys are required. The Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust, as well as Buckinghamshire Councils, the Environment Agency, the National Trust and Quainton Parish Council, provide a range of specific suggestions for further assessment and field surveys, including for specific sites and species.
- 6.12.11 A few respondents also comment on the proposed ecological mitigation measures, with some questioning the effectiveness of greenbridges as mitigation for habitat severance and commenting that there is insufficient information about the proposed planting to judge whether or not it would be sufficient mitigation for loss of woodland.

Traffic and transport

- 6.12.12 Several respondents are concerned about the impact that road closures, diversions and re-alignments along with the construction of new overbridges could have in terms of traffic and disruption. Many of these concerns relate specifically to the proposed plans for the realignment of Station Road.

- 6.12.13 A number of respondents, including Quainton Parish Council, comment on the possible isolation of Quainton from the surrounding area, including from amenities in Waddesdon and Aylesbury, as well as access to the Buckinghamshire Railway Centre, which respondents describe as an important local visitor attraction.

“Quainton is particularly concerned at the proposed re-alignment of Station Road. There is a lot of movement between Quainton and Waddesdon. Most of the secondary schoolchildren go to Waddesdon School. The Doctor's Surgery is in Waddesdon. The Post office is in Waddesdon.”

Individual

- 6.12.14 Other comments include concerns about impacts on pedestrian routes, with Quainton Railway Society expressing concerns about the proposed pedestrian underpass at Station Road in Quainton. There are concerns that it would be little used and may even lead to antisocial activities which could in turn present a security issue as well as comments that a pedestrian overbridge is the preferred option.
- 6.12.15 Some respondents, including Buckinghamshire Councils, Quainton Parish Council and the National Trust, also make specific suggestions for mitigation measures or changes to the proposed plans, such as a lowering of the route alignment, the use of a cutting near Quainton, changes to local road alignments, or the construction of a bypass around Waddesdon.
- 6.12.16 A number of respondents comment that local roads, including Edgcott Road, are unsuitable for use by construction traffic due to their narrow and rural nature. A few specifically express concerns that such roads would need to be widened in order to accommodate heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic, leading to increased disruption or landscape impacts.

Cultural heritage

- 6.12.17 Several respondents, including Buckinghamshire Councils, Quainton Parish Council, the Buckingham Archaeological Society, the National Trust and the Historic Houses Association, express concerns about impacts on listed and historic buildings in the area. These include Grade II* listed Doddershall House and Grade I listed Claydon House and Waddesdon Manor and Gardens.
- 6.12.18 Some respondents express specific concern about associated visual impacts, noise impacts, or impacts on the historic landscape.
- 6.12.19 The demolition of the Grade II* Listed Lodge at Doddershall House is a subject of some concern, as is the impact of the proposed auto-transformer feeder station situated near Doddershall House. Some respondents also question the proposed mitigation measures and sometimes suggest alternative ways to protect the historic landscape.

“As a fundamental point of principle, it is evident that HS2 Ltd and its consultants have significantly fallen short of its own ‘mandate’ of ‘protecting natural and cultural resources and enhancing the environment’ (HS2: Investing in Britain's Future) when it comes to designing this section of the route. Indeed, one would hard-pushed to find an area in the Country where there is a greater concentration of historic buildings, parks and gardens and historic landscape.”

The Waddesdon Estate and Rothschild Foundation

- 6.12.20 The Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society raises concerns about the potential impact of HS2 on the Great Central Railway and feels that its heritage significance has been overlooked

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.12.21 A number of respondents are concerned about the visual impact that HS2 would have on the countryside of this area. These concerns are often accompanied by a request to lower the vertical alignment of the track to better mitigate visual impact.

“The works will have a significant visual impact on the character and appearance of this area and also on our property. The DES fails to identify any visual impact at my or my neighbour’s properties. Given that we are only 130m from the line, it is implausible to think that there would be no visual impact upon us.”

Individual

- 6.12.22 Some respondents have specific concerns about views from properties, footpaths or public rights of way, as well as the possible visual impact of the proposed scheme on the setting of cultural heritage sites such as Doddershall Estate.
- 6.12.23 A few respondents comment that the assessment and/or photomontages provided are not detailed enough to allow the level of landscape and visual impacts to be properly determined.
- 6.12.24 Some respondents express specific concern about the potential visual impact of the proposed auto-transformer feeder station and the national grid substation near Quanton as an intrusive structure in a rural landscape.
- 6.12.25 A few respondents are concerned about potential light pollution from operating trains, from the Calvert IMD nearby in CFA 13 as well as from construction sites. There is concern among a few respondents that the impact of light pollution would be especially high given that the current levels in the area are particularly low.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.12.26 Several respondents comment on potential noise and sound impacts both during construction and operation of the line, especially in light of the area’s relatively quiet and tranquil nature. A few respondents challenge the assessment of the noise baseline for the area, stating that it is too high.
- 6.12.27 Some respondents also express concerns about the impacts of vibration on properties, including the Grade II* Listed Doddershall House, while a few, including the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), are concerned about noise impacts on the Sheephouse Wood SSSI and associated impacts on wildlife, including birds.

“Lying in my bed I will hear cows, cockerels and a thundering train. We are not in a position to move nor are we close enough to receive compensation but our life will be drastically changed and it is out of our hands.”

Individual

- 6.12.28 A number of respondents, including Quainton Parish Council, are concerned that the assessment and sound contours provided in the draft ES are inadequate. For example, the noise assessment is criticised for making use of average noise values rather than peak level and for failing to take into account the local terrain and prevailing westerly wind.
- 6.12.29 A few respondents comment on sound and noise mitigation or compensation measures, with some stating generally that these measures are inadequate, and others making specific suggestions. Examples of such suggestions include that noise bunds are constructed early or used more extensively, that provision is made for tree planting and landscaping mitigation, that more provision is made for property noise insulation, or that the cutting near Waddesdon is extended to beyond Quainton and the Sheephouse Wood SSSI.

Community

- 6.12.30 Some respondents raise the issue of impacts on and closures of local footpaths and public rights of way, with a few making specific suggestions for mitigation measures. A few note the value of these networks to the local area in terms of leisure, recreation and quality of life. The Ramblers' Association takes issue with the diversion of the WAD/5/1 along the A41 and Blackgrove Road; this issue is also raised by the Buckinghamshire Local Access Forum. However the Ramblers' Association does also welcome some of the potential improvements to the connectivity of the path network due to the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.12.31 Buckinghamshire Councils also highlight the role of woodlands as a community facility.

"It is very concerning that community impacts seem to be dismissed just because this is a rural area. Similarly, the strategic right of way network in this area may be quieter than the Chilterns but less heavily used does not mean it is any less valuable."

Buckinghamshire Councils

- 6.12.32 Some respondents express concern about impacts on properties, either related to general proximity to the line, compensation measures, or impact on property values or selling. A few respondents, including John Bercow MP, refer specifically to the proposed demolition of the Lodge at Doddershall House.
- 6.12.33 A few respondents are concerned that sections of road left disused following proposed road realignments may become a magnet for fly-tipping or anti-social behaviour, causing problems to local landowners.

Socio-economics

- 6.12.34 Some respondents raise the issue of socio-economic impacts in the area. Most of these comments refer to the potential impacts on farm businesses, and there are concerns about the viability of some specific farms.
- 6.12.35 Other concerns raised relate to effects on the tourism economy of the area. Some respondents are worried about the potential impact on various tourist attractions, including the Waddesdon Estate, the Buckinghamshire Railway Centre and the Windmill in the village of Quainton.
- 6.12.36 A few respondents are concerned that visual and access impacts might discourage visitors including cyclists from the area.

Agricultural, forestry, soils

- 6.12.37 A few respondents raise concerns about the anticipated impact of construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme on farming businesses; this is often in the context of a respondent's specific concern about a certain land or farm.

"We have great concerns as to the ongoing viability of the farm as a business with the decrease in useable farming land and the isolation of the farm buildings to the North side of the line."

Individual

- 6.12.38 One respondent is concerned about the loss of land at a dairy farm, commenting that the land needed for construction would result in a loss of cows thus making the business unviable. However, the respondent does welcome the proposed crossings to mitigate severance.
- 6.12.39 Another respondent highlights the need for all construction materials to be stored within animal-proof fencing to ensure the welfare of the animals.

Other issues

- 6.12.40 A small number of respondents, including the Environment Agency, comment on issues concerning water resources and flood risk assessment. Specific issues raised include the location of balancing ponds, the use of culverts, and a possible need to divert water supply utilities due to the construction of overbridges.
- 6.12.41 The topics of air quality and land quality are addressed by a small number of respondents commenting on CFA 12. A few respondents, including Buckinghamshire Councils, comment on the issue of dust during construction. Similarly, Buckinghamshire Councils and the Environment Agency comment on the assessment and management of potentially contaminated land along the route, while Quainton Parish Council mentions a landfill site near the proposed route.

6.13 Calvert, Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Chetwode (CFA 13)

Overview

- 6.13.1 The Calvert, Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Chetwode community forum area (CFA) extends from the Calvert Green parish boundary in the south to the Barton Hartshorn parish boundary in the north, comprising approximately 10km of the Proposed Scheme. The CFA is largely within the county of Buckinghamshire, with a 300m section of the route that is located in Oxfordshire. The area includes land within the parishes of Calvert Green, Steeple Claydon, Twyford, Chetwode, Preston Bissett, Godington and Barton Hartshorn.
- 6.13.2 There are 282 respondents explicitly addressing Calvert, Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Chetwode (CFA 13) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 13, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 13 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.13.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 13 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 13.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.13.4 A small number of respondents discuss issues or observations for a section of the route including CFA 13 and adjacent CFAs, rather than just for CFA 13. See above for issues relevant to CFAs 12 and 13. Respondents occasionally discuss impacts on Chetwode and Newton Purcell within the same response, which span CFAs 13 and 14 respectively.

Overarching issues for CFA 13

- 6.13.5 Fears that the IMD at Calvert/Steeple Claydon would result in prolonged disruption is the most widely discussed issue in comments relating to CFA 13. Concerns relating to the assessment of impacts on the IMD span a number of topics, including noise, landscape and traffic.
- 6.13.6 Respondents raise particular concerns about the construction phase of the proposed railhead and depot, which many believe would increase congestion on local roads and result in significant noise and visual blight. There is also a sense among respondents that local services and amenities would be unable to cope with the influx of workers needed during the construction and operation of the IMD.
- 6.13.7 On many occasions, concerns about the IMD are raised as part of an organised response – particularly with respect to Steeple Claydon, where construction impacts are expected to be especially pronounced. Organised responses also account for a significant proportion of total comments relating to Chetwode, with respondents highlighting concern about noise impacts and visual blight.
- 6.13.8 Twyford Parish Council discusses a variety of common issues in CFA 13, including traffic congestion in Twyford and Charndon associated with the closure of Perry Hill and West Street. They advocate an alternative, more direct route for the proposed line between Calvert and Finmere, which they believe would avoid many of the problems anticipated in Twyford, as well as lessening the exposure of the Proposed Scheme to uncertainty surrounding the planned upgrade of the Bicester-Bletchley railway line. Alternatively, the council proposes that a continuous bund be installed through Twyford to offer further noise mitigation to houses along Portway Road. Their petition receives 450 signatures.

Traffic and transport

- 6.13.9 A significant number of respondents commenting on CFA 13 discuss traffic and transport issues. Many respondents express concern about proposed construction activities to be undertaken in the area, as they believe the local road network – which is characterised by *“poorly maintained narrow or single lane ‘C’ class roads”* – would struggle to cope with projected heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements. On some occasions, construction traffic is discussed in conjunction with concerns about air quality, noise and visual impacts. Respondents also consider the effects of workers trying to access the various construction sites, which they believe may result in further disruption to the community.

- 6.13.10 Many respondents object to the closure of Perry Hill Road owing to fears that proposed diversions through the villages of Twyford and Chardon would inconvenience road users trying to reach West/A41 and increase congestion on narrow country roads, which are currently shared with pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders. Junctions at School Hill and Portway Road are a source of particular concern for one respondent, who highlights that these are used by local school buses and vehicles accessing the landfill site.
- 6.13.11 Perry Hill Road, according to respondents, is a major artery and in their view it should therefore remain open. For the most part, respondents commenting on proposals to re-direct this road under the Bicester-Bletchley railway line and over the HS2 route are supportive of this proposal. However, a few respondents express reservations about the realignment, with one member of the public comparing the new route to “a rollercoaster”.
- 6.13.12 Proposals to use Country Lane as a construction route to Chetwode are also frequently commented on. Several respondents, including Chardon Parish Council, comment that this road is single track, offering no suitable places for large vehicles to pass each other. A few respondents express particular concerns about congestion between the School End and A421 junctions. Some suggest alternative routes.
- 6.13.13 Steeple Claydon is frequently discussed in relation to construction traffic, reflecting the high number of compounds proposed in this location. Some respondents ask whether traffic management plans have been devised and suggest specific measures to help control HGV movements.
- 6.13.14 In view of concerns that journeys by commuting construction workers would result in further congestion in Steeple Claydon, a few respondents recommend that materials and workers be brought onsite via local rail services.
- 6.13.15 There are fears that as HS2 becomes operational, workers commuting to the IMD would further impact local traffic. Steeple Claydon Parish Council expresses alarm at projected car movements and asks that rail options be considered for workers as “robust traffic mitigation going forward”.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.13.16 Noise is a prominent issue for those commenting on CFA 13, with respondents expressing concerns about the scope of the assessment conducted in the area, particularly in relation to the IMD, which they believe poses specific threats to Calvert and Steeple Claydon. As is observed in relation to many CFAs, the time-averages used to calculate the baseline and operational noise contours are frequently criticised by respondents. While most comments emphasise operational noise, comments about the construction phase – particularly in relation to the proposed railhead at Steeple Claydon – are also numerous.
- 6.13.17 Discussion of the noise assessment and likely sources of impact are interspersed with more specific comments about properties and community facilities, as well as one or two responses raising concern in relation to public rights of way users and wildlife. For example, one respondent discusses plans to divert bridleway 225/4/20, which would follow the new high speed line as it passes near Godington village. Another respondent, North Buckinghamshire Bat Group, raises concerns about noise impacts on bats.

- 6.13.18 A significant number of respondents voice concerns about impacts on Chetwode, which they refer to as a “*quiet, rural parish*”. They claim that HS2 Ltd had announced that details of further mitigation would be provided in the draft ES and express disappointment that no additional measures have been proposed to alleviate what are expected to be high levels of operational noise. Overall, the noise assessment undertaken in Chetwode is a source of dissatisfaction to respondents, with many identifying impacts on livestock and horses as a significant omission. A few respondents also raise specific concerns about noise impacts on cattle at Portway Farm, referring to the purported link between noise and milk yields.
- 6.13.19 For many of the respondents commenting on Chetwode, a green tunnel is the preferred option for mitigating noise impacts at Manthome Farm, Sunflower Farm, Rosehill Farmhouse, Rosehill Bams, Old Stable Cottage, the Hermitage and the Burrows, and various properties in Chetwode – particularly those at School End.
- 6.13.20 Those discussing Calvert in their responses also express concern about the noise assessment in the draft ES. One respondent questions the inclusion of freight train noise in the baseline. Another respondent asserts that noise from ‘shunting’ activity at the IMD has not been properly assessed. Organisations and members of the public also take issue with the contour maps, often requesting further noise assessment in the hope of securing further mitigation for Calvert. Some respondents cite the definition of nighttime hours as a concern, reflecting fears about disturbance from the IMD, which is to operate on a 24-hour basis.

“HS2 Ltd states that the only noise levels estimated are from the HS2 line alone and do not take into account the IMD or FCC. It was also confirmed by an HS2 noise expert that the published noise figures do not include maintenance trains throughout the night. He stated that the measure for noise and associated blight is measured in Lmax at night and is already projected by HS2 Ltd to be exceptionally high in our area. We believe that the additional maintenance trains and IMD operations could render the true noise levels illegal.”

Individual

- 6.13.21 Charndon Parish Council is disappointed that no mitigation has been proposed for the Calvert side of the IMD and, in view of concerns about nighttime disturbance, suggests that loading activities at the depot be restricted to daylight hours. It also recommends that the installation of higher fences and earthworks at Calvert, which is proposed in the draft ES as an additional mitigation option, should be adopted as “a necessity”. One or two members of the public share the view of the Council on this final matter, as does John Bercow MP.
- 6.13.22 Respondents fear that noise impacts could be especially pronounced in Twyford, with some identifying pantographs as a particular issue. The proposed mitigation measures are seen as insufficient by several respondents, who say they would prefer a continuous bund across this stretch of the route. A few respondents think this would alleviate concerns about noise impacts on local facilities, such as Twyford recreation ground.
- 6.13.23 Other respondents, however, argue that the proposed continuous bund option in Twyford is “*unnecessary*”. A few make the further claim that the proposal has benefited from excessive promotion by the Stop HS2 campaign. One respondent raises concerns about the visual impact of the bunds, which they believe could compromise views from their property and affect local wildlife.

- 6.13.24 Noise associated with the use of the proposed railhead during the construction phase is a source of anxiety for those discussing impacts on Steeple Claydon. Cheryl Gillan MP requests that landscape bunding be installed on the Steeple Claydon side of the depot in order to mitigate operational noise. Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Oxfordshire remarks that old GCR embankments could be utilised for noise screening at Godington.
- 6.13.25 The Parochial Church Council of Chetwode asks that construction vehicles be kept away from Chetwode Church, as they would put the building at risk of structural damage from ground-borne noise. Charndon Parish Council requests that a number of older properties aligning the School Hill – Brackley Road be considered for compensation, stating these properties are vulnerable to vibration from construction traffic on account of their old foundations or brickwork.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.13.26 Several responses that relate to CFA 13 include comments about agriculture, mostly discussing potential impacts on agricultural land and farms. Temporary loss of productive land during the construction phase is among the specific issues mentioned, with several respondents commenting on the likelihood of permanent impacts on soil as a result of compaction. These remarks often precede requests that land be returned to an “*equivalent grade*” following construction.
- 6.13.27 Some respondents link impacts on agricultural land to drainage issues, which they believe may result in elevated flood risk. For example, Twyford Stop HS2 warns that many local fields are characterised by “complex land drainage systems” which they say must be replaced prior to reinstatement. Several respondents also request that field drains be reinstated following the construction phase.
- 6.13.28 Several respondents mention the issue of land-take. The proposed demolition of farm buildings, containing a grain dryer and storage facility, at Chetwode Manor Farm is a concern for some. Respondents believe the viability of this farm could be threatened, prompting criticism of the impact assessment at this location.
- 6.13.29 There are also worries about long-term damage resulting from the temporary severance of agricultural land, which some respondents believe may be exacerbated by road access issues during construction. To mitigate this impact, several respondents ask for bridges and footpath diversions to allow farmers access to land.
- 6.13.30 On occasion, concerns about agricultural land and farms overlap with issues discussed within the ecology theme. For example, one respondent objects to the alignment of the preferred route through Twyford, citing concerns that the railway line would sever “*highly productive agricultural land*” which is also a biological notification site of “*ancient ridge and furrow field*”. Meanwhile, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust discusses potential impacts on arable farmland in CFA 13, which they believe may provide habitats to Species of Principal Importance (see the ‘ecology’ section for more detail on these comments).

- 6.13.31 As discussed in the section on sound, noise and vibration, respondents express concern about threats to animals from noise. This issue is frequently mentioned in relation to horses, with many respondents referring to previous incidents in the Chetwode area, where noise associated with the old Great Central Main Line (GCML) railway is understood to have contributed to the deaths of two animals. Respondents believe these incidents justify requests for further assessment of noise impacts on agriculture. Other comments about livestock include concerns about deteriorating air quality and severance of grazing land used for dairy cattle at Portway Farm.
- 6.13.32 For the handful of respondents commenting on balancing ponds, the primary concern is to prevent these being sited on productive agricultural land. Twyford Stop HS2 claims that plans to install these visually “invasive” ponds in the middle of fields would result in additional work for farmers. A few respondents also raise specific concerns about maintaining borehole water quality and flow rates, citing potential impacts on Portway Farm, which they assert holds a number of groundwater abstraction licenses.

Ecology

- 6.13.33 When discussing issues in CFA 13 relating to the ecological theme, many respondents – particularly organisations – cite Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) which they believe would be affected by the railway cuttings and FCC Environment (the waste operator for the Calvert landfill site) sidings, including Calvert Jubilee, Decoypond Wood, Barton Hartshorn Railway Wood, and Calvert Railway Station.
- 6.13.34 Quainton Parish Council expresses reservations about proposals to move FCC sidings from the Calvert waste site. They contend that the new site is too narrow for the sidings, which may result in additional land-take from Sheephouse SSSI and Decoypond, which provide habitats for the Bechstein’s and barbastelle bat.
- 6.13.35 Various organisations comment on proposals to install green bridges to mitigate impacts on bats at Decoypond, Calvert Railway Station, and Calvert Jubilee Line, expressing doubt about their effectiveness. The Buckinghamshire Bat Group comments that bat populations observed elsewhere tend to use multiple points when crossing railway corridors.

“it does not follow that the provision of crossing points will act to reduce the numbers of bats using the corridor and there is no reason to infer that this type of mitigation is in any way appropriate except in the cases where the bats are crossing the line. Indeed the early results from HS2’s surveys infer that this type of mitigation will be ineffective for this type of activity.”

Individual

- 6.13.36 Local parish councils raise concerns about barn owls, turtle doves and bitterns, which they believe to be at risk of colliding with passing trains – particularly at Jubilee Nature Reserve. These organisations are also dissatisfied with the impact assessment at Calvert Railway Station LWS, which they say provides habitat to a growing wildlife population. Calvert Green Parish Council suggests that efforts are undertaken to restore this wildlife site following relocation of the FCC sidings.

6.13.37 Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust recommends that potential impacts on hydrology are fully assessed at designated sites in CFA 13 before mitigation proposals are finalised. The Environment Agency offers specific mitigation advice in relation to viaducts at Twyford, Godington and Padbury Brook, which it believes may reduce impacts on wetland habitats. Other respondents discuss the potential for leachate and other contaminants to enter watercourses and threaten resident wildlife.

Landscape and visual assessment

6.13.38 The proposed location of the scheme – particularly the IMD – in an area of unspoilt countryside is a concern for many respondents, with a few identifying particular views which they fear may be compromised. The proximity of St Mary’s Church in Twyford to the Proposed Scheme receives one or two mentions, as does the potential deterioration of views from Claydon House. One respondent asks for additional screening to protect the outlook from Casemore Farm.

6.13.39 The proposed autotransformer at Chetwode is commented on by a number of respondents. They state that they are unclear about the magnitude of visual blight associated with autotransformers and question the absence of images depicting the proposed structure at Chetwode from the consultation documents. Many respondents suggest that a green tunnel is appropriate mitigation for visual impacts from the Proposed Scheme at this location.

6.13.40 Respondents also highlight concerns about light pollution within CFA 13 – from the various construction sites as well as the operational IMD. Respondents refer to the low levels of light currently observed at local village settlements, which many value as “*dark sky areas*”. Some respondents raise additional concerns about impacts on the behaviour of nocturnal wildlife.

6.13.41 One or two mitigation suggestions for light pollution emerge from responses, including a request that backlight shields be installed at construction sites. One respondent implies that light pollution would be less significant in Chetwode if the route were to be tunnelled.

“Light pollution is not mentioned. Chetwode has no street lights or existing light pollution. Without a tunnel, the light from the trains, OLE, ATS and ongoing maintenance will impact adversely on the parish and conversation area.”

Individual

Community

6.13.42 There is considerable overlap between comments made within this theme and those discussed in sections above, as respondents consider how noise and traffic would disrupt communities in CFA 13 and erode the “*peace and quiet*” enjoyed by residents of the area.

6.13.43 There are fears that these impacts would harm property values at Chetwode, where respondents say no houses have sold for two years. There are also concerns about property blight at School Hill, owing to noise and odours associated with the FCC sidings, which are proposed to be relocated there.

- 6.13.44 Impacts on amenities and facilities are also discussed in a number of responses, particularly St Mary's Church at Chetwode and the recreation ground at Twyford. Buckingham County Council provides a detailed appraisal of footpath diversions in CFA 13 and suggests a number of amendments to proposed routes.

"It is desirable to have longer diversions along Footpaths SCL/7/2 and SCL/9/3 south of the IMD to avoid the public taking short cuts. SCL/9/3 could run across the north side of Blackmoorhill Farm; and this path could then link with SCL/7/2 to cut across the field directly to the entrance of the Steeple Claydon Footpath 8 over-bridge. The new path running east west to the south of the IMD would not be necessary. The red line would need extending to enable these paths to be legally diverted."

Buckinghamshire Councils

- 6.13.45 A number of respondents mention workforce impacts as a concern, especially with regard to Steeple Claydon, which they say faces prolonged disruption from construction activities associated with the railhead and the IMD, and further impacts once the depot becomes operational.
- 6.13.46 In view of scope and duration of construction activities proposed for Steeple Claydon, several members of the public request that mandatory stakeholder meetings take place with community representatives, to ensure ongoing dialogue with residents.
- 6.13.47 A particular concern among respondents is that local infrastructure and facilities would be unable to cope with the daily influx of workers. Some respondents ask that a community impact assessment be undertaken to gauge the likelihood of crime levels increasing. Requests for a regular "*hiatus*" of construction activities are common, as respondents hope this would provide some respite to the community.
- 6.13.48 Another suggestion made by various respondents is to provide onsite amenities and welfare services in order to mitigate workforce impacts. Steeple Claydon Parish Council suggests that a temporary hotel – to be removed after 2026 – could be the best way to keep workers away from Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Calvert.
- 6.13.49 As discussed in the traffic and transport section, a number of respondents would prefer that workers commute to the IMD once it becomes operational. In addition, several request that the proposed East West Rail (EWR) station at Steeple Claydon be made a permanent feature, accessible to residents as well as workers. Among the supporters for this measure are Buckingham County Council and Stephen Bercow MP, both of whom think that a new station would provide some compensation to residents of Steeple Claydon.
- 6.13.50 Several respondents suggest that residents of Steeple Claydon and Calvert have been misinformed about the extent of blight associated with the railhead construction site and the IMD, sparking concern that fewer respondents have raised objections than might have otherwise. These comments are frequently accompanied by claims that the community engagement has been "*inadequate and deceptive*".

Cultural heritage

- 6.13.51 Many respondents raise concerns about listed buildings within Chetwode Conservation Area – especially the church of St Mary’s in Chetwode, which many believe would suffer significant visual intrusion and noise blight. Potential impacts on St Mary’s, St Nicholas Church, the Diocese of Oxford and a Grade 1 Listed Norman Church are also discussed within this theme.
- 6.13.52 In addition, a few respondents consider impacts on listed farm buildings, particularly those located at Rosehill and Portaway farms. Buckinghamshire Councils raises specific concerns about the settings of these buildings in their response.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.13.53 Contamination threats to non-mains water supplies are a common concern among respondents, particularly those licensed in Chetwode and Barton Hartshorn, and to Portway Dairy Farm. One respondent discusses risks to their own water supply, which is dependent on groundwater abstractions. They express concern that construction impacts on Padbury Brook tributaries would threaten this water source as well as increase the risk of flooding on their property.
- 6.13.54 The Environment Agency also discusses flood risks at Padbury Brook, which they believe may be more pronounced in the Godington area, stating that a section of bunding could impede water flows and reduce flood storage capacity. They recommend that appropriate mitigation be provided on a *“level for level, volume for volume basis”*, and indicate that further assessment of the flood plain in Padbury Brook would be required. Finally, the Environment Agency asks that their responsibilities vis-à-vis the Bedford Group Internal Drainage Board, in relation to Padbury Brook, are clarified in the formal ES.

Land quality

- 6.13.55 Several responses discuss potential contamination issues associated with the proposed relocation of FCC sidings at the Calvert landfill sites, which overlap with ecology and water themes. The Environment Agency is among the organisations commenting on this issue. They advise that measures be taken to avoid damaging the infrastructure and engineering of landfill sites at Calvert, due to the possibility of impacts on nearby nature reserves.
- 6.13.56 The Environment Agency also comments on proposed fuelling facilities at the IMD, saying it could represent a threat to secondary aquifers. They recommend that an alternative location be identified for underground fuel storage, or that more advanced techniques are employed during the construction of these facilities.

Other issues

- 6.13.57 There are relatively few comments on the topics of air quality and socio-economics, explicitly in relation to CFA 13.

6.14 Newton Purcell to Brackley (CFA 14)

Overview

- 6.14.1 The Newton Purcell to Brackley community forum area (CFA) covers an approximately 11.8km section of the Proposed Scheme in the council districts of Cherwell, Aylesbury Vale and South Northamptonshire, extending from the Buckinghamshire-Oxfordshire county boundary between Newton Purcell and Barley Fields in the south to a point approximately 2.4km north-east of the edge of Brackley. The area includes land within the parishes of Newton Purcell with Shelswell, Finmere, Mixbury, Westbury, Turweston and Whitfield.
- 6.14.2 There are 150 respondents explicitly addressing Newton Purcell to Brackley (CFA 14) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 14, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 14 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.14.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 14 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 14.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.14.4 Respondents occasionally discuss impacts on Chetwode and Newton Purcell within the same response, which span CFAs 13 and 14, respectively.
- 6.14.5 Several respondents comment on the impact on the Fox Covet Local Wildlife Site (LWS), which spans CFA 14 and CFA 15.

Overarching issues for CFA 14

- 6.14.6 Responses relevant to the CFA 14 report often focus on the disruption the construction and operation of HS2 would cause to this rural setting. Many respondents express worries about the impacts of construction traffic on small local roads and there is widespread concern about the impact on local wildlife and habitats. Comments about the visual and noise impact of the operation of the Proposed Scheme are also prevalent.
- 6.14.7 One organised response requests a deep bore tunnel through Turweston to mitigate environmental damage and another highlights the issue of impediments to accessing agricultural fields during construction.
- 6.14.8 Mixbury Parish Meeting responds on behalf of 62 members of the public. They express specific concerns about the noise assessment in Mixbury and argue that proposals for a green tunnel have not been properly considered.
- 6.14.9 Another response – made on behalf of the village of Radstone – includes 41 individual signatures. Potential impacts on Radstone Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are a source of concern for these respondents, as is the likelihood of noise and visual blight on St Lawrence Church – a Grade I listed building. The response suggests a green tunnel as mitigation for the village.

Ecology

- 6.14.10 Ecological impacts are a particular area of concern for several respondents commenting on CFA 14. Many emphasise specific species and habitats likely to be affected by the proposed route.
- 6.14.11 A few respondents express particular concern about the impact the proposals would have on the Helmdon Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the effect upon the wildlife there, particularly the small blue butterfly.

“Helmdon SSSI is a disused railway consisting of chalk grassland, scrub and hedgerows which are home to many species of wildflower and butterfly - including Northamptonshire's only population of the nationally scarce small blue butterfly.”

Individual

- 6.14.12 A few respondents, including the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, express concern about potential habitat damage at Turweston Manor Grasslands. They also question the suitability of habitat recreation as a form of mitigation.
- 6.14.13 Several respondents are worried about the possible impact on local wildlife such as butterflies, bats, birds, badgers, water voles and the severance of their habitats including hedgerows, grassland and woodland.
- 6.14.14 A few respondents raise concerns about the quality of ecological baseline assessments in this CFA and request more information as to how the area's wildlife will be sustained through more detailed explanations of mitigation such as replacement habitats.

“No mention of otters along the river at this point, nor of the level of Hares living in the field due to become a satellite construction compound”

Individual

Traffic and transport

- 6.14.15 Respondents often discuss the potential impacts of construction traffic on their communities and some are specifically concerned about the noise, air quality and safety impacts of increased numbers of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) on small country roads.
- 6.14.16 Many respondents, including Finmere Parish Council, are particularly concerned about the proposed construction traffic route through Finmere and have concerns about this jeopardising the safety of children at the local school as well as leading to further deterioration of the road.

“The prospect of main heavy traffic being diverted through small narrow inadequate and failing village roads needs more consideration. In the small village like Finmere, it is essential to protect the life of the village and its inhabitants, particularly the village school.”

Individual

- 6.14.17 Some respondents express their support for a new cycleway from Westbury to Brackley as mitigation for the impacted footpaths, cycleways and bridleways, and the disruption to the Westbury circular ride in particular.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.14.18 Noise resulting from the operation of the proposed route is of concern to a number of respondents, and several also request more information about potential noise levels.

“I am extremely concerned about lack of detail for the white zone – we need more detailed impact levels and also figures for peak noise levels.”

Individual

- 6.14.19 Some respondents are concerned about the lack of suitable mitigation of operational noise from the Proposed Scheme. There is concern that bunding and noise barriers discussed previously in meetings with HS2 appear to have been omitted from the CFA report.
- 6.14.20 Several respondents raise concerns about increased traffic noise resulting from the proposed realignment of the A421 and the A43 overbridge at Brackley.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.14.21 There is general concern amongst several respondents about the visual impact of the proposed route on the countryside within CFA 14.

“We live close to the proposed line. It will be very intrusive visually in this attractive countryside.”

Individual

- 6.14.22 Respondents also voice concern regarding the visual impacts of the power lines necessary for the operation of the Proposed Scheme and request that they are routed underground. In addition, a few respondents say they are concerned about light pollution during both construction and operation.
- 6.14.23 A few respondents suggest there has been a lack of information about the design of the River Great Ouse viaducts at Turweston and state that the design of these features must be of very high quality and fit in well with the area to offset visual impacts on the countryside.
- 6.14.24 One respondent raises concern about the visual impact of the construction site south of the A422. This respondent also requests more detail about loss of trees and plants at this site in addition to the proposed replanting scheme.

Community

- 6.14.25 Many respondents discuss the impact on the playing field in Turweston and are keen for HS2 Ltd to mitigate the loss of the playing field during construction. Respondents argue that the village does not have a suitable alternative.

“The village are due to lose part of our Playing Field but now note that, during construction (up to 3/4 years) up to 40% will be lost. I cannot at the moment see that there is another suitable site in the village so at this stage we are looking for significant compensation and mitigation to enable us to continue to use the Field for future generations.”

Individual

- 6.14.26 The Ramblers Association is concerned about the impact of the Proposed Scheme on public rights of way and bridleways, in particular footpaths Brackley BD2, BD4 and BD8 and Radstone AX7 and AX14, and make suggestions regarding perceived omissions and errors in the draft ES documentation. Other respondents also express concern regarding impacts on footpaths and bridleways, highlighting the importance of equestrianism and walking to the area. Several request more information as to how these routes will be preserved. A few respondents raise concerns regarding the possibility of horses being startled by trains.
- 6.14.27 Oxfordshire County Council and other respondents express concern about current and ongoing property blight and advocate full compensation for all those affected. Newton Purcell Parish Council states that its village would be bisected by the proposed route and request that mitigation measures are considered further.
- 6.14.28 Buckinghamshire Councils highlights the necessity of considering the impacts of the Proposed Scheme upon the viability of Shelswell Inn, Whitfield Racecourse and Westbury Cricket Club.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.14.29 Comments about agriculture in CFA 14 tend to emphasise the impact on farmland. There are some concerns about severance, especially in the Newton Purcell area. Comments on this issue are often raised as part of a small campaign response. Severance is also often mentioned alongside concerns about farm access.

“There will also be an impact on productive farmland in Northamptonshire. Where the current HS2 route severs agricultural holdings, there will be a need for livestock and crop access and new bridges to a width to accommodate farm machinery.”

Northamptonshire County Council

- 6.14.30 Buckinghamshire Councils expresses concern about the potential impact on dairy farming and milk production in this area as a result of the Proposed Scheme’s operational noise and vibration.
- 6.14.31 A few respondents are concerned about the impact upon other rural businesses, specifically shooting and equestrian enterprises.

Air quality

- 6.14.32 A few respondents express concern about a negative impact on air quality in CFA 14, particularly as a result of construction work and construction traffic.
- 6.14.33 Buckinghamshire Councils raises concerns regarding the monitoring and mitigation of construction dust.

“During the construction phase, sensitive receptors are likely to be adversely effected by dust without appropriate, proportionate and effective dust management regimes.”

Buckinghamshire Councils

Cultural heritage

- 6.14.34 Specific heritage sites attract comments from a few respondents. For example, CPRE Northamptonshire and English Heritage are concerned about the impact on the setting of the Grade I listed St Lawrence Church in Radstone. English Heritage also expresses concern about the impact of the proposed temporary roadway on the archaeological remains of (Upper) Radstone shrunken medieval settlement.
- 6.14.35 South Northamptonshire District Council argues that more thorough assessment of cultural heritage in CFA 14 is needed generally, also stating that more detailed study is needed for Turweston and the area between Mixbury and Brackley.
- 6.14.36 Turweston Parish Council is particularly concerned about the impact of proposed power lines and deep cutting excavation on Turweston Conservation Area, as well as the impact on the settings of listed buildings in Turweston and views from the area. Buckinghamshire Councils also highlights the impact on the setting of Turweston Conservation Area.

Waste and material resources

- 6.14.37 Waste and material resources are mentioned relatively infrequently in responses relating to CFA 14. However, a couple of respondents state concerns about the management of excavated material and suggest using them for mitigation.

“What is to happen to the excess excavated materials once the cuttings are dug out and the time element in which to dispose of them? The waste could be used alongside the A43 on the west side of Turweston as bunds to cut down the noise of the A43 by-pass.”

Individual

Other issues

- 6.14.38 A couple of respondents suggest that previous proposals included a green tunnel at Turweston and that this has now been replaced with an overbridge. Respondents believe this decision has been driven by cost and runs counter to the preference of local residents.
- 6.14.39 There are relatively few comments on the topics of land quality, socio-economics, and water resources and flood risk assessment, explicitly in relation to CFA 14.

6.15 Greatworth to Lower Boddington (CFA 15)

Overview

- 6.15.1 The Greatworth to Lower Boddington community forum area (CFA) covers an approximately 17km section of the Proposed Scheme in the district of South Northamptonshire. It extends from south-east of Halse Copse South, near Radstone, in the south to the Northamptonshire-Warwickshire county boundary in the north. The area includes the wards of Greatworth, Marston St Lawrence, Thorpe Mandeville, Culworth, Chipping Warden and Edgcote, Aston le Walls and Boddington. It extends from the boundary between Radstone and Greatworth parish in the south-east to the intersection of Boddington, Wormleighton and Stoneton parishes in the north-west.

- 6.15.2 There are 386 respondents explicitly addressing Greatworth to Lower Boddington (CFA 15) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 15, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 15 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.15.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 15 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 15.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.15.4 Several respondents comment on the impact on the Fox Covet Local Wildlife Site (LWS), which spans CFA 14 and CFA 15.
- 6.15.5 Comments spanning CFAs 15 and 16 include concern that the draft ES has not acknowledged or sufficiently addressed the impacts of reducing the size of Fox Covert (Glyn Davies Wood) which respondents say is home to a large number of bird, bat and insect species, as well as being ancient woodland and a valuable amenity to the local community. Additionally, respondents express concern regarding road layout and bridging over the proposed Wormleighton maintenance loop which they believe would increase local travel time and petrol use.

Overarching issues for CFA 15

- 6.15.6 Responses relevant to the CFA 15 report often include requests for specific mitigation for the noise and visual impacts of the proposals. Mitigation requests featuring in many responses are an extension of the green tunnel at Greatworth, increased height of the earth banks through Boddington and a green tunnel past Lower Boddington. Responses also highlight the impacts of construction with particular concerns about the impact of construction traffic.
- 6.15.7 South Northamptonshire District Council and Northamptonshire County Council both respond comprehensively on issues relevant to CFA 15. Northamptonshire County Council tends largely to focus on traffic and transport, community and landscape issues, while South Northamptonshire District Council highlights ecological, agricultural, community and landscape issues.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.15.8 Many respondents are concerned about the noise impact of the Proposed Scheme when it is operational. Several respondents comment on the noise assessment or request more information about the predicted noise levels.

“The noise levels we have been given are simply averages so in a quiet and peaceful area such as ours the peaks as a train passes are likely to be extremely loud.”

Individual

- 6.15.9 Respondents also express concern regarding noise impacts from the construction sites in this CFA, with particular emphasis on the perceived anti-social working hours of construction. Respondents also question the necessity of three satellite construction sites in the area and feel that this is disproportionate.

- 6.15.10 Many respondents are concerned about the positioning of the proposed green tunnel to the west of Greatworth, which they say is closer to the village than originally proposed. They express additional concern about the proposed raising of the track by eight metres, asserting that this would counteract the benefits of the green tunnel as adequate sound and visual mitigation. These comments are often accompanied by requests to extend the green tunnel eastwards past Greatworth Hall.

“Location of the green tunnel has been moved too far to the west of Greatworth to have any benefit with regard to noise or visual impact particularly for people living on the east of the village. Latest plans suggest the alignment will be raised by eight metres which will have a detrimental impact on the village.”

Andrea Leadsom, Member of Parliament for South Northamptonshire

- 6.15.11 There are also numerous requests for a green tunnel past Lower Boddington to mitigate the operational noise, and other impacts, of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.15.12 A few respondents express concern about potential noise impact from the green tunnel portals, the maintenance loops and pantographs.

Traffic and transport

- 6.15.13 Many responses discuss the proposed route for construction traffic through Thorpe Mandeville along the B4525 (Banbury Road/Welsh Lane). Most comments emphasise that this road is unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and that increased traffic would lead to an increase in accidents.

“The B4525 is an incredible busy road linking the M1 to the M40. It is already a 'red route' due to fatality numbers. More HGV's for construction will further endanger lives.”

Individual

- 6.15.14 A number of respondents, including Chipping Warden and Edgcote Parish Council, express concern about the proposed route of construction traffic through Chipping Warden via the A361, often accompanying this point with a specific request for a bypass around the town. Respondents highlight specific concerns about the safety of children at a local school which is situated on the A361.
- 6.15.15 A small number of respondents highlight potential vibration impacts on properties caused by routing of construction traffic through Thorpe Mandeville and Chipping Warden. A number of these respondents request that HS2 repair any damage.
- 6.15.16 The proposed closure of Culworth Lane is also a concern for some respondents who believe that this would increase congestion on the A361 as well as impeding access between Chipping Warden and adjacent villages.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.15.17 Several respondents express general concern about the visual impact of the proposed route in CFA 15 and the detrimental effect this would have on the character of the area and the countryside.

- 6.15.18 There are several requests for a green tunnel past Lower Boddington to reduce the detrimental effect on visual amenity in the area. There are also several requests to increase the height of the proposed earth banks to at least eight metres to mitigate visual impact on Upper and Lower Boddington.

“I want to see the height of the earth banks increased so no part of the train is visible from either Upper or Lower Boddington.”

Individual

- 6.15.19 Several respondents are concerned about the positioning of the green tunnel to the west of Greatworth, as discussed above in the Sound, noise and vibration section.
- 6.15.20 A few respondents are concerned about the visual impact of the proposed viaduct at Lower Thorpe, specifically in relation to proposals to raise it by two metres as a result of a shallower Greatworth green tunnel.
- 6.15.21 Some respondents express concerns about the visual impact of the proposed maintenance loop to the west of Lower Boddington. A few are especially concerned about potential light pollution from this feature, particularly at night.
- 6.15.22 Some respondents request more photomontages depicting views of the track from various locations as they believe that the documentation provided makes it difficult to understand the appearance of the line in operation.
- 6.15.23 Similarly, a few respondents are concerned about the visual impact of the tunnel portal building at Greatworth and request more accurate representations of proposed tunnel entrances so that they can better visualise the potential impact.

Community

- 6.15.24 Respondents express some general concerns about the impact of the proposed route and its construction on the communities of Greatworth, Thorpe Mandeville, Chipping Warden and Boddington.
- 6.15.25 Property blight is a specific area of concern, and several respondents request compensation for loss of value or damage to property.

“it is HS2's responsibility to ensure that every effort is provided to avoid residents paying directly for HS2 through blight and collapse in the property markets”

Individual

- 6.15.26 The Ramblers' Association and Northamptonshire County Council, among others, are concerned about the impact on public rights of way and bridleways across CFA 15. The Rambler's Association believe that all public rights of way affected by the Proposed Scheme should be listed in the reports. They are especially concerned regarding the impacts of a realigned Banbury Road on Thorpe Mandeville BB3. The Ramblers' Association also highlights a number of perceived errors regarding footpaths in the documentation.
- 6.15.27 A couple of respondents express concerns about the Proposed Scheme altering the viability of their communities; they are concerned that the works would discourage young families from moving into the area.

- 6.15.28 Thorpe Mandeville Parish Council, among others, expresses concern about the impact of the proposed demolition of properties at Lower Thorpe.
- 6.15.29 HS2 Action Alliance raises concerns about the impacts of construction on the three remaining dwellings on Banbury Lane in Lower Thorpe, highlighting that these dwellings will be surrounded by construction activity.

Ecology

- 6.15.30 CPRE Northamptonshire expresses particular concern about the anticipated destruction of woodland at Halse Copse South and suggests ways to mitigate this, namely using the soil from Halse Copse South as the basis for new planting. They also make detailed comments on potential locations and quantities of new planting.
- 6.15.31 The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire expresses concerns about loss of habitat connectivity and other wildlife impacts at the following locations: Halse Copse South LWS, Costow House, Thorpe Valley, Trafford Bridge Marsh LWS, Aston le Walls LWS, Lower Boddington area and Fox Covet LWS. The Wildlife Trust supports the considered linkage mitigation at Halse Copse South, welcomes the decision not to import topsoil at Costow House and supports the proposed mitigation at Trafford Bridge Marsh LWS. They do, however, make various suggestions as to how ecological mitigation can be improved at all of these sites.
- 6.15.32 Northamptonshire County Council and a small number of other respondents raise concerns about the potential impact of the Proposed Scheme on locally significant hedgerows and the wildlife they sustain.
- 6.15.33 The Environment Agency, echoed by others, expresses concerns about the impact on bat, great crested newt and other specific wildlife populations in CFA 15.

“Eight great crested newt ponds are to be isolated and possibly three breeding sites lost. A mitigation package should seek to ensure that new replacement ponds sit within the context of a connected habitat mosaic to maximise viability”

The Environment Agency

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.15.34 Water resources and flood risk are referred to relatively infrequently by individual respondents. However, some organisations make detailed comments regarding proposed water diversions and impacts on water supply.
- 6.15.35 Some respondents are concerned about the impact, design and management of the proposed drainage ponds in CFA 15, whilst others highlight the proposed diversion of the stream running through Manor Brook House and potential impacts on the sewage treatment plant.
- 6.15.36 A few respondents are concerned about impacts of the Proposed Scheme on drainage and its management in the local area.
- 6.15.37 Chipping Warden and Edgcote Parish Council, in addition to a few other respondents, raises concerns regarding flood risk and drainage issues at the Chipping Warden WWII airfield.

“We are particularly concerned that disruption of this channel could result in localised flooding in areas to the west of Byfield Road around Long Barrow or that water would find new channels to the Cherwell probably causing potential flooding in the low parts of the village at Hogg End or Arbury Banks.”

Chipping Warden and Edgcote Parish Council

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.15.38 Some respondents raise concerns regarding the impact of the Proposed Scheme on their business, land or farm, while many respondents express concerns more generally about loss of farmland, access and severance effects. The continued viability of a significant number of respondents' farms is a key issue with many owners suggesting specific measures to combat any negative impact on their land.
- 6.15.39 One respondent raises a concern about whether the reinstatement of land above the Greatworth green tunnel will be graded to enable crop planting in the future, while a few other respondents raise concerns specifically about reinstatement of their land.

Cultural heritage

- 6.15.40 Impacts upon cultural heritage are addressed infrequently in regard to this CFA; however English Heritage does express a number of concerns regarding the impact on various listed buildings and historical sites that it believes need protecting.
- 6.15.41 English Heritage highlights the importance of Edgcote as an ensemble of heritage assets and also expresses concern about several listed structures including Lower Thorpe Farmhouse, Greatworth Hall and Trafford Bridge, as well as Edgcote Battlefield as an area of archaeological potential. A few other respondents also comment on potential impacts to the listed Greatworth Hall.
- 6.15.42 Aston le Walls Parish Council expresses concern about the potential impact on the Grade I listed Church of St Leonard and other Grade II listed buildings in the village.

Socio-economics

- 6.15.43 Some respondents at Chipping Warden suggest that, to help the local economy, workers should be accommodated locally in bed and breakfasts rather than in custom made compounds.

“Cancel the construction compound for overnight accommodation and house workers in local hotels thereby benefitting our local economy - this is a key action”

Individual

- 6.15.44 Some respondents, including Aston le Walls Parish Council, raise issues about the loss of Washbrook Farm, highlighting the importance of the equestrian centre here which provides opportunities for local employment, a factor which they say is not considered in the draft ES.
- 6.15.45 Greatworth Hall is also emphasised by a number of respondents as a significant employer for the local community.

Air quality

- 6.15.46 A few respondents express concern about the negative impact of construction work, and construction traffic in particular, on air quality in the area.
- 6.15.47 Greatworth Parish Council expresses specific concern about the impact of dust generating activities on sensitive animal and plant species in the locality. They request that such activities are kept to a minimum as a means of minimising air quality impacts.

Other issues

- 6.15.48 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topic of land quality, explicitly in relation to CFA 15.

6.16 Ladbroke and Southam (CFA 16)

Overview

- 6.16.1 The Ladbroke and Southam community forum area (CFA) covers a 13.1 km section of the Proposed Scheme in Stratford-on-Avon District, where it passes to the west of Southam. It extends from Wormleighton in the south to the Grand Union Canal at the boundary with Warwick District in the north. The area includes land within the parishes of Stoneton, Wormleighton, Priors Hardwick, Radbourn, Hodnells and Wills Pastures, Ladbroke, Southam, Ufton and Long Itchington.
- 6.16.2 There are 62 respondents explicitly addressing Ladbroke and Southam (CFA 16) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 16, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 16 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.16.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 16 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 16.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.16.4 See 6.15 for comments relevant to CFAs 15 and 16.
- 6.16.5 A comment spanning CFAs 16 and 17 suggests that HS2 trains would traverse this area at the highest speed, and therefore it should receive maximum mitigation funding.

Overarching issues for CFA 16

- 6.16.6 Respondents relevant to the CFA 16 report often focus on the visual and noise impacts of HS2, its construction, and associated traffic, and the negative effect that this would have on the peaceful countryside setting. Footpaths and public rights of way are also important issues for respondents commenting on this area, with others highlighting the increased risk of flooding from Lot Brook that residents of the Ladbroke area would face.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.16.7 A large proportion of respondents commenting on CFA 16 express concern regarding noise impacts. Many of these concerns relate to the construction traffic and the trains, while others, including Ladbroke Parish Council, are particularly concerned about construction noise. A number of respondents are also worried about the noise of diverted traffic through or near Ladbroke and Southam; they suggest roads should be surfaced with noise reducing materials, and that noise from overbridges needs to be considered.

"I refer to the construction traffic that will be using the main road between roundabouts running parallel to Hurst Road, Southam. This is a very busy road most times during the day and the surface of the road is not a good one and does nothing to help to keep down traffic noise. The Highways have been approached to do this, but to no avail as yet. We feel they are awaiting your movements. We would ask that you at least replace the existing surface with a [sic] absorbing noise reducing surface, which we know exists as it has been used on other roads near here and makes a remarkable difference in noise quality."

Individual

- 6.16.8 A number of respondents disagree with the noise modelling in the draft ES, suggesting that the use of average noise level rather than peak noise level is misleading and inadequate as it is the latter that people notice. Additionally, several respondents comment that the draft ES noise estimates should not rely on the assumption that future technological improvement to train and track design would provide quieter trains in time for HS2. They argue that such improvements are unlikely and therefore the noise mitigation measures currently suggested are inadequate.

"The maps show no additional noise impacting the village from HS2. The maps are however totally misleading in that they measure average noise over many hours not the passing noise of the train. Residents wish to understand honestly the noise problems they face, stating that noise falls at night simply because the number of trains fall is absurd, if may fall on average, but that is no consolation when you are woken by a passing train!"

Individual

- 6.16.9 A number of respondents are keen for greater investment in noise mitigation measures, in particular they argue for higher bunds as the proposed height is seen to be insufficient. Other respondents suggest more extensive tree planting or the building of earthworks to provide more substantial noise screening for the surrounding villages. Several respondents also express concern about the exact location of the balancing ponds at Harp Farm, which they say would interrupt the bunds and potentially funnel the noise to Ladbroke village.
- 6.16.10 Several respondents argue that Radbourne Ironstone Fringe Landscape Character Area is incorrectly omitted from the draft ES as a tranquil or quiet area.
- 6.16.11 A small number of respondents express concern regarding vibration. These comments mainly relate to a number of "ancient listed buildings" in Ladbroke, which respondents say lack modern foundations and are vulnerable to vibration.

Community

- 6.16.12 A large number of respondents including Ladbroke Parish Council and the Ramblers' Association are concerned about the impacts on footpaths and public rights of way. Of particular concern to many is the proposal to sever and not re-route the cross-country path between Southam and Ladbroke. Several respondents discuss the local desire for a combined footpath and cycleway between these two locations, which they argue was accepted by HS2 Ltd at a community forum but has not been included in the draft ES. Additionally, respondents are concerned about the lack of provision for continuing use of footpaths and bridleways throughout construction, adding that the current re-routing of some footpaths along roads is unnecessary and should be minimised

"Ladbroke village has consistently campaigned to obtain a community benefit by way of a new footpath/cycleway to link the village with Southam along the route of the A423; the plans do not show what has been discussed with HS2 Ltd and tacitly agreed at various meetings - why? Indeed the existing cross country path between the two communities now appears to be severed and re-routed without linkage - why?"

Individual

- 6.16.13 Several respondents express concern regarding the impacts on specific places, such as Fox Culvert Wood, which respondents argue would suffer from a reduction in size and an increase in noise. The Canal and River Trust says there should be no detrimental impact from the works on canal use.
- 6.16.14 Warwick District Council is particularly concerned about the health impacts associated with HS2 and argue that a full health and social impact assessment should be conducted by HS2 Ltd. They say that changing and reducing recreational walking routes (especially the Harry Green Way) and open spaces may negatively impact the health of local communities. Additionally, they express concern regarding the health impacts of light, noise and air pollution, disruption caused by construction and rehousing, combined impacts on amenities, and job losses. Several other respondents echo these health concerns, in particular regarding the impacts of pollution on older residents of Bascote Heath.
- 6.16.15 A number of respondents also argue more generally that HS2 would lead to significant disruption, reduced quality of life, and health impacts in their communities, which they are not being compensated for despite drawing no benefit from the project itself.

Traffic and transport

- 6.16.16 Many respondents are concerned about probable traffic increases around Ladbroke, Southam and Ufton. They argue that many roads which construction traffic would use are already congested, and pass by schools and residential areas – particularly Welsh Road. Long Itchington Parish Council is concerned about the specific routes to construction sites for the Long Itchington Wood Tunnel, while a number of respondents are worried about the impacts of construction traffic on Bascote Heath, which they say is sensitive.
- 6.16.17 Several respondents are worried that village-centre routes would become heavily used by traffic avoiding slower routes near construction sites, and some call for solutions to this such as bypass roads.

“There is no assessment of the impact in terms of vehicle numbers of vehicles using the Ladbroke village road as a ‘rat run’ due to excessive construction vehicles on the A423 and when delays occur on the A423 during construction work. Use of the narrow village road, with adjacent roadside listed buildings in this way would be totally unacceptable. HS2 cannot just consider the impact of its own vehicles but must consider the impact on other vehicles and the choices drivers are able to make which will impact Ladbroke village.”

Individual

- 6.16.18 Some respondents suggest that all new roads and bridges should include pedestrian and cycle paths.
- 6.16.19 A few respondents express concern that the construction and general traffic routes proposed in the draft ES are different to those they discussed at the community forums, and some also comment that the report does not distinguish between peak and average daily traffic, which makes it difficult to properly assess the proposals.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.16.20 The visual impact of HS2 on countryside views is of concern to a number of respondents. Greater mitigation measures are argued for by many of these, in particular higher bunds, embankments made from locally excavated material, or more extensive tree planting. A few respondents suggest these measures would also be beneficial in reducing light pollution. Several respondents identify a need to shield the earth grading machines and transport vehicles at Greenleaf Nursery stockpile site. One respondent also argues that to reduce the visual impact of site compounds and offices, these should be placed in areas screened by topography or woodland.
- 6.16.21 A number of respondents express concerns regarding the number and type of trees that would be planted to screen the line. In particular it is felt that whilst coniferous trees are better for sound reduction and visual screening compared to broad leaved trees (particularly in winter), the former would not fit visually with the area. The Environment Agency says that planting and restoration work should be done in accordance with “*Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines, Natural England National Character Assessments and Forestry Commission Bulletin 113, Planting Native Woodlands*”.
- 6.16.22 A small number of respondents comment that designs for viaducts, bridges and tunnel mouths need to be of a higher quality to lessen the negative visual impact of HS2, while some argue that the line should pass under the Oxford Canal to have less impact on the countryside.

Ecology

- 6.16.23 A number of respondents express concerns about ecological impacts of the project, most commonly relating to Long Itchington and Ufton Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Fox Covert. Respondents think that the SSSI is at risk from construction (including impacts of dust), hydrology and fragmentation, while they believe other ancient woodland, wildflower meadows, watercourses, hedgerows and their associated species are at risk of impact by the Proposed Scheme. The Environment Agency is concerned about the impacts on fish movements, particularly where culverts are proposed, while Warwickshire County Council suggests that mitigation measures including high noise fences and earth bunds may be detrimental to local ecology.
- 6.16.24 The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) and Banbury Ornithological Society express particular concern about impacts of woodland size reduction and noise on wildlife in Fox Covert (Glyn Davies Wood) as discussed in section 6.15.5. Additionally, the RSPB suggests a realignment of the road leading to Priors Marston to avoid further reduction of and damage to the wood.
- 6.16.25 A small number of respondents comment that a more robust baseline ecology survey for the area is required in order to measure the effects of HS2 and the success of mitigation measures.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.16.26 The risk of flooding from Lot Brook affecting Ladbroke is commonly discussed by respondents, including Warwickshire County Council. Respondents highlight this waterway is already prone to flooding and are concerned that the proposed drainage may make this worse. Several respondents suggest more study is needed on how to mitigate this risk, while others argue for the creation of a balancing pond upstream of Ladbroke, potentially allowing excess flows to build up behind the embankment, reducing flooding risk and thereby providing an overall benefit to Ladbroke. Warwickshire County Council suggests that the current location of the balancing ponds north of Ladbroke is counter-intuitive with respect to local topography and natural drainage.

“Houses in Ladbroke currently flood in extreme weather conditions, this has been notified to the Community Forum with a request for a balancing pond to ensure that the problem is not exacerbated by HS2 and to resolve the problem if possible, no response has been received and the consultation maps do not include proposals to resolve the flooding risk. This needs to be achieved whilst avoiding any break in the earthworks which might act as a funnel for noise affecting the village.”

Individual

- 6.16.27 More generally on the subject of flood risk, several respondents stress the need to ensure maintenance of existing drainage to prevent extra surface water flooding, while a number of respondents say that HS2 Ltd have made no contact with the Warwickshire County Council Flood Officer and therefore have not properly considered flood risks.
- 6.16.28 The Environment Agency makes a number of specific suggestions regarding the routing of the HS2 line and treatment of existing waterways. In particular it suggests that re-meandering the Radbourne Brook would be environmentally beneficial and reduce flood risk.

Air quality

- 6.16.29 A number of respondents express concern about the dust and pollution created by construction and traffic, suggesting it would worsen air quality, and possibly health, in the area. There is particular concern from some respondents about dust at Bascote Heath, and also near the Greenleaf Nursery materials stockpile site, for example from earth graders and construction traffic.
- 6.16.30 Several other respondents making comments specific to CFA 16 say that there is not enough detail on air quality impacts in the draft ES to comment fully.

Waste and material resources

- 6.16.31 Most of the comments relating to waste and material resources focused on CFA 16 relate to the excavated material from Windmill Hill and Long Itchington Wood Tunnel. Several respondents are concerned about the transport by road of this material, while others question where excavated soil would be “dumped”. HS2 Action Alliance and others suggest this material should be reused in creating earthworks for noise and visual mitigation.

“We seek the use of (locally excavated) spoil (Windmill Hill cutting and Ufton/Bascote Heath tunnels) to create adequate bunds to shield us from noise and visually from sight of the line and any light pollution in hours of darkness. There is no indication of any additional (to earthworks) noise barriers for our location so getting the earthworks properly completed is essential.”

Individual

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.16.32 Only a few respondents mention agricultural issues in conjunction with this CFA. Several respondents express concern about the amount of arable land that would be taken away by the main HS2 line, the maintenance loop, and by road diversions.
- 6.16.33 Access is another issue commonly discussed by respondents concerned about agricultural effects. In particular, one farm owner whose land would be divided in two by the HS2 line is concerned that the only access between the two sides for farm machinery and livestock would involve travelling along public roads for several miles. This respondent is also concerned that HS2 ensures continuing water and electricity connectivity between the two sites. Wormleighton and Stoneton Parish Meeting expresses a number of additional concerns regarding vehicle access to a number of other farms, in particular Stoneton Manor Farm, as well as Hodnell and Wills Pastures.
- 6.16.34 Warwickshire County Council notes that CFA 16 is within a nitrate vulnerable zone (NVS) dominated by arable crops and would like measures taken to prevent nitrogen loss rather than simply reduce it.

Cultural heritage

- 6.16.35 The few comments addressing cultural heritage relating to CFA 16 are concerns regarding the impacts of vibration and noise on the Grade 1 listed All Saints Church in Ladbroke. Respondents are anxious about the omission of this building from the draft ES and stress the need to protect the building itself and also its visual setting which they believe has much historical and community significance.

“Visual Impact All Saints Church has provided the focal point across the plain between Ladbroke and Southam for many centuries, the church spire being a local landmark with spectacular views across the fields from the church. We wish to see the prominence of this ancient place of Christian worship retained despite the trains that will cut through this area. The train line should be shielded from the line of site of the church by trees in order to, in part, preserve the current position. We would ask HS2 Limited to take note of this request.”

All Saints Church Parochial Church Council

Socio-economics

- 6.16.36 A few respondents express concern regarding the effect of HS2 on local businesses, particularly regarding potential disruption to businesses at the business park near Southam caused by traffic.
- 6.16.37 Warwickshire County Council also discusses the potential consequences of the estimated 30 job losses in this CFA, noting that as this is a very rural area these are harder to replace and may have significant impacts, including on the health and wellbeing of individuals.
- 6.16.38 A number of respondents are anxious about their house values falling significantly since the announcement of HS2. Several respondents indicate they would like to sell their houses but cannot afford to at the new low price, and one respondent argues that HS2 Ltd should offer to purchase all homes in the vicinity of the line which owners want to sell, at their higher, pre-HS2, value.

Land quality

- 6.16.39 Few respondents discuss issues relating to land quality specific to CFA 16, however one respondent is anxious that HS2 Ltd should guarantee the restoration of existing drainage schemes to ensure the land continues to be usable for agriculture.

Other issues

- 6.16.40 The Canal and River Trust asks for clarification of the proposed Oxford Canal crossing design as this has not been included in the documentation.
- 6.16.41 Priors Hardwick Action Group (PHAG) proposals for the alignment of the HS2 line passing under the Oxford Canal are supported by a number of respondents, including Wormleighton and Stoneton Parish Meeting, as a means of mitigating noise, visual and other impacts around Priors Hardwick. Several respondents say that arguments previously made against these proposals by HS2 Ltd have been shown to be untrue or inapplicable.

6.17 Offchurch and Cubbington (CFA 17)

Overview

- 6.17.1 The Offchurch and Cubbington community forum area (CFA) covers a 7.2km section of the Proposed Scheme in Warwick District, where it passes to the east of Royal Leamington Spa. It extends from the Grand Union Canal in the south to the boundary between Weston-under-Wetherley and Stoneleigh parishes in the north. The area includes land within the parishes of Offchurch, Cubbington and Weston-under-Wetherley.
- 6.17.2 There are 56 respondents explicitly addressing Offchurch and Cubbington (CFA 17) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 17, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 17 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.17.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 17 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 17.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.17.4 A comment spanning CFAs 16 and 17 suggests that HS2 trains would traverse this area at the highest speed, and therefore it should receive maximum mitigation funding.
- 6.17.5 One comment spanning CFAs 17 and 18 argues that there has been insufficient consideration of the impacts of construction traffic on the roads between Leamington Spa and the University of Warwick. They are concerned that this already busy area would become gridlocked, and urge consultation with the University.

Overarching issues for CFA 17

- 6.17.6 The proposed height of the HS2 line in CFA 17 is the subject of concern for a large number of respondents, including Cubbington Parish Council. Respondents argue that the proposals in the draft ES represent a significant change from the design which the community was consulted on in the past, with the line being raised by up to 9 metres in some sections, compared to original plans. They disagree with the assertion in the draft ES that the environmental impacts of the new design are broadly similar, arguing that the environmental impacts of the raised line are much more severe, particularly as regards noise impact. Many respondents comment that these changes have been made by HS2 Ltd for purely financial reasons, and that they are of no benefit at all to local communities. A large number of respondents comment that these changes invalidate the previous community consultation, which recommended a range of mitigation measures they feel have been completely ignored, including lowering the track or creating a tunnel.

“The post-consultation changes that have been made to the design of the proposed route through Offchurch and Cubbington, referred to by HS2 Ltd as ‘Option B’, have raised the trackbed height along the whole of this run, with consequent increased environmental impacts. These changes appear to have been made solely for cost reasons, including reducing the costs of spoil disposal, and have been of no benefit whatsoever to the local communities.”

Individual

“None of the proposals for mitigation by the Offchurch and Cubbington Community Forum, especially those to keep the track bed as low as possible to minimise noise and visual impact, and our proposed green tunnel, have been accepted by HS2. Indeed, the track height has consistently been raised (to save money). As a result the impact of HS2 will be much worse than it need be. I demand that the mitigation proposals made by the Offchurch and Cubbington Action Groups and supported by the CF are included in the ES”

Individual

6.17.7 The impacts of the proposals on South Cubbington Wood are also discussed by a large number of respondents, who oppose the land-take and damage to the woodland entailed by the HS2 proposals. They comment that the wood is a popular local amenity site, which they say is used frequently by the community and has extremely high ecological and heritage value due to its status as ancient woodland, containing anemones, bluebells, a range of wildlife and the oldest wild pear tree in England. Cubbington Parish Council notes that although the section of the wood to be affected by HS2 is privately owned, the owner maintains open access and as such it is an important leisure amenity for the local community. The Warwickshire Wildlife Trust argues that in addition to the land-take and severance of part of the woodland, the proposals are likely to cause *“localised hydrological changes, the introduction of noise and visual disturbance to the adjacent fragments and soil erosion created by passing trains during the operational stages”*. They believe the individual and combined impacts on the ancient woodland need to be considered in the full ES, to enable the fullest possible mitigation for any significant effects.

6.17.8 Overlapping with the previous point, many respondents voice support for Cubbington Action Group’s proposal for the track to follow the currently proposed route, but at a reduced height, and then to pass through a 1200-metre twin-bore tunnel through the hill on which South Cubbington Wood is located. This is considered beneficial as it would save the ancient woodland from extensive damage, reduce the visual and noise impact in Leam Valley, and avoid the need to divert the B4453 over a new bridge.

“The mitigation proposals for South Cubbington Wood are totally inappropriate. They do not take account of the irreplaceable nature of ancient woodland nor of the considerable loss of amenity for the local community that the destruction of the only publically accessible area of the woodland will cause. The proposal from the local community to save South Cubbington Wood by tunnelling under it has been treated dishonestly and with total contempt by HS2 Ltd”

Individual

6.17.9 Additionally, a number of respondents state they support the Offchurch Action Group’s proposal for a cut-and-cover green tunnel between Hunningham Road and Welsh Road towards Southam, and note the benefits of the proposal. For example, they say that this would reduce noise and visual impact, reduce impact on agricultural holdings, maintain the Offchurch Greenway and wildlife corridor, reduce the amount of excavated material requiring disposal, and enable several roads and public rights of way to be reconnected without the need for bridges.

- 6.17.10 Finally, a large number of respondents express dissatisfaction with the community engagement process. They comment that the information provided by HS2 Ltd at the community forums was misleading or inadequate, and that recommendations and decisions made at these forums have been ignored and misrepresented – particularly those relating to the Action Groups’ tunnel suggestions. A number of respondents express the opinion that these problems invalidate HS2’s community engagement, which they argue should be noted in the ES.

“The DES should note the dissatisfaction of community representatives with the management of the Offchurch and Cubbington Community Forum by HS2 Ltd. On two occasions this led to resolutions of no confidence in HS2 Ltd being passed. The DES should therefore conclude that community engagement has been highly inadequate.”

Cubbington Parish Council

Community

- 6.17.11 Many respondents discuss concerns regarding HS2’s impact on the community in CFA 17 – in particular relating to South Cubbington Wood as discussed in paragraph 6.17.7 Concerns regarding impacts on community use of the countryside, footpaths and woodland more generally are also discussed by a number of respondents – one of whom argues that the use of these spaces as important recreational assets by the community is not adequately recognised in the draft ES.

“You have failed to recognise properly that the proposed line will cut through a key area of recreational space for the residents in this area. You say that Leamington Spa is where the majority of people go for their recreation. This is not true. Many local people regard the countryside and woodland in the area as the place they spend their time, walking, running, exercising their dogs, etc.”

Individual

- 6.17.12 A number of respondents express specific concerns regarding changes to footpaths in the area. In particular, comments express dissatisfaction with the proposed diversion of footpath W129y, and both the Ramblers’ Association and Cubbington Parish Council suggest alternative routes to reduce the amount of roadside walking. Alterations are also suggested for footpath W128.
- 6.17.13 Additionally, Warwick District Council and Cubbington Parish Council express concern regarding potential adverse health and social impacts of proposed changes to and disruption of the Centenary Way, Shakespeare’s Avon Way, Millennium Way and Grand Union Canal Walk. Warwick District Council also requests more information about impacts of the proposals on the “*vital network of public footpaths that link the small communities within this area*”, and express concern at the omission of the Offchurch Greenway in the draft ES.

“It is unclear how the Proposed Scheme will impact upon vital networks of public footpaths that link the small communities within this area. Further information is needed regarding the impact with particular regard to potential social isolation, community cohesion and health and well-being if the routes were to be negatively affected by the Proposed Scheme.”

Warwick District Council

- 6.17.14 More generally, a number of respondents argue that the construction and operation of HS2 would cause serious disruption and detrimental impact to the community, and that this is not being sufficiently recognised or mitigated. Cubbington Parish Council expresses concern that at community forums they were informed by HS2 Ltd that the construction affecting this area would last between 18 and 24 months, while the draft ES suggests this would in fact be a period of 'seven years, plus two years of reinstatement activity'.
- 6.17.15 One respondent expresses their anxiety regarding the impact of HS2 on their quality of life and their property value, which they argue is not being adequately addressed or compensated.

"This project has in effect made the value of my house zero, I cannot sell it even if we wanted to for the next 30 years - in effect you have made my family prisoners in our own home, a home we worked hard for 25 years to finance a mortgage - What are your proposals to compensate a sad, angry, frightened and deeply concerned family? [...] Currently it appears that an area of woodland near this development is more important than a family living in fear of what will happen over the next 30 years - Yes the woodland is important and so much effort has been invested in minimising impact to it. Sadly I do not see the same effort invested for the people unlucky to be positioned so near."

Individual

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.17.16 Noise impacts are discussed by a number of respondents in relation to CFA 17. In particular, they are concerned about the increased noise disruption that would be caused by the raised track height proposed in the draft ES, as discussed in section 6.17.6 of this report.
- 6.17.17 A few specific comments about noise impacts are also made, including concerns expressed by a small number of respondents regarding potential distress and disruption caused by construction traffic noise to residents of the Cubbington Mill Care Home, which they say is situated on a construction route. Cubbington Parish Council comments on the possible detrimental impacts of HS2 construction and operation noise on livestock and horses, while one respondent argues that the height of the viaduct over the River Leam would exacerbate noise issues.
- 6.17.18 A number of respondents disagree with the noise estimates made for this area in the draft ES. They argue that the noise contour maps and use of averaged noise levels are misleading. In particular, respondents believe that residents of Offchurch would be adversely affected by the noise.

"The text and maps purport to show the noise impact on Offchurch by means of noise contours. This information is however highly misleading as it applies an averaged equivalent sound level not the actual pass-by noise which would be created by each train. The latter would be much louder - perhaps more than twice as loud. It therefore seems likely that a much wider area - including much of the village of Offchurch - would be subject to significant noise nuisance."

Individual

Traffic and transport

- 6.17.19 A number of comments are made regarding traffic and transport in CFA 17. In particular, the use of Hunningham Road, Welsh Road and the B4455 as routes for construction traffic is contested by respondents, who argue that these are too narrow and/or too busy already. Additionally, Sir Thomas White's Charity objects to the permanent use of a farm road on its property as a service route, arguing it is unsuitable and would impede access.
- 6.17.20 As mentioned in paragraph 6.17.17, a small number of respondents including Cubbington Parish Council object to a construction route passing in front of the Cubbington Mill Care Home, as well as many other houses, due to noise and safety concerns.
- 6.17.21 Some respondents express concern about access to their properties and to local facilities such as those in Leamington Spa, while one respondent worries the proposed half day and overnight closure of Hunningham Road could trap them in their house. Warwickshire County Council objects to the closure of Offchurch Lane.

Ecology

- 6.17.22 As discussed in paragraphs 6.17.7-6.17.8, many respondents express concern about ecological impacts of the anticipated partial destruction, severance and broader disruption caused to the ancient South Cubbington Wood. Whilst most respondents argue that this should be avoided entirely, a number also object to HS2 Ltd's proposed new tree-planting mitigation measures if the plan does proceed. In particular, Cubbington Parish Council argues that *"the only genuine opportunity to compensate for the loss of a part of South Cubbington Wood"* would be to restore part or all of North Cubbington Wood.

"Most of North Cubbington Wood is what the Woodland Trust refers to as PAWS (Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites), having been extensively planted with non-native, commercial tree species (predominantly conifers). This woodland would appear to provide the ideal opportunity for meaningful mitigation for the ancient woodland that will be lost in Cubbington due to HS2. Rather than low- value planting of unsuitable land with whips (sapling trees), the restoration of North Cubbington Wood, in accordance with Woodland Trust principles [...] would appear to offer a much higher value proposal."

Cubbington Parish Council

- 6.17.23 A few respondents express general concern for woodlands, wildlife and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) in the area, and argue for greater recognition of these and more substantial mitigation measures, particularly where the proposed HS2 line bisects the four main wildlife corridors in the area – the Offchurch Greenway, the River Leam, the Ridgeway and the Grand Union Canal.
- 6.17.24 The Environment Agency discusses a number of detailed issues relating to watercourses and species in CFA 17. This includes recommendations that the needs of various protected fish species, great crested newts and otters are taken into account. They also argue that angling clubs should be consulted about any changes that may affect them.

“Otters are known to be present on all watercourses in this area including all canals, the River Leam and it’s [sic] tributaries. [...] We believe all crossings should assume otters will be present and where restricted bridges are to be constructed otter ledges/pipes will be required.”

(Environment Agency)

- 6.17.25 Warwickshire Wildlife Trust also makes a number of detailed comments relevant to CFA 17, including an assertion that the baseline figures for a number of species are underestimated. They also discuss particular concerns relating to Cubbington Wood, the Grand Union Canal, Offchurch Greenway, the River Leam and the ash beds, which they argue are variously threatened by impacts including habitat loss, severance, hydrological changes, noise and visual disturbance, and contamination.
- 6.17.26 One respondent notes that a couple of farms in CFA 17 are the subject of a Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) scheme with English Nature. They are concerned that the proposals would have a significant impact on these locations, and would likely result in the termination of the HLS agreement. They call for this to be included in the ES, along with proposed mitigation.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.17.27 A number of comments are made relating to the visual impact of HS2 on CFA 17. In particular, Warwick District Council notes that the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) map has “*still not been produced*”, and argues that landscape effects have not been adequately addressed. They also request contour plans showing the zone of influence of construction site lighting be produced and shown by HS2 Ltd to the relevant local authorities for approval.
- 6.17.28 A small number of respondents express concern about the visual impact of the screening earthworks, which they argue are visually intrusive and ineffective. One respondent suggests that they may just be a “*convenient spoil tip*”, and asks for further justification and quantification of the benefits of these structures. Another respondent requests that the proposed tree planting at the bottom of their garden be cancelled, as this would obscure their view of the valley.
- 6.17.29 Other concerns expressed by respondents focus on the visual impact of the proposed Hunningham Road overbridge and the anticipated light pollution from cars crossing the Coventry Road and Rugby Road flyovers. Additionally, one respondent requests that the formal ES contains photomontages of the route at sensitive locations, including the viaducts across the Grand Union Canal and the River Leam.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.17.30 A small number of respondents comment that there would be an increased risk of flooding in Cubbington due to the project, and note that Pingle Brook and the River Lea both represent flood risks. Additionally, one respondent expresses concern that HS2 changing the local water courses combined with the effects of climate change would increase the general likelihood of floods.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.17.31 A few concerns are expressed regarding the impact of the proposals on agricultural land. In particular, a small number of respondents suggest that the current proposals to plant trees on agricultural land as mitigation for the land-take in South Cubbington Wood are unnecessary and would have detrimental impacts on the farmer and the country's food supply.

"Your proposal to transplant S Cubbington Wood into a neighbouring piece of prime agricultural land is both damaging to our economy and stupid. You will not be able to recreate the ancient woodland, and you are taking away the livelihood of several generations of farmers, and reducing the amount of land for growing food that we badly need."

Individual

- 6.17.32 Warwick District Council also expresses a number of concerns about impacts on agricultural land and compensation proposals, while another respondent argues that HS2 Ltd has carried out insufficient engagement with local farmers. Additionally, a small number of respondents voice concerns about access for farmers and landowners between pieces of land separated by the proposed track, and stress the need for crossings suitable for farm vehicles, while Sir Thomas White's Charity notes that an area of Manor Farm would be permanently separated from the rest of the farm, and requests that HS2 Ltd purchase this from them.

"Immediately to the north of the railway and west of the River Leam Viaduct is an area of land which will remain severed from the remainder of Manor Farm. It is considered appropriate that HS2 purchase this land which will be of no use to the remainder of the holding subject to an appropriate price being negotiated and in addition it is considered this area would be suitable for tree or woodland planting to screen the railway line from the north."

Sir Thomas White's Charity

Socio-economics

- 6.17.33 A small number of comments are made regarding socio-economic impacts in CFA 17, including concerns about decreased property values as mentioned in paragraph 6.17.15 above.
- 6.17.34 More generally, Cubbington Parish Council comments that socio-economic impacts are not adequately considered in the draft ES, particularly as no reference is made to permanent impacts on farm and farm-based employment.

Air quality

- 6.17.35 A few respondents express concerns that air quality would significantly decrease for properties close to the construction sites and traffic routes, primarily due to dust, the effects of which respondents say are underestimated. Cubbington Parish Council is especially concerned about the impacts this would have on the Old Mill Care Home, and argue that this needs to be assessed further by HS2.

Other issues

- 6.17.36 The Canal and River Trust discusses a number of specific issues relating to the potential impact of the Proposed Scheme upon the Grand Union Canal's infrastructure, access and environment, and recommends a range of alterations and mitigation measures. They also comment that they "*strongly support the proposal to extend the Long Itchington Tunnel*".
- 6.17.37 Other issues discussed by respondents in relation to CFA 17 include a few calls for more tree planting between houses, and for the proposed rail line to minimise dust and noise. Conversely, Sir Thomas White's Charity objects to the proposed woodland planting on some of their land, and also to the proposed public access to this.
- 6.17.38 Additionally, one respondent is concerned that the Offchurch Auto Transformer situated near their house "*could cause contamination*".
- 6.17.39 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topics of cultural heritage and land quality, explicitly in relation to CFA 17.

6.18 Stoneleigh, Kenilworth and Burton Green (CFA 18)

Overview

- 6.18.1 This Stoneleigh, Kenilworth and Burton Green community forum area (CFA) covers an 11.2km section of the Proposed Scheme where it passes through the narrow gap of countryside between Kenilworth and Coventry. It extends from a point just before the A445 Leicester Lane in the south to Waste Lane at Beechwood in the north. The area includes land within the parishes of Stoneleigh, Kenilworth and Burton Green, Berkswell and Balsall. Offchurch and Cubbington (CFA 17) lies to the south and Balsall Common and Hampton-in-Arden (CFA 23) lies to the north-west. Coventry lies to the north and the administrative boundary extends into the eastern side of the area around Gibbet Hill, the University of Warwick Campus, Westwood Heath and Tile Hill.
- 6.18.2 There are 130 respondents explicitly addressing Stoneleigh, Kenilworth and Burton Green (CFA 18) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 18, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 18 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.18.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 18 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 18.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.18.4 One comment spanning CFAs 17 and 18 argues that there has been insufficient consideration of the impacts of construction traffic on the roads between Leamington Spa and the University of Warwick. Respondents are concerned that this already busy area would become gridlocked, and urge consultation with the University.

- 6.18.5 Additionally, Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council provides detailed comments on the draft ES, covering the majority of the ES topics at a general level, as well as for specifics CFAS (18-25). The response highlights a number of areas where the Council believes there would be negative effects, where additional assessment is required, where it thinks further information is needed and where it suggests additional mitigation arrangements are needed.

Overarching issues for CFA 18

- 6.18.6 A large number of respondents commenting on CFA 18 express concern about the impacts of constructing a cut-and-cover tunnel through the village of Burton Green, which are thought to be severe and underestimated in the draft ES, particularly with respect to community, noise, socio-economic and health impacts. On this basis, many respondents, including Warwickshire County Council, suggest that a deep bore tunnel should be used instead; a proposal they argue has been rejected by HS2 Ltd without sufficient justification.
- 6.18.7 Impacts on Kenilworth Greenway are also frequently mentioned by respondents commenting on the CFA 18 report, while many also discuss other community, noise and traffic concerns.

Community

- 6.18.8 A large number of respondents express concerns relating to the treatment of the Kenilworth Greenway in the proposals. Organisations including Warwick County Council, Coventry City Council, Berkswell and Burton Green Parish Councils, The Ramblers' Association and The Greenway Trust, as well as many members of the public, note that the Kenilworth Greenway is a valued amenity. Its functions are variously listed as a recreation site, transport route, wildlife corridor and Burton Green's primary "open green space". Many respondents are particularly concerned about noise effects on users and wildlife of the currently "tranquil" Greenway, particularly where the HS2 rail line would run close to it, and discuss the need for mitigation measures.

"The Kenilworth Greenway is a major community asset, and there is considerable concern about proposals for construction and operation of the scheme. South of Waste Lane, realignment alongside the new railway may not be satisfactory unless noise abatement is of the highest standard. This is necessary for both walkers/cyclists and equestrians. A solid full-height noise-absorptive barrier is required, and the appearance of this needs to be softened by suitable plantings. Consequently, the proposed land-take needs to be increased."

Various respondents

- 6.18.9 Additionally, various respondents express concern about the proposed temporary closure of part of the Greenway during construction, and Coventry City Council suggests it should be diverted during construction rather than closed, due to its use as a transport route. Other respondents are concerned that the Greenway would never return to its current "distinctive" state after its reinstatement.

“We welcome the decision to reinstate the Greenway alongside its present route through this section; although, given the upheaval it will have to endure, we doubt if the Greenway can ever be restored to even a semblance of its existing condition and we fear that it will end up looking like any other cycleway. Above all, as it is a multi-user path, the reinstated Greenway needs to be wide enough to accommodate both cyclists and pedestrians without either endangering the other.”

The Ramblers' Association

- 6.18.10 A number of respondents discuss other issues relating to public rights of way in CFA 18. In particular, various respondents argue that HS2 Ltd has underestimated the importance, and the usage, of local public rights of way, including the Kenilworth Greenway and the Connect2Kenilworth cycle path.
- 6.18.11 National Cycle Route 52 is also the subject of a few comments, which request that it is maintained to its current quality level and length, as respondents say it is an important university commuter route.
- 6.18.12 The impacts of HS2 on the village of Burton Green are discussed frequently by respondents. As discussed in paragraph 6.18.6, many respondents argue in favour of a deep bore tunnel rather than the cut-and-cover tunnel currently proposed. Various respondents are concerned that the current proposals would have an adverse impact on social cohesion in the community, and cause isolation to residents. The HS2 Action Alliance comments that the CFA 18 report underestimates the impacts the proposals would have on the village, saying it expects around 20% of residents to leave because of HS2.

“The DES downplays the environmental effects so only three properties are referenced as being demolished but then the further 18 properties immediately adjacent to the line only 'may need to be re-housed temporarily'. In reality of course these people are all in the safeguarding zone and will be gone as soon as possible, as will the next 20-30 properties if any sort of VPZ appears - so something like 20% of the village will leave. However these impacts are not mentioned.”

HS2 Action Alliance

- 6.18.13 A number of respondents express concern about impacts on Burton Green Village Hall, particularly during construction. Several respondents, including the Burton Green Village Hall organisation, Burton Green Parish Council and Berkswell Parish Council, say this facility is used by a large number of local organisations and individuals for a wide range of purposes, and its temporary closure would have a significant detrimental effect on the community. A number of respondents further argue that due to its close proximity to the proposed line, significant disruption would remain even once the building is returned to use. Mitigation measures are suggested, including the aforementioned bored tunnel, as well as the suggestion that a temporary or permanent alternative facility should be provided to compensate for the loss of the village hall.

“The Village Hall, which is now proposed to be one of the closest remaining buildings in the village to the line, is the hub of the community with continuous use for church services, toddler groups, Parish Council and Resident Association, WI, among many others. It will be necessary to provide temporary accommodation during construction to replace this invaluable facility. HS2 Ltd has not yet mitigated for this breakdown in communication and services within our community. This is unacceptable and needs to be addressed forthwith.”

Burton Green Parish Council

- 6.18.14 Other comments relating to Burton Green include a request from one respondent that the Burton Green tunnel is extended 150 metres to move the tunnel portal away from their house to an area where it would not affect anyone. Additionally, Warwickshire County Council is concerned about the proposed diversion of an oil pipeline through the village.
- 6.18.15 Respondents addressing the CFA 18 report also express concern about a number of general community impacts, particularly access to and impacts on community facilities, including schools, medical facilities and shops. The health impacts of air pollution, noise and disruption that would be caused by the construction of HS2, as well as the health impacts of changes to public rights of way, are of concern to a number of respondents. Warwickshire County Council requests a health impact assessment is carried out.
- 6.18.16 Some respondents make general comments on the impacts of temporary and permanent land-take and property loss in CFA 18, while a few respondents express dissatisfaction that HS2 has caused their house value to decrease.
- 6.18.17 A number of respondents argue that impacts on the communities in CFA 18 have been ignored or underestimated by HS2 Ltd, while the Crackley Residents' Association expresses concern that indirect impacts on the communities of Kenilworth and Coventry are considered to “*fall outside the scope of the study area for this assessment*”.

“The impacts on the community have seemingly been ignored [...]. People do matter - the effect on their lives is of paramount importance and should not be dismissed as a sop to some self seeking political agenda.”

Individual

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.18.18 A large number of respondents express concern regarding the anticipated noise impacts of HS2's construction and operation in CFA 18, and many comments call for additional mitigation measures such as tree planting and noise-absorbent fencing. Locations of particular concern to respondents include Stoneleigh Village, Warwick University, Kenilworth Greenway, Kenilworth Castle, Crackley Woods Nature Reserve, Burton Green Primary School, the Waste Lane overbridge and HS2 viaducts.
- 6.18.19 The health impacts of noise disturbance are specifically mentioned by a number of respondents, with one respondent requesting noise mitigation near their house, stating they have children with sensory difficulties.

“HS2 crosses my land very close to my house. Six of my seven children are on the autistic spectrum and have severe sensory problems. There is currently no mitigation for noise (which my children are particularly susceptible to) as the train enters my land.”

Individual

- 6.18.20 A number of comments highlight noise disruption to Stoneleigh Park and Showground. A few respondents, including Warwickshire County Council, express concern that the noise could cause distress to the horses and livestock brought to Stoneleigh Park. A number of respondents suggest that the draft ES underestimates noise levels at this location, and a few propose a cut-and-cover tunnel as a solution.
- 6.18.21 As in comments made in relation to other CFAs, many respondents also note their disagreement with HS2’s noise estimate calculation methods, which they believe have resulted in underestimation. Some call for compensation if these estimates are exceeded.

Traffic and transport

- 6.18.22 A large number of respondents express concerns about construction traffic, road changes and the associated traffic congestion and transport disruption in CFA 18.
- 6.18.23 Many respondents, including Warwickshire County Council and Berkswell Parish Council, are concerned about access and congestion due to the closure of Dalehouse Lane and Waste Lane. Respondents also suggest that a number of proposed construction routes, including Truggist Lane and Cryfield Grange, are not considered suitable for heavy goods vehicles (HGVs). Kenilworth Town Centre Partnership anticipates that Kenilworth would be affected by traffic disruption, and wants to work with HS2 Ltd to minimise this.

“The construction works that will be undertaken to deliver HS2 will [...] involve road closures, diversions and construction collateral damage – dust noise and disruption – and our wish is to develop a meaningful mutually beneficial relationship with the team delivering HS2 in our location so that we can minimise any impact wherever possible and seek to optimise any benefits both short term during construction and then longer term for the benefit of our stakeholders.”

Kenilworth Town Centre Partnership

- 6.18.24 The response from Warwickshire County Council includes a number of detailed comments and recommendations regarding traffic routes, while also expressing concern that bus services in the area would suffer from diversions and delays during the construction phase.
- 6.18.25 A number of respondents express concern about disruption to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders caused by changes to the public rights of way, and Warwickshire County Council notes that the temporary closure of the Connect2Kenilworth cycleway would affect commuters to the university. Other comments emphasise safety concerns for non-mechanised traffic due to the construction traffic and congestion.

- 6.18.26 A number of respondents are concerned about access between Stoneleigh and Kenilworth, as well as between Crackley and the wider area including Coventry. Additionally, respondents stress the importance of considering those who commute to Warwick University or Coventry, or those who need to access the University Hospital in Coventry from the surrounding towns and villages. Access to Stoneleigh Park is discussed by a few respondents, including Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council.
- 6.18.27 Stoneleigh Action Group and a number of other respondents argue that construction traffic should be prevented from passing through Stoneleigh village or across Stoneleigh Bridge, which they indicate is a vulnerable scheduled monument. The question of who would fund the repair of additional potholes and road deterioration caused by construction traffic is also raised.
- 6.18.28 Additionally, one respondent is concerned about the cumulative disruption caused by HS2 construction running concurrently with a number of nearby road improvements, while others argue that traffic planning needs to take into account other approved future developments in the area, including the expansion of Stoneleigh Park, Warwick University, Kenilworth town, and the need for more housing. Coventry City Council and the transport provider Centro request that HS2 Ltd protects their ability to four-track various routes on classic rail network in future.

“There is no consideration being taken that very disruptive road improvements are already scheduled for the exact same timeframe just two miles north of the HS2 route - at the A45/A46 junction at Tollbar End (and associated works on the northbound carriageway leading to the A46/A45 junction at Stivichall - starting less than a mile from the HS2 works). This will already cause delays or diversions to reach the University Hospital at Walsgrave and for commuters. How can it be justified to add HS2 disruption on top of this already planned work?”

Individual

Ecology

- 6.18.29 A number of respondents address ecological issues relating to CFA 18. Respondents express concerns about HS2’s impact on Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), wildlife and habitats in the area, with mention of a number of specific species. Some respondents argue that the species baseline surveys carried out have been inadequate, and request further information, while others stress the need to survey migration patterns in the Kenilworth Greenway wildlife corridor and mitigate for any detrimental impacts. A number of comments call for extra mitigation measures to protect wildlife and habitats, including a request to use a cut-and-cover tunnel through Stoneleigh Park to protect the bat population on that site.
- 6.18.30 The impact of HS2 on woodland in CFA 18 is the subject of a number of concerned comments. Some respondents, including Burton Green Parish Council, comment that the baseline omits a number of woodlands in the area, including ancient woodlands. The Woodland Trust and other respondents express concern about impacts on Black Waste Wood, and argue that translocation would be an unsuccessful mitigation strategy. A few respondents voice concerns about impacts on Jubilee Wood due to the proposed diversion of Canley Brook, with several arguing for this wood to be resited.

- 6.18.31 The Environment Agency expresses particular concern for otters in the area, and suggests a range of watercourse enhancements and other improvements that could be made to improve habitats for this animal and other species in CFA 18.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.18.32 Many respondents voice general concerns about the detrimental impact they expect HS2 to have on the landscape in CFA 18, particularly around Stoneleigh, Kenilworth and Warwick University, and some request more mitigation measures. Some respondents are particularly concerned about the elevated sections of the proposed route, which they believe would exacerbate visual impacts.
- 6.18.33 A small number of respondents, including Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council, express concern about light pollution from proposed construction sites. Warwick District Council comments on the assessment of this light pollution and request a “*zone of influence contour plan*”.
- 6.18.34 Crackley Residents’ Association comments that the baseline omits many specific features, while Burton Green Parish Council is concerned that overhead power lines are not included in the landscape and visual assessment.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.18.35 A number of respondents express concern about water resources and flood risk in CFA 18. In particular, some respondents worry that the proposed diversion of the flood-prone Canley Brook would increase flood risk to residential properties, and others are concerned about the impact of this diversion on Jubilee Wood. The Environment Agency comments that it would like to input into the design of the proposed realignment.
- 6.18.36 Burton Green Parish Council states concern about the size of the floodplain being created at Crackley and its impact on Burton Green, as well as the assessment of drainage and flooding in the South Hurst, Bockendon and Burton Green areas.
- 6.18.37 The potential for HS2 to “*increase flood risk for others during construction and maintenance*” is mentioned as a specific concern, with associated comments about perceived inconsistencies and inaccuracies regarding flood risk in the CFA 18 report.

“Para 13.6.7 of report 18, states “vulnerability of river flood risk receptors associated with these watercourses (i.e. Finham Brook) is low”. This would suggest lack of background research, since multiple properties along Finham Brook within 1km of the proposed route have been flooded in the past 12 months.”

Individual

- 6.18.38 A few respondents also express concern that the history of flooding for Coventry Road has not been taken into account in the report.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.18.39 Warwickshire County Council discusses a number of concerns relating to the impacts of HS2 on agriculture in CFA 18. These include comments about negative impacts on Stoneleigh Showground, soil contamination from construction, and loss of agricultural employment within the Stratford-on-Avon district.
- 6.18.40 Respondents are also concerned about the impacts of land-take or severance on farms including New Kingswood Farm, Little Beanit Farm and Furzen Hill Farm; a few express concern about the impact of the Proposed Scheme on livestock. Burton Green Parish Council comments that the National Farmers Union guidelines on small farm viability have not been taken into account when considering small farms in the parish, which they assert are likely to suffer more from impacts of HS2 than larger farms.

Air quality

- 6.18.41 A number of respondents express concern about the air quality impacts of HS2. Respondents are primarily concerned about this issue during construction, but some also mention operational impacts. Burton Green Parish Council discusses a number of specific air quality issues, including the possible effects on agriculture and livestock, while Warwickshire County Council requests further assessment of air quality impacts and their effect on public health.

Cultural heritage

- 6.18.42 HS2's potential impacts on Stoneleigh Abbey, Park and Village are the primary issues discussed by respondents in relation to cultural heritage in CFA 18. English Heritage and a number of other respondents are concerned that the Proposed Scheme would have detrimental effects on the Grade II* registered Stoneleigh Park, and Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council are concerned that the route would sever the historic link between the Park and Stoneleigh Village. Stoneleigh Action Group is also worried about the impacts of construction and traffic on Stoneleigh Village as a Conservation Area with a high number of listed buildings.

"The proposed route will sever Stoneleigh Village from its historic link with Stoneleigh Abbey, we have stressed to you many times that our area has a rich cultural heritage, and it worries us that you appear not to have considered any impact at all on Stoneleigh Village, a significant village in terms of the number of Listed Buildings within a Conservation Area (approx 67%)."

Stoneleigh Action Group

- 6.18.43 Additionally, Burton Green Parish Council suggests a number of heritage assets in CFA 18 are missing from the baseline.

Socio-economics

- 6.18.44 The socio-economic impacts of the HS2 proposals in relation to CFA 18 are discussed by a small number of respondents. Respondents express concern that businesses in Kenilworth, Burton Green and Stoneleigh Park would suffer financially from the disruption, perhaps leading to job losses. Burton Green Parish Council is concerned that the loss of its village hall would impact on the businesses which run from it. They suggest that any businesses affected, including schools and nurseries, should be compensated. Warwickshire County Council calls for economic assessment to be conducted regarding the impacts on local businesses and tourist attractions in CFA 18.
- 6.18.45 Concern that HS2 would detrimentally impact rural enterprises and farms is voiced by a number of respondents, including Cubbington Parish Council. One respondent also discusses the potential loss of their equestrian business due to HS2.

“HS2 will effectively grant a free for all on the destruction of swaths of the Warwickshire countryside, that to date have been fiercely protected, by councils and local communities alike - all will be destroyed by HS2. Rural enterprise which has worked hard to survive in tough economic times will be decimated - will horse riders want to hack across a rail motorway, country sports won't take place as trains fly by at 250mph. There will miles of abandoned land, that is no longer economically viable any longer in the decade of construction or afterwards.”

Individual

- 6.18.46 Kenilworth Golf Club provides a detailed response regarding the expected impacts of HS2 on its business. For example, they are concerned that their income and sustainability would suffer if customers are put off playing at the course, and note that they would prefer a cut-and-cover tunnel to be built to mitigate these issues. The Golf Club comments that it would prefer the construction of a permanent diversion to the north side of their property rather than closing or temporarily diverting Dalehouse Lane.
- 6.18.47 A number of respondents also express concern for homeowners whose property values are negatively affected by HS2, and some argue that these individuals should be given the opportunity to sell to the government at a fair price.

Land quality

- 6.18.48 A few comments are made regarding land quality impacts in CFA 18, including from Burton Green Parish Council, who are concerned about pollution from fuel lines under Kenilworth Greenway. Another respondent requests more information on the cleaning of contaminated land after construction, and the measures taken to minimise contamination, noting the longer land is *“taken out of its original use”*, the longer it will take to recover.
- 6.18.49 Additionally, Berkswell Parish Council and Warwickshire County Council express concern about the potential sterilisation of deep coal deposits under the route. They request that further investigation and discussion be carried out about this.

“the section of route does fall within the County's deep coal MSA and there is the potential for coal related activity at some stage in the future. The BGS report 'Minerals Safeguarding Areas for Warwickshire' (2009) [...] states that for such high precision industries [such as high speed railways], this may sterilise an area of up to 500m from the edge of the resource (or in this case,

500m either side of the route). WCC requests that HS2 holds joint discussions with the Coal Authority, relevant coal operators (such as UK Coal) and WCC (as the Mineral Planning Authority) so that the potential sterilisation impacts can be assessed and any measures to reduce sterilisation are investigated.”

Warwickshire County Council

Other issues

- 6.18.50 Burton Green Parish Council expresses concerns about the proposed location of the autotransformer, while another respondent voices concern that the report does not adequately consider safety risks where the proposed HS2 line crosses fuel pipelines.

“This report makes no mention of the dangers that could be met - for instance the proposed route crosses the MoD and Government emergency fuel transfer lines 3 times. These high pressure fuel lines are 14 inches in diameter and less than a meter below ground. Further along the proposed route intersects and follows the path of the cross country gas line. None of this is mentioned in the report nor how HS2 plan to carry out the work safely in accordance with the regulations.”

Individual

- 6.18.51 Finally, a few respondents object to the language used to describe the Kenilworth Greenway in the draft ES, saying “it is very disparaging for this to be repeatedly described as the ‘dismantled Kenilworth to Balsall line’ with little mention of its current use”, and others also note that any references to this dismantled line should read the “Kenilworth to Berkswell line”.
- 6.18.52 Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council requests clarification on why the “draft ES does not refer to options having been considered for realignment or tunnelling adjacent to Hampton in Arden” which they believe would help minimise impacts on the village.

6.19 Coleshill Junction (CFA 19)

Overview

- 6.19.1 The Coleshill Junction community forum area (CFA) covers a 13.5km section of the Proposed Scheme in North Warwickshire, where it passes to the west of Coleshill. It extends from the M6 in the south to the boundary between Coleshill and Curdworth parishes in the north and the boundary between Water Orton parish and Birmingham in the north-west. Parts of Solihull are included within the area, west of the M6 and the Proposed Scheme. The area includes land within the parishes of Coleshill, Fordbridge, Kingshurst, Smith’s Wood and Water Orton.
- 6.19.2 There are 50 respondents explicitly addressing Coleshill Junction (CFA 19) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 19, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 19 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.19.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 19 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 19.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.19.4 Although some respondents do discuss CFA 19 alongside other CFAs, they do not specifically raise issues that relate to CFA 19 and adjacent CFAs.

Overarching issues for CFA 19

- 6.19.5 An overarching issue discussed in many comments specific to CFA 19 is the impact of the proposed delta junction and the associated land-take required. Respondents identify a range of resulting community, visual, noise, traffic and transport, agricultural, and ecological impacts.
- 6.19.6 Many concerns in comments relevant to this CFA relate specifically to the anticipated effects on the Water Orton Primary School, which would lose a portion of its playing field to the land-take of the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.19.7 A few respondents support a suggested local route alternative along the Minworth effluent conduit, arguing that this would reduce a range of impacts in comparison to the proposed route, including noise impacts and impacts on the Water Orton Primary School.

Community

- 6.19.8 Many respondents express concern about the impact of the Proposed Scheme on children and schools, and specifically on the Water Orton Primary School, which respondents specify is in close proximity to the proposed line and would lose a portion of its playing field. Several respondents also state concern about the proposed demolition of the Old Saltleians Rugby Football Club, a local recreational facility. Other comments include concerns about the severance and future viability of the hamlet of Gilson, balancing ponds attracting anti-social behaviour, loss of open space, and general disruption and stress affecting local communities.

“The whole of Gilson will be adversely affected as it is being cut in half by the HS2 track. It will no longer be a viable community.”

Individual

- 6.19.9 A number of respondents raise the issue of impacts to property, with several expressing concern about the demolition of property and/or loss of property curtilage in Gilson and Water Orton, including on Attleboro Lane. A few respondents are concerned about general proximity of the line to their property, or discuss property values and compensation.

“The Delta Junction will have a significant impact on the surrounding communities [...]. Significant impacts on the village of Water Orton, the rugby club and the primary school are cumulative, and to date the community has had no indication of how these impacts will be mitigated.”

Dan Byles, Member of Parliament for North Warwickshire

- 6.19.10 The Coleshill Action Group argues the assessment of community impacts is inadequate, saying this makes consultation on this matter pointless. Warwickshire County Council considers that community impacts should also be assessed in relation to human health and wellbeing. The council makes several other specific comments, including a request for clarity regarding the effects on public rights of way and recreational routes in the area and a concern about the potential isolation of Gilson from essential services and amenities.

Traffic and transport

- 6.19.11 Some respondents, including Warwickshire County Council, raise the issue of traffic and transport, most often expressing concerns that certain roads, such as Attleboro Lane, Gilson Drive or Water Orton Road, are unsuitable for construction and heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic, or that proposals for diversions or realignments, such as for Gilson Road, are inappropriate. Some respondents worry that the proximity of construction traffic to residents' properties would cause vibration damage and general stress, create potential dangerous situations, including for schoolchildren or that it would make existing congestion or access problems even worse.

"[Water Orton Road is] already heavily congested at school start and finish times and with the increased traffic that we have been advised will be using this route we feel this may pose a hazard for our pupils and other road users."

Individual

- 6.19.12 Several respondents, including the Coleshill Action Group, the North Warwickshire Borough Council and Warwickshire County Council, comment that the traffic and transport assessment provided in the draft ES is inadequate in their view or that further clarification is needed about specific impacts, especially in relation to construction traffic. Specific comments include that the assessment should include impacts on junctions and bus routes, that consideration should be made for emergency access, as well as that it should be consistent with the air quality assessment.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.19.13 A number of respondents make comments about sound, noise and vibration. Several respondents express concerns about noise generally, with a few commenting specifically on noise resulting from the operation of the line, including concerns about frequency of the services, height of the proposed line, or general proximity to properties. A few respondents also refer specifically to noise related to construction or construction traffic, including a concern about working hours and duration of the proposed works. A small number of respondents make comments about vibration, including concerns of possible structural damage to properties.
- 6.19.14 A few respondents comment on the sound, noise and vibration assessment, arguing that it should account for cumulative effects such as the combined effects of traffic noise, that it should be conducted under certain wind conditions, that it is generally inadequate or that it should be independently evaluated. The Coleshill Action Group thinks the noise assessment provided in the draft ES is inadequate for the purposes of consultation, while Warwickshire County Council comments that both the noise assessment and mitigation measures should account for associated impacts on human health and wellbeing, as well as suggesting that ongoing noise monitoring be conducted both during construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme.

“It is noted that construction effects have not been assessed, so the consultation on this point is pointless. However it is misleading to suggest that potential construction noise effects could occur at the communities listed close to the works. They undoubtedly would occur if HS2 goes ahead and this should be clearly acknowledged.”

Coleshill Action Group

- 6.19.15 A few respondents comment on the subject of noise mitigation measures. Views include that further mitigation is generally required and that a local route alternative along the Minworth effluent conduit would reduce noise impacts. One respondent highlights their support for the mitigation measures as proposed.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.19.16 Several respondents comment on visual impacts on the area, with a number of these stating that much of the proposed route in this area runs on viaducts or embankments. A few respondents are concerned about impacts on views from their properties, while a few express concern about the anticipated loss of trees in the area. A small number of respondents, including the Warwickshire Wildlife Trust and the Coleshill Action Group, make specific comments about visual impacts, mentioning a Local Wildlife Site (LWS), the Water Orton Primary School, the green belt, as well as the photomontages and visual representation provided in the draft ES.
- 6.19.17 A few respondents, including the North Warwickshire Borough Council and the Coleshill Action Group, make comments about visual mitigation measures. Alongside general comments about the need for further mitigation, there are comments focusing on the proposed planting, either stating that this should be more extensive, or that it is ineffective or excessive in its land-take. Warwickshire County Council also comments that light pollution should be managed according to appropriate standards, due to its possible implications for human health.

Ecology

- 6.19.18 A few respondents, including the Coleshill Action Group, comment on ecological impacts, with specific comments referring to the expected loss of open space that provides a habitat for wildlife, possible impacts on bats, the need for further ecological assessment, and impacts on grassland habitat. The Warwickshire Wildlife Trust makes comments about specific LWSs in the area which they say would be vulnerable to construction impacts and/or partially lost, adding that plans should be reviewed to minimise impacts, providing mitigation as needed and compensating for any remaining losses. These sites include the Coleshill Hill Farm LWS, the Coleshill Park Belt LWS, the Wheeley Moor Farm LWS and the Coleshill Sewage Works Grasslands LWS.

“The dES concludes that 69% of the [Coleshill Hall Farm] LWS will be lost and we believe the remaining areas would also be vulnerable to disturbance, hydrological changes, contamination and other sources of disruption during the construction phases. We strongly recommend that the requirement for and extent of the engineering works at this site is reviewed so as to reduce the magnitude of the impact as far as feasibly possible. However, indirect effects on the remaining habitat should be assessed within the formal ES so that any additional impacts are mitigated to fullest possible extent. All remaining losses will need to be fully compensated.”

Warwickshire Wildlife Trust

- 6.19.19 The Environment Agency and Warwickshire Wildlife Trust make comments about aquatic habitats in the area, including concerns about possible impact on the River Cole, the anticipated loss of ponds, impacts on the Coleshill and Bannerly Pools Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), the need for further hydrological assessment, and loss of habitat for fish or the great crested newt.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.19.20 A small number of respondents express concern about impacts on agricultural land, mainly in relation to accessibility and severance issues, or the land-take of the Proposed Scheme. Some argue this would be exacerbated for example by the use of additional land for the planting proposals. The Coleshill Action Group comments that the draft ES does not define the level of effect for lost best and most versatile (BMV) land and does not define the level of residual effects for the land holding affected.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.19.21 A few respondents make comments about effects on drainage, mainly in relation to agricultural land, stating this should be managed properly to avoid land becoming waterlogged. A small number of respondents express concern about the location of balancing ponds, with some arguing that such sites could attract anti-social behaviour.

“Where existing ditches, drainage channels and water courses are severed, meaningful and workable drainage solutions should be installed to prevent land becoming waterlogged, as has happened on land impacted by the M6 toll motorway. There is little detail of this in the Environmental Statement for this holding or indeed the rest of the land impacted.”

Individual

- 6.19.22 The Environment Agency and the Warwickshire Wildlife Trust express concerns about potential impacts on surface water bodies and rivers in relation to their role as aquatic habitats, as referred to above in the ecology section.

Other issues

- 6.19.23 A small number of respondents make comments related to socio-economic issues in relation to CFA 19. One respondent expresses concern that a business estate bisected by the line would be left unusable due to noise, vibration and visual intrusion. Warwickshire County Council also makes a comment about possible impacts to existing plans in the form of a regeneration zone.

- 6.19.24 A relatively small number of respondents comment on the topic of air quality in relation to CFA 19. One respondent expresses concern about the cumulative impact of air pollution given the existing transport infrastructure in the area. Warwickshire County Council suggests that measures to manage air pollution impacts are put in place along with ongoing monitoring and that a health impact assessment should be conducted, taking into account the impact of air pollution and in particular dust from construction. The Coleshill Action Group comments on air pollution mainly in relation to assessment and traffic, noting that even small changes in traffic flows could have significant effects on air pollution levels.
- 6.19.25 Land quality and waste and materials resources are highlighted in a relatively small number of comments . Warwickshire County Council points out that some areas of land within this CFA are nitrate vulnerable zones, commenting that consideration should be given to the management of agricultural runoff. They also express concern about possible impacts on the Coleshill Sewage Treatment Works, as well as the possible sterilisation of sand and gravel mineral resources as a result of the Proposed Scheme. In both cases they request that further assessment take place and that appropriate mitigation is provided. The Coleshill Action Group comments that further detail is needed about the management of construction waste and materials in relation to land quality, and that the risk of accidental spillage of pollutants during the operation of the Proposed Scheme needs to be assessed. Warwickshire Wildlife Trust expresses concern that local SSSIs (discussed above under ecology) could be vulnerable to contamination during construction.
- 6.19.26 A small number of respondents, including the Coleshill Action Group, make negative comments about the consultation process or suggest that it is necessary for further engagement to take place with stakeholders and particularly those whose property is directly affected by the Proposed Scheme.

“It is unacceptable that the Y Junction continues to fall between the cracks of these consultations. The impact of the junction itself, and the aggregated impact on those communities that will be affected by both the phase 1 and the phase 2 lines, are simply not being considered in any detail. These communities feel isolated and shut out of the process. This consultation does nothing for them.”

Dan Byles, Member of Parliament for North Warwickshire

- 6.19.27 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topic of cultural heritage, explicitly in relation to CFA 19.

6.20 Curdworth to Middleton (CFA 20)

Overview

- 6.20.1 The Curdworth to Middleton community forum area (CFA) covers a 7.8km section of the Proposed Scheme in the borough of North Warwickshire, where it passes to the north-east of the Birmingham urban area. The southern boundary of the area is defined by the River Tame, near Coleshill Parkway and the boundary between Warwickshire and Staffordshire represents its northern limit. The area includes all or part of the parishes of Curdworth, Lea Marston, Wishaw, Kingsbury and Middleton

- 6.20.2 There are 96 respondents explicitly addressing Curdworth to Middleton (CFA 20) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 20, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 20 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.20.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 20 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 20.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.20.4 Although some respondents do discuss CFA 20 alongside other CFAs, they do not specifically raise issues that relate to CFA 20 and adjacent CFAs.

Overarching issues for CFA 20

- 6.20.5 Comments in relation to CFA 20 often highlight the impact on roads from construction in the area. Many respondents mention the proposed re-routing of the A4091 which runs through the centre of the area and on the A446. Concerns about construction compounds are also raised by many respondents including those proposed for Church Lane, Crowberry Lane, Hams Hall and Langley Brook. The impact of works on Langley Brook, including the proposed crossing and viaduct, is another frequently mentioned concern.
- 6.20.6 There are a number of scheme features in CFA 20 which are sometimes mentioned by respondents in relation to a variety of potential impacts. Most notably these include the siting of a construction railhead at Hams Hall, and the impacts of construction of the Leeds spur.

Traffic and transport

- 6.20.7 Many respondents addressing the CFA 20 report make reference to issues regarding traffic and transport. A particular issue of concern to some respondents, including Middleton HS2 Action Group and Middleton Parish Council, is the potential for increased traffic and noise due to the proposed re-routing of the A4091. A number of respondents including Curdworth Parish Council are concerned about the impact of construction traffic on Kingsbury Road – the A4097 – which they deem not suitable for heavy goods vehicles (HGVs); Lea Marston Parish Council suggests baseline traffic data be obtained for this road.
- 6.20.8 A few respondents are worried about access to and the perceived isolation of Middleton during the construction period. The locations of the Church Lane overbridge and Langley Brook viaduct construction compounds are seen as inappropriate by some organisations including the Middleton Heath, Education and Well-being Group. Warwickshire County Council expresses concern that proposed compounds in the area, including the Hams Hall compound, would have severe adverse effects on the A446.
- 6.20.9 The effect of the Proposed Scheme on non-motorised traffic is also mentioned in a few responses. A few organisations including Middleton Amateur Dramatics express concern about the impact of construction traffic on Crowberry Lane which they say is used by cyclists and horse-riders. A couple of respondents are also concerned about the re-routing of footpaths, including the T17. Warwickshire County Council and Middleton HS2 Action Group disagree with the assessment of public right of way footfall.

Sound, noise and vibration

6.20.10 Respondents express concern about potential sound, noise and vibration impacts from both the construction and operation of HS2. A number of respondents argue that the noise assessment in the draft ES is inadequate. Also of particular concern to respondents is the noise impact on the A4091 as discussed above in paragraph 6.20.08. Mitigation suggestions are offered by some respondents. For example, Middleton Parish Council comments that mitigation could be offered by lowering the line; Middleton HS2 Action Group prefers an alternative of replacing the proposed Langley Brook Viaduct with raised embankments, noise mitigation earthworks and bunding; Warwickshire County Council suggests that noise mitigation measures be detailed alongside effectiveness data.

“Measures taken to reduce noise nuisance need to be detailed with expected effectiveness data given in order to demonstrate they meet the permitted noise levels. We also recommend continued noise monitoring in this area during construction and after the project is complete.”

Warwickshire County Council

“The re-alignment, and changes in elevations to the road network (particularly the A4091) will significantly impact on noise levels in the area yet the acoustic/noise information appears to take no account of this.”

Various respondents

Community

6.20.11 Comments are made to highlight the potential impact on health and health facilities, with some respondents including Warwickshire County Council specifically requesting a health impact assessment is carried out. A number of other respondents, including Curdworth Parish Council, outline issues regarding the expected loss of footpaths and public rights of way. In addition, Middleton Parish Council and Middleton HS2 Action Group specifically express concern regarding the proposed diversion of the T17 footpath along the A4091.

Although the local network has been broken up somewhat over time, those remaining still have an important leisure role in our communities and Curdworth Parish Council would question the validity of the survey methodology used by HS2 Ltd to assess the usage of PROW.”

(Curdworth Parish Council)

6.20.12 A small number of respondents voice concern about the impact of prolonged construction works at Middleton, particularly in the context of the construction of the wider network.

6.20.13 Middleton Parish Council makes detailed comments about proposed mitigation measures and suggests an alternative alignment further away from the village.

“The mitigation hierarchy identified in the document (Fig 9) shows that the first priority is to ‘avoid’. Cross referring to CFA report 20 this supports the need to move the line further East from Middleton in line with the Middleton Action Group proposals.”

Middleton Parish Council

- 6.20.14 A small number of respondents, including Warwickshire County Council, are concerned about the proximity of the proposed Hams Hall railhead to Curdworth and the amount of land required at this site. Curdworth Parish Council specifically requests that it is moved further away from the village.

Ecology

- 6.20.15 The impact on woodlands is repeatedly mentioned by respondents. Warwickshire Wildlife Trust is concerned about the anticipated loss of North Wood, an area of ancient woodland. The Environment Agency suggests an opportunity to tie the mitigation measures into existing improvement schemes such as Woodland for Water project.
- 6.20.16 Some respondents make comments on designated sites. Natural England welcomes the detail in the CFA 20 report and is positive about continued engagement to discuss impacts and mitigation. A few other organisations express concern about the Middleton Pool Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), with the Environment Agency and the RSBP highlighting the need for mitigation to protect the SSSI from construction work for the crossing over Langley Brook. The Environment Agency also comments that this SSSI should be the subject of overwintering bird surveys. A small number of respondents express concern regarding wildlife sites in general and a few others about the impact on specific species.

“Up to 90 sites of wildlife importance could be adversely affected by the direct and indirect impacts of the HS2 route as it cuts through Warwickshire and Solihull. At least 80 sites are of county importance. Five SSSIs are vulnerable to impacts from construction, hydrology or fragmentation. The route goes across numerous major watercourses, ancient woodlands and wildflower meadows, with subsequent effects on their associated species.”

HS2 Action Alliance

- 6.20.17 Middleton Parish Council notes that the elevated nature of the route in proximity to Kingsbury Water Park and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) reserve could increase the risk of birds striking overhead power lines.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.20.18 Several respondents comment on the perceived lack of measures to mitigate visual impacts in this area, with suggestions that the draft ES should have proposed further landscaping and planting measures. Some respondents believe the draft ES should have provided greater detail regarding the impact of HS2 on the landscape. Alongside this, there are comments from respondents stating general concern about the Proposed Scheme's impact on the landscape and the countryside.
- 6.20.19 Lea Marston Parish Council expresses particular concern about the design of the Hams Hall railhead.

“The Rail Head design is of concern together with landscape mitigation to such an area. Design of the Rail Head must not be left to a Contractor to determine its impact.”

Lea Marston Parish Council

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.20.20 The anticipated impact on surface water resources and flood risk is picked up by a number of respondents. For example, Warwickshire Wildlife Trust outlines the effects on a number of waterways in the area such as severance of river corridor habitats, hydrological changes and habitat loss.
- 6.20.21 The Canal and River Trust raises concerns regarding land-take and water flow impacts on the Birmingham to Fazeley Canal in the vicinity of the Marston Lane Bridge. They suggest a number of mitigation measures. The Environment Agency argues that the ES should include further detail of mitigation measures, also indicating that they would like the opportunity to provide input. A number of organisations refer to a previous HS2 proposal that would see the Langley Brook Viaduct replaced with raised embankments.

“We believe mitigation should be considered for potential impacts during construction as well as post construction.”

The Environment Agency

Socio-economics

- 6.20.22 Some respondents raise concerns over the impact on businesses and the loss of jobs within the CFA 20 area. In addition to general comments regarding the anticipated loss of jobs, some respondents state they disagree with the job-loss figures in the draft ES. A couple of organisations point out that the impact on Belfry Leisure and Golf Centre is not mentioned in the draft ES. Some respondents comment on the specific impacts of HS2 on local businesses, arguing for example that the entire site of a large recycling business would be taken by the proposed Hams Hall railhead.

“The loss of 80 jobs and the businesses that employ the people in such a small community is extremely significant, and the statement needs to be amended to reflect this.”

Various respondents

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.20.23 The loss of agricultural land is an issue raised by some respondents including Dan Byles, Member of Parliament for North Warwickshire. In some instances the loss or negative impact on farms are highlighted, for example Middleton Parish Council is concerned about the impact at Cuttlemill Farm and Middleton House Farm business complex. One respondent is also concerned that Grade II farmland would be used for “*dumping*” poor quality soil.

“The loss of high quality agricultural land, ancient woodland and heritage assets are acknowledged with no real analysis of how these are to be mitigated.”

Dan Byles, Member of Parliament for North Warwickshire

Air quality

- 6.20.24 Commenting on air quality, a few respondents, including Warwickshire County Council, highlight concerns about dust from the construction of the Proposed Scheme. Respondents tend to consider dust alongside other impacts such as noise and visual impact, and emphasise the need for mitigation of these impacts. Middleton HS2 Action Group and Middleton Parish Council note the omission of the proposed realignment of the A4091 from air quality assessments.

“While it is positive to see that measures will be taken in relation to air quality and noise, we would recommend that it is ensured that measures ensure levels of noise and air pollution are below the recommended level rather than solely reducing them. A health impact assessment is also recommended.”

Warwickshire County Council

Cultural heritage

- 6.20.25 A few respondents advocate greater use of tunnelling, with English Heritage commenting that a tunnel past the Grade II listed Greatworth Hall would reduce the operational impact of HS2. A number of respondents make comments about particular features of the Proposed Scheme.

Other issues

- 6.20.26 A number of respondents make comments about particular features of the Proposed Scheme. A few respondents comment on design elements. North Warwickshire Borough Council for example requests that embankments and viaducts be built to the highest quality, while other respondents state a preference for cuttings and embankments in place of the proposed Langley Brook Viaduct. A number of respondents also suggest that local alternatives to the proposals have not been sufficiently considered.
- 6.20.27 A handful of respondents refer to land quality, voicing concern about the contamination of land.

6.21 Drayton Bassett, Hints and Weeford (CFA 21)

Overview

- 6.21.1 The Drayton Bassett, Hints and Weeford community forum area (CFA) covers a 9.1km section of the Proposed Scheme in the District of Lichfield, Staffordshire, where it passes through the countryside between Sutton Coldfield and Tamworth. The city of Lichfield is situated to the north-west of the area. The study area follows the route from the boundary between Warwickshire and Staffordshire in the south to its crossing of the A51 Tamworth Road at Whittington Heath in the north and includes land within the parishes of Drayton Bassett, Hints, Canwell, Weeford, Swinfen and Packington.
- 6.21.2 There are 65 respondents explicitly addressing Drayton Bassett, Hints and Weeford (CFA 21) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 21, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 21 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).

- 6.21.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 21 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 21.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.21.4 Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council (joint response) include a 'Mitigation and Enhancement Plan' covering CFAs 21 and 22. Their response also draws on the views of a range of organisations such as Kings Bromley Against HS2 and the Lichfield and Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust.

Overarching issues for CFA 21

- 6.21.5 The majority of comments specific to the CFA 21 report refer to the impact of the Proposed Scheme on the Hints area. The vertical alignment of the proposed route is also discussed by many, in particular the visual and noise impacts of the high embankment and from the proposed Drayton Basset Viaduct. Some respondents express concern about the impact of road realignments to Drayton Lane. Land-take from Roundhill and Rookery Woods is also mentioned as an issue by many respondents; as is the impact on farms and agricultural businesses. Numerous respondents also offer mitigation suggestions for the above impacts.
- 6.21.6 A number of respondents ask for a tunnelled section through CFA 21, saying this would protect ancient woodlands, high value landscape and local species and habitats. Those advocating this proposal also claim that the community of Hints would be spared from visual blight and noise impacts if a tunnel would be provided in the formal Environmental Statement.

Ecology

- 6.21.7 The impact on ecology is the most prevalent issue in comments relevant to CFA 21.
- 6.21.8 Respondents express concern about the impact on woodland, and in particular the effect on Roundhill and Rookery Woods. A number of respondents note that these are ancient woodland and argue that this is not acknowledged in the draft ES.
- 6.21.9 A number of respondents also discuss the impact on bats in the area, citing the presence of bat roosts around Hints including at Middleton Hall and Bucks Head Farm. Christopher Pincher, Member of Parliament for Tamworth, comments on the loss of woodland, wetland and bat habitats as the proposed route bisects the Bourne Valley. Other impacted wildlife mentioned includes a number of bird species, butterflies, otters and badgers.

"Staffordshire Wildlife Trust conducted a survey in 2011 of rare species in the Staffordshire area; Hints was included. A number of rare species of birds, bats and mammals were sited.

Hints and Area Action Group

- 6.21.10 With regard to ecology, many respondents suggest that existing mitigation proposals are not satisfactory and make suggestions for alternative approaches. One is to replace mature hedgerows with well-established planting instead of saplings. The Environment Agency requests that mitigation for both construction and post construction should be considered. Staffordshire Wildlife Trust expresses concern about the perceived loss of integrity of Roundhill Wood Site of Biological Importance (SBI) and suggests planting by way of mitigation.

- 6.21.11 Some respondents comment on the anticipated loss of hedgerows, trees, grasslands and wetlands in the CFA 21 area.

“How on earth can you justify the destruction of the ancient woodland landscape (plus SBI /BAP hedgerow links) of an -entire district-? It cannot be swept to one side by the offer of 'some woodland creation”

Individual

Community

- 6.21.12 Most comments related to the community emphasise property concerns. Many respondents are worried about the proposed demolition of houses in the area. Flats Lane and Knox Grave Lane Residents Group requests that houses due to be demolished in these Lanes are rebuilt prior to the requirement to move arising; the group also highlights residents' uncertainty due to changing plans for demolition of these properties.
- 6.21.13 Some respondents express concern about reductions to property values and the resulting difficulty in moving. One respondent believes the way to mitigate this impact is for the proposed route to be moved or buried in a tunnel. Hints and Area Action Group expresses concern that property devaluation is increasing, with some estate agents refusing to view properties deemed unsellable.

“Demolition of someone's home and business is a major and significant life changing event and the effects on the wider community should not be minimised.”

Hints with Canwell Parish Council

- 6.21.14 Some comments refer to the impact on footpaths, public rights of way and bridleways in CFA 21. Respondents express concern that diversions would change the character of footpaths, and affect the safety of walkers and horse riders. Some respondents specifically comment on the impact of cutting off Drayton Lane, while the Heart of England Way and the rail bridge over Rookery Lane are also mentioned in a number of responses.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.21.15 A number of respondents discuss the visual impact of the proposals in relation to CFA 21. Issues raised include concern about the visual impact on countryside and rural views, with a couple of comments suggesting that the objective to 'protect natural and cultural resources and enhance the environment' has not been met. Several respondents suggest that proposed mitigation measures are not adequate and make further recommendations including suggested additional green tunnels. A few respondents comment on the time it would take for mitigation planting to mature and become effective and others are concerned about changes in the landscape resulting from planting.
- 6.21.16 A small number of respondents express concern about light pollution, in particular from nighttime construction working. Building of new homes on green belt land to replace demolished property is supported by Flats Lane and Knox Grave Lane Residents Group and opposed by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Staffordshire.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.21.17 A number of respondents comment that the current noise assessment is incomplete and question the appropriateness of using noise contour maps and average noise levels within this rural area. Some respondents suggest that the amphitheatre-like topography of the area would result in magnified noise and vibration, affecting countryside tranquillity.

“Noise contour maps and effects - incorrect measurement used for a rural community”

Individual

- 6.21.18 Noise during construction, especially from proposed nighttime construction compounds is also of concern. Operational noise issues include concerns regarding increased noise levels due to embankment height.
- 6.21.19 Many respondents state that the proposed noise mitigation is not sufficient and make specific suggestions for further measures. For example Drayton Basset Action Group recommends the proposed Drayton Basset Viaduct be lowered while other respondents favour increasing the height of mitigation fencing for the proposed viaduct. There are also suggestions to use green tunnels, begin planting earlier and ensure planting take does not utilise agricultural land.

Traffic and transport

- 6.21.20 With regard to traffic and transport, many respondents are concerned about the impact of proposed road diversions, realignments, the impact of construction traffic on country roads and access issues for farms in the area.
- 6.21.21 A number of respondents suggest that Drayton Lane, Bangle Lane, Waggoners' Lane and Shirral Drive are not suitable for use by large and heavy construction vehicles. Drayton Lane is mentioned in particular as respondents highlight this is the only access route for local amenities such as shops and schools and a carrier for the Heart of England public right of way.
- 6.21.22 Some respondents express concern that the height of the proposed underpass at Rookery Lane would be too low to allow agricultural vehicles to pass and that the disruption to the Lane would cut the village in half.
- 6.21.23 A few comments relate to the impact from the proposed A5 overbridge, and others express concern about the impact on horse riders, pedestrians, and rail services.

“The only access to basic services from the village (shops, post office, secondary schools) is via this lane [Drayton Lane] and any additional traffic would be unsustainable.”

Individual

Cultural heritage

6.21.24 A few organisations, including HS2 Action Alliance, express concern that the Conservation Area status of Hints is not taken into account in the draft ES. Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council also express concern about the impact of HS2 on the area's cultural heritage including on the setting of a listed building at Bucks Head Farm. They also comment on the baseline in the draft ES, making reference to Roman roads in the area such as Watling Street. Hints and Area Action Group gives details of a number of listed and historical structures of importance including the Church of St Bartholomew and Hints Hall.

“Appropriate account of the Conservation Area status has not been taken in determining what constitutes proper mitigation”

HS2 Action Alliance

Agriculture, forestry and soils

6.21.25 A number of respondents are concerned about the anticipated loss of usable farmland, including Horsley Brook Farm, Packington Moor Farm, Freeford Manor and Streethay Farm and Gorse Farm. Some respondents express concern around proposed mitigation planting and landscaping resulting in the loss of high-quality agricultural land, and a few respondents fear that construction operations would contaminate land. Road diversion impacts on Rookery Lane and the impact from the proposed A5 overbridge are also mentioned under this topic. Some respondents comment on the loss of non-designated forestry including at Jobs Hill, and Hints and Canwell Parish Council expresses concern regarding the corridor width in relation to livestock.

“Destruction of productive farmland is not acceptable at a time when we need to harness this resource as effectively as possible. This is a comment not confined to Drayton Bassett, but the whole route.”

Individual

Water resources and flood risk assessment

6.21.26 Some respondents, mainly organisations, comment on the impact on waterways and flood risk. CPRE is concerned about the impact on the area's canals and makes detailed mitigation requests. Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council would like to see further modelling of watercourse crossings such as at the proposed Black Brook Viaduct; the Environment Agency would like to input into the proposals for the realignment of Bayley Brook. Flood risk is a concern for some, with a few commenting on uncertainty regarding flood management. A few respondents comment on drainage, stating that disrupted farm drainage should be restored promptly and that sustainable drainage should not be limited to urban areas.

“We draw attention to the proximity of HS2 to the canals along this stretch, and others, and the transformation this effects on their tranquil setting. Staffordshire's canals are a major feature of its rural attractiveness and thus rural economics. Detriment to these historic and environmental assets is to be deplored and avoided by whatever means.

CPRE Staffordshire

Socio-economics

- 6.21.27 When commenting on socio-economic issues, the majority of respondents discuss the anticipated loss of jobs. One respondent suggests the loss of rural and self-employed jobs have not been considered in the draft ES; another argues that farm businesses would be impacted, such as the Packington Moor Farm shop; and another is concerned about potential job losses at Whittington Heath Golf Club.

Other issues

- 6.21.28 Many respondents express concern about proposed viaducts in the area, including discussion about the height and width of viaducts. The Drayton Basset Viaduct is mentioned as a particular concern by many. There are some suggestions, including in the response by Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council, that lowering of the Drayton Basset Viaduct would help to mitigate visual and noise impacts. Other respondents express concern about deep cuttings as well as the visual and sound impacts of high embankments, and suggest mitigation measures are required. The introduction of a green cut-and-cover tunnel is requested by some respondents in order to mitigate visual and sound impacts on communities, Roundhill and Rookery Wood and on bat habitats.

“Noise and visual impacts are a concern for this village [Drayton Basset] particularly due to the height of the proposed viaduct as the route crosses the floodplain on the Staffordshire/Warwickshire boundary.”

Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council, joint response

- 6.21.29 There are very few comments on air quality specific to CFA 21. Those who make comments tend to concentrate on construction dust, with one comment concerned about dust arising from property demolition and another from dust deposits on crops.
- 6.21.30 Of the few respondents that comment on the waste and material resources topic, most refer to evacuated material from construction including contamination of soil and movement of excavated material.

6.22 Whittington to Handsacre (CFA 22)

Overview

- 6.22.1 The Whittington to Handsacre community forum area (CFA) is centred on the 11.9km section of the Proposed Scheme where it passes approximately 1km to the east of Lichfield to connect with the West Coast Main Line (WCML) at Handsacre. The area is situated in the District of Lichfield in Staffordshire. It includes all or part of the parishes of Whittington, Lichfield, Fradley and Streethay, Curborough and Elmhurst, Kings Bromley, Longdon, and Armitage with Handsacre.
- 6.22.2 There are 76 respondents explicitly addressing Whittington to Handsacre (CFA 22) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 22, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 22 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).

- 6.22.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 22 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 22.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.22.4 Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council (joint response) include a 'Mitigation and Enhancement Plan' covering CFAs 21 and 22. Their response also draws on the views of a range of organisations such as Kings Bromley Against HS2 and the Lichfield and Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust.

Overarching issues for CFA 22

- 6.22.5 Comments addressing CFA 22 often include comments on two key features of the Proposed Scheme in this area: the proposed crossings of the West Coast Mainline (WCML) and the A38. Of particular concern for numerous respondents are the repercussions these crossings have on vertical alignment and perceived exacerbation of noise and visual impacts.
- 6.22.6 Comments regarding these issues are often accompanied by requests for a more sympathetic alignment which takes account of local topography. Similarly, a number of respondents propose specific engineered mitigation measures.

"In the Lichfield area the majority of the line is elevated and should be redesigned in cutting or tunnel to lessen the huge environmental impact on an area which will see no gain whatsoever from this scheme."

Individual

- 6.22.7 Such mitigation proposals feature prominently in the Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council joint response.

"Lowering the route so that the WCML, South Staffordshire Railway and A38 are on new structures over HS2 will result in the railway being in cutting rather than visually intrusive embankments. [...] We believe lowering the route at this location would also result in the Phase Two grade separated junction at Fradley being significantly lowered (rather than being on embankment 10m- 15m high) which further mitigates the visual and noise intrusion."

Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council (joint response)

- 6.22.8 In contrast, one respondent is concerned that alternative alignments over the WCML may have a detrimental impact on their property.
- 6.22.9 Other design features commented on which are relevant to CFA 22 include the proposed HS2-WCML junction and Phase 2 provisions and construction.

Community

- 6.22.10 Respondents who raise community issues in relation to CFA 22 often highlight construction effects, with many identifying direct impacts to their own property. Some respondents are especially concerned about the use of private drives and properties for construction compounds and haulage routes.

- 6.22.11 A number of respondents express concern about construction issues in Armitage with Handsacre and the impact of works on the WCML to accommodate HS2 trains in particular. This issue is also highlighted by Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council. The councils note that the proposed HS2-WCML junction is within 500 metres of a large housing estate and that alterations required on the WCML will bring the line further into the estate. The councils call for “*detailed mitigation*” on this issue, particularly given recent developments.

“The village of Handsacre suffered substantially during the upgrade of the WCML between 2005 and 2008 and will now have to endure further disruption as a result of HS2.”

Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council, joint response

- 6.22.12 The councils are also concerned about the impacts of construction of the HS2-WCML junction on properties in the Kings Bromley area. They identify a number of locations at risk on Tuppenhurst Lane and request that HS2 Ltd support the owners to rebuild on a “*like for like basis*”. Similarly, the councils highlight potential impacts to Hayes Meadow Primary School through construction of the HS2-WCML junction and through increased train movements in the longer term.
- 6.22.13 A number of respondents, including the Canal and River Trust, raise concerns regarding impacts on Kings Bromley Marina and the new Kings Orchard Marina.
- 6.22.14 A small number of respondents contend that the proposed overall timescale of construction in CFA 22 (when construction of Phase 2 in the locality is also taken into consideration) would have a disproportionate effect on the area.

“I am also concerned about the construction schedule, which appears to require the full nine years and with much of the work front loaded. With Phase 2 also scheduled in this area, the overall construction period in Lichfield will be very prolonged.”

Individual

- 6.22.15 A number of respondents (including organisations and members of the public) raise concerns regarding impacts on a variety of leisure facilities in the area, most commonly Whittington Heath Golf Club and Lichfield Cruising Club. These impacts are discussed in the section on socio-economics below.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.22.16 A significant number of respondents comment on the visual impacts of the Proposed Scheme in the Whittington to Handsacre area. Most commonly respondents addressing this issue highlight the vertical alignment of the line, which is perceived to be excessively elevated in order to cross over the A38 and WCML.

“...I have extreme concern about the height of the track through our area, which runs above ground level continuously for some 9km over 7 viaducts and many high embankments. This will cause a high level of noise and visual blight. The reason the track has been designed at this height is to pass over the West Coast Main Line and the A38. It would be technically possible and much better environmentally to pass below the WCML and the A38.”

Individual

- 6.22.17 A number of respondents, including CPRE Staffordshire, are especially concerned about potential impacts to views of Lichfield and the setting of its cathedral due to the vertical alignment of the route.

“This length of HS2 presupposes a continuous 45ft to 50ft high embankment (plus power pylons) effectively ‘damming’ the longitudinal visual sweep of the bally [sic] and cutting across the eastern arc of view of Lichfield and its cathedral spires.”

CPRE Staffordshire

- 6.22.18 One respondent argues that baseline assessments should take account of Lichfield District Council Local Plan Core Policy 14: Our Built and Historic Environment, which specifically covers impacts on the skyline of the city. Several respondents believe that such impacts have been deliberately downplayed.

“It is significant that the photomontages included in the DES map book are looking away from Lichfield, ignoring the impact of the loss of views of the cathedral spires when approaching Lichfield from the North East quadrant.”

Individual

- 6.22.19 Some respondents give detailed comments on proposed infrastructure which they feel would be especially prominent. One respondent is concerned in particular about the “*intrusive*” nature of the Curborough Viaduct, while another identifies the Cappers Lane Viaduct as a source of visual disturbance to the Lichfield Cruising Club, residents on Cappers Lane and the Whittington community.
- 6.22.20 HS2 Action Alliance is concerned about views from Woodend and the Trent and Mersey Canal. The Canal and River Trust suggests that the horizontal alignment of the route avoids the Fradley Junction section of this canal in order to reduce visual impacts on the “*sensitive canal corridor*”.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.22.21 Several respondents comment on sound, noise and vibration impacts in relation to CFA 22. Some of these highlight potential impacts from construction-related activities and identify sites which are at risk, such as Hayes Meadow Primary School.

“We seek assurances that non-residential noise sensitive buildings and in particular Hayes Meadow Primary School at Handsacre are appropriately mitigated for the duration of the construction works.”

Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council, joint response

- 6.22.22 Most respondents who raise concerns regarding noise effects focus on operational impacts. They often highlight the issue of vertical alignment in relation to local topography and the repercussions this relationship would have for noise levels in the area.

“Much of the city of Lichfield lies on relatively high ground at or close to the contour level of the HS2 track and without extended and adequate noise mitigation measures, trains running at speed will be heard across much of the city and this will be an unacceptable intrusion into the peace and quiet of peoples lives.”

Individual

- 6.22.23 Other locations that respondents believe would be adversely impacted by noise include family accommodation at Whittington Barracks (raised by the Ministry of Defence), Whittington Heath Golf Club and the surroundings of the proposed Cappers Lane Viaduct, including the Lichfield Cruising Club. Whittington Heath Golf Club would like to see designs for noise mitigation measures as the noise impact “... on the golf course generally is huge and specifically golfers and future business.”

Cultural heritage

- 6.22.24 Only a small number of respondents comment on heritage assets in relation to CFA 22. These are mostly general comments on impacts to historic and listed buildings and very few specific sites are identified. Detailed comments are provided by a small number of organisations.
- 6.22.25 Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council are concerned that impacts on the setting of Lichfield Cathedral have not been considered. This is echoed by other respondents. The councils also express concern regarding impacts on the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area and disagree with the heritage value assessment of Streethay Manor (Grade II).
- 6.22.26 The Canal and River Trust is particularly concerned about the impact of the proposed HS2 Trent and Mersey Canal crossing (including the Phase 2 Junction spur) on the listed Woodend Lock Cottage.

“The Trust has major concerns regarding the potential adverse impact that the proposed HS2 rail crossings, including the Phase 2 junction spur, will have upon the listed Woodend Lock and Lock Cottage and the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area on the Trent and Mersey Canal”

Canal and River Trust

- 6.22.27 HS2 Action Alliance is also concerned about impacts at Woodend and describes the proposed canal crossing as “*damaging*” to listed buildings and the heritage environment. English Heritage suggests the relocation of the listed Tamworth Road milepost identified for demolition as part of a proposed road diversion.

Traffic and transport

- 6.22.28 A common concern among respondents addressing transport related issues in CFA 22 is the proposed interface with the West Coast Main Line (WCML). One respondent expresses disappointment that the WCML was not specified to take high speed trains when it was upgraded a few years ago.

“Why was the line not upgraded at the point to carry these new High Speed trains for the future instead of overspending and destroying yet more countryside and farmland unnecessarily.”

Individual

6.22.29 Network Rail believes that asset interventions on the WCML north of the proposed Handsacre Junction must be assessed and disagrees with assumptions that no capacity work is needed as a result of HS2. They also express concerns regarding the combined power supply demands from WCML and HS2 and expect this to be acknowledged in the formal ES.

6.22.30 Another common concern for respondents commenting on this CFA is the use of local roads by construction traffic. Respondents think these roads are unsuitable due to their width and current use as farm access routes. Roads highlighted by respondents include Cappers Lane, Darnford Lane, Riley Hill and Whittington Common Road. Other concerns include the use of private access roads as construction routes.

“How HS2 think they have the right to use private drives for construction traffic & to take part of private fields & access gates to widen a country road for construction traffic without asking permission or personally consulting the owners is an unbelievable disgrace!”

Individual

6.22.31 Kings Bromley Stop HS2 Action Group is especially concerned about the use of the Riley Hill area as a construction route. Similarly, Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council note that Kings Bromley already experiences high levels of goods vehicle traffic and cite recent dialogue between the highway authority and local businesses as part of an attempt to manage this problem. The councils also have concerns regarding construction traffic impacts in the Whittington and Fisherwick Parish area and make specific mitigation proposals with reference to highway authority guidance.

“The highway authority considers the use of Cappers Lane unsuitable [...] It is expected that HS2 Ltd will make use of the trace from Cappers Lane [...] to gain access to the other work sites. This would remove the need for accommodation works and reduce the impact on the local community. It is expected that each road crossing would incorporate hard standing areas with temporary traffic lights and security. To reduce disruption, the temporary traffic lights would only be in operation during operational hours of the site.”

Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council, joint response

6.22.32 A small number of respondents express concern about the use of Wood End Lane as a construction traffic route; however, others suggest that this road (and the A38) is used as an alternative which may provide reduced journey times when construction traffic on the A51 and A5127 (which extend into CFA 21) through Lichfield is taken into account.

6.22.33 In contrast, Fradley and Streethay Parish Council are concerned about increased traffic levels on the A38 specifically.

6.22.34 The Canal and River Trust has concerns over potential use of Huddlesford Road Bridge as a construction route due to its weight limit of 7.5 tonnes.

6.22.35 The Ministry of Defence (MoD) has concerns regarding impacts on the highway network in the vicinity of the Whittington Barracks site and requests further information on these, particularly the proposed diverted A51 Tamworth Road which would include an overbridge.

- 6.22.36 There are a number of sites associated with the construction and maintenance of HS2 which respondents highlight as having potential impacts on the highway network. Of particular concern is the Trent and Mersey Canal West Underbridge compound and proposed access to a balancing pond from Wood End Lane.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.22.37 Very few respondents comment on water resources or flood risk issues with regard to CFA 22. However a number of organisations make detailed comments on this subject.
- 6.22.38 Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council are particularly concerned about drainage impacts at Ravenshaw Wood. They also raise concerns regarding the Cappers Lane viaduct and the relationship between its proposed design and flood modelling carried out to date.

“Using local knowledge there is no recorded flood event that indicates the presence of the floodplain included on HS2 Ltd's drawings. Therefore detailed flood modelling is expected to understand the true floodplain in this area so as to shorten the length of a lower viaduct...”

Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council, joint response

- 6.22.39 The councils are also concerned about rainfall run-off from construction sites and material stockpiles at Streethay and Tewnals Lane and the increased risk of contamination to local watercourses these present.
- 6.22.40 The Canal and River Trust is particularly concerned about the proposed extent of land-take at Cappers Lane and the impact of this on the Coventry and Lichfield Canals. They also raise concerns regarding the impact of balancing ponds on water flows and identify a number of culverts where poor condition is likely to impede flow rates. Similarly, one respondent raises concerns regarding the position of a balancing pond which may impede drainage flows to the Trent and Mersey Canal, thereby increasing the risk of flooding to agricultural land.
- 6.22.41 Lichfield and Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust is concerned that alternative local suggestions ('Proposals for further consideration') to lower the alignment of the proposed line to pass under the WCML and A38 could conflict with plans to reopen the Lichfield Canal (formerly known as the Wyrley and Essington Canal).

“We believe that it should be possible to reroute the canal to take account of a realigned HS2, but this would probably involve land not in the Trust's ownership and additional restoration costs. While pleased to work with HS2 engineers to find the best solution, we would naturally expect HS2 Ltd to meet the extra costs if rerouting were necessary.”

Lichfield and Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust

- 6.22.42 Kings Bromley Stop HS2 expresses disappointment about not being given the opportunity to officially respond to realignment proposals and is particularly concerned about the impact of these on a lake near Marlpit Wood. The MoD would like more information regarding flood risk to the Whittington Barracks site and details of proposed mitigation measures.
- 6.22.43 One respondent is concerned about the potential for flooding in the Riley Hill area and believes that this issue has not been addressed sufficiently.

Ecology

- 6.22.44 Several respondents who comment on CFA 22 cite ecological impacts as a particular area of concern. These respondents most commonly highlight potential impacts to habitats and wildlife in general.
- 6.22.45 A common concern among respondents is the impact the Proposed Scheme would have on ancient woodlands, particularly at Ravenshaw Wood; a location identified by both members of the public and organisations.

“...Ravenshaw Wood Kings Bromley are among the ancient woodlands that will be directly impacted by HS2 and their loss is of great concern...”

Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council, joint response

- 6.22.46 Staffordshire Wildlife Trust has concerns regarding impacts on bat, bird and great crested newt populations and is disappointed to note that recent baseline data identifying populations at locations such as Curborough has not been incorporated into the draft ES. In addition, they express reservations regarding the location of a proposed ecological mitigation area at Fradley Business Park as the line severs links between this location and ponds at Curborough House where great crested newt populations have been recorded.
- 6.22.47 One respondent disagrees with the assessment of Whittington Heath Golf Course as a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and raises concerns regarding proposed mitigation for this site. In contrast, CPRE Staffordshire is concerned about impacts to this site especially given its development as a site of “unbelievable natural beauty” over the past 50 years.

Socio-economics

- 6.22.48 Only a very small number of respondents comment on socio-economic issues in relation to CFA 22. Comments generally correlate closely with community facility issues (see community section above for further detail on these impacts).
- 6.22.49 Several respondents are particularly concerned about impacts on the Whittington Heath Golf Club. Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council detail the components of this site physically affected by the proposed route. The councils “insist” that HS2 Ltd supports the club’s ambitions to remain viable in the long term and believes that this will require discussions with the local planning authority as well as significant advanced works to the club.
- 6.22.50 Similarly, other respondents are concerned about land-take impacts on the Lichfield Cruising Club. These respondents are particularly concerned about the loss of moorings during construction of the Cappers Lane Viaduct. Another issue highlighted is the proposed use of the Club’s land as mitigation for “common land” lost elsewhere, especially given the importance of this land in hosting events such as the ‘Huddlesford Gathering’.
- 6.22.51 Kings Bromley Stop HS2 Action Group notes that many businesses are located in this area precisely because of its rural and quiet nature and are especially concerned about impacts to a bed and breakfast, a cattery and two bridal shops.

- 6.22.52 Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council note that the proposed A51 Tamworth Road Overbridge Compound may impact negatively on the Whittington Arms public house. The councils also comment on the wider economic effects of the Proposed Scheme in the region and expect HS2 Ltd to:

“... include local engagement at the construction procurement phase to ensure that substantial links are made with Staffordshire's supply chain, and that there is development and employment of local workforce, including targeted training initiatives for that workforce.”

Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council, joint response

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.22.53 A number of respondents express concern regarding agricultural impacts in relation to CFA 22. The majority of comments on this issue highlight the loss of productive farmland or land which is managed under Entry Level and Higher Level Stewardship Schemes (ELS/HLS).

“Some of my ground is under ELS and HLS agreement with Natural England for 10 years, how do HS2 intend to deal with this as a lot of farmers along the proposed route have land entered into the ELS and HLS.”

Individual

- 6.22.54 Staffordshire Wildlife Trust says it is disappointed to note that the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) does not cover compensation for loss of payments from such schemes.
- 6.22.55 A number of respondents highlight effects on individual holdings such as Ashton Hayes Farm, Common Farm and Whittington Hill Farm. Other respondents identify the closure of Shaw Lane as problematic as this is seen as a “*highway for local farmers*”.
- 6.22.56 Other respondents say there would be a disproportionate effect on a number of farms in the longer term due to land-take required for both phases of the Proposed Scheme.

“Phase One and Phase Two will leave Woodend Common Barn sandwiched between both high speed lines while dissecting prime farmland.”

Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council, joint response

Air quality

- 6.22.57 The topic of air quality is infrequently discussed in relation to CFA 22. The majority of comments highlight potential impacts from dirt and dust arising from both construction activity and construction traffic.
- 6.22.58 One respondent is concerned about construction dust deposition on fruit production at New Farm and at an organic dairy at Freeford Manor. They also identify the Tewnal's Lane Main Compound as a potential source of dust and are particularly concerned about its proximity to a housing estate at Handsacre.

Land quality

- 6.22.59 Land quality is also infrequently discussed in responses concentrating on CFA 22. Most comments on this subject come from Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council who make suggestions regarding general principles which should be applied when dealing with contaminants.
- 6.22.60 One member of the public expresses concern about leakage of hydraulic oils from trains and contends that statements suggesting that contamination from this source will not be significant are “worrying”.

Other issues

- 6.22.61 Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council state they expect the assessment of the reuse and recycling of materials at the Streethay construction site to incorporate the Waste Local Plan, as well as making a number of detailed comments regarding construction site locations and associated impacts.

6.23 Balsall Common and Hampton-in-Arden (CFA 23)

Overview

- 6.23.1 The Birmingham Interchange and Chelmsley Wood community forum area (CFA) covers an approximately 4.4 km section of the Proposed Scheme in Solihull Borough. It extends from south-east of the A45 Coventry Road, Hampton-in-Arden, at its southern boundary to the administrative boundary between Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council and North Warwickshire Borough Council, in close proximity to where the M42 intersects with the M6, at its northern boundary. The area includes land within the parish of Chelmsley Wood and parts of the Bickenhill, Hampton-in-Arden and Little Packington parishes.
- 6.23.2 There are 73 respondents explicitly addressing Balsall Common and Hampton-in-Arden (CFA 23) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 23, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 23 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.23.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 23 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 23.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.23.4 A small number of respondents discuss issues or observations for a section of the route including CFA 23 and adjacent CFAs, rather than just for CFA 23. This includes one respondent addressing CFAs 23-26 calling tunnel cutting to be used, stating this would protect the countryside, homes, businesses and residents.
- 6.23.5 Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council provides a detailed response regarding impacts on ecology and specific heritage assets in CFAs 23-25. They argue that for these CFAs “*there is at present a much greater (permanent) adverse impact on habitats and species predicted than beneficial*”, and comment that mitigation measures need to be developed much further.

6.23.6 The response from the Heart of England High Speed Railway Action Group focuses on CFAs 23-25 (as well as CFA 18), and includes a number of concerns. In particular, they do not believe agricultural impacts such as land-take, pollution, and noise impacts on livestock have been sufficiently taken into account. Additionally, they argue that detrimental community impacts, especially the combined effects of amenity loss, are more serious than estimated, and should be compensated in an ongoing manner. The Heart of England High Speed Railway Action Group also feels that cultural heritage in this region has been underestimated, that a precautionary approach should be explicitly required with regard to ecological impacts, and that more extensive ecological mitigation should be guaranteed.

Overarching issues for CFA 23

6.23.7 The proposed Berkswell-Balsall Common viaduct is the subject of a large number of comments. Respondents, including several residents' organisations, believe that the viaduct would be highly detrimental due to the severe noise, visual intrusion, community and ecological impacts. Many of these respondents argue that instead a tunnel should be used in this area. They comment that HS2 Ltd dismisses this option in the draft ES on the grounds that costs exceed benefits, however respondents do think this is insufficiently justified, arguing that no full reasoning or calculations for this assessment are provided. The Heart of England High Speed Railway Action Group comments that it is unclear if a Balsall Common tunnel alternative was adequately considered by HS2 Ltd.

"We do not feel that there has been sufficient work done to present a proper cost/ benefit analysis of tunnel options in this area. Design schemes need to be developed in sufficient detail to allow objective assessment of the benefits for each of the Environmental Topics."

Balsall Common Village Residents' Association

6.23.8 The proposed Diddington Road diversion is also frequently addressed by both organisations and members of the public, who argue that the road is unsuitable for construction vehicles and would cause severe disruption in the area. A large proportion of these responses suggest making alterations to allow Meriden Road to pass under the railway, which would make the Diddington Lane diversion unnecessary. Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council recommends the rail viaduct be raised 1.3 metres for this purpose, and comments that HS2 Ltd has agreed to investigate the viability of this course of action.

6.23.9 The positioning of construction sites and stockpiles on farm land is the subject of large number of comments relating to CFA 23. In particular, the proposed construction site at Mouldings Green Farm is contested by a number of respondents, who argue this would prevent the continuation of farming operations and production of food, detrimentally impact the land and the River Blythe and potentially also pollute potable water in the Shustoke Reservoir. Additionally, a number of respondents including the Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council argue that situating construction sites on agricultural land is unnecessary in this area, as alternative brownfield sites are available, including the Cornets End Lane quarries or sites associated with the Interchange Station.

“We see no justification for a main Construction Compound at Mouldings Green Farm as suitable alternatives are available at Cornetts End Lane Quarries. [...] farming from Mouldings Green Farm will be impossible. There is a consequent impact on water quality in the River Blythe used as a source of potable water to Shustoke Reservoir.”

Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council

- 6.23.10 Another comment made frequently by respondents addressing the CFA 23 report relates to the monitoring of HS2 construction and operation, which many respondents argue should be funded by HS2 Ltd but undertaken by Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council or other local authorities to ensure an independent control.

Community

- 6.23.11 A large number of respondents mention community impacts as a key area of concern. Responses from local organisations and members of the public argue these are more severely detrimental and enduring than is estimated in the draft ES, with the combination effects of amenity loss being a cause of particular concern. Many of these responses call for more substantial and longer-lasting community compensation.

“We do not accept the assertion that communities will adjust to losses of amenity after the first year of operation. The absence of an assessment of combination effects on amenity needs has to be corrected before an informed response to the consultation can be given.”

Berkswell Parish Council and Balsall Parish Council

- 6.23.12 The Kenilworth Greenway is discussed in a large proportion of comments relevant to CFA 23, and respondents consider it an important community asset. Some respondents stress the need to protect this route from noise and visual intrusion, with Berkswell Parish Council requesting the construction of solid, full-height noise-absorptive barriers accompanied by planting to soften their appearance. The Ramblers' Association, Balsall Common Village Residents' Association, Berkswell Parish Council and a number of other respondents request that the proposed construction track between the Greenway and Berkswell Station be retained after construction as a permanent addition to the Greenway. They argue this would benefit the community by enabling cycle access to the current Greenway from Balsall Common. A small number of respondents also request that this construction track be open to cyclists during construction. Additionally, a small number of respondents express their disagreement with the plans to use part of the Greenway as a construction transport route.
- 6.23.13 Footpaths, bridleways and cycle tracks other than the Greenway are the subject of a number of responses. For example, the Ramblers' Association recommends a range of additions to the current plans, such as footbridges, extra sections of track and reclassification of some routes to enable greater use of this network. Additionally, one member of the public argues that a much more substantial network of cycle and pedestrian routes be constructed between the villages and from these to the Interchange Station.

- 6.23.14 The expected impacts of the construction and running of HS2 on children and educational facilities in CFA 23 are discussed in a few comments. Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council expresses concern about the impacts of rail and construction noise on the Island Project School which serves children with acute learning needs. They comment that mitigation measures for this school are currently “uncertain or unreported”. Additionally, one respondent is concerned as the construction traffic and road closures between their home and their children’s school would cause them severe disruption for at least four years.

“There appears to have been little thought given to the mitigation of this impact on the children in the area. [...] In the long term there will be an effect from the HS2 noise and construction on their educational outcomes. The noise will impact their ability to concentrate on their work. The disruption on their access to the school will affect their ability to access school facilities.”

Individual

- 6.23.15 Some respondents mention concerns relating to HS2’s impact on property values and residents’ ability to sell, as well as direct imposition into some residents’ land. One respondent whose garden is required for construction is surprised and unhappy that HS2 Ltd does not intend to purchase their property, as the respondent does not believe they could continue living there.

“We are significantly affected by the construction of the new bridge at Lavender Hall lane, since our whole garden, our drive and septic tank form part of the land that is required for construction. I was surprised to be told that there are no plans to acquire the property, but I cannot see how we could continue to live here [...] the compensation consultation has not been rerun and we do not know what our future position is, since we would wish to move permanently from the immediate vicinity because of the severe disruption and the permanent loss of amenity. The continued delay in restarting the compensation consultation is not acceptable.”

Individual

- 6.23.16 Several other comments are made regarding community impacts in CFA 23. This includes a discussion by Balsall Common Village Residents’ Association about the lack of reference to Lavender Hall Fishery in the draft ES. They argue that due to noise disturbance this facility would no longer be viable when HS2 is in operation. Additionally, one respondent comments that the hours of work listed are not consistent between the draft ES and the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). They believe that long hours of work are going to take place and argue this is unfair to residents, particularly in Diddington Lane due to its proximity to the works. Finally, a number of respondents express concern about an “influx of migrant workers during the construction phase”, and argue that the location of temporary workers’ accommodation at Park Lane is unsuitable.

Traffic and transport

- 6.23.17 A large number of respondents comment on issues of traffic and transport related to CFA 23. Meriden Parish Council, Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council, Heart of England High Speed Railway Action Group and a range of other respondents express concern about impacts on local roads including Meriden Road, Kenilworth Road, Lapwing Drive, Truggist Lane and Hodgetts Lane – which they consider unsuitable for heavy vehicles. Similar concerns are also expressed by a large number of respondents regarding the Diddington Lane diversion, as was discussed in paragraph 6.23.8.
- 6.23.18 Balsall Common Village Residents' Association is worried about high volumes of traffic commuting through Balsall Common due to the proposed siting of the Interchange Station. HS2 Action Alliance is concerned at the lack of information given about the work to be done on the A45 trunk road, as well as impacts due to the Stonebridge Roundabout.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.23.19 Many respondents express concern regarding the noise impacts of construction, operation and increased traffic in CFA 23, which they consider very disruptive generally, and for specific locations including Meriden Road, Lapwing Drive, and particularly Diddington Lane. Respondents believe there is a lack of sufficient mitigation, with some comments arguing that noise barriers should be at least six metres high and that trees should be planted. Noise from the proposed Berkswell-Balsall Common Viaduct is also the subject of a number of concerns, and many respondents recommend tunnelling instead, as discussed in paragraph 6.23.7.

“On a personal level, my property along with all even-numbered houses on Diddington Lane will be seriously affected by noise during and after construction.”

Individual

- 6.23.20 As discussed in other CFAs, a number of respondents disagree with the noise assessments in the draft ES, arguing that the maps are inadequate, information is missing, peak levels should be used rather than average operational levels, and that construction noise estimates need to be included in addition to operational noise. Berkswell Parish Council provides a detailed response regarding noise – they believe the estimates are too low, dispute the calculation methods, and argue for greater mitigation measures.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.23.21 A few respondents discuss visual impacts in CFA 23, commenting generally about the negative impact of the Proposed Scheme on the countryside landscape, as well as expressing specific concerns about the visual impact of the proposed Berkswell-Balsall Common Viaduct, which they argue should blend into the landscape, and not be made of concrete, which respondents consider an eyesore. Additionally, Berkswell Parish Council comments that visual intrusion is a key concern for residents, and argues that this should be mitigated through realigning the rail further to the east, made possible by a tunnel at Balsall Common. The Parish Council is also concerned about light pollution at night during construction, operation and maintenance work.

Ecology

- 6.23.22 A number of comments include concerns regarding the ecological impacts of HS2 in CFA 23. In particular, a few respondents are concerned about adverse impacts on the River Blythe Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and the Environment Agency comments that the ES should reference aquatic plants found in this river. Several respondents also mention concerns about impacts on Marsh Lane Nature Reserve, including Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
- 6.23.23 Other respondents voice anxieties about impacts on wildlife more generally, with specific mentions of barn owls and great crested newts, while one respondent comments that ancient woodland should be protected as an important habitat. Some respondents also argue that the ecology assessment in the draft ES underestimates the importance of wildlife in the CFA 23 area.
- 6.23.24 Additionally, Warwickshire Wildlife Trust suggest that the draft ES contains misleading assumptions about the potential impacts of the route on SSSIs, citing in particular the omission of the likely significant adverse impact on Berkswell Marsh SSSI.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.23.25 A few comments discuss detrimental effects of the Proposed Scheme on agriculture in CFA 23. In particular, respondents express concerns about the stockpiling of materials on farmland, as discussed in paragraph 6.23.9. Other respondents express concerns about the impact on the farming community of using Truggist Lane for construction traffic. More generally, a number of respondents suggest the Proposed Scheme is likely to impact negatively on food production and increase the need for the UK to import food – effects which they argue have not been factored into the overall cost/benefit calculation of the project.
- 6.23.26 Berkswell Parish Council discusses a number of issues regarding agriculture in CFA 23, including concerns about loss and damage of high quality land, lack of guarantee of field drain restoration or mitigation, and propagation of weeds in construction sites. They argue that mitigation and safeguarding measures need to be effectively enforced and more appropriate compensation given.

Air quality

- 6.23.27 A small number of respondents discuss general concerns regarding air quality in the area, with some specifically concerned about Diddington Lane. One respondent argues that air pollution levels would be further compounded by the proposed second runway at Birmingham Airport. Additionally, Balsall Parish Council comments that *“the deterioration of air quality due to increased and diverted traffic is not considered significant, but we believe this will be a contributor to loss of property value”*.

“Little consideration is given to the air quality issues associated with the construction phase, especially where significant works (e.g. cuttings, embankments, viaducts, construction compounds or construction transport routes) are close to residential buildings. This is a significant concern to those who will be directly affected and a further real basis for property blight. [...] Air quality will be affected by plant and vehicle exhaust emissions and dust and odour from excavated materials especially where former land fill sites are breached during construction.”

Individual

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.23.28 As discussed in paragraph 6.23.7, a number of respondents express concern about the impact of materials stockpiles on the water quality of the River Blythe and Shustoke Reservoir.
- 6.23.29 One respondent notes that the A452 has frequently been closed in recent winters due to flooding, commenting that the proposed Diddington Lane diversion would be unusable, particularly for public transport.

Socio-economics

- 6.23.30 Berkswell Parish Council expresses concern regarding the socio-economic impacts of HS2 on CFA 23. In particular, they argue that job losses are underestimated in the draft ES, and question why agricultural employment losses are excluded from consideration of significant job impacts in the report.

Other issues

- 6.23.31 The public transport provider Centro is concerned that the HS2 crossing of the West Coast Mainline does not allow for future four-tracking of the Coventry-Birmingham rail corridor, which is their long term aspiration. They note that “*passive provision for such an eventuality has already been built into many of the structures erected over this section of the West Coast Main Line*”, and say they “*see no justification for HS2 being treated any differently from any other new infrastructure scheme in this respect*”.
- 6.23.32 One respondent suggests that HS2 Ltd's plans should involve planting trees now so that woodland can mature before the line is constructed.
- 6.23.33 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topics of cultural heritage and land quality, explicitly in relation to CFA 23.

6.24 Birmingham Interchange and Chelmsley Wood (CFA 24)

Overview

- 6.24.1 The Birmingham Interchange and Chelmsley Wood community forum area (CFA) covers an approximately 4.4km section of the Proposed Scheme in Solihull Borough. It extends from south-east of the A45 Coventry Road, Hampton-in-Arden, at its southern boundary to the administrative boundary between Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council and North Warwickshire Borough Council, in close proximity to where the M42 intersects with the M6, at its northern boundary. The area includes land within the parish of Chelmsley Wood and parts of the Bickenhill, Hampton-in-Arden and Little Packington parishes.
- 6.24.2 There are 46 respondents explicitly addressing Birmingham Interchange and Chelmsley Wood (CFA 24) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 24, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 24 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.24.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 24 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 24.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.24.4 A number of comments addressing CFAs 23-25 are discussed in section 6.23.

Overarching issues for CFA 24

- 6.24.5 Respondents addressing the CFA 24 report commonly focus on the cumulative impacts on the area from past infrastructure projects, current operational ones, and the additional issues posed by HS2. The perceived lack of transport links from the proposed Birmingham Interchange Station is also discussed frequently by respondents, some of whom suggest alternative designs, or additional links that could be made.

Socio-economics

- 6.24.6 The location and transport links of the proposed Birmingham Interchange Station are frequently addressed in the comments about CFA 24. Birmingham City Council notes the location of the proposed Interchange Station gives a *“tremendous opportunity to implement strategically important development which will add real value to both the City’s and the region’s economy”* and recommends collaborative working to fully realise these opportunities. However, a small number of respondents argue that the proposed station should be located differently to improve its integration with other transport.

- 6.24.7 A number of respondents stress the need for effective links between the proposed Birmingham Interchange Station and other transport modes including air and existing rail. Birmingham City Council would like to see good links to the National Exhibition Centre (NEC), Birmingham International Airport, and locations in East Birmingham, and also asks for consideration to be given to demand from new M42 Gateway developments. Additionally, Network Rail comments that further work is needed to specify the impact of parking at the proposed Interchange Station combined with parking at Birmingham International Airport and the NEC. They would like more information on the proposed people mover between these facilities.
- 6.24.8 HS2 Action Alliance is concerned about the impact of the siting of Birmingham Interchange Station on the Green Belt, as well as its implications for future development.
- 6.24.9 A few other comments are made regarding the anticipated socio-economic implications of HS2 for CFA 24. Warwickshire County Council expresses concern about claims made in the draft ES regarding development opportunities near the National Exhibition Centre (NEC). They note that some of these are within the Green Belt and argue that it is *“wholly inappropriate to suggest this is a positive gain without an assessment of the negative impacts”*.
- 6.24.10 Birmingham City Council expresses concern about the use of some NEC car parks as site compounds. They argue this would cause the tenants *“significant financial loss”* and possibly put jobs at risk. Additionally, the Heart of England High Speed Railway Action Group requests *“a realistic scheme to offset the results of a loss of parking space”* at the National Motorcycle Museum, which is expected to be subject to significant impacts from the Proposed Scheme.
- 6.24.11 The Garden and Leisure Group also voice anxiety about the economic impacts on the Melbicks Garden Centre land and business caused by construction works and the proposed new roundabout.

Traffic and transport

- 6.24.12 A small number of comments are made regarding traffic and transport in CFA 24. In particular, Birmingham City Council questions the assumption made in the draft ES that increased levels of traffic at the proposed Interchange Station are not significant, and expresses specific concern regarding increased traffic on Junction 6 of the M42 if HS2 becomes operational. This point is echoed by Aero Engine Controls, which comments that Junction 6 is already at capacity. Additionally, Warwickshire County Council expresses concern regarding *“substantial trip generation”* associated with the proposed Interchange Station, and expects that *“mitigation on the local highway network will be required”*.
- 6.24.13 Aero Engine Controls is also concerned about access to the Birmingham Business Park during roundabout works, and mention cumulative impacts of other proposed infrastructure, including the M42 Economic Gateway. The Garden and Leisure Group expresses concern about access to the Melbicks Garden Centre site during construction.
- 6.24.14 More generally, one respondent expresses their opposition to the proposed Interchange Station, as they argue it would cause increased car use and associated pollution.

Ecology

- 6.24.15 A few specific comments are made regarding ecology issues in CFA 24. One respondent worries that due to habitat destruction, badgers, foxes, herons, swans and various other wild birds would not return to affected locations for at least ten years, and that the swifts at Coleshill Hall Farm and the timber yard may never do so.
- 6.24.16 Natural England is pleased that its advice has been followed regarding Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and that this has been incorporated into the draft ES baseline.
- 6.24.17 The Environment Agency expresses concern about Hollywell Brook, Pendigo Lake and the Blythe and Cole rivers, requesting surveys and adaptation measures for fish and otters, and asking for the opportunity to feed into the design of the re-routed Hollywell Brook. More generally, they argue that *“the potential loss of areas of angling value should be considered”*.

Community

- 6.24.18 A small number of comments are made regarding community impacts of HS2. Several respondents, including Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council and Heart of England Group, express concern about the expected loss of football pitches at Heath Park and argue for their replacement.

“Given the loss of football pitches at Heath Park due to HS2 I would like to see LIKE FOR LIKE REPLACEMENT of the green space rather than financial compensation to the community. I believe the current agricultural land on the other side of the Coleshill Heath Road would be suitable. [...] This is unlikely to be suitable agricultural land in the future and is suitable for new football pitches within close proximity to the existing pitches at Heath Park. There is evidence to show the football pitches are full on a Sunday and are in short supply in the North Solihull area.”

Individual

- 6.24.19 A number of respondents also make more general comments regarding the negative community impacts they anticipate from the proposals. They argue that HS2 would cause disruption to people’s lives while bringing very little benefit to the region, which they describe as a deprived area. Additionally, one respondent discusses how existing infrastructure built in the area over the years has caused suffering to the community and has deteriorated people’s quality of life.

“Over the last 40 years we have seen the construction of the M42, M6 Toll Road, Birmingham International Airport, Birmingham International train station, the NEC, numerous hotels, buildings along with the Business Park, all of which have taken place in this vicinity. Each time we are told that environmental effects will be minimised and the area surrounding area restored to it’s former pleasant state, which never happens, we have gone from a quiet country lane, with cows and a wide variety of wild life to a concrete jungle.”

Individual

- 6.24.20 The Ramblers’ Association comments that it is satisfied with the minor changes to the footpaths in the area.
- 6.24.21 One comment expresses concern about access for horse riders during the construction phase, which the respondent argues would also have wider impacts on wellbeing.

“The area supports a large number of residents who own horses and regularly hack along the proposed site of this development. The area is one of high social deprivation, and most of these animals are on DIY Livery, and are a great source of pleasure not only to their owners but to the other local residents. By restricting the right of people to access these areas due to construction works, once again people's lives are being blighted.”

Individual

Sound, noise and vibration

- 6.24.22 A number of respondents express concern about the impacts of noise and vibration. In particular, a few respondents say that they already suffer from noise from existing infrastructure such as the M42 motorway and the West Coast Mainline railway, and argue that HS2 construction and operational noise would exacerbate this. HS2 Action Alliance echoes this comment, and points out that no noise assessment is provided on the cumulative impacts from two stations and an airport in close proximity.
- 6.24.23 Noise and vibration impacts on Birmingham Business Park and Common Farm are also specifically discussed by concerned respondents, while the Hampton-in-Arden Society argues that higher noise barriers are required to mitigate noise impacts throughout the area. Some respondents also comment that they think the noise assessments provided by HS2 Ltd are unclear and confusing. Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council queries how the noise and visual impact of the viaduct over Heath Park would be mitigated.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.24.24 A number of respondents comment on the landscape and visual impacts of HS2, including one respondent who feels that the proposed viaduct would have a negative visual impact on nearby properties, and another who argues for the proper protection of an avenue of deciduous trees near the National Motorcycle Museum, which they say has practical and historical value. More generally, HS2 Action Alliance thinks the draft ES should have discussed the impact on the Green Belt more extensively.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 6.24.25 A couple of comments are made regarding Common Farm, with respondents requesting information on how mineral reserves at the farm would be dealt with, and also arguing that an unnecessarily large amount of agricultural land is being taken for construction compounds, material storage areas and planting. More information on loss of land is also requested regarding Brickfields Farm.

Cultural heritage

- 6.24.26 English Heritage comments that the level of impact on the Grade II* registered park at Packington Hall is not clear, including any permanent impacts of the infrastructure associated with the proposed Interchange Station.

Air quality

- 6.24.27 Aero Engine Controls stresses the importance of managing construction and traffic dust near the Business Park.

“Due to the nature of AEC manufacturing activities, significant investment has been made in the environmental controls within the facility to manage and control the air quality from the locality. AEC seeks assurance that the dust generation and emissions from the construction traffic will be contained within the outlined measures.”

Aero Engine Controls

Land quality

- 6.24.28 One respondent expresses concern regarding land quality at Wheeley Moor Farm. They argue that the siting of the proposed Coleshill Heath Road main construction compound on grazing land at this location would lead to land pollution from materials and heavy machinery, saying it would take many years to make the land safe again for grazing animals. The respondent suggests an alternative site be used, such as the M6 toll road compound site or the nearby Warwickshire County Council road works site.

Other issues

- 6.24.29 There are relatively few comments on the topic of water resources and flood risk assessment, explicitly in relation to CFA 24.

6.25 Castle Bromwich and Bromford (CFA 25)

Overview

- 6.25.1 The Castle Bromwich and Bromford community forum area (CFA) covers a 5.1km section of the Proposed Scheme within the Birmingham City Council administrative area. The Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council administrative area is located just to the south at the eastern end of the route and the eastern edge of the route is on the boundary of the North Warwickshire Borough Council administrative area 3. The area includes parts of the Sutton New Hall, Castle Bromwich, Tyburn and Hodge Hill Wards. It extends from just south of where the B4118 Birmingham Road or Water Orton Road⁴ crosses the M6, west to Bromford Drive, Bromford.
- 6.25.2 There are 34 respondents explicitly addressing Castle Bromwich and Bromford (CFA 25) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 25, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 25 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.25.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 25 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 25.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.25.4 A number of comments addressing CFAs 23-25 are discussed in 6.23.
- 6.25.5 Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust stresses the need to reference the Birmingham and Black Country Nature Improvement Area (NIA) in the relevant sections of CFA 25 and 26 reports. They would like both of these reports to address how HS2 is likely to impact on the NIA's objectives, and how these impacts would be mitigated or compensated for.

Overarching issues for CFA 25

6.25.6 Comments addressing the CFA 25 report most commonly focus on ecology, traffic and community impact, with some also discussing flood risk and socio-economic impacts. In particular, a number of detailed responses are made by organisations regarding the impacts of HS2 Ltd's proposals on Park Hall nature reserve. Potential impacts of the proposed construction traffic route through Castle Vale on safety and wellbeing also elicits a number of comments.

Ecology

- 6.25.7 The largest proportion of comments regarding CFA 25 focus on ecology issues, and all of these come from organisations. In particular, Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust is concerned about the impact on wildlife sites, the natural environment and people's access to it, and they suggest opportunities for mitigation in some places.
- 6.25.8 Comments relating to ecology are primarily concerned with the impacts of the construction and location of HS2 across Park Hall nature reserve, which falls within the Birmingham and Black Country Nature Improvement Area. Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust argues that the full scale of impacts at this location, which they say is ancient woodland, is not identified in the draft ES, and that mitigation options should include box-cutting with vertical sides, cut-and-cover tunnel or a green bridge through the wood. They also request that adequate compensation should be made for loss of part of the nature reserve, and to address impacts on biodiversity.
- 6.25.9 Birmingham City Council requests further dialogue "to better understand the impact on Park Hall Nature reserve and the River Tame during the construction period and thereafter the level of mitigation to enhance this facility providing compensatory provision for impacts elsewhere on the route". HS2 Action Alliance also expresses concern over the impacts on the nature reserve, specifically that the proposed viaduct would split the reserve in two, create cuttings through ancient woodland, realign the River Tame and remove access from the reserve.
- 6.25.10 Concerns about access to the reserve are also discussed by other organisations. Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust requests compensation for the anticipated lack of access during construction, while the Environment Agency suggests there is an enhancement opportunity at Park Hall through the provision of pedestrian access and reinstatement of vehicular access.
- 6.25.11 In addition to the above, the Environment Agency expresses concerns about fish in Plants Brook, and requests that the formal ES includes data on fish and the expected impacts of HS2, including on the functioning of the brook as a refuge for fish, as well as a safe passage for otters during flooding. The Environment Agency also makes some specific comments on potential enhancements which could be made in relation to Dunlop Conduit, Plants Brook, and the River Tame diversion. They would like the opportunity to input into the detail of this.

Traffic and transport

- 6.25.12 A number of respondents express concern about the proposed construction traffic route through Castle Vale along Javelin Avenue and Cadbury Drive. They argue that this route is not suitable for heavy construction traffic as the roads are very narrow, saying these are residential roads which would encounter noise, safety and accessibility issues. Respondents suggest that the access route is changed to avoid these roads. Additionally, one respondent requests a redesign of the proposed new Attleboro Lane junction to reduce the noise impact.

“The construction phase, which we are led to believe to be around 8 years, will see construction traffic entering Castle Vale and utilising roads that were never meant for or designed for heavy plant. The roads locally are narrow with resident parking and are in use day and night. There are elderly residents who rely on vehicular access and there are children constantly playing nearby. It is the Trust’s serious concern that if these roads are utilised for the construction phase there will be constant damage to the road surface, noise issues, and safety issues.”

Community Environmental Trust

- 6.25.13 A small number of respondents also comment on the use of Water Orton Road outside Park Hall Academy. They say this road is already congested at school start and finish times, and that increased traffic would be a safety hazard to pupils. They suggest that road widening or lay-bys could be provided by HS2 Ltd in this area to alleviate this.

Community

- 6.25.14 Some respondents address community issues when commenting on CFA 25. Many of these relate to the proposed construction traffic routing discussed in paragraph 6.25.12. In particular, respondents express concerns for the safety of children outside the school and playing near the roads. Additionally, some respondents worry that construction vehicles would pass close to front doors on some roads, which they say is unsafe and may damage property.
- 6.25.15 One respondent is concerned that the proposed layout of Attleboro Lane, reservoir and planting area, and the footpath from Water Orton to Chelmsley Wood, would exacerbate crime due to their secluded locations. This respondent recommends moving the footpath further west to deter crime, as well as the introduction of extra security measures around the proposed line in this area.
- 6.25.16 The Ramblers' Association says that it is not aware of any public rights of way directly affected by this section of the route, however some concern is expressed by other respondents that open spaces and public rights of way would lose accessibility during construction. There is also more general anxiety expressed about impacts on the local community during construction.

“Our interpretation of the Construction boundaries marked on your map is there are some open spaces and footpaths currently accessible to the public, will not be accessible through the duration of the construction. The restricted access to open spaces and the prospect of the construction traffic the quality of life for residents in this area will be severely affected down to level that we find unacceptable, and we wish to register our strong objection to your plans.”

Castle Vale Neighbourhood Partnership

Water resources and flood risk assessment

6.25.17 Some comments are made by respondents regarding flood risk in the area. One respondent notes that Attleboro Lane currently floods on a regular basis, at the point of the proposed reservoir, while Birmingham City Council comments that this is a high flood risk area, and requests that *“the proposed design alterations should not preclude appropriate flood attenuation measures”* and suggests that *“a collaborative approach is required to maximise opportunities to address”* this flood risk. This call for collaboration is echoed by the Environment Agency, which suggests a flood risk management scheme in Bromford and requests the opportunity to explore synergies between this and the HS2 proposals.

Socio-economics

6.25.18 A small number of comments are made regarding socio-economic issues, most of which focus on the Castle Bromwich Business Park. Some respondents are pleased that the proposed railhead in this area has been moved from the Safeguarding Directive, but express continuing concern over potential vibration and noise levels, and the impacts of traffic, tunnelling, as well as changes to air quality and groundwater in the business park and nearby areas of socio-economic importance. These respondents request further information and dialogue on these potential impacts, echoed by Birmingham City Council, which also would like further discussion on mitigation measures.

6.25.19 The transport provider Centro requests that permanent mitigation measures be made to address increased passenger numbers and traffic movements, as well as reassurance that there would be no adverse effects on existing operations and capacity levels of the Tamworth line, or on Centro’s aspirations for new local stations at Fort Parkway and Castle Bromwich.

6.25.20 Birmingham City Council also notes that employment rates and qualification levels are much lower in Birmingham than the West Midlands and England, and that the effects of the estimated 600 job losses would be more difficult to mitigate here than in other areas of the proposed route. They request that commitments be made to work with the local authority and other agencies to maximise job opportunities in construction for local people.

“The City Council is very concerned that the scheme may see 600 jobs displaced within the area. We do not agree that the economy in Castle Bromwich and its hinterland is relatively healthy; we consider it challenging to find evidence to support this assertion. If the 600 displaced jobs ‘may experience difficulties in finding and moving to suitable locations’ in a relatively healthy economy, it is clear to us that the reality is that it may be much harder than currently suggested, and we believe this should be acknowledged and addressed.”

Birmingham City Council

Cultural heritage

6.25.21 A small number of respondents, including Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council, express concern that no impact should be made on Castle Bromwich Hall and Gardens, which they say have great historical significance.

Other issues

- 6.25.22 In addition to the comments discussed above, Birmingham City Council calls for further impact assessments to be conducted relating to many of the ES topic areas, particularly traffic, air quality, vibration and noise, all of which they express some concern about, stating they require assurance of sufficient mitigation or compensation in the case of adverse effects.
- 6.25.23 There are relatively few other comments on the topics of agriculture, forestry and soils, air quality, land quality, landscape and visual assessment, and sound, noise and vibration, explicitly in relation to CFA 25.

6.26 Washwood Heath to Curzon Street (CFA 26)

Overview

- 6.26.1 The Washwood Heath to Curzon Street community forum area (CFA) covers a 5.7km section of the Proposed Scheme in Birmingham, to the east of the city centre. It extends from Bromford Lane, Bromford in the east to Moor Street Queensway, on the eastern edge of Birmingham city centre, in the west.
- 6.26.2 There are 50 respondents explicitly addressing Washwood Heath to Curzon Street (CFA 26) in their response to the consultation, as well as a number of other comments on specific locations or features within CFA 26, and some referring to specific sections of the CFA 26 documents within the draft Environmental Statement (ES).
- 6.26.3 Those comments explicitly or implicitly focusing on the CFA 26 report are summarised below by topic, beginning with any issues shared with adjacent CFAs and an outline of the overarching issues specific to CFA 26.

Shared issues with adjacent CFA reports

- 6.26.4 A number of comments addressing CFAs 23-25 are discussed in section 6.23.
- 6.26.5 Additionally, Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust stresses the need to reference the Birmingham and Black Country Nature Improvement Area (NIA) in the relevant sections of CFA 25 and 26 reports. They would like both of these reports to address how HS2 is likely to impact on the NIA's objectives, and how these impacts would be mitigated or compensated for.

Overarching issues for CFA 26

- 6.26.6 Comments addressing the CFA 26 report come mainly from organisations and often focus on socio-economic concerns, particularly relating to job losses, business survival and relocation, and employment opportunities, as well as the impacts of city centre infrastructure proposals. Ecology, cultural heritage, water resources, and traffic and transport are also frequently discussed.

- 6.26.7 In a detailed response, Birmingham City Council comments on all the ES topic areas. In particular, they express concern about the socio-economic impact of the proposals, which they suggest is underestimated in the draft ES. They focus on job losses, business relocation and employment opportunities, and also suggest that an equalities impact assessment and health impact assessment should be conducted to inform the ES. Additionally, the City Council provides a large number of comments on the proposed infrastructure in the city centre, and its expected impacts on both close and distant areas. Issues of traffic and cultural heritage are also discussed in detail by the Council.

Socio-economics

- 6.26.8 Socio-economic concerns in relation to CFA 26 are frequently discussed by respondents.
- 6.26.9 A number of respondents express concern about the location of the proposed maintenance depot site at Washwood Heath. Some are concerned at the lack of regard for previous proposals for a new technology/business park here, while others are worried about impacts on existing businesses located at this site – they suggest that there has been inadequate analysis of socio-economic effects and insufficient consideration of alternative sites, both of which they believe need further discussion.

“At the site of the Birmingham's old LDV plant where the new maintenance depot will be, there seems to be little to be gained. There government has blocked plans for the business park that was due to be built there which would have provided much more jobs, in an area which is economically deprived.”

Individual

- 6.26.10 Birmingham City Council agrees in principle with locating a depot in the West Midlands but are concerned about the “*excessive amount of land*” proposed for use at Washwood Heath – they request that HS2 revisit design proposals to improve efficiency. Additionally, the Council is keen to ensure employment potential is maximised in this area, and request data on this. They suggest that HS2 and the City Council work together on a master planning exercise “*covering land use and transport for the Washwood Heath area, to explore interim and permanent uses*”.
- 6.26.11 Some respondents express concern over adverse socio-economic effects on other areas of CFA 26. These include Birmingham Business Park and Eastside Locks – where respondents voice specific concerns about traffic increase, regeneration plans and need for access. Additionally, a number of respondents are anxious about adverse effects on the economic wellbeing of Digbeth, as well as a perceived lack of commitment to link the terminal with the Digbeth National Express coach station.
- 6.26.12 One respondent points out inaccuracies in the documentation, which they say does not take into account the design refinement proposals' implications on Saltley Business Park.
- 6.26.13 Respondents also very frequently discuss concerns and suggestions regarding the proposed connections between HS2 and Birmingham city centre. In particular, respondents are concerned about access due to the removal of the proposed walkway from the HS2 station to the Bull Ring and city centre. They request that proposals for passenger interchange to other transport hubs, such as other rail stations and bus and coach services, be developed in greater detail, with some specific suggestions being made. Some respondents also request that more be done to encourage the north-south flow of walkers and cyclists to Digbeth.

“We believe that the scale and treatment of the tunnel routes should actively encourage north-south flow by those who walk or cycle, and should be safe, attractive and welcoming to all. This is particularly the case for those young people who study on one side of the station and who see Digbeth as one of their key leisure destinations, as well as those living south of the terminal approach, who may be travelling to work in the north and see the new park as a community asset. In addition, poor connectivity has significant implications for the long term economic wellbeing of Digbeth.”

Digbeth Residents' Association

- 6.26.14 A number of respondents also request greater connection to services from Birmingham New Street Station, arguing that ongoing northbound journeys from Curzon Street Station are difficult. One respondent suggests lowering Curzon Street Station by ten metres to enable a “*mega hub*” with through platforms on the New Street approach lines. Additionally, some respondents call for analysis to be conducted of potential benefits of a connection between the proposed high speed line and the classic network.
- 6.26.15 Birmingham City Council discusses in detail various infrastructure concerns relating to CFA 26. They request that world-class facilities and architecture be constructed, with a highly integrated and accessible interchange at the HS2 Birmingham city centre station. They are disappointed at the perceived lack of proposals to improve the physical environment of Moor Street and expect that opportunities for wider transport network improvements be enabled rather than precluded by HS2.

Ecology

- 6.26.16 Issues relating to ecology are frequently discussed in relation to CFA 26, primarily by organisations.
- 6.26.17 A few organisations are concerned about ecological effects on the waterways, with the Canal and River Trust stating that the “*Curzon Street approach will have an adverse effect on the ecology of the site due to the shading of open space*”. They also request more impact information regarding the River Rea and Washwood Heath Brook proposals, and suggest an opportunity for Kingfisher banks on the overflow waterway or enhancements for them on the canal.
- 6.26.18 The Environment Agency is also concerned about Washwood Heath Brook, suggesting that this be replaced with an open channel. Additionally, they argue for fish surveys to be conducted in both small and large waterways in CFA 26, and comment that consideration needs to be paid to fish rescue and habitat provision.
- 6.26.19 The Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust stresses the need to reference and discuss the Birmingham and Black Country Nature Improvement Area (NIA) in the CFA 26 report.

Cultural heritage

- 6.26.20 A number of respondents comment on HS2 proposals regarding buildings and other features of cultural heritage, with particular concern being expressed about the Curzon Street railway building and the Fox and Grapes Public House.

- 6.26.21 Whilst respondents are pleased that Curzon Street Station building would be retained, several, including English Heritage and Chiltern Railways, request “*more sensitive reuse*” of the building. Additionally, the Victorian Society suggests “*the archaeological deposits associated with the Grade I listed Curzon Street Station and its curtilage to be of high heritage value rather than moderate as stated*”.
- 6.26.22 The proposed demolition of the Fox and Grapes Public House is opposed both by the Victorian Society and English Heritage. The latter urges an alternative to be considered such as dismantling and reconstruction. The Victorian society also stresses its opposition to the proposed demolition of the roof of the Eagle and Tun Public House (both listed) and other unlisted structures of Victorian character.
- 6.26.23 Respondents express concerns and suggestions regarding a number of other sites of cultural heritage, including the Museum Collections Centre and the listed existing tunnel portal. More broadly, English Heritage suggests the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) is meaningless in the city centre due to the number of listed buildings, and suggests a more nuanced approach is needed.

Water resources and flood risk assessment

- 6.26.24 A number of responses focus on water resources in CFA 26. In particular, the Canal and River Trust makes a number of detailed comments outlining their concerns regarding access and impacts to the canal as well as suggestions for mitigation measures.
- 6.26.25 The Environment Agency mentions the opportunity to remove the concrete slab from the River Tame bed, and comments that it would appreciate the opportunity to discuss any proposed new culverts on the River Rea and the proposed watercourse realignments and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) at the Washwood Heath Maintenance Depot.

Traffic and transport

- 6.26.26 Some respondents express concerns regarding traffic and transport in CFA 26. A few comment that Digbeth High Street is an unsuitable route for the transport of materials, while others are anxious that the proposed loss of Park Street would have a negative impact on bus routes and congestion. Concern is also expressed that the closure of Saltley Viaduct would negatively impact the highway network.
- 6.26.27 A number of organisations express concern about impacts on public transport in Birmingham city centre – with the Moor Street and Queensway areas eliciting particular concern from organisations including Birmingham City Council, Digbeth Residents’ Association, Centro, National Express and Chiltern Railways. The transport provider Centro notes that it supports HS2 overall, but is concerned that negative effects on existing rail and bus services need to be recognised and mitigated. Its detailed response includes a number of specific suggestions regarding this.
- 6.26.28 A request is made that proposed cycle routes for during and after construction are included in the formal ES.

Community

- 6.26.29 A number of respondents make comments regarding the potential impacts of the HS2 proposals on communities, many of which overlap with the concerns discussed in the socio-economic section (6.26.8-6.26.15). Additionally, one respondent expresses concern over the impacts of restricted access to a Polish Catholic Association community centre, and the Ramblers' Association asks that the footpath across the proposed Rolling Stock Maintenance depot be diverted along its southern side rather than closed.
- 6.26.30 Leigh Junior, Infant and Nursery School, which is situated adjacent to the Washwood Heath Depot site, requests the donation of a small amount of land from HS2, which they argue would greatly benefit the community and create good public relations for HS2 Ltd.

Landscape and visual assessment

- 6.26.31 Concerns are expressed by a small number of respondents about the loss of part of the Eastside City Park and the whole of Park Street Gardens. Birmingham City Council requests that impacts on the new City Centre Park be minimised. A few respondents also express concern regarding negative impacts of the proposals on views within and out of the Warwick Barr Conservation Area, while one respondent argues that the Curzon Street Station would be visually intrusive.

Other issues

- 6.26.32 There are a relatively small number of comments on the topics of agriculture and land quality explicitly in relation to CFA 26.
- 6.26.33 A small number of comments are made by organisations regarding noise, vibration and air quality. These include a request by the Birmingham Museums Trust for information on anticipated noise, vibration and pollution levels at the Museums Collection Centre location. The West Midlands Fire Service also expresses detailed concerns relating to these issues, requesting more information and adequate mitigation to ensure their continued effective operation.

"There is little information on the noise levels to be experienced, but they may affect Fire Control adversely. In addition, other staff may be affected adversely, from long-term exposure to noise. Also, high level meetings will be disrupted (Corporate Board; Authority, etc.)"

West Midlands Fire Service

Chapter 7 Draft Code of Construction Practice

Introduction

7.1.1 Question 3 of the HS2 Draft Environmental Statement (ES) Consultation asks respondents for their comments on the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). A total of 1,076 respondents answered this question directly, with a number of respondents also discussing various aspects of the draft Code in response to Questions 1 and 2, or as part of a letter or email response. In total, there are 3,958 comments across all questions relating directly to various aspects the draft CoCP, as well as a large number of others focusing on overall construction impacts across different ES topics. This chapter summarises those comments, and is divided into three areas to broadly reflect the structure of the draft Code: overall comments (including comments on management principles and implementation), general requirements, and management of specific issues.

7.2 Overall comments , management principles and implementation

Overview

- 7.2.1 A relatively small number of respondents discuss the management principles as laid out in the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), namely the HS2 sustainability policy, Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) and environmental management system (EMS). Other respondents discuss the overall approach to construction or to the draft CoCP, or comment on the timescale or budget of the proposed construction works. A small number of respondents say there is too little information to comment on the effectiveness of the draft CoCP.
- 7.2.2 Comments regarding implementation focus largely on enforcement and monitoring, as well as some on the topics of Local Environmental Management Plans and safety.
- 7.2.3 There are a small number of direct references to specific sections of the draft CoCP. However, most comments on the draft CoCP concentrate on issues or concerns rather than pointing towards particular document sections.

Overall comments on approach

7.2.4 A number of respondents make comments regarding the overall assessment or methodology behind the draft CoCP. These include challenges to the assessment or coverage of specific aspects such as dust emissions, working hours, landscape impact and ecology – these are picked up in the sections below. Some respondents are concerned that specific issues such as airports, local community impacts, railhead construction (and related socio-economic impacts), utilities impact, raw material sources and supplies, greenhouse gas emissions, disposal of excess excavated material, and overall construction risks have not been taken into account at all. Others disagree with the figures for the length of the ‘peak period’ or the number of workers that will be required.

7.2.5 The lack of description of construction activities or other local detail in the draft CoCP is of concern to several respondents. This includes comments that the current non-localised approach and limited survey could lead to inaccuracies of data and/or an increased risk of specific local impacts (for example on safety, disruption and delivery time). Some respondents suggest there is a need to develop overall or local figures and surveys in line with best practice, as well as a need to consult with local organisations and communities.

“No thought or constructive thought has been put into this, somebody has sat in an office and said ‘this is OK’, without actually seeing the area, consulting with the local inhabitants, and looking at the obstacles and difficulties of placing an IMD in the middle of a poor rural area. This needs revisiting and a proper study undertaken which should result in a proper report..”

Individual

“Requirements for Noise and Emissions should be based upon the NPPF Technical Guidance for Minerals issued by the Dept for Communities and Local Govt in March 2012 which should be regarded as the minimum acceptable standard.”

Individual

7.2.6 A number of respondents express concern that specific phrases within the draft CoCP such as ‘best practicable means’, ‘where reasonably practicable’ and ‘it is assumed’ would undermine the effectiveness of the CoCP in mitigating impacts, with one respondent referring to these as “*caveats and loopholes*”. Others are concerned about the use of technical terms making the draft CoCP harder to understand, or even meaningless, for the general public. One respondent is concerned that they have been informed the CoCP would not be made an open access document; others say there is conflicting information between the draft CoCP and wider draft Environmental Statement (ES).

7.2.7 Many of the respondents commenting on assessment and methodology go further by stating that the draft CoCP overall is inadequate. Often they cite a lack of consideration of specific aspects or figures as outlined in sections 7.1.4 and 7.1.5 above. Terms such as “*unrealistic*”, “*noncommittal*”, “*inadequate*”, “*ambiguous*”, “*flawed*”, “*without teeth*”, and “*falling short of best practice*” are used by these respondents.

- 7.2.8 In contrast, a small number of respondents express support for the draft CoCP or say that it is adequate. Others attach specific caveats to this support. These include: the need for the CoCP to be adequately enforced, concern over practicalities of delivery, the need to see Local Environment Management Plans, and the presence of other specific outstanding concerns such as overall budget or specific impacts.

“This document is fairly succinct in its expectations and requirements. It is difficult to add to this without the detailed design being finalised and assessed for its likely impact.”

Highways Agency

- 7.2.9 Some respondents discuss policy issues relating to construction. Among other issues, they suggest there is a need to take into account changing EU regulations on construction as well as other relevant international, national or local policy requirements. Further observations include a suggested commitment to maximise use of rail for construction, the perceived inadequacy of existing statute and standards for projects of this length, and the suggested need to comply with or cross reference good practice or other existing construction guidelines in specific locations (for example the NEC (New Engineering Contract) Construction Guidelines, Considerate Constructors Scheme). There are also comments on the power of local authorities with respect to enforcement, discussed below in section 7.1.21.

Timescale, budget and other general concerns

- 7.2.10 The overall duration or timescale of the construction period is one of the most common aspects raised by respondents discussing the draft CoCP. These comments tend to emphasise the length of time over which disruption and impacts would occur during construction, affecting either communities or the natural environment. Some respondents focus on specific issues within these comments such as air pollution, noise, landscape or ecosystem disruption, and traffic impacts; others discuss general impacts on the environment, residents, local economy or overall amenity.

“My experience with construction projects is that the estimates of the duration of use of compounds is optimistic at best. Any prolonged use would seriously compromise the productivity of local farms and affect wildlife. Destruction of productive farmland is not acceptable at a time when we need to harness this resource as effectively as possible. This is a comment not confined to Drayton Bassett, but the whole route.”

Individual

- 7.2.11 There are also a small number of comments on the construction budget or finance (aside from those relating to the overall cost of the project which have been discussed above). For example, respondents express concern over where the money would come from for specific enforcement measures such as policing construction drivers taking shortcuts, and the potential for contractors to focus on profit rather than good practice.
- 7.2.12 A number of other concerns are highlighted in relation to the potential impacts arising from the construction process. Where these relate to a specific environmental topic (for example Air Quality) these are covered in the relevant parts of section 7.3 below.

Management principles: HS2 Sustainability Policy

- 7.2.13 There are a small number of references to the sustainability policy or overall sustainability assessment across responses to all questions. Two respondents reference the phrase in the sustainability policy: 'to deliver enhancements as far as practicable to ensure there is no net loss to the natural environment' and ask for further details on how this would be assessed and monitored. Another asks how ecological sustainability would be maintained in perpetuity, rather than just during the construction period.
- 7.2.14 A small number of respondents say they are pleased with the inclusion of the policy. Specific suggestions for amendments to the policy include: the use of zero waste principles where possible, the application of the waste hierarchy, a commitment to take into account embedded carbon and water in materials used in the project and a commitment to monitoring and restoration. The inclusion of a goal of no net loss to the natural environment is also suggested, though one respondent believes the no net loss approach is not consistent with current national policy as set out in the Natural Environment White Paper 2011.
- 7.2.15 Some respondents state that the policy is not adequate, for example listing points that should be covered by the policy on issues such as public rights of way, new structures and design, and works traffic and road diversions.

"This section of the document provides a brief overview of HS2 Ltd's commitment to sustainability, referencing four key principles set out in the UK's 2005 sustainability strategy, Securing the Future. This section of the DES makes no claims as to how HS2 aligns with these principles. HS2AA believes HS2 fundamentally contradicts each of the sustainability principles outlined in this section of the DES."

HS2 Action Alliance

- 7.2.16 Others comment that the sustainability policy is not compatible with current plans in specific areas, for example due to the level of impact on communities and the environment.

Management principles: Environmental Minimum Requirements

- 7.2.17 There are a small number of comments specific to Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) as discussed in the draft CoCP. These include a request that the EMRs be enforceable in law, and a question over whether the commitments contained within the EMRs would extend beyond the construction period. A couple of respondents are concerned about specific wording, for example asking for "*must contain...*" rather than "*are likely to be formed of...*", and suggesting that "*reasonable endeavours*" is not strong enough.
- 7.2.18 The omission of transport matters from the EMRs' scope is mentioned, as is concern that the EMRs as currently presented would contain a loop-hole which according to one respondent would enable unacceptable adverse impacts to occur. Similarly the need to include provision for mitigation measures "*to be tied to the grant of development consent and enforceable in the event that they are not complied with*" is also highlighted. One respondent suggests that agricultural and other land based businesses require a specific EMR due to their special status. Others discuss the need for reassurance regarding the inclusion of relevant local concerns and issues, suggest specific requirements for example for landscape mitigation and noise, and ask for clearer definition of engagement processes within the EMRs.

“Further it should be made clear that the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) should define how the nominated undertaker will engage with landowners and farmers as this engagement is different to engagement with communities. The NFU is pleased to see that each EMR will be formed of policies setting out the approach to particular aspects of the scheme including land acquisition, noise mitigation, pre-emption of and repairs relating to damage from settlement. The NFU looks forward to seeing the draft of these policies.”

National Farmers Union

- 7.2.19 A small number of respondents express explicit support for the presence of EMRs, whilst others note that they are not yet fully available, would like more information on them, or would like the opportunity to input into their drafting, for example “*to ensure that local concerns and issues are considered and addressed*”. The need for public scrutiny of the EMRs is also mentioned by one respondent.

Management principles: Environmental Management System

- 7.2.20 As with Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) above, there are very few comments specifically on environmental management system (EMS) as outlined in the draft CoCP. These include concern that the EMS would be produced too late to be effective, and a request for an opportunity to review any proposed EMS. One respondent requests further definition of the role of the Nominated Undertaker and Principle Contractor with respect to EMS; another suggests the need for independent scrutiny. Additionally, one respondent asks that more stringent requirements than ISO 14001 be applied.

“In a challenging CoCP I would like to see proper standards cited i.e. OHSAS 18001 (H&S), ISO 50001 (Eco-management and Audit Scheme), compliance with EMAS and other more relevant requirements. This evidence relating to lack of important information underpins that the authors are technically ill informed to draft such an important document.”

Individual

Implementation: Enforcement

- 7.2.21 The most common concern raised with respect to enforcement relates to what respondents describe as the self-regulating nature of the proposed arrangements, with the related assertion that this is not made clear in the draft CoCP itself. There are several references to the powers of local authorities and the need to liaise with them on this issue. Many respondents specifically suggest the need for an independent body (such as a council or a local monitoring committee) to provide oversight and monitoring, with funding from central government or HS2 Ltd suggested as mechanisms for resourcing this. Some respondents specifically mention the potential role of Environmental Health Officers in enforcement.

“The CoCP describes Contractors and HS2 Ltd self-governing the CoCP. This is a clear conflict of interests: both parties have interests which conflict with best practice, as contractors look to maximise their returns and HS2 need to minimise their costs. The enabling legislation must provide for (and pay for) Bucks CC to independently monitor the application of the CoCP, and allow their assessors access to the works at any time for that purpose. They must be given powers to stop work that contravenes the CoCP and enforce it properly.”

Individual

- 7.2.22 Other suggestions include the need for a clear monitoring system, a mechanism to stop contractors working in the event of a breach or major adverse event, stringent procedures to ensure compliance, a straightforward complaints procedure, and clear trigger levels (for example for dust emissions) beyond which enforcement would occur. Overall, the need to have a monitoring and enforcement regime in place that safeguards the local community is mentioned a number of times. The perceived lack of a strong accountability structure within the CoCP is a specific concern for a few respondents.
- 7.2.23 A few respondents mention past experience as the reason behind their concerns. Others talk about a lack of belief in the ability of contractors to adhere to any self-regulating or less-than-stringent arrangements without external oversight. Generally the detailing of enforcement in the draft CoCP is thought by some respondents to be lacking, while others suggest that some of the language as currently used in the draft CoCP is weak or non-binding.

Implementation: Local Environmental Management Plans

- 7.2.24 Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMPs) are mentioned several times across all questions. For some respondents there is a lack of clarity over when these would be developed or indeed if they have already been developed. Others are concerned that LEMPs have not yet been developed or would only be developed after the hybrid bill stage, which leads to related concerns that respondents have no knowledge of the level of detail they will include. Several note that by that point it may be too difficult or costly or late for local authorities and communities to comment. To address this, some respondents request that the LEMPs be produced before the full ES is published.

“The production of LEMPs must be made before the full ES is produced. If this is not done many residents will fear that new matters will be added which have not been outlined in the Draft CoCP and CFA 23 or 24.”

Various respondents

- 7.2.25 A number of respondents think that local authorities, local communities (for example through community forums) or other stakeholder organisations would expect or be expected to input, comment and review – or even have power over – LEMPs prior to construction starting; this applies either generally or to specific topics such as workforce travel. There is also one suggestion that outputs should be agreed by all parties (with reference to previous experience), as well as an expectation of the provision of appropriate specialist staff and consultation for the preparation of related plans and documents (with respect to local authorities).

“The Local Environment Management Plans will be significant documents. Experience suggests that simple consultation, in this case with local authorities, is not sufficient. Local authorities must have the power to require particular standards to be adhered to. Presumably many others will also be consulted.”

Chilterns Conservation Board

- 7.2.26 Some respondents ask that particular issues be covered in each LEMP, for example known areas and features of nature conservation, landscape and visual issues, local hydrology, geology, groundwater, watercourses, overland flow routes and flood plains, specific delivery times, dust and air quality, noise, vibration, historic environment, cumulative effects, site lighting remediation. There are also some requests for a standard LEMP template and for reassurance that all contractors would adhere to the principles given in LEMPs.
- 7.2.27 A number of specific issues are mentioned with respect to LEMP areas. For example, because the LEMP boundaries follow community forum area (CFA) boundaries, respondents say there would be increased complexity in agreeing local standards and measures where CFAs cross local authority boundaries.

Implementation: Site management, contractors' method statements and supervision

- 7.2.28 Few respondents comment explicitly on site management, method statements and supervision. Comments on site management include the need for extra policing in low crime areas that currently have zero policing, and a request for clearer language with respect to reinstating sites to the satisfaction of the local council or amenity group. Comments on method statements include the request that these also set out site security standards and measures, suggestions of specific coverage for these statements, and comments that these should be subject to approval from relevant stakeholders. Other comments on method statements and supervision tend to relate to the need for robust enforcement mechanisms as discussed in sections 7.1.21 - 7.1.23 above.

7.3 General requirements

Overview

- 7.3.1 Respondents discussing the general requirements as laid out in the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) often emphasise working hours, with many also mentioning community relations, site layout and location, and temporary living accommodation, with associated reference to local impacts due to the presence of the workforce.

Community relations

- 7.3.2 Several respondents perceive a need for HS2 to work with communities, local authorities and stakeholders on all aspects of construction, including agreement of procedures or measures, input into documentation such as the CoCP and LEMPs, involvement in or control of monitoring and enforcement, and the development on ongoing feedback mechanisms. Community forums, local partnerships, local councils and other specific stakeholders receive specific mention. The overarching message of the need to consult with the local community wherever possible emerges across a number of responses.
- 7.3.3 A relatively small number of respondents explicitly mention the need for a complaints system, body or helpline, particularly to report any non-compliance with the CoCP. Suggestions include a telephone number that operates 24/7, with expeditious response times, as well as a complaints process independent of HS2, a parliamentary ombudsman or independent complaints commissioner to adjudicate disputes, or a multi-stakeholder standing committee.

"I do urge you to adopt the solution which worked well for us at King's Cross which was a regular standing committee of contractors, developers and representatives of tenants and residents group - meeting every month and with a telephone hotline. It dealt with dust, noise, working-hours, vibration, severance and other issues very well."

KXRLG and Just Space

- 7.3.4 Likewise, the small claims procedure is mentioned by a relatively small number of respondents. There are a few requests for the ceiling to be increased above the current £7,500 (for example the suggestion of a £25,000 ceiling, or to increase the ceiling over time in line with inflation), as well as the implication that the phrase 'small claims' does not cover the degree of damage and impact that would be incurred as a result of the project. Some respondents think there is a need to impose a timescale on settlements and to ensure local awareness about the process that exists. Others are concerned that the small claims procedure is vague or uncertain and would favour the nominated undertaker.
- 7.3.5 Other comments regarding community relations include an expectation that parish councils would receive a budget to enable regular communications with residents. Specific requests are made for details of how construction timing and other events would be communicated to residents, provision of named personnel with contact numbers and proactive engagement at specific points (for example prior to tunnel boring machines passing under houses). There are also some comments on definitions around community engagement, for example suggestions that the current wording enables the nominated undertaker to opt out of community engagement by leaving it to the contractor, and a question over what constitutes 'reasonable steps' to engage.

Working hours

- 7.3.6 The issue of working hours draws the highest amount of comments of all the CoCP topics. The main concern among respondents is the possibility of longer or even 24/7 working hours, with particular concern about the resulting traffic, noise, light (particularly in winter), dust and vibration impacts on local communities throughout the construction period. Other related comments include statements that working through the night or on bank holidays and weekends is not acceptable, that hours should be more specifically restricted (for example to 8-5 on weekdays and 8-1 on Saturdays), and that cumulative noise levels over a 24-hour working period would be unacceptably high, particularly given the baseline noise levels of some rural communities.
- 7.3.7 Some respondents talk about a lack of clarity with respect to working hours generally, what kind of work is 24/7 and what is 8-6, and whether there are any likely restrictions on times of travel or delivery to sites. It is also suggested that there is a lack of consistency between the working hours as described in the draft Environmental Statement (ES) and the draft CoCP.
- 7.3.8 The need for mitigation and compensation is raised by a number of respondents, with suggestions including funding of double glazing for local residents and the provision of agreed "*hiatus periods*" from construction work. Other respondents discuss the need to undertake engagement with local councils and other stakeholders around construction timetables, as well as the necessity for HS2 to provide full justification for any work outside core hours.

“It is unacceptable to put forward a proposal for work to take place on the doorstep of private dwellings which involves substantial noise levels at night and weekends over a very substantial period of time, without indicating what the arrangements will be for the residents to maintain sanity and for compensation.”

Individual

Construction site layout and good housekeeping

- 7.3.9 The majority of comments in relation to construction site layout and good housekeeping focus on the actual location of specific sites. A number of respondents ask that sites should avoid specific areas, for example: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) or Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), specific communities or rural areas, other existing infrastructure such as transport hubs or emergency services through-routes, key habitats (for example for Red Listed farmland bird species) and other planned works such as tree planting. Others say the working area for certain sites is too large, that there are too many sites close together, or that there should be an assumption of the minimum possible land being used.

“I do not understand the need for 3 satellite construction camps so close together in our area. One camp would seem to minimise the amount of disruption particularly if it was serviced by a road alongside the route.”

Individual

- 7.3.10 Some respondents suggest what they view as better or preferred locations for specific sites, access roads or relief roads, while others ask for more detail on specific sites proposed (for example size, location, scale) or access points. Some perceive a need to consult locally on the size, location and impacts of working areas. For example, several respondents mention the Steeple Claydon railhead construction site, site compounds and Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD), expressing concern that local residents did not know about this until recently.

Worksite security, site lighting, hoardings, fencing and screening

- 7.3.11 Residents' safety and security is mentioned as a specific concern by some respondents, for example the safety or security of nearby property and communities during construction (with some referencing an influx of workers as a concern), and safety on local roads for drivers, cyclists or pedestrians due to increased construction traffic. In some cases specific roads or properties are mentioned in relation to traffic safety. Other concerns are asbestos release during demolition, risks to local residents from nearby stockpiling and excavation, and the need for safe and secure fuel storage.

- 7.3.12 Several respondents comment on fencing, expressing a range of views. Some suggest animal-proof or strong fencing, or request detail on fencing specifications that would keep pests and trespassers out. Others request that there be no flood lighting or security fencing (particularly high perimeter fencing or hoarding) used at all during construction, or are concerned about its presence. Other comments related to lighting and fencing include suggestions that site lighting be powered by the mains supply but otherwise by generators housed in sound-insulated containers, that green living walls or sensitive screening should be considered during construction to minimise visual impact, and that a study should be undertaken to develop an integrated solution to noise and security issues through the use of fencing.
- 7.3.13 A few respondents express concerns about the security of specific sites such as the proposed crossover headhouse near the Victoria Business Park in community forum area (CFA) 4, and the proposed planting area and reservoir near Attleboro Lane in CFA 22. Others would like further detail of overall security measures for the line and the IMD, with reference to past experience for example from the M6 Toll.
- 7.3.14 Other comments include a statement that fencing or hoarding would not mitigate visual or landscape impacts. A security impact statement is requested, alongside assurance that sufficient screening would be built to safeguard local communities or farms. The balance between safety requirements and community needs is also highlighted.

“The lighting of the site works and the working compound is also of concern and the balance between safety and security must be considered alongside the need not to generate nuisance to the community.”

Greatworth Parish Council

Unexploded ordnance

- 7.3.15 There are a very small number of references to unexploded ordnance with respect to the draft CoCP. These include references to an unexploded bomb in a field at Gilson and to construction sites in London that have already uncovered unexploded ordnances. Other respondents comment on the need for emergency response procedures to be agreed well in advance, and to consider potential temporary road closures, station closures and evacuations.

Temporary living accommodation

- 7.3.16 Many of the respondents mentioning temporary living accommodation express concern about the influx of workers, particularly in relation to transport, security, utilities, and social impact. Some state that temporary accommodation is not acceptable in a village environment. Views on transport are mixed. Some respondents say that the pressure of a new workforce on limited public transport would be too much, and that parking facilities would be needed; others (generally discussing less rural areas) say that public transport provision in their area is good and request that there be no additional parking. There is also a request for an assessment of impacts on local services.
- 7.3.17 Some respondents request more detail, for example regarding welfare facilities for workers and whether these would be self-contained. Others suggest alternative options to temporary accommodation such as hotels.

Clearance and re-instatement of sites on completion

- 7.3.18 The need to return land to its original use or state is discussed by a number of respondents especially in relation to agricultural land. More detailed comments are provided below in sections 7.3.5 – 7.3.10.

Pollution incident control

- 7.3.19 There are very few comments specifically on the topic of pollution incident control. Comments include the need for the Environment Agency and other environmental bodies to be directly involved in this aspect of the CoCP and the suggestion that the CoCP confirm that all pollution incidents would be reported to the Environment Agency immediately.
- 7.3.20 Other respondents suggest the need to take into account all ecological receptors (not just designated sites). It is also suggested that more rigorous standards should be applied in specific locations or overall (for example detail on the reporting process) and that training be undertaken and maps made available to contractors.

Interface management between adjacent construction areas

- 7.3.21 Comments on adjacent construction sites tend to focus on cumulative impacts, for example on air quality, community, environment, moorings and traffic, rather than interface management.

7.4 Management and mitigation of specific issues

Overview

- 7.4.1 Many respondents link their comments on the draft CoCP or overall construction activities to specific issues or potential impacts, or express concern specifically about construction when discussing ES topics or particular CFAs. Comments specific to individual CFAs are reported in the relevant sections of chapter 6 above. More general comments on issues or potential impacts explicitly relating to construction and the draft CoCP are summarised here. It should be noted that this section only includes comments where respondents explicitly mention construction, whereas in reality many other comments will implicitly relate to anticipated construction as well as or rather than operational impacts.

Mitigation

- 7.4.2 A number of respondents comment that the proposals in the draft CoCP are not enough to mitigate potential effects on air quality, landscape and other impacts. Others say that there is a lack of detail on specific measures to mitigate potential impacts, for example compensation for loss of trade, amelioration measures for round-the-clock construction, environmental mitigation, compensation for loss of buildings (including farms) and avoidance of traffic disruption. Several respondents judge specific commitments in the draft CoCP, for example “would be controlled and managed during construction”, to be inadequate.

“The draft Code of Construction Practice (part of the draft ES) sets out the standards and procedures for contractors to follow and should minimise the construction impacts on local communities. 51m is very concerned that it has very little in the way of protection and far more in the way of exception.”

51m alliance of Councils

- 7.4.3 Several respondents suggest specific mitigation or compensation measures that might be taken in relation to construction and/or included in the CoCP. These include commitments to restore land, enhancement of buildings or natural environments, provision of money for specific measures such as double glazing, provision of utility connections to specific areas and screening mechanisms to reduce visual and noise impacts. Some respondents think the cost of mitigation measures should be included in the overall budget for HS2.
- 7.4.4 A few respondents submit the same text supporting measures to reduce specific impacts: “We support the introduction of the Code of Construction practice and we support all necessary measures to reduce the impact on agriculture air quality visual intrusion and noise”.

Agriculture, forestry and soils

- 7.4.5 There are a number of comments explicitly citing anticipated construction impacts on agriculture, forestry and soils, often expressing concern that agricultural activity would be thwarted by permanent or temporary land loss, or by disruption from construction activities. Some respondents emphasise that construction sites would destroy or damage farmland and its setting, and register their concern about the time it would take for this land to recover. A few worry that damage to drainage could make fields unworkable beyond recovery. There are also comments highlighting a need to minimise agricultural land take.

“Under Ecology it very clearly states that contractors will reduce any habitat loss within the land provided for the project by keeping the working area to the minimum required for the construction project. The NFU feels that the same principle should be applied for agricultural land so that owners and occupiers can carry on farming as much land as possible next to the construction works.”

National Farmers' Union

- 7.4.6 Respondents commonly relate an anticipated loss of high quality farmland to construction activities. They call for the total potential loss of high grade land and its economic impact to be assessed, and for the proposals to include details regarding solutions, mitigation or compensation. For example, some respondents question how soil damage would be prevented or mitigated or ask for detail on soil replacement, structure and improvement.
- 7.4.7 Several respondents highlight an expectation that after the proposed construction activities land would be returned in a condition equivalent to or better than its pre-construction state.

“Agricultural land must be returned to an equivalent grade. Compaction of sub-soil must be reversed. Field drains must be reinstated. Hedgerows and trees must be protected and replaced.”

Various respondents

- 7.4.8 Others question when land would be returned and in what condition, for example requesting clarity over the phrase “agreed end use”, or ask whether land would be bought or rented from its current owner.

- 7.4.9 Maintaining access to fields and farm buildings during proposed construction is a concern for several respondents; others discuss the potential impacts of construction on agricultural vehicle movements. Potential impacts on crops or livestock are also mentioned, and one respondent suggests that stockpiling would be contrary to national food production policy in the UK. Others highlight a need for dust monitoring where fruit and vegetable crops are grown nearby, general impact of dust on crops, or a need to assess impacts on livestock, for example from vehicles, dust and noise.

“There is no evidence to say HS2 will not have an impact on livestock [...]. Evidence overseas has shown fertility and milk yields can be dramatically affected.”

Twyford Stop HS2

- 7.4.10 Other comments in relation to the impacts of construction on agriculture include a request for clearer definitions of “reasonable precautions” and “significant/not significant”. Respondents also highlight the need to take into account the seasonal nature of farming and forestry practices during assessments, as well as the special circumstances of farms with listed buildings. One respondent asks how HS2 Ltd would deal with land along the proposed route that is part of a location for planned construction site or compound, but which is under an ELS (Entry Level Stewardship) or HLS (Higher Level Stewardship) agreement with Natural England; another suggests trust funds for future management of land acquisitions, referring to HS1.

Air quality

- 7.4.11 Respondents discussing air quality in relation to proposed construction mostly focus on two issues: dust and emissions.

“During construction, air quality will be degraded by NO₂ and PM₁₀ emissions, and by dust generated during earthmoving or blown from stockpiles.”

Berkswell Parish Council and Balsall Parish Council

- 7.4.12 Comments on emissions often relate to anticipated construction traffic and, to a lesser extent, onsite emissions for example from machinery. Cumulative impacts with other or already busy roads are mentioned by some respondents; others highlight the number of heavy goods vehicle movements per day, or the potential impacts of displaced traffic. Some respondents comment specifically on traffic assessments.

“The assumptions for construction traffic and the subsequent emissions. The information on construction traffic impacts are scarce, but does show areas in Birmingham and London where congestion is likely to be a significant problem. A lorry moving swiftly on an open road emits a lot less than one stuck in busy urban traffic. This needs to be factored into the assessment.”

Buckinghamshire Councils

- 7.4.13 Several respondents mention a need for site-specific dust assessments, or raise the issue of dust in relation to the proposed demolition of property. Others suggest that the establishment of a dust emissions baseline and dust monitoring programme would be required, with the establishment of trigger levels and requirements, for example based on the NPPF Technical Guidance for Minerals (CLG, March 2012).

- 7.4.14 In relation to the impact of air quality on health and well-being, the proximity of proposed construction sites to residential areas, schools, hospitals, businesses, farms and protected sites such as SSSIs is of concern to respondents. Specific concerns are also expressed about the potential impact on older people, children and those with breathing difficulties. One respondent suggests the need for a health impact assessment of workers on site and their living accommodation- in addition to local communities and affected properties- in order to better determine air quality impacts.
- 7.4.15 Some respondents think the draft CoCP lacks detail on air quality impacts from proposed construction in various locations, and some question the assessment of airborne pollution during proposed construction, for example where the draft CoCP states “impact negligible”. Respondents also express concern over the length of time for which air quality would be impacted and over levels of air pollution particularly for locations close to multiple proposed construction sites. Suggestions are also made around restrictions or provisions for air pollution, as well as independently enforceable standards of operation. A few respondents question who would monitor air quality, with the suggestion that funding would be needed from HS2 Ltd should local councils be expected to undertake this work.
- 7.4.16 Some respondents think that the draft CoCP should be more specific where it states “where reasonably practicable”, as well as making overall comments suggesting the CoCP is insufficiently robust or effective with respect to air quality.

“In reality, significant emissions of dust are a natural consequence of major earthworks and the extent of emissions may be reduced by watering but never eliminated. No trigger levels for dust emissions have been included in the COCP. In addition, though the ‘relevant local authorities will be consulted regarding the monitoring procedures to be implemented,’ there is no allowance for the rigour of independent monitoring and enforcement required to safeguard the local community.”

Various respondents

- 7.4.17 Comments about mitigation include a number of detailed suggestions with regard to the management of potential construction activities:
- Routing construction traffic as far from sensitive receptors and Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) as possible, or take these into account during routing.
 - Use only construction machinery conforming to the latest standards.
 - Control construction dust through strict regulations for cleaning, watering, and sheeting.
 - Fit all road vehicles used on the construction of HS2 with engines which meet the EURO VI emission levels and low rolling resistance tyres to minimise fuel use.
 - Careful consideration of crushing locations and suitable permitting in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010.
 - Scheduling of operations to take into account peak pollution times, seasonal pollution fluctuations and other nearby construction activities.
 - Various other measures to reduce air pollution from dust or emissions.
 - With respect to mitigation measures and good practice, respondents suggest reference be made to:

- Guidance on the Assessment of the Impacts of Construction on Air Quality and the Determination of their Significance: Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM), January 2012.
- Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites: IAQM November 2012.
- Up-dated Guidance on Construction Site Evaluation Guidelines and Mitigation Measures: GLA Supplementary Planning Guidance Document.
- Best Practice Guidance: The Control of Dust and Emissions from Construction and Demolition: Mayor of London 2006.

Cultural heritage

- 7.4.18 A number of respondents comment on potential cultural heritage impacts in direct relation to the draft CoCP or explicitly focus on the construction impacts on cultural heritage.
- 7.4.19 A few respondents react positively to the inclusion of cultural heritage in the draft CoCP, for example saying that it has taken into account previously submitted comments.

“The section on Cultural Heritage in the draft Code of Construction Practice is broadly acceptable, in itself. However, the effect of construction of HS2 on the historic environment must be minimised as far as possible.”

Historic Houses Association

- 7.4.20 Some respondents are concerned about the proximity of proposed construction sites to heritage assets. The need to include undesignated assets in considerations is also highlighted, with mentions of sites newly identified as heritage or archaeological assets, as well as cultural venues.
- 7.4.21 Heritage agreements are mentioned by a few respondents. For example, there is a request that explicit mention be made to the status of registered parks and gardens in the context of a heritage agreement.
- 7.4.22 A number of respondents request further information on the extent of building condition surveys, monitoring and enforcement, with some expressing concern about compliance of contractors.

“The reality is that HS2 Ltd managers construction companies will be incentivised by bonus schemes that reward completion of the line at least on time and on budget. They will regard considerations about the historic environment and heritage assets as an impediment. They will have no incentive to take account of them during the course of normal working and every incentive to disregard them wherever possible. It is therefore essential that strong enforcement provisions be written into the CoCP to ensure that it is adhered to.”

Little Missenden Parish Council

- 7.4.23 A number of respondents highlight potential risks to cultural heritage arising from the proposed construction works, including the potential effect of reduced localised groundwater levels to listed buildings without modern foundations and the removal of remains from historic burial sites. A small number of respondents are concerned that the mitigation measures referred to in the draft CoCP are not clear or extensive enough.

“4.21 Para 8.1.2: As written this is a very general statement which does not actually say who will require what or how. We recommend that it is re-written as an obligation by HS2 Ltd to ensure that its contractors manage all works in accordance with appropriate specified standards and guidelines - Institute for Archaeologists, English Heritage etc.”

Oxfordshire County Council

- 7.4.24 Specific mitigation suggestions include funding local authorities to allow archaeologists and field officers to monitor construction works, HS2 Ltd and contractors involving suitable advisors, the introduction of staff induction and training programmes where appropriate, and keeping the mitigation strategy under review.
- 7.4.25 Some respondents mention archaeological remains as a specific consideration, for example arguing that these features should be respected during site reinstatement and that sufficient time should be allowed to investigate and record sites of archaeological importance. Other respondents request a clear course of action should artefacts of archaeological interest be found, with one respondent suggesting a commitment to depositing samples or finds with local museums or equivalent, and others mentioning provision for post-excavation analysis, publication and museum storage.

Ecology

- 7.4.26 Many comments on ecological issues relate to the construction phase, either implicitly or explicitly. As the overall comments on the ecology topic are discussed in detail in sections 5.2 and 5.3, only comments made in response to Question 3 are summarised here.
- 7.4.27 Commenting on the level of detail of the draft CoCP, respondents request to see reference to direct and indirect potential impacts, more detail on how ecosystems would be protected during proposed construction, definition of features of ecological importance, and more detail on specific protection measures or procedures.
- 7.4.28 Some respondents emphasise a need for continuous or up-to-date survey data to inform the baseline, sometimes adding that methods to reduce potential impacts would depend on the results of ecological surveys. With this in mind, respondents highlight that mitigation or compensation should be flexible to changes in baseline data and that the CoCP should be amended accordingly.

“9.1.1: states: ‘Appropriate measures will be adopted to protect the ecology of the area through which the route is constructed, with special attention to specified areas of ecological value, as identified within the ES’. This should be amended to state that ‘appropriate measures’ will be informed by up-to-date ecological survey information and not just limited to that reported in the ES.”

Various respondents

- 7.4.29 Respondents say they would like to see ecological audit and monitoring in place and the introduction of a commitment to induction and/or training on ecological receptors for the whole construction workforce “*with specialist inductions to be provided in work areas of particular sensitivity*”. Some believe there is a need to extend monitoring into the post-construction period until new habitats are established is, or request that monitoring would apply to statutory and non-statutory sites as well as individual species. One respondent suggests that monitoring and survey work should be informed by data from local environmental records centres, and that any additional survey data collected could be shared with these centres.
- 7.4.30 Specific habitats respondents have concerns about with respect to potential construction impacts include hedgerows, woodlands and watercourses. Some respondents suggest hedgerows and trees should be protected during proposed construction; others express concern that a focus on known areas of nature conservation would entail a risk of less consideration for the wider countryside.
- 7.4.31 Some respondents make detailed comments about specific flora and fauna they believe would be affected by proposed construction. In particular, the potential impact of construction dust on sensitive plant and animal species is raised as a concern, as is the potential impact of light pollution on bats and other nocturnal animals. A few respondents also discuss European Protected Species Licensing, for example asking whether overarching or site-wide licenses would be granted, and whether these would be informed by additional survey data prior to construction.
- 7.4.32 Respondents provide a number of specific comments on mitigation, with questions over how ecological mitigation would be provided, particularly when in conflict with site operational requirements, whether the nominated undertaker would be responsible for implementing any remedial action required and how long they would be responsible for maintenance of the land or habitat. Suggestions for remedial measures include scoping opportunities for ecological enhancement (or betterment), introducing reinstatement procedures for areas of temporary habitat loss, individual habitat or species management plans, and replacement of hedgerows and trees. However, other respondents argue that the destruction of ancient woodlands cannot be mitigated.

Ground settlement

- 7.4.33 Ground settlement is covered as a specific topic in the draft CoCP but not in individual CFA reports or the overarching Volume 1 report. Where respondents specifically mention ground settlement, they often focus on potential risks or impacts, assessment and monitoring, and mitigation or compensation. Several respondents believe there is a need for more detail on the proposed approach to ground settlement, as well as on localised risks and potential impacts.

- 7.4.34 Some respondents raise concerns about potential risks and impacts of ground settlement, and these include comments regarding specific geologies or lithologies, for example increasing the risk of damage or differential settlement in some areas. Respondents also express concern about potential destabilising effects of boring, tunnelling, or general ground vibration. Some highlight a need for specialist engineering experience with regard to tunnelling under old buildings of high heritage value with potentially vulnerable foundations. Respondents also mention potential impacts of settlement on water supply and wastewater infrastructure, or on water courses such as canals. Some argue problems with subsidence and building damage related to construction of HS1 are insufficiently acknowledged.
- 7.4.35 Respondents believe there should be designated limits to ground settlement as well as a clear monitoring process and a clear action process if ground settlement would occur. Some specify that ground surveys would be needed to review settlement effects, as well as a finer resolution of ground condition and geology assessments, and reference to historical data on settlement, collapse or subsidence.
- 7.4.36 Several respondents discuss mitigation with respect to ground settlement, expressing concern that the draft CoCP does not provide assurance either about prevention of damage or compensation in the case of damage. A number of respondents say that monitoring would not be enough or would do little to prevent settlement occurring.

“If the risk of settlement is not avoided, how far would it be limited? What limits would be considered acceptable? What mitigation would be provided for different limits and risks?”

Regent’s Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 7.4.37 Specific potential mitigation or compensation measures discussed by respondents include stabilisation of structures and compensation for loss of water flow or property damage.

Land quality

- 7.4.38 Many comments highlighting land quality issues relate to the proposed construction works, either implicitly or explicitly. As the overall comments on the ecology topic are discussed in detail in sections 5.2 and 5.3, only comments made in response to Question 3 are summarised here.
- 7.4.39 Where respondents mention potential construction impacts on land quality, they mostly raise concerns about contamination of ground or surface water. Other comments highlight issues around contamination of land and ground gas.
- 7.4.40 Some respondents suggest that soil assessments would require early consideration, as well as maximum containment standards and sampling frequency, and that the results of testing should be submitted to the local authority. Others say that any investigative procedures and remediation activities would need to be discussed and agreed with the local authority, or request more detail on the procedure for reporting and managing pollution incidents.

“Camden Council considers that more emphasis should be placed on the remediation strategies implemented being sustainable solutions.”

Camden Council

“5.10 Pollution incident control – The standards applied to the construction site at Chipping Warden are not rigorous enough. The site will exist for over 5 years. Standards for permanent structures should be applied. Examples would be demanding paved areas with drainage using oil and sediment interceptors for all standing areas for all vehicles to prevent pollution of groundwater.”

Individual

- 7.4.41 A few respondents are concerned that there is no mention of the potential sterilisation of mineral resources due to proposed construction, or of associated mitigation measures. Others say that the CoCP should focus on minimising the amount of primary aggregate potentially required and give detail of sourcing for primary aggregate, for example from local sources.
- 7.4.42 Other comments include requests from respondents that private water supplies or boreholes would be identified early, that ground gas monitoring would be carried out in accordance with applicable CIRIA guidelines, that boundaries and junctions of sub-soil would be taken into account, that reference to contaminated land be made in the CoCP, or that a commitment to restoring ground is made.

“This does not include a legal commitment for the full restoration of all damaged ground to its original state before the trains begin operating. This must be done.”

Individual

Landscape and visual

- 7.4.43 Light pollution is one potential visual impact highlighted in relation to construction. A number of respondents express concern about light from construction sites, particularly in locations where there are multiple proposed sites nearby, and in relation to nighttime construction work. Many comments emphasise the potential impacts of light pollution on communities or residential areas and the surrounding landscape, especially in rural areas.
- 7.4.44 Respondents mention a number of particular issues with relation to light pollution. Some identify a need for further studies or assessment, as well as clear restrictions and the implementation of the Lighting Management Plan (in some cases asking which organisation would be responsible for this). Some respondents suggest lighting arrangements should be agreed with the local community. Compensation for the potential effects of light pollution on communities is also suggested.
- 7.4.45 Respondents also make other comments with regard to the potential visual impacts of the proposed construction works, including expressions of concern over the potential visual impact of construction sites or major earthworks and the potential duration of the impact. A need to mitigate these potential impacts, for example through screening and other control measures is highlighted by several respondents, with some expressing a preference for natural topography over other screening measures.

“The major earthworks and construction of large structures cannot in reality be disguised by anything other than the natural topography of the land - except where unsightly spoil heaps are located between the worksites and public areas. The 'use of well maintained hoardings or fencing' will not hide the excavators, dump trucks, bulldozers, cranes and other miscellaneous items of major construction plant. Appropriate measures to reduce landscape, visual and other environmental impacts associated with temporary site offices and compounds' is so vague as to be meaningless. The only way to remove compounds from the public view is to locate them in an area screened by topography or woodland.”

Various respondents

- 7.4.46 One respondent says that the CoCP should take account of the statutory purpose of AONBs, requiring the contractor to take this into account throughout the proposed construction process, with independent inspection and monitoring.

Sound, noise and vibration

- 7.4.47 Many respondents comment on the relation between proposed construction and potential noise or vibration impacts. Often, respondents express concern about noise from construction, especially in rural areas with low background noise levels, but with regard to some urban areas as well. Respondents highlight the potential impacts on locations close to multiple construction sites, expressing concern about non-stop construction activity over many years, with associated impacts on health and well-being. Some respondents are concerned specifically about the noise that construction workers would make.

“The CoCP does not set a noise limit or even an expectation. Subject to a maximum of 55dB(A)LA eq, 1h (free field), contractors should aim to establish a noise limit at the noise-sensitive property that does not exceed the background level by more than 10dB(A). The limit set should be as near that level as practicable during normal working hours (07:00-19:00) and should not exceed 55dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field). Evening (19:00-22:00) limits should not exceed background level by more than 10dB(A) and night-time limits should not exceed 42dB(A) LAeq, 1h (free field) at noise-sensitive dwellings. Where tonal noise contributes significantly to the total site noise, it may be appropriate to set specific limits for this element.”

Individual

- 7.4.48 Some respondents express concern at the assumption in the draft CoCP that some areas would experience no significant effects, or suggest that in general noise and vibration issues have been underestimated in the ES.

“Given the timescale for the construction phase the noise should be looked at in the same way as operational noise and the same standard of mitigation should be applied too. Noise impacts from ground breaking, contouring, heavy machinery, lorry movements, rail grinding etc on and away from the route must be considered.”

Various respondents

- 7.4.49 A number of respondents comment on the assessment of potential local impacts, with one suggesting noise contour maps for proposed construction compounds or works. A number of others express concern that “Best Practicable Means” is not adequate, arguing that they would need further assurances about how this would be determined.

- 7.4.50 A number of respondents request further detail about potential effects and mitigation measures, with some arguing proposed mitigation measures are lacking or insufficient. One respondent suggests that proposals for noise insulation and temporary rehousing do not seem to consider business or farm premises. There are also several suggestions or requests regarding mitigation, including continued noise monitoring, provision of compensation and temporary housing, use of enclosed workshops, limiting working hours, property surveys, and health impact assessments.

“In addition, it is imperative that greater screening of properties adjacent to works is addressed by measures such as noise barriers and green screening running behind and between the back gardens of all affected properties[...] Noise barriers should be aesthetically pleasing, well maintained and sympathetic to the surrounding environment.”

Ealing Council

- 7.4.51 However, others express concern that it would be difficult to reduce noise and vibration once work has started, as well as commenting that the proposals in the draft CoCP would not be effective at reducing effects. Some respondents express specific concern about it not making provision for limiting working hours, which would be *“the only way to reduce the impact on the community”* according to some. Respondents go on to argue that assessment and agreement of proposed construction activities and working hours should take place on a case-by-case basis with a process for local agreement, in order to help manage potential noise effects.
- 7.4.52 Several respondents discuss the ability of local authorities to control noise during construction, with particular reference to Section 61 applications. There are suggestions that the CoCP should provide clarity about how the process for Section 61 applications would work, and how enforcement would be carried out.
- 7.4.53 The potential impact of sound and vibration from construction traffic is mentioned by a number of respondents. Some express general concern about potential impacts on residents and properties, including businesses. Others specifically mention vibration issues in relation to proposals to route construction traffic on roads seen as unsuitable for this purpose. In relation to this, some respondents request more detailed assessments or monitoring of potential noise and vibration, while others suggest mitigation measures including sound insulation of potentially affected properties.
- 7.4.54 Some respondents highlight the potential sound and vibration impacts from tunnelling, with concern over the effects this could have on residents and businesses, particularly if it would occur at night. Respondents would like the CoCP to provide greater detail with regard to pre-notification, complaints, and the proposed handling of allegations of minor property damage caused by tunnel boring machines. Some respondents suggest that local circumstances should be considered, or whether question whether the principle of 24-hour tunnelling would be non-negotiable. Others request more detail on compensation for nearby properties and stress a need to consider measures for vulnerable residents, such as temporary rehousing.

Traffic and transport

- 7.4.55 Many respondents comment that they are concerned about the potential impact of construction traffic. Anticipated congestion is a common concern in responses, with related concerns about potential safety and environmental impacts. Respondents mostly mention anticipated HGV movements, as well as potential additional road traffic from construction workers travelling to and from sites. Where respondents cite specific roads this is picked up in the relevant CFA sections in chapter 6.
- 7.4.56 Commenting on anticipated construction traffic, a number of respondents ask for further detail and localised publication of information on authorised routes, penalties and Traffic Management Plans. Similar comments are made with regard to proposed mitigation measures and monitoring plans, which some local authorities would expect to be consulted on. Several respondents suggest the construction of dedicated haulage roads in specific areas, and underline the need for “*extra precautions*” at accident hotspots. Other mitigation suggestions from respondents (other than rerouting) include avoiding peak hours and prioritising the use of rail over roads. Some respondents say the CoCP should include a commitment to repair any damage caused, or to return roads to their original condition and width, as well as a commitment to ongoing highway maintenance.

“It is unclear as to whether local roads will be upgraded to accommodate heavy lorries as they are currently little more than country lanes and should be returned to this state after construction is complete in keeping with an AONB”

Individual

- 7.4.57 Some respondents highlight potential impacts of construction traffic on other road users, including cyclists, pedestrians (especially children), cars, taxis and buses. Comments regarding cyclists and pedestrians tend to emphasise safety concerns, with suggestions for mitigation measures such as approved driver training, cycle sensors, foot- and cycle path diversions, clear signage, localised speed limits, and wide nearside carriageways. Reference is made to documents such as the Transport Research Laboratory report, the ICE State of the Nation report on Transport, and the All Party Parliamentary Report to Get Britain Cycling, as well as to other projects thought to have displayed good practice.

“We are keen that the draft Code of Construction Practice and all other key policies relating to the use of HGVs and other machinery which moves on the public highway take the same concern for the welfare of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists as you are showing for your own employees. We consider Crossrail to have done well in this regard and would see their efforts as a minimum.”

Hammersmith and Fulham Cyclists

- 7.4.58 With respect to cars, other than concerns about expected congestion and reduced road safety, a relatively small number of respondents specifically discuss parking as a potential issue. One concern noted is that construction workers would take up parking spaces. The potential impact on bus routes due to diversions and stop closures is another issue raised by respondents, as is the possible impact on public transport and taxis.
- 7.4.59 The potential impact of proposed construction or demolition of bridges on wider transport is mentioned as a specific concern by a relatively small number of people.

Waste and materials

- 7.4.60 Excavated material and its associated potential impacts are of concern to many respondents. A number of respondents, including an organised response, request further detail on the proposed disposal of excavated material in their local area. Others are concerned about the anticipated quantity of excavated material destined for transportation or stockpiling. Details of proposed transportation and, more specifically, the inclusion of an assessment of vehicle movements due to movement of excavated material are requested by several respondents, many of whom state concern about related traffic impacts and disruption. The proposed use of excavated material for bunds and landscaping is also discussed by some respondents.
- 7.4.61 Some respondents would like the CoCP to include a commitment to transporting waste by sustainable or less locally impactful means where possible, for example via existing rail routes or not at night; others suggest greater weighting towards the waste hierarchy to reduce, reuse, and recycle anticipated construction waste where possible. There are also comments that the CoCP should acknowledge the need for planning permissions for the expected disposal of waste off-site, and a request for clarity over proposed landfill and waste management sites.

Water resources and flood risk

- 7.4.62 As discussed in paragraph 7.4.39 above, potential contamination of surface and groundwater due to construction is of concern to a number of respondents. Other respondents suggest that surface drainage might be interrupted by construction and thus increase flood risk, requiring that existing drainage would be maintained during proposed construction or at least reinstated afterwards.
- 7.4.63 Some respondents highlight a need for local and up-to-date assessments of, for example, hydrology, groundwater, watercourses and flood risk, and for detail on monitoring, enforcement and compliance in the CoCP. There are also requests that all relevant evidence bases take into account local, national and international plans and policies with respect to flooding and water quality.
- 7.4.64 A number of respondents request that non-mains water supplies would also be protected from contamination or damage resulting from proposed construction.
- 7.4.65 Some respondents suggest potential mitigation and compensation measures, including limited discharge rates, compensation for stockpiling in floodplains, cessation of activities and early reporting in the case of contractors uncovering drainage systems.

Community and socio-economics

- 7.4.66 Although not contained within the draft CoCP as a specific section, a number of respondents comment on the potential impact of construction on communities and socio-economic factors. These are discussed where relevant in other sections of this chapter, while wider community issues are covered in sections 5.2 and 5.3, and issues specific to particular CFAs in the relevant sections of chapter 6.

- 7.4.67 Potential impacts on local communities, including community safety, are frequently highlighted as a concern with regard to proposed construction works. Respondents also express concerns about impacts on children or schools, cumulative effects, impacts on specific facilities or amenities, business and employment impacts, effects on health and quality of life, property damage or structural issues, and impacts on property values.

Management of other issues

- 7.4.68 The risk of damage to utilities as a result of proposed construction activities is mentioned by a number of respondents, alongside the perceived need to assess this risk and make provision for mitigation or compensation requirements.
- 7.4.69 Other respondents comment on carbon emissions from construction, expressing concern about the potential overall carbon footprint of proposed construction (including construction traffic) and anticipated impacts on the micro or macro climate as a result, with some requests for more detailed modelling or account of specific issues.

“Originally this project was deemed to be carbon friendly however only cursory reference is made in the Non-Technical Summary. Carbon emissions in the manufacture of cement and steel, no doubt in France and India need to be considered. The proposed speed requires generation of huge quantities of electricity.”

Individual

- 7.4.70 Some respondents discuss the proposed construction of specific features such as bridges. Comments on potential effects of specific structures are summarised in the relevant CFA sections in chapter 6.

Chapter 8 Other sections of the draft Environmental Statement

Introduction

- 8.1.1 This chapter summarises comments on other sections of the draft Environmental Statement (ES) documentation not specifically covered elsewhere in this report, namely the appendices to Volume 1 (Sustainable design aims, HS2 sustainability Policy, Maps and list of CFAs), the map books, and the glossary of terms.

8.2 Appendices

Appendix A: Sustainable design aims

- 8.2.1 There are a small number of direct and indirect references to Appendix A (sustainable design aims) across all questions. The sustainable design aims contain four priorities, with between one and four specific design aims sitting beneath each priority. The four priorities are: reduce greenhouse gas emissions and combat climate change (design aims 1 and 2), protect natural and cultural resources and enhance the environment (design aims 3 and 4), create sustainable communities (design aims 5, 6, 7 and 8), and achieve sustainable consumption and production (design aim 9).
- 8.2.2 Comments on specific design aims include the following:
- A suggestion that instead of simply avoiding any increase in flood risk (design aim 2), the Proposed Scheme should provide betterment over the existing situation.
 - A suggestion to amend design aim 2 (managing flood risk) to avoid any increase in flood risk from all sources.
 - Support for design aim 3 (protecting natural resources) but disappointment that there is no clear commitment to the government's policy objective to achieve a net gain to nature from development, and a suggestion that this is amended accordingly.
 - A suggestion to amend design aim 3 to reflect an aspiration for no obstructions or constraints in attaining Good Ecological Status/Potential in the future.
 - Clarification of design aims 4 and 5 requested.
 - A comment that design aim 5 (controlling noise and vibration) is not supported by sufficient data on noise effects.
 - A concern that design aim 7 would not be delivered by severing public rights of way and rerouting them alongside busy roads.
- 8.2.3 One respondent comments specifically on the sustainable design aims in relation to CFA 21, stating that priorities 3 and 4 are currently not achieved here based on current plans. The same respondents states that priority 2 has been largely ignored with respect to CFA 21, as well as suggesting a mitigation measure that would help to achieve priorities 2 and 3 of the sustainable design aims.

- 8.2.4 Other respondents state that the Proposed Scheme fails to deliver priority 2 in CFA 21 due to the poor provision of mitigation or lack of regard to local environmental protection policies in this area.
- 8.2.5 Respondents also comment that priority 2 is an example of a high standard that would not be delivered, that HS2 would not create sustainable communities (priority 3), and that the Proposed Scheme overall would not conform to the four priorities of the sustainable design aims (with specific examples given in some cases).

“Taken together HS2AA believe HS2 contradicts the core principles of sustainability-which should lie at the heart of all Government policy making. Indeed so deep are the problems with HS2 HS2AA believe that HS2 should be cancelled on sustainability grounds alone.”

(HS2 Action Alliance)

- 8.2.6 A small number of respondents request the inclusion of relevant details in the Formal ES that demonstrate the sustainable design aims have been included, for example details of specifications and alternatives using a cost-benefit analysis. There is also a request for detail of the internal assurance and verification processes for the design aims, and concern that the main driver for the design process is cost control rather than other considerations.

Appendix B: Sustainability Policy

- 8.2.7 See sections 7.1.13 – 7.1.16 in chapter 7 above for a summary of comments on the HS2 sustainability policy.

Appendix C: Maps

- 8.2.8 There appear to be no comments specifically relating to the Appendix C maps in the draft ES. Comments addressing the more detailed mapping of each CFA as covered in the map books are summarised in section 8.2 below.

Appendix D: List of CFAs

- 8.2.9 There are no comments specifically on Appendix D, the list of CFAs.

Suggested appendices

- 8.2.10 Some respondents request that specific or more detailed information be included in the formal ES as appendices, including:
- Key assumptions upon which the preparation of noise contours has been based.
 - List of heritage assets with the results of the matrix for establishing overall significance of impacts recorded against each one (referencing the ZTV).
 - Technical notes on fieldwalking and geophysical survey, and scoping methodology (referencing the archaeological potential of the route).
 - Calculations and assumptions associated with estimated job losses.
 - Details on proposed infrastructure features, for example dimensions of twin track layout, and typical layouts and dimensions of screening measures such as fencing.
 - Other details on the calculation of ‘likely significant effects’ and mitigation measures.

“We have found it difficult to assess critically the process by which ‘likely significant effects’ (in the terms of the 2011 Regulations) have been arrived at, or to assess the mitigation proposed, without the technical appendices which would normally accompany an Environmental Statement.”

English Heritage

8.3 Map books

- 8.3.1 Across all responses, there are a number of comments on the maps and photomontages, in some cases making direct references to specific map sheets for individual community forum areas (CFAs). General comments or issues with the maps and photomontages are summarised below.
- 8.3.2 There are several comments on the maps, particularly in relation to perceived inaccuracies or missing features, for example:
- Inconsistencies between the maps and the text in the draft Environmental Statement (ES) or CFA reports.
 - Mislabelling of footpaths as roads and other issues with the labelling of public rights of way and roads, including alterations to the highway network and temporary diversions of public rights of way appearing to be missing or inaccurate on the maps.
 - Missing properties, assets or features on maps, including proposed haul roads, proposed construction areas, proposed planting areas and flood storage areas, proposed overbridges, green roads, watercourses, cemeteries, schools or children’s services, community centres, conservation and other designated areas (including Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation – SINCs), ancient woodlands, public open spaces or parks, surface water flood risk, bridges, land of agricultural value, archaeological areas, Green Belt areas, and undesignated ecological or environmental assets (including proposed wildlife sites and other records such as from Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre).
 - Inaccurate naming or misnaming of specific features or properties, as well as comments that maps are out of date and concern that specific streets are not labelled.
 - Inaccurate mapping, for example of properties, proposed land take areas, planting areas, natural features, and current or proposed infrastructure (for example vent shafts and viaducts).
 - Lack of definition of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). Lack of visual receptor points.
 - Lack of definition between temporary and permanent land acquisition.
 - Mislabelling of the status of listed buildings and no inclusion of undesignated heritage assets.
 - Concern that additional settlements be included in the annotated towns and cities along the route.
 - Concern over the labelling of drainage channels as ‘new watercourses’.
 - Confusion over why residential and commercial areas are marked as a potential source of pollution.
 - Lack of detail on how the proposed HS2 line relates to the existing Network Rail line.
 - Unexplained features appearing on maps.

"The maps include several unexplained features - e.g. CT-05-032-03 - which shows a large construction area in a field, but this does not appear anywhere else, nor is any reason given for it."

Individual

- 8.3.3 Other respondents request additional maps or images showing aspects such as wider construction or haulage routes, impact of construction site lighting, LIDAR (a remote sensing technology) images, aerial photographs of the ZTV, a larger scale at specific areas (for example the gap at Calvert), sensitive ecological areas and buffer zones where pollutants are to be stored or used, Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitats, ground contours or underlying geography, and visualisation of which land parcels have and have not been accessible for assessment of ecological and other impacts.
- 8.3.4 One respondent comments that the inadequacies of the maps and plans provided may have deterred people from responding to the consultation as this would have hampered their ability to comment.
- 8.3.5 Respondents make other comments on the maps such as observations that the line has changed position on some maps or may not exactly match the final route, and a belief that the maps contain too much information in general but too little local information.
- 8.3.6 Some respondents make general comments about a lack of overall explanation or clarity associated with the maps, for example that there are no titles on the maps, the colour key is confusing, the key is applied inconsistently or is generally poor, it is difficult to identify certain features, and that there is a lack of consistency between maps for different CFAs (for example different ordering of maps from north to south and vice versa). Others say that the file sizes are too large, that the maps are cumbersome and not sequential, that all maps should have been available in hard copy, and that some libraries were not sufficiently supplied with relevant map books.
- 8.3.7 A number of respondents comment on the noise contour maps, specifically:
- Concern that the maps are based on average, rather than peak noise levels, and that they only provide information for a fixed height above ground (with additional comments that this should be made clearer).
 - Inaccurate calculation of sound levels, primarily underestimation of levels generally or in specific areas, as well as failure to take account of specific winds, the distance sound can travel across open space, and the potential for sound amplification from specific features.
 - Poor definition of the communities identified as potentially significantly affected, or lack of information for local residents to determine probable noise impacts.
 - Requests that levels be calculated for a wider area (for example up to 1km or 2km away from the line), that areas of lower decibel levels be shown (for example 40dB, with reference to the World Health Organisation), and for more detailed impact levels to be provided.
 - Comment that the measurements used are unsuitable for a rural community.
 - Concern that night time noise levels would be of higher impact than shown on the maps due to annoyance and sleep disturbance effects.
 - Surprise or suspicion at the relatively small predicted noise transmissions impacts for specific areas.

“We are surprised to see a relatively small impact in noise transmission from the Crackley Brook viaduct up the Coventry Road towards Kenilworth. We would like to see much greater detail in relation to all noise mitigation measures that will be employed within the Crackley Gap – earth bunding, barriers etc.”

Crackley Residents Association

“SV-01-63 & SV-01-64 completely unbelievable that HS2 are suggesting we are naive enough to believe that noise will not effect woodend common barn farm and woodend long barn.”

Bromley Hayes Cattery

- Lack of representation of envisaged barrier locations.
- A desire for the calculation and presentation of baseline noise levels, noise levels during the construction phase, noise levels from two trains passing, ground borne vibration, and additional noise levels from night-time maintenance, stations and diverted traffic.
- No indication of how sound levels were calculated and questions over the exact nature of calculations.

“We understand that the noise profile maps are derived from projections based on present estimates of rolling stock noise characteristics and we would ask for clarification / confirmation of the following detail points: 1/ That noise levels are expressed as dB(A). 2/ That the noise profiles contain a degree of pessimism-bias in respect of; assumed wind strength and direction; and other atmospheric conditions such as air temperature, air pressure and relative humidity. 3/ The exact conditions upon which the noise figures are predicted at the location of Glebe Farm (229-2-001). 4/ That the noise maps are intended (as stated by HS2 staff) to form an eventual 'contract' against which future actual noise levels may be compared.”

Individual

- Too many caveats for the contour maps to be deemed acceptable.
- Questions or comments about the type of train used, which could make a difference to current maps.
- Concern that some affected areas do not yet have detailed noise contour maps (for example the East Acton area).
- Other suggestions for improvements or additions.

“Environmental baseline - agree that use of GLA produced maps is preferable to Defra's. A map showing the location of the relevant boroughs' air quality monitoring sites within the area would be useful in this section. Potentially sensitive receptors could also be illustrated on a map to show proximity to the key construction sites.”

(London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham)

8.3.8 There are again several comments on the photomontages, particularly in relation to inaccuracies or missing features, for example:

8.3.9 Inconsistencies between the maps or photomontages and the text in the draft ES or CFA reports.

- 8.3.10 Comments that photomontages are inaccurate, for example not showing the correct height of the line, showing the wrong and/or mislabelled compass direction, or incorrectly naming the exact location from which the photo was taken.
- 8.3.11 Concern over representation of specific impacts or features in the photomontages, for example overhead lines and gear, pylons and substations not being shown, and concern that replacements for certain country lanes shown in photos appear to be roads rather than similar lanes.
- 8.3.12 Comments that some photos are taken from an 'unusual' or less common angle, don't show views from particular locations, don't give an accurate picture of affected communities, or underplay the true (particularly visual) impacts of the line. Some respondents argue that the photos are deliberately misleading and give a false sense of reality due to the lighting, colours, camera angle or lens, or selective choice of location.
- 8.3.13 Lack of adequate mitigation represented by some photos (for example planting, balancing ponds, and acoustic earthworks provision), or a lack of consistency between how mitigation measures are described in the text and how they appear in the photos.
- 8.3.14 Other specific comments on the photomontages include requests for more, and more accurate, visual representations of the fully operational line generally or in certain locations (including various rural or sensitive locations, locations of vent shafts and other features, and other locations such as key watercourses and the proposed Leeds Junction), and requests for more middle- and long-distance views. One respondent asks for clarification of the methodology used to produce the photomontages.
- 8.3.15 Some respondents request more detailed drawings or visual representations (including CAD drawings and wireframe images) of proposed features such as viaducts, tunnel portals, depots and autotransformer stations. Others request more longitudinal or cross-section drawings, or say that the photomontages are not sufficient.

"Sections and longitudinal section drawings are required as part of the ES in order to appreciate the full visual, acoustic and landscaping impact of the railway."

Various respondents

"We would submit that the photography and photomontages produced by HS2 Ltd do not comply with the Landscape Institutes Advice Note 01/11 in that 'two dimensional photography and photomontages alone cannot capture or reflect the complexity underlying the visual experience.'"

Priors Hardwick HS2 Action Group

8.4 Glossary of terms

- 8.4.1 A relatively small number of respondents refer explicitly to the glossary of terms produced as part of the draft Environmental Statement (ES) set of documents. One respondent suggests an individual list for each community forum area (CFA) report to provide location-specific definitions, while others express disquiet that they did not receive the glossary automatically when they were sent other draft ES documents – this relates to a wider comment about a perceived lack of a document list and the need to request documents separately rather than being sent them all.
- 8.4.2 Words or phrases that appear to be missing from the glossary are pointed out by some respondents, for example 'isolation effect' and 'green tunnel'. Other respondents raise concerns about specific definitions, for example best practical means, scheduled monument, and public rights of way.

“Within the 'Glossary of terms and list of abbreviations', the term 'road used as a public path' used as the definition for Public Rights Of Way no longer exists following the enactment of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 s47(2). The term Restricted Byway should be used. A byway is more correctly known as a Byway Open to All Traffic.”

Warwickshire County Council

- 8.4.3 Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council in particular makes several suggestions for additions or amendments to the glossary. A small number of respondents, including the National Trust suggests the need for the production of a single comprehensive technical glossary, including relevant EU and Environmental regulations.

8.5 Other documents

- 8.5.1 There are no explicit comments on the guide to draft Environmental Statement (ES) topics or the draft ES event schedule.

Chapter 9 Other comments

Introduction

- 9.1.1 This chapter summarises comments on the HS2 project overall and any other comments not directly related to the scope of the consultation on the draft Environmental Statement (ES).

9.2 Comments on the HS2 project

- 9.2.1 Many respondents to the consultation express general opposition to the HS2 project, sometimes also saying that it is unfeasible, disruptive, or not in the national interest. Comments also contrast specific local impacts, to a perceived lack of local benefits. Some respondents say that the fact they have responded to the consultation should not be seen as support for the Proposed Scheme.

“The Solihull MBC response should be read in the context of the Council’s High Speed Rail Policy, which supports the principle of High Speed Rail, provided that: The economic benefits can be captured effectively in the local area. Effective environmental mitigation measures can be secured in Solihull.”

Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council

- 9.2.2 A large number of respondents question the strategic or economic case for HS2. By far the most prevalent of these comments is that the reduced journey times are not sufficient justification for the Proposed Scheme to go ahead. Respondents also suggest that HS2 is a vanity project or that it lacks a robust cost-benefit analysis. Some respondents are concerned that the fares would be unaffordable to many people. Others question the demand predictions, with several commenting that improved technology has or will decrease the need for travel. It is also suggested that figures on the strategic case should have been part of this consultation.

“...the production of information regarding mode shift, increase/reduction in vehicle-kilometres and person kilometres by mode, journey time savings, increased frequency and capacity are fundamental aspects to the case for the HS2 project and an assessment of its aspects. In the absence of this information, the consultation is incomplete and flawed. It does not enable consulted parties to understand, consider and comment upon the proposals in a comprehensive manner.”

Camden Council

- 9.2.3 Other comments specific to capacity include suggestions that HS2 would constrain future capacity for certain other services such as the North London Line, and that speed and capacity are being confused in relation to the HS2 project.

- 9.2.4 Another common area of concern for respondents is the perceived high cost of the project. Comments in relation to cost include the suggestion that the project is a waste of money, or specifically taxpayers' money, with expressions of concern about the scheme's increasing costs and some comments about spending money on HS2 in times of austerity.
- 9.2.5 Several respondents say that money would be better spent on alternatives, or ask for a comparative cost for alternative solutions. Others suggest that alternatives have not been properly considered. This includes comments on strategic transport alternatives, routing alternatives and local options, as well as the suggestion of alternative financial outlay on non-transport issues such as health, education and energy. Many respondents do not provide specific suggestions for strategic alternatives, although there is mention of improvement of existing rail lines or services as an alternative to HS2.
- 9.2.6 A number of respondents raise the issue of equity in relation to the HS2 project. Most of these respondents say that too few people would benefit from the Proposed Scheme. Others comment on issues of regional equity, primarily saying that HS2 would not benefit the North, or would benefit London and the Southeast most.
- 9.2.7 Some respondents express explicit support for HS2 or high speed rail in general, for example saying that it would help the national economy, assist the decarbonisation of the economy, and would improve north-south links or bring local benefits. Others attach caveats to their support, stating for example that it is subject to specific issues (both local and general) being dealt with in the Environmental Statement (ES), subject to particular mitigation measures being put in place, and subject to other specific points such as taking into account future transport links.
- 9.2.8 Future-proofing is an issue raised by a small number of respondents, who highlight a need to take into account future transport links or other developments both locally and nationally, as well as taking into account potential future design standards, capacity needs and technical advances.

"If the scheme is confirmed by Parliament, it needs to become an exemplar scheme worthy of the nation, particularly as it is the latest transport infrastructure project in UK history. As it stands it will fundamentally & permanently alter communities to the detriment and needs to be radically redesigned."

South Northamptonshire Council

- 9.2.9 Some respondents believe that HS2 will damage the reputation of the incumbent political parties, or that as a world leader on environmental protection the UK should take more care with its own environment.
- 9.2.10 A small number of respondents comment on safety and security in relation to HS2, expressing concern that the line could be a target for terrorists or sabotage, or emphasising the risk of major accidents.
- 9.2.11 Other comments include comparisons with HS1, as well as references to Phase 2 of the Proposed Scheme.

9.3 Other comments

- 9.3.1 A relatively small number of respondents provide submissions to the separate HS2 Design Refinement consultation as part of their submission to the draft ES consultation.
- 9.3.2 Other comments on politics refer to the overall political landscape as well as to specific political parties or individuals.

Appendices

Appendix 1 List of participating organisations

1. Table A1.2a, starting on the next page, lists the names of all the organisations which submitted responses to the HS2 Draft Environmental Statement 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 they did not classify themselves. Categorisation of responses was carried out separately from coding and does not affect the way in which coding is carried out. The sectors are listed below in Table A1.1, and the organisations on the following page.

Table A1.1 Respondent sectors

Sectors
Member of the public*
Action group – includes interest groups campaigning on various aspects of the high speed rail network proposals
Business – national or international
Business – local or regional
Elected representatives – includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors
Environment, heritage, amenity or community group – includes environmental groups, schools, church groups, residents' associations, recreation groups, rail user groups and other community interest organisations
Local government – includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships
Other campaign/representative group – includes chambers of commerce, trade unions, political parties and professional bodies
Real estate, housing associations, or property related

* names not included in the following table

Table A1.2a Responding organisations by sector

Action Group
51m alliance of 19 Councils
Amersham Action Group
Boddington Action Group
Burton Green Residents' Association and Burton Green HS2 Action Group
Chalfonts NO to HS2
Chiltern Ridges HS2 Action Group
Coleshill Action Group
Drayton Bassett Action Group
Great Missenden Stop HS2 Group
Heart of England High Speed Railway Action Group
HS2 Action Alliance
HS2 Amersham Action Group
HS2 Euston Community Forum
Kings Bromley Stop HS2 Action Group
Ladbroke Action Group
Little Missenden Action Group
Marston Against HS2
Middleton HS2 Action Group
North Ealing Against HS2
Pan-Camden HS2 Alliance
Potter Row Action Group
Priors Hardwick HS2 Action Group (PHAG)
South Heath Stop HS2 Action Group
Southam Area Action Group
Stoke Mandeville Action Group (SMAG)
Stoneleigh Action Group
Stop HS2
Stop HS2 Kenilworth Action Group Ltd
Stop the Tunnels, North Westminster & Harrow Road against HS2
Twyford Stop HS2
Wendover HS2 Group
Business - national or international
Aero Engine Controls
Birmingham Airport Ltd
Chiltern Railways
DHL UK & Ireland
Freightliner Group
Friend Life
Garden and Leisure Group Ltd (GLGL)
Genting Solihull Ltd and Genting Casinos UK Ltd ("Genting")
Goodman
Guernsey Global Trust Ltd
Heathrow Airport

Heathrow Express Operating Company Ltd
Heathrow Hub Ltd
Highways Agency
IBM UK Ltd
IM Properties
Merck Sharp & Dohme Ltd and Intervet UK Production Ltd
National Express Bus
National Grid
Network Rail
Royal Mail Group Ltd – Green Park Way
Royal Mail Group Ltd - Castle Bromwich delivery office
Savannah Hotels
Scottish Widows Plc
SJ Berwin LLP
TB Resort Holdings S.a.r.l.
Tower Transit Operations Ltd
Business - local or regional
A J Owen & Sons
Andrew Garnett - Architect
Bickerton's Aerodromes Ltd
BF Humphrey & Sons
Bimsy Ltd
Bromley Hayes Cattery
Bronze Arrow Ltd
C J Pusey Discretionary Trust
C M Brown & Co Ltd
Chesham Glass Company
Chetwode Manor Farms
Curzon Park Ltd
F Thame & Sons
Foxtons Ltd
Furzen Hill Farm
Hodge Jones & Allen LLP
J Hubbard & Son Ltd
J.H. Brunt & Son
John Watts Farms
Kibble&Sons
Morrells Farming Ltd
Musk Marine Sales (Harefield)
National Exhibition Centre
New Kingswood Farm Ltd
Norman Hague and Son Ltd
Pearce Family Farms
R.A.E. Wilson and Son
R.W. Wilcox Ltd
Shenstone and District Car Club Ltd
Smith Brothers Farms Ltd

Stanley Sidings Ltd
Steve Dent Ltd
Top Hat & Tails Kennels & Cattery Nursery Cottage
Townshend Partners
Warden Farm
Washbrook Farm
Whitmans Farm
Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC, Camden Town
Elected representatives
Andrea Leadsom Member of Parliament for South Northamptonshire
Catherine Fulljames Councillor for Oxfordshire County Council: Ploughey Division
Cheryl Gillan, Member of Parliament for Chesham and Amersham
Chris Naylor Ward Councillor for the Camden Town and Primrose Hill
Chris Williams Councillor for Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
Christopher Pincher Member of Parliament for Tamworth
Dan Byles Member of Parliament for North Warwickshire
David Lidington Member of Parliament for Aylesbury
Dominic Grieve Member of Parliament for Beaconsfield
Frank Dobson Member of Parliament for Holborn and St Pancras
Heather Johnson Councillor for Regents Park Ward
Jeremy Wright Member of Parliament for Kenilworth & Southam
John Bercow Member of Parliament for Buckingham
John Chilver Steeple Claydon Ward for Aylesbury Vale District Council
John Randall Member of Parliament for Uxbridge & South Ruislip
John Whitehouse Councillor for Kenilworth Abbey Division
Navin Shah London Assembly Labour Member for Brent
Nick Hurd Member of Parliament for Ruislip, Northwood & Pinner
Sarah Hayward Leader Camden Council & Sir Edward Lister Deputy Mayor of London
Environment, heritage, amenity or community group
117 Parkway Residents' association
A Coventry Way Association
Adelaide Local Nature Reserve
Alexandra & Ainsworth Tenants and Residents' Association
Amersham & District Residents' Association
Ascol Drive & Cranage Villas Residents' Association
Aylesbury Park Golf Club Ltd
Ballinger Road Residents' Association

Balsall Common Village Residents' Association
Banbury Ornithological Society
Bat Conservation Trust
Berkswell Clay Pigeon Club
Birmingham & Black Country Local Nature Partnership
Birmingham Eastside Forum
Birmingham Group
Birmingham Museums Trust, Museum Collection Centre
Birmingham Museums Trust, Thinktank
Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society
Buckinghamshire Gardens Trust
Buckinghamshire Local Access Forum
Burnham TRA
Burton Green Village Hall
Camden Garden Centre
Camden Lock Market Ltd
Camden Railway Heritage Trust
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), London
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), Northamptonshire
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), Oxfordshire
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), Staffordshire
Campaign to Protect Rural England, (CPRE), Buckinghamshire
Canal & River Trust
Cathedral and Church Buildings Division, Church of England
Central Chilterns Community Forum
Centre for the Magic Arts Ltd
Chalfonts and Amersham Community Forum
Chesham Society
Chiltern Countryside Group
Chiltern Society
Chilterns Conservation Board
Church Buildings Council
Coleshill Estate
Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company
Community Environmental Trust
Conserve the Chilterns and Countryside
Crackley Residents' Association
Crown Estate Commissioners
Cumberland Market Residents' Association
Cycling Club of Middleton
Darwin Court Residents and Leaseholders Association
Day Centre for Polish Senior Citizens
Delancey Street Residents' Association
Digbeth Forum
Digbeth Residents' Association
Drummond Street Tenants and Residents' Association

Dunsmore Society
Ecology Technical Group
Elm Village Business Group and Camley Street Neighbourhood Forum
Elm Village Tenants and Residents' Association
English Folk Dance and Song Society
English Heritage
Environment Agency
Ernest Cook Trust
Flats Lane and Knox Grave Land Residents' Group
Forestry Commission
GeoConservation UK
Geology Trusts
Get Wendover Cycling
Gloucester Avenue Association
Gloucester Crescent Residents' Association
Great Missenden C of E Combined School
Great Missenden Community Group
Great Missenden Parish Revitalisation Group
Great Missenden Village Association
Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society
Green Fox Community Energy
Greenway Trust (Kenilworth to Berkswell)
Hammersmith and Fulham Cyclists (a branch of the London Cycling Campaign).
Hampton-in-Arden Society
Hanger Hill (East) Residents' Association
Harefield Tenants and Residents' Association HS2 Sub-Committee
Hawley Infants' School Association
Heart of England Aeromodellers
Hillingdon Arts Association
Hillingdon Outdoor Activities Centre (HOAC)
Historic Houses Association
Hyde Heath Infant School
Hyde Heath Village Society
Ickenham Residents' Association
Inland Waterways Association
Island Triangle Residents' Association
Iver and District Countryside Association
Jeffrey's Street Association
Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Kenilworth Golf Club Ltd
Kensal Rise Association of Boaters
Kensal Triangle Residents' Association
Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum
KXRLG and Just Space
Lappetts Lane Neighbourhood Watch Scheme
Lee Common CE School
Leigh Junior Infant & Nursery School
Lichfield & Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust

Little Kingshill Village Society
Maria Fidelis Convent School
Marriotts Avenue Group
Middleton Amateur Dramatics
Middleton Community History Group
Middleton Health, Education & Well-Being Group
Middleton Horticultural Society
Middleton Recreation Room
Misbourne River Action
National Trust
Natural England
Netley Primary School Governing Body
North Bucks Bat Group
North Camden Town Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group
North Northolt Neighbourhood Watch and Residents' Association
Northamptonshire Local Access Forum
Northolt Village Residents' Association (NVRA)
Old Sattleians Rugby Football Club
Park Hall Academy
Park Village and Environs Residents' Association
Parochial Church Council of Chetwode, Buckinghamshire
People's Trust for Endangered Species
Polish Catholic Association
Potter Row Neighbourhood Watch Scheme
Quanton Railway Society Ltd
Queens Park Area Residents' Association
Railfuture
Railway Heritage Trust
Ramblers Association
Ramblers Association, Buckinghamshire, Milton Keynes and West Middlesex Area
Ramblers Association, Northamptonshire Area
Ramblers Association, Warwickshire Area
Regent's Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Regent's Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee
Residents' Environmental Protection Association
Road Dahl Museum and Story Centre
Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Fountain Trust
Ruislip Gardens Primary School
Ruislip High School
Ruislip Residents' Association
Ruislip Rifle Club
Ruislip Woods Trust
Scar Studios
Shelswell Group of Churches
Sibleys Rise Residents' group
Sir Thomas White's Charity
Solihull Ratepayers Association
South Ruislip Residents' Association

South and City College Birmingham
St John the Baptist Church, Middleton
St Pancras Parish Church Parochial Church Council
Twyford Cricket Club
Twyford Parochial Church Council
University College London
Victorian Society
Village of Radstone
Waddesdon Estate & Rothschild Foundation
Waterside Place Residents' Association
Wells House Road Residents' Association
Wendover Cricket Club
Wendover Society
West Hampstead Gardens and Residents' Association
West Midlands Fire Service
West Twyford Residents' Association
Whittington Heath Golf Club
Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire & Northamptonshire
Wildlife Trust for Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire
Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and Black Country
Wildlife Trust for Herts & Middlesex
Wildlife Trust for London
Wildlife Trust for Staffordshire
Wildlife Trust for Warwickshire
Wildlife Trusts (England)
Wood Lane Residents' Association
Woodland Trust
Woodman Public House ('the Woodman')
Local government
All Saints Church Parochial Church Council (PCC)
Aston-le-Walls Parish Council
Aylesbury Town Council
Balsall Parish Council
Berkswell Parish Council
Bickenhill Parish Council
Birmingham City Council
Boddington Parish Council
Buckinghamshire Councils
Burton Green Parish Council
Calvert Green Parish Council
Camden Town District Management Committee
Centro
Chalfont St Peter Parish Council
Charndon Parish Council
Cherwell District Council
Chesham Town Council
Chetwode Parish Meeting
Chiltern District Council
Chipping Warden & Edgcote Parish Council

City Services and Development Directorate, Coventry City Council
Coldharbour Parish Council
Cubbington Parish Council
Curdworth Parish Council
Ellesborough Parish Council
Finmere Parish Council
Fradley and Streethay Parish Council
Great and Little Kimble cum Marsh Parish Council
Great Missenden Parish Council
Greater London Authority
Greatworth Parish Council
Halton Parish Council
Hampstead District Management Committee
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council
Hertfordshire County Council
Hillesden Parish Council
Hints with Canwell Parish Council
Iver Parish Council
Kenilworth Town Centre Partnership
Kenilworth Town Council
Ladbroke Parish Council
Lea Marston Parish Council
Lichfield District Council
Little Missenden Parish Council
London Assembly
London Borough of Brent
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Ealing
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Borough of Islington
Long Itchington Parish Council
Meriden Parish Council
Middleton Parish Council
Mixbury Parish Meeting
Newton Purcell Parish
North Warwickshire Borough Council
Northamptonshire County Council
Oxfordshire County Council
Quainton Parish Council
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
South Northamptonshire Council
Staffordshire County Council
Steeple Claydon Parish Council
Stoke Mandeville Parish Council
Stone with Bishopstone and Hartwell Parish Council
Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council
Stratford on Avon District Council
The Lee Parish Council

Thorpe Mandeville Parish Council
Three Rivers District Council
Turweston Parish Council
Twyford Parish Council
Waddeson Parish Council
Warwick District Council
Warwickshire County Council
Wendover Parish Council
Westbury Parish Council
Westminster City Council
Whittington Parish Council
Wormleighton and Stoneton Parish Meeting
Other campaign/representative group
ASLEF
Aylesbury Constituency Conservative Association
Brazilian Aeronautical Commission in Europe
Camden Cutting Group
Camden Lib Dem Party
Central Association of Agricultural Valuers
CLA (Country Land & Business Association)
CLA and David Coles architects
Defence Infrastructure Organisation on behalf of the Ministry of Defence
GMB
National Farmers' Union (NFU)
Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
Royal College of General Practitioners
Royal College of Ophthalmologists
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Ruislip Chamber of Commerce

Samuel White and Lady Middleton Charities
SEGRO Plc
The Coal Authority
Transport Salaried Staff's Association
Real estate, housing associations, or property related
6 Lymington Road (NW6) Ltd
Barn Management UK (2) Ltd
Berkswell Estate
Carington Estate
Canwell Estate Company Ltd
Castle Vale Neighbourhood Partnership Board
CBRE Advisory Committee
DJM Consulting
Fountain Lake Ltd
Greatworth Hall Estate
Grimms (Dyke) Estates Ltd
Hansteen (UK) Industrial Property Ltd Partnership
LaSelle Investment Management
Line Planning Ltd
Miller Homes Ltd
Packington Estate Ent Ltd
Pridewater Estates Ltd
Schroder Property Investment Management Ltd
St Modwen Corporate Services
Sydney and London Properties Ltd

In addition, the organisations listed in Table A.1.2b submitted responses on behalf of their clients:

Table A1.2b

Organisations responding on behalf of their clients
Atkins Ltd
Bagshaws LLP
Barlow Associates Ltd
Berry Morris Chartered Surveyors
Bidwells LLP
BNP PARIBAS Real Estate
Carter Jonas LLP
Deloitte LLP
Fisher German LLP
Gerald Eve LLP
Godfrey-Payton Chartered Surveyors

Greene & Greene
Hinson Parry & Company
Jones Lang LaSalle
Margetts
Pegasus Group
Savills
SJ Berwin LLP
Strutt & Parker
Taylor Wessing LLP
Waterman Group
Wragge & Co LLP

Appendix 2 Organised submissions

1. Table A2.1 below lists the various types of organised submissions that were identified during the data entry and analysis stages.
2. A response is considered part of an organised submission if its content is identical or nearly identical to numerous other responses, e.g. consisting of a pre-printed response postcard to which respondents add their details.
3. Responses that are part of organised submissions do not always have a title or subject line that helps identify them; the identification was done on the basis of the content of the response. As many of the postcard types closely resemble each other (sometimes varying only by a few words) we have clustered the similar variations together under a single type represented by a number. The right column indicates how many responses of each type were received.
4. Examples of the most commonly received postcards have been included after the table.

Table A2.1 Overview of organised submissions

Response Type	Count
Organised Response Type 1	190
Organised Response Type 2	6152
Organised Response Type 3	2492
Organised Response Type 4	2404
Organised Response Type 5	6042
Organised Response Type 6	228
Organised Response Type 7	509
Organised Response Type 8	44
Organised Response Type 9	40
Organised Response Type 10	90

Figure A2.1 – Organised Postcard Type 1

First name Family name

Address... Postcode

Regarding consultation on the HS2 Draft Environmental Statement *(Please tick all boxes applying to you.) (*Delete as applicable)*

Construction works for Euston and the Link across Camden to HS1 would cause massive disruption (and delay to road traffic) in Camden for a long time. There is no description of how delay might be avoided or of how inconvenience and/or loss of trade to residents and businesses will be compensated.

My home* / business* would be demolished. There is no explanation of how or when I will be rehoused in the Camden community and kept financially whole.

My home* / business* environment would be badly harmed by the proposed construction works. There is no indication of how the harm could be avoided or of how the harm could be comprehensively measured and compensated for.

There is insufficient detail in the Draft Environmental Statements for Camden for me to have any degree of confidence that HS2 Limited is taking all reasonable measures to minimise harm to my living or working environment.

HS2 Limited has failed to demonstrate why its prime London station should be at Euston rather than at Old Oak Common.

There is no demonstrable business case for the tunnelled and surface link to HS1 that would justify either the construction cost or the environmental and economic damage to Camden.

HS2 Limited has totally failed to show that it has openly and honestly evaluated suggested alternatives to its "own" proposals. It can thus not justify the environmental consequences of its proposals.

Other (please describe):

The appalling disruption and destruction proposed for Camden is totally unjustified. The alternative of Old Oak Common instead of Euston has to be seriously considered and accepted.

02.11.2019

Figure A2.2 – Organised Postcard Type 2

Dear Prime Minister, Secretary of State for Transport and HS2 Ltd

Response to Phase 1 Draft Environmental Statement (DES) Consultation

The DES provides official confirmation that HS2 as currently designed will have a highly negative impact on our environment.

Constructing a new railway capable of handling trains travelling at 400kph will require a significant landtake, severely damage irreplaceable ecosystems, sentence people and communities to years of construction disruption and cause permanent damage when it's built.

I am concerned that the DES:

- Underplays the real noise and visual impacts of HS2.
- Omits the inconvenient truth that HS2 won't even reduce our carbon emissions.
- Contains plans for mitigation far short of people's expectations.
- Gives inadequate detail on the rejection of local alternatives to allow proper challenge.
- Does not provide the required baseline data.

I believe it's a poor deal to trade irreversible environmental damage for journey time savings of such dubious value.

I urge you to be honest about the environmental impact of HS2.

I believe that even though the DES is superficial and incomplete the environmental cost of HS2 is too high and its time to think again.

Figure A2.3 – Organised Postcard Type 3

I write with regard to the draft Environmental Statement.

On the phase 1 stretch of HS2 from London to Birmingham, at least 21 ancient woods, covering a combined area of 409ha, will suffer direct loss and a further 12 are at risk from noise, vibration and further infrastructure such as roads.

Sadly this draft Environmental Statement does not recognise the environmental importance and national significance of ancient woodland, or why its complexity as a habitat makes it irreplaceable. This must be recognised and considered.

In addition, this current assessment does not fully take into account many environmental impacts on ancient woodland - including for example, noise and vibrations. Nor does it adequately suggest ways that you will take responsibility for and mitigate the effect of these impacts, or set out the principles of compensation for loss or damage that can't be avoided or reduced.

In lacking vital details like these, this draft Environmental Statement cannot be regarded as an appropriate assessment of the impacts of Phase One of this route.

Therefore I urge HS2 Ltd to ensure that the Environmental Statement produced later this year is both comprehensive and takes in to consideration these issues, and is followed by a rigorous formal public consultation process, with substantially more time allowed for communities to respond than given with this consultation.

Figure A2.4 – Organised Postcard Type 4

This is my formal response to the Draft Environmental Statement Consultation.

The Draft Environmental Statement for Community Forum Areas 6 & 7 is totally inadequate and shows reckless disregard for the environment. It uses out of date (2009) traffic assessments & insufficient detail about noise, vibration, & socio-economic impacts. Detailed baseline data that was promised to the community forums such as noise monitoring locations and traffic and footpath counts, is not present. Your Draft ES fails to satisfy this community that the hugely damaging & potentially hazardous impacts have been properly assessed & will be appropriately mitigated. It also highlights that there are no benefits, environmental or otherwise to the affected communities. I am also alarmed & concerned that you present the contents of your Draft ES as having already been through a consultative process with the local Community Forums. This is not the case, as much of the information revealed is new & shocking; requests through Forums for further information & assistance were routinely ignored or mishandled; & community suggestions for full & appropriate mitigation (such as an extended tunnel) were ruled out on consideration of cost only, without considering costs of compensation, disruption and environmental issues. In fact, it is obvious that major decisions affecting this community have been made without properly assessing the local impacts; without properly considering local views; & without properly considering alternatives. In my opinion, your handling of these particular Community Forums have not respected the provisions (or spirit) of the Aarhus Convention which enables 'public participation in environmental decision-making'. None of the forum's comments have been taken into account in your decision-making. **I am appalled that a most sensible, least damaging option of an extended tunnel has been ignored for Ickenham and the Colne Valley.** The current route's consequential impacts are ill considered in the statement and are unacceptable and environmentally damaging and are too much for one London Borough to bear.

- Some additional comments:**
- Working hours seem to have no limits, with so many exceptions that 24 hour, 7 day working & transportation will happen frequently
 - Over 2,700 Heavy Goods Vehicle movements daily on a local road system that is already extremely busy, particularly at peak times
 - Traffic information does not include spoil from the tunnel, additional mileage due to diversions and worker traffic movements
 - Air pollution & particulates (from the HGV diesel traffic, delayed traffic & from construction dust) which could cause or worsen health problems
 - Congestion & delays for up to 9 years for residents, businesses, deliveries & commuters to and from Uxbridge, Heathrow, Stockley Park, Ickenham, Ruislip, Harfield, Northwood, Pinner, & Harrow. It is not clear if junctions have been modelled
 - No consideration of how people will get to local hospitals, the crematorium or schools during prolonged road closures and diversions. Or how emergency services will respond to calls – Ruislip Fire Station for example is on the construction route
 - Longer pedestrian routes, discouraging a green travel alternative
 - An expensive, unsightly, and very disruptive viaduct construction, affecting local businesses & local amenities
 - Numerous construction sites (13 in CFA 6 alone), substations and concrete production placing an unreasonable burden on one London Borough
 - Potential local job losses (which do not appear to have been assessed in detail yet) & doesn't consider indirect impacts or HQAC
 - Significant train noise or vibration (which do not appear to have been assessed in detail yet). Noise contour maps give no explanation of how they have been calculated, other than very general assumptions about operational details set out in paragraphs 5.12.17 to 5.12.22 of Volume 1. You are not fully conforming to current standards of best practice recommended by the World Health Organisation and the European Union (CNOSSOS-EU)
 - Huge ecological impacts including loss of local woodland & wildlife habitat
 - Impacts at important cultural sites, such as archaeological remains and a registered scheduled monument
 - Loss (or destruction) of parts of popular local amenities, including the Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre (HOAC), Ruislip Golf and Rifle Clubs

Name: [Redacted] Date: 10/6/13
 Address: [Redacted] Postcode: UB10 8BW

Please remember to post your postcard by the 9th of July

Figure A2.5 – Organised Postcard Type 5

Dear Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Transport

27 JUN 2013

**Response to High Speed Two:
Stage 1 Draft Environmental Statement Consultation**

The draft Environmental Statement sets out in stark detail the level of environmental destruction which will occur should the current plans proceed to construct HS2 across the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Your Government's current plans envisage almost half of the Chilterns AONB being exposed to the open and damaging its unique landscapes, tranquility and habitats. But there is a better way which would protect the Chilterns AONB, a national asset visited over 50 million times a year. The Draft Environmental Statement provides official confirmation that the different tunnel options which have been presented by local groups to HS2 Ltd are all technically feasible and would dramatically reduce environmental damage to this area.

Please do the right thing. Protect the AONB as required by statute and replace the current proposed surface route for HS2 through the Chilterns AONB with a bored tunnel.

Name

Address

Figure A2.6 – Organised Postcard Type 6

My Response to the Draft Environmental Statement Consultation
a tick in the box indicates my agreement with the statement made beside it.

Q1 My comments on Report 15 - Greatworth to Lower Boddington

1.1 I am concerned by the lack of information available, the plan views of the area do not help me understand the appearance of the line when the trains are running, how much of the train and pylons and catenary will be visible. I would like to see more 'after' photomontages from sensitive local locations.

1.2 I do not understand the sound maps as they show average sound levels after mitigation. What noise will I hear as each train passes. How does this compare to the background sound at the moment?

1.3 We had asked for the line to be lowered, it now seems to be higher and more of it is on an embankment. I think the train will still be visible with the height of earth banks proposed and HS2 admits there will be noise from the pantograph. Given the significant effect of the noise and the effect on my visual amenity (stated by HS2 to be major and severe) I want to see the height of the earth banks increased so no part of the train is visible from either Upper or Lower Boddington. That would be a height of 8m above the rails. The section past Lower Boddington should be enclosed in a green tunnel to completely mitigate the sound from the trains.

1.4 Spoil from the nearby cutting and Aston le Walls green tunnel could be used to increase the height of the earth banks. Alternatively the line could be lowered and then the earth banks would be lower and the land take would not be so severe.

1.5 I understand trees will be planted on the earth banks to further screen the line, could these be planted as soon as possible during the construction of the line.

1.6 There is no evidence supplied to explain decisions taken not to give us a green tunnel or lower the line. Given the considerable construction disruption already planned further disruption is not a valid reason to refuse better mitigation and cost should not be the only factor given the severity of the impact of the line

1.7 It is not clear to me what the situation will be as regards light pollution once the train is running. There will be light from trains running outside daylight hours, and also from the maintenance loop and traffic needed to ensure the line is maintained.

Q2 My comments on Volume 1 of the Draft Environmental Statement

2.1 I think the documentation is very complicated and in so many different sections that it is difficult to absorb the information and make sense of it. I was unable to study the information prior to the meeting in Boddington Village Hall.

2.2 HS2 promises to mitigate significant effects of the line, pg 56. The most important effects to me are noise and loss of view. HS2 acknowledges that these effects are long term and severe in my area but there is no information on how HS2 judges that their mitigation measures are successful apart from the dubious sound profiles.

Q3 My comments on the Draft Code of Construction Practice.

3.1 Hours of working are meaningless, together with start up times and exceptions there seems to be licence to work 24/7, especially in an area like ours between a tunnel and a cutting with 3 construction camps.

3.2 I do not understand the need for 3 satellite construction camps so close together along with the security fencing and lighting and traffic that go along with them.

3.3 I am worried about the volume of construction traffic along Banbury Road. We were originally assured there would be an access road built alongside the track for material movement during construction. Banbury Road is not suitable for large amounts of HGVs.

02 JUL 2013

Figure A2.7 – Organised Postcard Type 7

This card represents my submission to the consultation on the HS2 Draft Environmental Statement.

- The Draft Environmental Statement is clearly incomplete and inadequate and does not provide enough information to make appropriate judgements about the impact of HS2 on Wendover and its surrounding countryside (either during the construction phase or during operation of the railway). HS2 Ltd must provide more detailed information to make this consultation a meaningful process.
- Should construction of HS2 go ahead, **a continuous bored tunnel through the Chilterns AONB and surfacing at the AONB boundary north west of Wendover** provides the only appropriate level of mitigation for Wendover and the AONB.
- In addition, the following safeguards must be included, at a minimum, within any HS2 scheme for Wendover:
 - Noise mitigation must meet World Health Organisation Guidelines on Community Noise. If a bored tunnel is not forthcoming, those guidelines would at a minimum require the lengthening of the Wendover “green tunnel” at both ends, enclosing the viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean and increasing the height and efficiency of sound barriers where necessary
 - The Bacombe Lane / South Street junction must be retained to provide appropriate access to Bacombe Lane
 - New cricket facilities must be provided to replace Wendover’s lost cricket ground
 - All structures, such as viaducts, tunnel portals, ponds and earthworks must be designed (with public involvement) to fit as unobtrusively as possible into the rural landscape and achieve appropriate levels of safety for residents
 - New habitats must be created for at-risk fauna and new woodland planted using native species
 - The Weston Turville reservoir Site of Special Scientific Interest must be protected from any potential pollution or water shortage
 - Wildlife crossings must be created across the route to help mitigate the loss of hedgerows
 - Utilisation of the Chiltern line rather than HGVs to bring in materials and remove spoil during construction should be fully investigated
 - There must be independent oversight and monitoring of the Code of Construction and its implementation

Other comments:

07 JUL 2013

This is my only submission to the consultation on the HS2 Draft Environmental Statement.

Name:

Address:

Postcode:

Appendix 3 Codes by theme and by question

1. The analysis of consultation responses was carried out using a coding framework consisting of 25 themes containing a total of 5,809 codes, of which over 3,500 refer to specific locations mentioned by respondents. The themes and codes are listed below in Table A3.1 and Table A3.2 respectively.
2. On the next page, the analysis themes are listed, using the order in which the coding framework was structured. The remainder of this appendix consists of a table in which all the codes used are listed. The order of themes mirrors Table A3.1; within the themes the codes are listed alphabetically. Table A3.2 also provides an overview of the number of responses to which each code was applied for each consultation question. Some themes and a number of codes were created specifically for one consultation question, others were applied across all consultation questions. Responses that did not address a specific consultation question are listed under 'Additional' in Table A3.2. Codes under the Document References theme are used to capture references to specific paragraph numbers in the Draft ES documents (for example CFA reports: DR - CFA01 - 01.2). The purpose of these codes is to allow HS2 Ltd to relate comments to the relevant section of the Draft ES documentation where this is indicated. Given the number of codes under this theme and the fact that they were always used in addition to codes from other themes, never in place of these, the Document References codes have not been included in the tables below.

Table A3.1 Coding framework themes

ES Themes
Agriculture, forestry, soils (AG)
Air quality (AQ)
Climate/greenhouse gas emissions (CL)
Community (CM)
Cultural heritage (CH)
Ecology (EC)
Ground settlement (GS)
Land quality (LQ)
Landscape, visual, townscape (LV)
Socio-economics (SE)
Sound, noise and vibration (SV)
Traffic, transport (TR)
Waste and material resources (WM)
Water resources and flood risk (WR)
Other Themes
Community Forum Area Reports (CA)
Construction issues and Code of Construction Practice (CC)
Design refinement (DE)
Document references (DR)
Engagement and consultation (EN)
General comments on ES (GC)
HS2 Project (HS)
Locations (LO)
Other issues (OT)
References (RE)
Scheme features/infrastructure and alternatives (FI)

Table A3.2 Count of comments per code per question

Agriculture, forestry, soils

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
AG - Approach (general)	1	~	~	4
AG - Assessment/method	57	12	8	52
AG - Baseline	10	2	1	23
AG - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support	~	~	~	2
AG - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	~	5	~	~
AG - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	19	~	2	53
AG - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	~	9	116	~
AG - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	49	~	~	77
AG - Policy issues	5	1	1	10
AG - Agricultural land/farms	170	33	32	255
AG - Agricultural land/farms - construction	96	~	73	61
AG - Cumulative effects	~	~	~	6
AG - Forestry	9	2	~	12
AG - Other enterprises (e.g. equestrian)	17	1	~	37
AG - Other issues/suggestions	7	~	~	8
AG - Other land (e.g. meadow, field)	16	2	1	44

AG - Severance	97	7	~	63
AG - Soils	12	5	74	35

Air quality

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
AQ - Approach (general)	1	~	~	~
AQ - Assessment/method	31	17	26	95
AQ - Baseline	5	1	1	20
AQ - Impacts/effects - construction (general)	~	~	~	116
AQ - Impacts/effects - construction (general)	48	15	40	~
AQ - Impacts/effects (general)	54	13	~	139
AQ - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support	~	~	~	8
AQ - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	~	~	20	~
AQ - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	18	7	~	69
AQ - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	~	~	33	~
AQ - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	19	8	~	84
AQ - Policy issues	6	~	5	40
AQ - Construction dust	63	23	136	2,585
AQ - Construction traffic	32	4	12	2,519
AQ - Cumulative effects	8	3	2	34
AQ - Dust	27	5	3	79
AQ - Traffic (not HGVs/LGVs)	8	2	1	63

Climate/greenhouse gas emissions

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
CL - Approach (general)	~	~	~	2
CL - Assessment/method	17	30	1	73
CL - Mitigation/adaptation	~	1	~	13
CL - Policy (greenhouse gas)	1	3	~	16
CL - Future proofing (to deal with changing climate)	~	2	~	10
CL - GHG - Carbon emissions	3	7	~	27
CL - GHG - Carbon emissions - construction	4	4	~	25
CL - GHG - CO2 reduction - suggestions/comments	2	2	~	15
CL - GHG - Decarbonisation/future footprint reduction	1	2	~	10
CL - GHG - Energy consumption/speed	7	18	1	51
CL - GHG - EU ETS (Emissions trading scheme)	~	~	~	2
CL - GHG - Impacts - comments/concerns	2	~	~	17
CL - GHG - Modal Shift/technology	2	2	~	24
CL - GHG - Ref other info/reports - Climate	1	2	~	~
CL - GHG - will not reduce CO2/will not address climate change	19	31	1	6,237
CL - GHG - will reduce Co2 emissions/help to address climate change	1	~	~	5
CL - Overlap with other themes	2	1	~	20
CL - Ref other info/reports - Climate	~	~	~	6

Community

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
CM - Approach (general)	~	2	~	~

CM - Assessment/method	92	43	18	2,569
CM - Baseline	45	5	~	85
CM - Compensation (not property specific)	46	12	14	162
CM - Impacts/effects - community - (general)	262	90	19	507
CM - Impacts/effects - community - construction (general)	115	26	107	6,306
CM - Mitigation - adequate/support	6	1	~	4
CM - Mitigation - adequate/support with caveat	5	~	~	4
CM - Mitigation - incomplete/inadequate	102	31	52	329
CM - Mitigation - suggestions/comments	139	37	25	763
CM - Policy issues	9	4	1	45
CM - Affected - children/schools	75	18	8	122
CM - Affected - children/schools - construction	69	11	28	147
CM - Affected - vulnerable groups e.g. elderly, disabled	57	17	10	94
CM - Disruption (general)	147	23	23	237
CM - Equality - (general)	4	~	4	23
CM - Equality - EQIA/Assessment	~	1	~	15
CM - Health - (general)	56	13	26	2,524
CM - Health - EMF	8	8	1	8
CM - Health - facilities/services	46	7	15	2,519
CM - Health - Health Impact Assessment/assessment	2	1	~	10
CM - Health - stress/psychological impact	26	9	16	79
CM - Other - affected communities will not benefit	87	19	7	2,533
CM - Other - crime/anti-social behaviour	16	4	10	52
CM - Other - cumulative effects	15	5	4	35
CM - Other - cumulative effects - construction	3	6	30	18
CM - Other - facilities/amenities	131	27	3	192
CM - Other - facilities/amenities - construction	33	5	9	2,487
CM - Other - footpaths/PRoW	146	28	6	158
CM - Other - footpaths/PRoW - construction	38	6	14	62
CM - Other - 'green/open' spaces/parks/human access to nature	91	23	7	256
CM - Other - quality of life/well being	54	12	6	160
CM - Other - quality of life/well being - construction	28	8	21	55
CM - Other - severance/splitting communities/viability	39	10	8	75
CM - Other - sports/leisure/social clubs and facilities/spaces	83	12	2	3,041
CM - Property - compensation	86	37	21	253
CM - Property - CPO/safeguarding	9	4	2	35
CM - Property - demolition/loss/relocation	346	44	12	311
CM - Property - garden/land	20	5	10	32
CM - Property - proximity/general	64	18	18	226
CM - Property - social housing	24	5	1	47
CM - Property - structure/damage	39	9	5	51
CM - Property - structure/damage - construction	16	5	10	130
CM - Property - values/renting	6	~	~	27
CM - Property - values/renting - construction	1	~	3	~
CM - Property - values/selling	198	33	20	143
CM - Property - values/selling - construction	16	~	5	31

Cultural heritage

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
CH - Approach (general)	3	1	2	20

CH - Assessment/method	~	21	~	~
CH - Assessment/method	25	~	7	86
CH - Baseline	16	5	2	54
CH - Impacts/effects (general)	21	15	11	2,490
CH - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support	~	~	~	5
CH - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	~	10	3	32
CH - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	113	~	~	~
CH - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	30	12	17	75
CH - Policy issues	10	5	7	34
CH - Archaeological remains	46	10	16	2,474
CH - Burial grounds/graveyards	9	2	4	26
CH - Cumulative effects	2	~	~	9
CH - Demolition	14	3	~	8
CH - Designated - conservation area	135	8	3	136
CH - Designated - listed buildings	177	125	5	154
CH - Designated - scheduled monuments	13	7	1	2,467
CH - Historic buildings/structures	53	14	4	107
CH - Historic landscapes (general)	11	8	~	102
CH - Other	7	2	1	30

Ecology

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
EC - Approach (general)	4	4	1	24
EC - Assessment/method	70	30	~	~
EC - Assessment/method	~	~	7	2,624
EC - Baseline	24	5	3	65
EC - Ecology - impacts/effects (general)	56	20	13	8,726
EC - Implementation/monitoring	3	1	~	18
EC - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support	3	~	~	11
EC - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	~	25	~	~
EC - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	65	~	6	2,317
EC - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	~	14	~	~
EC - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	57	~	42	733
EC - Policy issues	18	10	2	65
EC - Cumulative impacts	5	2	~	37
EC - Designated sites - other (e.g. nature reserve)	31	9	4	74
EC - Designated sites - SSSI	35	9	2	589
EC - Ecological impacts of mitigation	6	3	1	23
EC - Habitats - flowers and plants	11	4	1	38
EC - Habitats - general (non specific)	39	15	7	6,222
EC - Habitats - grassland/farmland	9	2	~	39
EC - Habitats - hedgerow	32	12	84	609
EC - Habitats - other	24	2	1	53
EC - Habitats - watercourses/water bodies	19	3	2	71
EC - Habitats - woodlands	163	56	48	5,742
EC - Other - (e.g. invasive/non-native species)	7	2	3	26
EC - Other - connectivity/severance	8	3	~	31
EC - Wildlife - amphibians (e.g. great crested newt)	11	2	~	33
EC - Wildlife - bats	38	11	5	106
EC - Wildlife - birds	47	15	3	123

EC - Wildlife - fish	8	~	~	17
EC - Wildlife - general (non specific)	86	30	17	445
EC - Wildlife - insects	8	3	~	47
EC - Wildlife - mammals (otter, water vole, hazel dormouse, badger etc)	26	6	3	91
EC - Wildlife - other	15	2	4	46
EC - Wildlife - reptiles	3	~	1	17
EC - Wildlife habitats (e.g. 'habitats for wildlife')	14	8	3	2,495

Ground settlement

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
GS - Approach (general)	~	~	1	1
GS - Assessment/method	7	~	5	22
GS - Impacts/effects (general)	13	6	6	36
GS - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	3	~	1	9
GS - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	1	1	4	11
GS - Policy issues	~	~	3	~

Land quality

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
LQ - Approach (general)	3	1	~	2
LQ - Assessment/method	21	6	4	27
LQ - Baseline	6	2	~	15
LQ - Impact/effects (general)	5	2	1	9
LQ - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support	4	~	~	3
LQ - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	5	~	7	17
LQ - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	11	1	8	25
LQ - Policy issues	6	2	~	7
LQ - Contamination - ground gas	5	~	1	8
LQ - Contamination - ground/surface water	18	9	111	562
LQ - Contamination - land	18	5	12	43
LQ - Designated sites - geological SSSI	2	1	~	5
LQ - Designated sites - other (e.g. LGS, RIGS, mineral safeguarding)	3	1	~	5
LQ - Mining/mineral resources	9	2	2	21

Landscape, visual, townscape

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
LV - Approach (general)	2	4	2	8
LV - Assessment/method	~	119	~	~
LV - Assessment/method	363	~	11	6,218
LV - Baseline	31	4	~	36
LV - Cumulative effects	6	~	~	18
LV - Impacts/effects - construction	16	~	67	2,476
LV - Impacts/effects (general)	79	278	5	198
LV - Mitigation/compensation - adequate support	~	~	~	18
LV - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support with caveat	3	~	~	6
LV - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	~	252	~	~

LV - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	77	~	21	121
LV - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	~	23	~	~
LV - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	360	~	21	256
LV - Mitigation-planting - incomplete/inadequate	~	14	~	72
LV - Mitigation-planting - incomplete/inadequate	89	~	2	~
LV - Mitigation-planting - suggestions/comments	285	14	~	127
LV - Mitigation-planting - suggestions/comments	~	~	5	~
LV - Policy issues	20	10	3	67
LV - Character/vegetation - AONB-designated	138	58	21	6,771
LV - Character/vegetation - cultural heritage	13	4	~	41
LV - Character/vegetation - greenbelt-designated/green urban fringe	22	2	1	61
LV - Character/vegetation - landscape (countryside)	150	57	26	1,198
LV - Character/vegetation - other designated (e.g. Special Landscape Area)	13	4	~	27
LV - Character/vegetation - townscape/villagescape	40	5	2	102
LV - Character/vegetation - trees (not woodlands)	30	11	50	82
LV - Light pollution	398	91	12	97
LV - Light pollution - construction	42	10	269	75
LV - Specific impacts/other views	314	37	4	119
LV - Views from - PRoWs	14	~	~	24
LV - Views from - residents/property	262	6	~	58
LV - Views from - transport (roads, etc)	5	~	1	19
LV - Visual impacts of mitigation	43	7	1	80

Socio-economics

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
SE - Approach (general)	3	~	~	9
SE - Assessment/method	55	28	2	2,543
SE - Baseline	17	~	~	28
SE - Impacts/effects (general)	28	1	~	85
SE - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	16	7	2	216
SE - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	25	9	2	105
SE - Policy issues	6	2	~	35
SE - Businesses/jobs - loss/concerns	187	44	7	2,713
SE - Businesses/jobs - loss/concerns - construction	49	7	35	2,716
SE - Other - cumulative effects	2	~	~	9
SE - Other issues/suggestions/technical	3	~	~	31
SE - Planned developments e.g. areas identified by council	21	6	1	79
SE - Regeneration (incl job creation) - HS2 will help/improve	13	2	~	29
SE - Regeneration (incl job creation) - HS2 will not help/improve	52	16	1	80
SE - Supply chain - use of local/national suppliers/employment - direct & indirect	7	9	2	29
SE - Tourism/visitors/leisure - impacts/effects	106	15	12	6,142

Sound, noise and vibration

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
SV - Approach (general)	3	~	~	7
SV - Assessment/method	535	439	88	8,815
SV - Baseline	34	10	~	77

SV - Cumulative effects	16	5	3	39
SV - Impacts/effects	219	397	26	2,926
SV - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support	3	1	~	10
SV - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	~	316	~	~
SV - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	261	~	31	221
SV - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	~	95	~	~
SV - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	401	~	57	838
SV - Mitigation-planting - incomplete/inadequate	~	8	~	27
SV - Mitigation-planting - incomplete/inadequate	55	~	~	~
SV - Mitigation-planting - suggestions/comments	52	~	~	79
SV - Mitigation-planting - suggestions/comments	~	8	~	~
SV - More information requested/reassurance sought	46	13	5	85
SV - Policy issues	23	14	13	3,047
SV - Construction - impacts/effects	189	45	185	237
SV - Construction - traffic - impacts/effects	61	5	22	87
SV - Construction - tunnelling - impacts/effects	11	1	4	56
SV - Operational - depot (e.g. IMD, maintenance loop) - impacts/effects	50	2	1	11
SV - Operational - green tunnels - impacts/effects	3	1	~	5
SV - Operational - impacts/effects	268	54	12	211
SV - Operational - pantographs - impacts/effects	254	4	~	35
SV - Operational - speed - impacts/effects	8	10	~	26
SV - Operational - traffic - impacts/effects	10	1	~	8
SV - Operational - tunnel portals - impacts/effects	19	5	1	37
SV - Operational - tunnels - impacts/effects	~	3	~	35
SV - Operational - tunnels - impacts/effects	15	~	~	~
SV - Operational - vent shafts - impacts/effects	8	2	1	27
SV - Operational - viaducts - impacts/effects	24	7	~	570
SV - Realignment of existing transport infrastructure - impacts/effects	50	7	~	32
SV - AG - domestic (farm) animals	67	6	2	27
SV - CH - impacts/effects	18	5	1	47
SV - CM - affected - children/schools	3	~	2	18
SV - CM - affected - children/schools - construction	~	1	~	9
SV - CM - facilities/amenities	11	5	3	29
SV - CM - health	12	2	~	34
SV - CM - other - cumulative effects	~	~	~	7
SV - CM - other - 'green/open' spaces/parks/human access to nature	~	1	1	11
SV - CM - property - construction - impacts/effects	~	44	20	83
SV - CM - property - impacts/effects	79	52	2	109
SV - CM - PRoW	11	2	1	19
SV - CM - quality of life/tranquility	38	7	3	85
SV - CM - vulnerable groups	7	~	~	2
SV - CM - vulnerable groups - construction	~	~	2	~
SV - CM - workplaces	7	~	~	8
SV - EC - habitats	1	~	~	2,449
SV - EC - impacts/effects	3	6	~	~
SV - EC - wildlife	8	~	~	42
SV - EC - woodland	2	~	~	~
SV - SE - impacts/effects	1	~	4	29

SV - WM - impacts/effects	~	~	~	2
SV - WR - surface water/rivers/canals	~	~	~	6

Traffic, transport

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
TR - Approach (general)	5	~	~	13
TR - Assessment/method	~	26	~	~
TR - Assessment/method	134	~	43	2,623
TR - Baseline	23	4	2	68
TR - Cumulative impacts	9	2	1	2,430
TR - Impacts/effects (general)	9	4	1	35
TR - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support	3	~	~	16
TR - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	~	10	~	~
TR - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	59	~	38	288
TR - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	~	36	~	~
TR - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	259	~	123	857
TR - Policy issues	6	2	6	32
TR - Bridges - construction impact	35	6	3	65
TR - Cycling/cycleways	56	11	6	82
TR - Cycling/cycleways - construction	33	6	12	82
TR - Emergency services access	17	5	8	68
TR - Farm transport	37	~	9	41
TR - Horse riding/equestrian	43	5	6	43
TR - Other e.g. aeroplanes	1	1	~	8
TR - Other e.g. aeroplanes - construction	~	~	~	3
TR - Parking	10	9	~	36
TR - Parking - construction	13	~	6	34
TR - Pedestrians	36	13	3	2,490
TR - Pedestrians - construction	41	8	10	122
TR - Public transport - buses	25	8	~	67
TR - Public transport - buses - construction	24	2	7	45
TR - Public transport (general)	13	2	~	61
TR - Public transport (general) - construction	~	~	~	26
TR - Rail - freight	7	6	~	19
TR - Rail - general/unspecified	19	6	2	25
TR - Rail - London Overground	19	5	~	43
TR - Rail - London Underground	9	6	~	55
TR - Rail - National Rail services/stations	7	8	~	39
TR - Rail - National Rail services/stations - construction	~	~	~	13
TR - Roads/traffic/access	276	56	18	910
TR - Roads/traffic/access - construction	566	74	520	3,327
TR - Safety	47	4	55	93
TR - Taxis	3	2	1	24

Waste and material resources

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
WM - Approach (general)	~	2	~	3
WM - Assessment/method	~	9	~	~
WM - Assessment/method	24	~	47	40

WM - Baseline	2	~	~	2
WM - Mitigation - adequate/support	~	~	~	7
WM - Mitigation - adequate/support with caveat	~	~	~	2
WM - Mitigation - incomplete/inadequate	8	4	5	20
WM - Mitigation - suggestions/comments	34	6	13	69
WM - Policy issues	3	2	1	6
WM - Construction - excavated material/earthworks/spoil	335	29	94	3,121
WM - Construction - general/dirt/other waste	11	9	15	54
WM - Operational - general/dirt/other waste	3	~	~	3

Water resources and flood risk

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
WR - Approach (general)	3	~	~	6
WR - Assessment/method	40	17	12	85
WR - Baseline	9	~	2	29
WR - Impacts/effects (general)	11	4	9	38
WR - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support	~	1	~	5
WR - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	~	7	6	~
WR - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	25	~	~	46
WR - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	~	6	~	~
WR - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	43	~	40	85
WR - Mitigation-balancing ponds	66	12	3	90
WR - Policy issues	6	1	2	26
WR - Canals	3	2	~	19
WR - Drainage	27	14	81	100
WR - Flood risk/flood plains	56	25	20	125
WR - Groundwater	24	13	6	68
WR - Other issues/suggestions	3	~	~	8
WR - Surface water/rivers	55	18	7	604
WR - Surface water/rivers - construction	14	~	~	17
WR - Water supply	21	9	95	68

Community Forum Area reports

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
CA - 00/all CFAs ticked	10	2	~	~
CA - 00/General/not specified	~	~	~	1,452
CA - 01 Euston	515	17	16	218
CA - 01/02	17	~	~	11
CA - 01/02/03	346	~	~	~
CA - 02 Camden Town and HS1 link	510	13	7	233
CA - 03 Primrose Hill to Kilburn (Camden)	457	7	3	117
CA - 04 Kilburn (Brent) to Old Oak Common	66	13	11	67
CA - 05 Northolt Corridor	34	5	2	24
CA - 06 South Ruislip to Ickenham	62	8	8	2,451
CA - 06/07	~	~	~	2,401
CA - 07 Colne Valley	98	15	11	2,450
CA - 07/08/09/10/11	~	~	~	2
CA - 08 Chalfonts and Amersham	83	11	10	75
CA - 08/09/10	12	~	~	~

CA - 08/09/10/Chilterns	~	~	~	5,970
CA - 09 Central Chilterns	148	28	31	132
CA - 09/10	13	~	~	~
CA - 10 Dunsmore, Wendover and Halton	121	20	19	113
CA - 10/11	~	~	~	6
CA - 11 Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury	62	11	10	53
CA - 12 Waddesdon and Quainton	38	6	1	24
CA - 13 Calvert, Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Chetwode	233	146	37	54
CA - 14 Newton Purcell to Brackley	103	6	10	46
CA - 14/15	~	~	~	2
CA - 15 Greatworth to Lower Boddington	326	22	232	61
CA - 16 Ladbroke and Southam	38	9	8	25
CA - 17 Offchurch and Cubbington	34	6	7	21
CA - 18 Stoneleigh, Kenilworth and Burton Green	68	17	14	62
CA - 19 Coleshill Junction	35	11	7	18
CA - 20 Curdworth to Middleton	72	52	48	26
CA - 21 Drayton Bassett, Hints and Weeford	39	6	7	25
CA - 22 Whittington to Handsacre	48	3	13	29
CA - 23 Balsall Common and Hampton in Arden	44	7	8	32
CA - 24 Birmingham Interchange and Chelmsley Wood	23	2	4	23
CA - 25 Castle Bromwich and Bromford	17	2	~	16
CA - 26 Washwood Heath to Curzon Street	17	2	~	32
CA - 27/Route-wide impacts	171	18	12	57

Construction issues and Code of Construction Practice

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
CC - Assessment/method	36	9	24	69
CC - CoCP/construction approach - adequate/support	~	~	14	13
CC - CoCP/construction approach - adequate/support with caveat	~	~	23	14
CC - CoCP/construction approach - inadequate/oppose	14	9	97	125
CC - Construction - general impacts/effects	55	12	19	206
CC - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	10	1	28	107
CC - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	35	4	87	182
CC - Policy issues (incl WSIs)	3	~	~	40
CC - Policy issues (incl WSIs)	~	~	21	~
CC - Community relations - complaints/helpline	~	~	21	26
CC - Community relations - other	1	1	19	18
CC - Community relations - small claims procedure	~	~	32	16
CC - Community relations - work with communities/LAs/stakeholders	6	6	97	79
CC - Construction - duration/timescale	140	33	122	2,693
CC - Construction - safety	21	3	12	30
CC - Construction - utility diversions/damage	37	5	7	104
CC - Implementation - budget/timeframe concerns	~	~	14	17
CC - Implementation - enforcement/monitoring	32	9	213	686
CC - Local Environment Management Plans	4	8	32	63
CC - Other issues/suggestions/technical	10	4	16	31
CC - Site - location/siting issues	111	47	333	2,606
CC - Site operation - fencing/screening/security	14	3	244	48
CC - Site operation - workforce impacts/local services/accommodation	101	18	53	2,555

CC - Site operation - working hours	73	31	461	241
-------------------------------------	----	----	-----	-----

Design refinement

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
DE - Comments/submission	35	12	5	101

Engagement and consultation

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
EN - Consultation process - challenge influence	23	10	9	2,482
EN - Consultation process - challenge timescale	42	24	6	2,600
EN - Consultation process - challenge/negative comments	133	105	27	3,362
EN - Consultation process - costs	~	~	~	13
EN - Consultation process - equity concerns	4	4	~	34
EN - Consultation process - fairness/transparency	8	14	~	84
EN - Consultation process - info request/FOI	10	5	3	2,453
EN - Consultation process - other comments	9	7	1	65
EN - Consultation process - questions/questionnaire	6	1	~	8
EN - Consultation process - support/positive comments	3	~	~	5
EN - Engagement - further consultation needed/suggestions	14	32	7	2,567
EN - Engagement - with affected parties/lack of	113	72	23	3,069
EN - Engagement - with stakeholders	18	8	37	120
EN - Events - general comments/references to	15	208	5	51
EN - Events - negative comments e.g. location inconvenient	34	21	8	73
EN - Events - positive comments e.g. staff helpful	7	1	2	10
EN - Follow up requested	22	11	3	181
EN - Forum - community forum engagement	94	20	20	2,516
EN - Publicity - comments/concerns	18	19	5	65
EN - Website - comments/concerns e.g. difficulties downloading files	9	3	2	24

General comments

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
GC - CFA - Adequate/support	12	~	~	~
GC - CFA - Adequate/support with caveat	1	1	~	2
GC - CFA - Assessment/method - incomplete/inadequate	43	2	~	43
GC - CFA - Baseline - incomplete/inadequate	29	2	~	2,414
GC - CFA - Inadequate/oppose	70	4	~	2,565
GC - CFA - Mistakes/clarification	10	4	~	26
GC - CFA - Mitigation	22	~	~	10
GC - CFA - Not detailed enough/more information needed	279	~	~	208
GC - CFA - Policy issues	4	1	~	~
GC - ES - Adequate/support	~	6	~	5
GC - ES - Adequate/support with caveat	4	3	~	5
GC - ES - Approach (general)	1	2	~	18
GC - ES - Assessment/method - incomplete/inadequate	91	88	4	2,671
GC - ES - Baseline	15	131	4	6,215
GC - ES - Inadequate/oppose	98	225	9	7,653
GC - ES - Mitigation/compensation - adequate/support with caveat	~	~	~	4
GC - ES - Mitigation/compensation - incomplete/inadequate	86	178	4	8,811

GC - ES - Mitigation/compensation - suggestions/comments	28	135	7	1,196
GC - ES - Not detailed enough/more information needed	73	104	5	683
GC - ES - Policy issues	13	22	1	133
GC - ES - Suggestions/revisions/rethink (general)	16	17	2	8,548
GC - Appendix A/Sustainability design aims	1	2	~	6
GC - Appendix B/Sustainability policy	2	8	~	22
GC - Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS)	3	5	~	18
GC - Comments/general references to Phase 2	7	4	1	27
GC - Documentation - biased/fair accompli	10	2	1	34
GC - Documentation - comments/concerns	40	19	12	82
GC - Documentation - large amount of data/difficult for layperson	31	252	9	73
GC - Documentation - mistakes/clarification	86	26	5	84
GC - Documentation - terminology	25	13	27	53
GC - EMRs (Environmental Minimum Requirements)	1	5	3	9
GC - Environment - impacts/effects	170	146	26	15,326
GC - Future-proofing (scheme and mitigation)	~	5	~	13
GC - Hybrid Bill/parliamentary scrutiny - comments/concerns	24	25	23	136
GC - Independent review/assessment	10	7	5	36
GC - Land acquisition/land grab/back door development	258	112	9	6,205
GC - Maps/photomontage - comments/concerns	475	67	13	228
GC - Mitigation hierarchy	1	5	1	21
GC - Other - cumulative effects	13	7	1	38
GC - Other - residual significant effects	1	~	~	7
GC - Priorities (e.g. Versus)	4	15	~	40
GC - Proposals driven by cost/should not override impacts	269	21	9	2,545
GC - Route wide (27) - assessment/document	8	~	~	17
GC - Sustainability - comments/concerns	~	2	1	18

HS2 project

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
HS - Cost - comments/concerns	279	91	36	1,364
HS - Equity - Regional/North-South	16	20	~	100
HS - Equity - too few benefit	37	18	3	286
HS - General opposition to HS2	307	164	53	1,127
HS - General support for HS2/high speed rail	10	3	~	32
HS - General support for HS2/high speed rail with caveat	14	5	~	33
HS - HS1 comparisons	2	2	4	30
HS - Need case - benefits/cost-benefit	80	55	5	553
HS - Need case - challenge/vanity project	225	126	27	1,065
HS - Need case - journey times/savings	116	45	5	6,379
HS - Need case - rail fares	2	1	~	82
HS - Need case - support	13	4	~	16
HS - Strategic - alternatives	90	62	8	491
HS - Strategic - alternatives insufficient consideration	12	28	~	266
HS - Strategic - modal alternatives	15	15	7	93
HS - Strategic - upgrade existing railways/services	74	77	10	640
HS - will improve capacity/disagree/challenge	3	13	~	42

Other issues

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
OI - Other comments	~	~	~	68
OI - Political	9	~	5	140
OI - Safety and security (general)	6	6	1	26

References

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
RE - AARHUS Convention	1	~	~	2,423
RE - Attachment e.g. maps, pictures	33	16	24	60
RE - Attachment table	1	~	~	11
RE - Crossrail 1	2	3	1	26
RE - Crossrail 2 (fmr. Chelsea-Hackney line)	1	1	~	7
RE - EIA Directive	6	5	~	23
RE - Govt - commitments e.g. historic sites	15	3	1	68
RE - Govt - criticism/scepticism	65	16	13	311
RE - Judicial review process/legal proceedings	3	3	1	19
RE - Legislation - Other	5	1	3	48
RE - Level of local/public concern/opposition	37	10	8	205
RE - Local context/background	64	10	14	106
RE - NAO report	3	4	1	6
RE - Network Rail Requirements 2.0	~	~	~	2
RE - NIMBY language/debate	8	1	~	27
RE - NPPF	7	5	3	33
RE - Organisation/stakeholder/local action group	159	68	43	326
RE - Other consultation	10	8	3	50
RE - Other country examples	37	15	5	135
RE - Other HS2 reports/documentation	8	7	~	42
RE - Other information/research/websites	62	42	13	215
RE - Other persons situation/property	9	2	~	27
RE - Other projects	58	23	23	242
RE - Other question	20	60	41	20
RE - Petition	4	~	~	12
RE - Precautionary principle	1	3	~	19
RE - Respondent - general information/response process/correspondence	180	278	250	18,636
RE - Respondent - own situation/property/impacts	182	31	39	328
RE - Respondent - previous response/correspondence	19	8	4	87
RE - SEA Regulations	2	3	~	4
RE - Support other stakeholders response	79	15	54	91
RE - Technical/in-depth	1	4	~	18

Scheme features/infrastructure and alternatives

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
FI - Assessment/method	64	17	2	96
FI - Mitigation - incomplete/inadequate	9	~	1	27
FI - Mitigation - suggestions/comments	271	17	3	155
FI - Associated infrastructure - autotransformer	45	89	2	44
FI - Associated infrastructure - other comments/suggestions	8	7	2	27
FI - Associated infrastructure - support as proposed	~	~	~	1

FI - Bridges - construction	26	7	~	69
FI - Bridges - other suggestions	33	8	1	90
FI - Connections - Heathrow link - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	29
FI - Connections - Heathrow link - concerns/oppose	10	2	2	16
FI - Connections - Heathrow link - support	10	5	~	~
FI - Connections - HS1 Link - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	21
FI - Connections - HS1 Link - concerns/oppose	44	9	1	219
FI - Connections - HS1 Link - support	5	5	~	10
FI - Connections - interface with other transport systems	18	8	~	61
FI - Connections - northern chord - design concerns	14	1	~	18
FI - Connections - other airport links	6	4	~	14
FI - Depot - IMD	74	56	20	41
FI - Depot - maintenance loop	253	9	2	24
FI - Depot - maintenance sidings	4	~	~	2
FI - Depot - rolling stock	2	5	~	19
FI - Design - more information/detail needed	17	6	~	31
FI - Design - other comments	12	4	1	82
FI - Design - process/selection/equity	20	16	~	36
FI - Design - quality of design/fit with area	54	10	2	628
FI - Local alternatives - alternatives insufficient consideration	311	144	2	8,678
FI - Local alternatives - concerns/comments	59	115	3	109
FI - Local alternatives - support revised proposals	~	~	~	8
FI - Local alternatives - support revised proposals with caveats	~	~	~	2
FI - Operational - frequency/operating hours	230	10	~	75
FI - Operational - maintenance	233	4	2	53
FI - Operational - other issues/suggestions/technical	3	6	~	19
FI - Operational - safety	9	11	1	548
FI - Operational - speed	36	147	2	6,183
FI - Power supply - impacts/effects	84	43	3	99
FI - Rail corridor - cuttings	68	16	9	102
FI - Rail corridor - embankments	60	6	3	83
FI - Rail corridor - height - below/above existing ground level	351	18	1	70
FI - Rail corridor - track	5	1	~	18
FI - Rail corridor - track - construction	~	1	1	1
FI - Rail corridor - width	7	3	~	14
FI - Rolling stock	6	2	1	23
FI - Route wide - alternative routes	34	25	4	69
FI - Route wide - alternatives insufficient consideration	8	36	~	72
FI - Route wide - follow existing corridors	30	19	5	53
FI - Route wide - oppose in specific area	39	52	7	60
FI - Route wide - oppose whole route	16	11	~	2,434
FI - Route wide - support in specific area	1	~	~	~
FI - Route-wide - summary of proposals	1	~	~	5
FI - Stations - Birmingham Interchange	4	1	~	25
FI - Stations - Central Birmingham, Curzon Street	4	4	~	23
FI - Stations - Euston	78	22	1	214
FI - Stations - lack of/additional suggested	2	7	~	17
FI - Stations - Old Oak Cmn (other comments)	11	6	~	43
FI - Stations - Old Oak Cmn (preferred terminus)	43	20	~	238
FI - Stations - Old Oak Cmn (preferred terminus)	~	~	2	~
FI - Stations - other suggestions	21	10	4	39

FI - Tunnels - green tunnels/cut-cover - impacts/effects	10	1	2	64
FI - Tunnels - green tunnels/cut-cover - inadequate mitigation	24	5	~	23
FI - Tunnels - green tunnels/cut-cover - other comments	26	1	1	37
FI - Tunnels - green tunnels/cut-cover - request in specific area/extend	402	8	3	583
FI - Tunnels - HS2 plans/lack of tunnels	7	~	1	4
FI - Tunnels - HS2 plans/support proposals	20	3	~	18
FI - Tunnels - impacts/effects	42	14	14	99
FI - Tunnels - more info/detail on tunnel plans	11	~	2	31
FI - Tunnels - other suggestions/comments	3	2	~	155
FI - Tunnels - portals - impacts/effects	44	6	1	53
FI - Tunnels - request across all of Chilterns/does not extend far enough	104	37	10	6,737
FI - Tunnels - request in specific area/support greater use	127	25	10	233
FI - Tunnels - safety impacts/effects	6	1	1	13
FI - Tunnels - vent shafts - impacts/effects	34	7	6	74
FI - Tunnels - vent shafts - mitigation - suggestions	9	~	~	6
FI - Tunnels/green tunnels - cost considerations	36	9	1	57
FI - Viaducts - impacts/effects	80	39	8	2,595

Locations

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Additional
LO - Chainage given	~	~	~	4
LO - OS Grid reference	1	~	~	3
LO - Other	4	~	~	4
LO - Specific address	2	1	~	7
LO - 10 Melton Street (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - 1-9 Melton Street (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Abbey Business Park (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Abbey Hive (02)	~	1	~	~
LO - Abbey Hive (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - Acton (04)	~	~	~	5
LO - Acton Cemetery (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - Acton Health Centre (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Acton Vale and Barnes (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Adelaide Community Garden (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - Adelaide Local Nature Reserve (03)	~	~	~	3
LO - Adelaide Road Local Nature Reserve (03)	~	3	1	~
LO - Adelaide Road Nature Reserve (03)	4	~	~	~
LO - Agar Grove Estate (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - Ainsdale Estate (01)	2	~	~	4
LO - Alexandra and Ainsworth Estates (03)	4	~	~	2
LO - Alexandra and Ainsworth Open Space (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - Alexandra Road Conservation Area (03)	2	~	~	1
LO - Alexandra Road Estate (03)	~	1	~	~
LO - All Saints, Ladbroke (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - All Souls Church (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - All Souls Loudoun (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Alum Rock Road Centre (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Amersham (08)	~	2	~	~

LO - Amersham Field Centre (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - Amersham Hospital (08)	5	1	~	17
LO - Amersham Road Cycling Club (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - Amersham/Amersham Old Town (08)	20	5	3	52
LO - Ampthill Estate (01)	1	1	1	5
LO - Ampthill Square (01)	1	~	~	1
LO - Ampthill Square Tenants Hall (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ampthill Tenants Hall (01)	1	1	~	~
LO - Annie Bailey's Restaurant (09)	6	~	1	7
LO - Appletree (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Appletree Trading Estate (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Archers Rest (16)	2	~	~	~
LO - Arden National Character Area (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Armitage with Handsacre (22)	3	~	~	5
LO - Arya Samaj Mission Building (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ash Beds Wood (17)	~	~	~	3
LO - Ash End Farm (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - Ashbrook (10)	~	1	~	1
LO - Ashbrook Recreational Area (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - Ashow (18)	~	~	~	12
LO - Ashton Hayes Farm (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Ashwells Barn (08)	1	1	~	4
LO - Ashwells Farm (08)	2	~	~	7
LO - Aston Hill (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - Aston le Walls (15)	10	~	~	7
LO - Aston le Walls LWS (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Atherstone (19/20/21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Augustus Redhill Allotments (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Avon valley (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Aylesbury (11)	16	9	3	47
LO - Aylesbury Church (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Aylesbury Linear Park (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - Aylesbury Park Golf Course (11)	2	2	2	3
LO - Aylesbury Sewage Works LWS (11)	~	1	~	3
LO - Aylesbury Vale (11)	6	6	3	14
LO - Aylesbury Vale Golf Club (11)	5	~	~	7
LO - Aylesbury Vale Parkway (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - Aylesbury Vale Playing Fields (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bacombe (10)	~	2	~	~
LO - Bacombe and Coombe Hill SSSI (10)	6	~	~	6
LO - Bacombe Hill (10)	2	2	~	6
LO - Ballabeg Stables (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - Ballinger (09)	5	~	1	9
LO - Ballinger (09/10)	~	1	~	~
LO - Ballinger Common (09)	1	~	~	2
LO - Balsall Common (23)	9	1	2	16
LO - Banbury (15)	5	1	1	6
LO - Bangleby Deer Park (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bank Farm (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bannerley Pools (24)	1	~	~	1
LO - Barking (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1

LO - Barleyfields Cottage (14)	49	~	~	~
LO - Barleyfields Farmhouse (14)	49	~	~	~
LO - Barn Cottage (21)	~	~	~	3
LO - Barn Farm (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Barn Field (10)	1	~	~	1
LO - Barnsley (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Barretts Lane Farmhouse (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Barrington Drive (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Barton Hartshorn (13)	1	~	31	~
LO - Barton Hartshorn Railway Wood LWS (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Barton Hill Farm (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - Bascombe Burrows (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bascote Heath (16)	4	~	~	5
LO - Basil Jellicoe Community Hall (01)	1	1	~	~
LO - Battlesford Wood (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Bayhurst Woods (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Beaconsfield (09)	4	~	2	8
LO - Beanit Farm (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - Beanit Spinney Barn (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Beaumont Castle (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Beaumont Lodge (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Beaumont Walk Estate (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bedford Road Estate (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bedworth (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Beech Lodge (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Beechcroft Farmhouse (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Beechcroft open space (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Beechwood (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Beechwood Farm (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Belfry Golf and Leisure Resort - Belfry (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - Belfry Golf Course (21)	2	~	~	~
LO - Bell Public House (06)	1	~	~	~
LO - Belsize (03)	~	~	1	~
LO - Belsize Park (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - Benfields (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bengali Workers Association/Surma Centre (01)	1	1	1	~
LO - Berkswell (23)	4	1	1	8
LO - Berkswell Clay Pigeon Club (23)	3	~	~	1
LO - Berkswell Estate (23)	2	~	~	2
LO - Berkswell Grange (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Berkswell Hall (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - Berkswell Hall/Park/Conservation Area (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - Berkswell Lake (23)	3	~	~	1
LO - Berkswell Marsh Meadow (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Berkswell Marsh SSSI (23)	4	~	~	3
LO - Berkswell Station (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - Bernwood BOA (12/13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bernwood Forest (12/13)	1	~	~	7
LO - Berry Close Hill Castle (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - BHS Warehouse (former) (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bicester (13/14)	3	2	~	4

LO - Bicester MOD Site (13/14)	1	~	~	~
LO - Bickenhill (23)	1	~	~	3
LO - Bickenhill Fire Station (24)	~	~	~	2
LO - Bickenhill Parkway (24)	1	~	~	1
LO - Biddlesden Park (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bierton (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - Big Lyntus Wood SBI (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Big Poors Wood (18)	~	~	~	2
LO - Birches Wood (18)	1	1	~	~
LO - Birches Wood Farm (18)	1	~	1	1
LO - Birmingham (24/25/26)	3	3	~	16
LO - Birmingham Airport (24)	1	2	~	8
LO - Birmingham and Black Country NIA (25/26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Birmingham Business Park (24)	1	~	~	4
LO - Birmingham City Centre Park (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - Birmingham City University Campus (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - Birmingham International Train Station (24)	~	1	~	~
LO - Birmingham Museums Collection Centre (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Birmingham NEC (24)	~	~	~	5
LO - Birmingham Park Street Gardens Cemetery (24)	1	~	~	~
LO - Bishopstone (11)	1	1	~	6
LO - Black - Bourne Brook Corridor BAS (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Black - Bourne Brook SBI (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Black Slough Wood (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Black Waste Wood LWS (18)	~	~	~	3
LO - Blackbrook Valley (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - Blackford (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Blackgreaves Farm (20)	~	1	~	~
LO - Blackgrounds Farm (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Blackgrove Farm Cottages (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - Blashford House (03)	1	~	~	1
LO - Blenheim Care Centre (06)	~	~	~	4
LO - Blenheim Crescent (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bletchley (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bloomsbury (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Bloomsbury Theatre (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Bluebell playing fields (19)	~	~	~	2
LO - Blythe Prior (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Blythe Valley (23)	3	~	~	3
LO - Blythe Valley Buisness Park (23/24)	~	~	~	1
LO - BMI Chiltern Hospital (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bockendon (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bockendon Grange Farmhouse (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Boddington (15)	10	4	~	5
LO - Boddington Hill (15)	1	~	~	1
LO - Boddington Reservoir (15)	1	~	~	3
LO - Boddington Village Hall (15)	~	16	~	1
LO - Bodymoor Heath (19/20)	1	~	~	~
LO - Bonehill (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Boswells Farm (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Botley House (22)	~	~	~	2

LO - Boundary Farm (14)	29	~	~	~
LO - Bourne Bridge (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bourne House, Weeford (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bourne Valley (21)	~	~	~	3
LO - Bow Wood (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Brackenbury (06)	~	~	~	3
LO - Brackenbury Farm (06)	~	~	~	5
LO - Brackenbury House (06)	~	1	~	5
LO - Brackley (14)	5	2	~	19
LO - Bradnock's Marsh (23)	4	~	~	2
LO - Bradnock's Marsh Autotransformer (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Brambles (09)	~	1	~	~
LO - Bray House (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Breakspear Crematorium (07)	1	1	~	1
LO - Bree Louise Public House (01)	6	~	~	1
LO - Brenham Sports and Social Club (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - Brent Reservoir (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - Brentford Wood LWS (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Brentham Sports and Social Club (05)	~	~	~	3
LO - Brick Hill Farm (19)	~	~	~	1
LO - Brick Kiln Spinney LWS (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Brick Wood (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Brickfields Farm (24)	~	~	~	2
LO - BRIDGE - A41 Overbridge (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - A421 (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - A43 Northampton Road Overbridge (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - A45 (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - A452 (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - A46 Kenilworth Eastern Bypass (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - A51 Overbridge (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Acton and Northolt Line Railway Bridge (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - B4009 Nash Lee Overbridge (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - B4113 Stoneleigh Road Overbridge (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Bacons End Bridge (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Baynes Street (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Bicester Road Overbridge (12)	1	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Black-Bourne Bridge (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Blackgrove Road Overbridge (12)	1	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Bowood Lane Overbridge (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Camden Road Bridge (02)	~	~	~	5
LO - BRIDGE - Camden Road North Bridge (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Camden Street Bridge (02)	~	~	~	2
LO - BRIDGE - Camley Street (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Cappers Lane Canal Bridge (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Carol Green Rail Underbridge (23)	3	~	~	4
LO - BRIDGE - Chalk Farm Road (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - Dalehouse Lane Overbridge (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Denham Station Railway Bridge (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - Drayton Lane (21)	1	~	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - Ellesborough Road Bridge (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Granby Terrace (01)	1	~	2	5

LO - BRIDGE - Great Western Bridge (04)	~	~	~	3
LO - BRIDGE - Grove Farm (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Hampstead Road (01)	2	1	~	8
LO - BRIDGE - Hampton Pack Horse (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Hanger Lane East (05)	1	~	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - Havenfield Wood (09/10)	~	~	~	3
LO - BRIDGE - Havenfield Wood Accommodation Bridge (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - Heart of England Way (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - Huddlesfield Road Bridge (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Hyde Lane over bridge (09/10)	~	~	~	2
LO - BRIDGE - Kentish Town Road (02)	1	~	~	8
LO - BRIDGE - Lavender Hall Lane (23)	1	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Lavender Hall Lane Railway Bridge (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Leather Lane Overbridge (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Marsh Lane Motorway Bridge (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Marston Lane Bridge (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Maybey Bridge (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Mercote Mill Farm (23)	2	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Millburn Grange (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Mitre Bridge (04)	1	~	~	2
LO - BRIDGE - Mornington Street Bridge (01)	7	4	3	32
LO - BRIDGE - Morrisons Access Road Bridge (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - Nash Lee Lane (09/10)	~	~	~	2
LO - BRIDGE - Newton Purcell (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Park Royal (04/05)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Patrick Bridge (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - BRIDGE - Randolph Street (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Rocky Lane (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Rookery Lane (24)	1	~	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - Royal College Street (02)	~	~	~	2
LO - BRIDGE - School hill (13)	~	~	~	2
LO - BRIDGE - Seeney Lane Bridge (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Small Dean (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Smalldean Bridge (10)	~	1	~	~
LO - BRIDGE - St Pancras Way (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Stare Bridge (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Stoneleigh (18)	~	1	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Tilehouse Lane (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Trafford Bridge (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Trent & Mersey Canal Bridge (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Victoria Road (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - BRIDGE - Waste Lane (18)	3	~	~	3
LO - BRIDGE - Willison (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bridleways (09/10)	1	~	~	1
LO - British Library (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Broadfields Retail Park (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - Broadwater Lake (07)	1	~	~	6
LO - Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve (07)	~	~	~	7
LO - Broadwells Wood (17)	~	1	~	7
LO - Brock Hurst Wood (21)	~	~	~	3
LO - Brockhurst Farm (21)	~	1	~	~

LO - Brokendown Wood (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bromford (25)	~	~	~	5
LO - Bromford Estate (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bromley Hayes Cattery (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - Brook Farm (21)	1	~	~	2
LO - Brooke House (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bubbenhall Plateau Farmlands (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Buckingham (outside CFAs)	7	~	~	8
LO - Buckingham Constituency area (11, 12, 13, 14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Buckinghamshire (across CFAs)	5	4	~	23
LO - Buckinghamshire Goat Centre (11)	1	~	~	2
LO - Buckinghamshire Railway Centre (12)	2	1	~	7
LO - Bucks Head Cottage (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Bucks Head Farm (21)	1	~	1	4
LO - Bugle Horn (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - Bull Ring (26)	1	~	~	~
LO - Burnham House (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Burnt Heath Farm (17)	~	~	~	2
LO - Burton Green (18)	18	7	4	18
LO - Burton Green electrical feeder station (18)	2	~	~	2
LO - Burton Green Farm (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Burton Green Village Hall (18)	3	~	~	3
LO - Bury Farm (09)	1	~	~	1
LO - Butcher's Hill (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Butler's Cross (10)	1	~	~	3
LO - Buzzed Valley (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Byfield (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Calley Farm (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Calvert (13)	22	12	9	40
LO - Calvert Brick Pits LWS (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Calvert Green (13)	3	1	~	13
LO - Calvert Jubilee (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Calvert Jubilee LWS/Nature Reserve (13)	~	~	~	9
LO - Calvert Lakes (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - Calvert Landfill Site (13)	1	~	~	7
LO - Calvert Railway Station LWS (13)	~	~	~	5
LO - Camden Broadway Conservation Area (02)	~	1	~	~
LO - Camden Cutting (01)	~	1	~	~
LO - Camden Gardens (02)	6	2	~	15
LO - Camden Incline (01)	1	1	~	~
LO - Camden Lock (02)	5	1	~	2
LO - Camden Lock Market (02)	~	~	~	3
LO - Camden Market (02)	9	2	~	19
LO - Camden People's Theatre (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Camden Road Station (02)	4	~	~	~
LO - Camden Roundhouse (02)	~	~	~	4
LO - Camden Town Centre (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - Camden Town Conservation Area (02)	1	1	~	~
LO - Camden/Camden Town (01/02/03)	130	17	7	262
LO - Camley Street (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - Camley Street Maintenance Depot - Network Rail (02)	~	~	~	1

LO - CANAL - Artillery Street Feeder Inlet (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - CANAL - Birmingham & Fazeley (26)	1	~	~	3
LO - CANAL - Coventry (22)	~	~	~	5
LO - CANAL - Digbeth Branch Canal (26)	1	~	~	1
LO - CANAL - Grand Union Canal (across CFAs)	6	2	~	33
LO - CANAL - Lichfield Canal (22)	1	~	~	4
LO - CANAL - Oxford Canal (16)	7	~	~	5
LO - CANAL - Regents (01)	1	1	~	~
LO - CANAL - Regent's Canal (02)	~	~	~	5
LO - CANAL - Trent & Mersey (22)	4	~	~	8
LO - CANAL - Wendover Arm - Grand Union Canal (10)	2	~	~	5
LO - CANAL - Wyrley and Essington Arm - Lichfield Canal (21)	~	~	~	3
LO - Canalside (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - Cannock Chase (22)	~	~	~	3
LO - Canterbury House (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Canterbury Yard (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - Canterbury Yard/works(04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Canwell Estate (21)	1	~	1	1
LO - Canwell Park Farm (21)	1	~	~	1
LO - Carol Green (23)	2	~	~	1
LO - Cartmel Estate (01)	~	1	~	2
LO - Casemore Farm (13)	1	~	~	1
LO - Castle Bromwich (25)	1	~	~	7
LO - Castle Bromwich Business Park (25)	~	~	~	4
LO - Castle Bromwich Hall & Gardens (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Castle Bromwich Motte and Bailey (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Castle Vale (25)	5	1	~	1
LO - Castlehaven Community Centre (02)	1	1	1	~
LO - Castlehaven Estate (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - Cecil Sharp House (03)	~	1	~	1
LO - Cedar House Farm (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Celandine (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Cemex Depot (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Central Chilterns Chalk Rivers BOA (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Central Middlesex Hospital (04)	~	~	~	3
LO - Cerebos Gardens (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - Cerebos Park (04)	~	~	~	3
LO - Chadwick House, Hints (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Chalcots Estate - Adelaide Road (03)	2	1	~	~
LO - Chalfont and Latimer Station (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - Chalfont Common (08)	4	~	~	6
LO - Chalfont Lane (8)	1	~	~	~
LO - Chalfont Park Lake (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Chalfont St Giles (08)	6	2	2	17
LO - Chalfont St Peter (08)	12	2	1	17
LO - Chalfont Valley Equestrian Centre (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - Chalfonts (07/08)	5	~	1	10
LO - Chalk Farm (02)	3	1	1	1
LO - Chalkdell Stays (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Chapel Farm (09)	4	~	~	9
LO - Chardon Recreation Ground (13)	~	~	~	1

LO - Charing Cross Hospital (04)	1	~	~	3
LO - Charndon (13)	6	~	~	7
LO - Chartridge (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Chearsey (11)	~	~	1	~
LO - Chelmsley Wood (24)	4	1	~	6
LO - Chelmsley Wood Estate (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - Chelsea & Westminster Hospital (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Chequers (11)	~	~	1	1
LO - Cherwell (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Cherwell Valley (15)	~	~	~	4
LO - Chesham (09)	11	1	2	22
LO - Chesham Lane Epilepsy Centre (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Chess Valley Headlands (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Chetwode (13)	125	108	38	19
LO - Chetwode Church (13)	54	104	1	~
LO - Chetwode Conservation Area (13)	3	~	~	2
LO - Chetwode Cutting BNS (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Chetwode Manor (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Chetwode Manor Farm (13)	38	~	1	~
LO - Chetwode Priory (13)	4	1	~	2
LO - Chiltern Cottage (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - Chiltern Cycle Way (08)	2	~	~	~
LO - Chiltern Open Air Museum (08)	1	~	~	5
LO - Chiltern Scarp (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - Chilterns AONB	4	3	~	~
LO - Chilterns AONB (08/09/10/11)	~	~	2	5,969
LO - Chilterns Crematorium (08/09)	1	~	~	3
LO - Chilterns/Chiltern Hills (08/09/10/11)	~	~	8	117
LO - Chilterns/Chiltern Hills (09)	~	13	~	~
LO - Chilterns/Chiltern Hills (across CFAs)	49	~	~	~
LO - Chipping Warden (15)	9	3	3	22
LO - Chiswick (04)	1	1	~	15
LO - Chorleywood (08)	2	~	~	~
LO - Christopher Wray Building (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Church Copse LWS (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Church Fenton (unidentified)	~	~	~	1
LO - Church of All Souls (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Church of St Peter and St Paul (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Church of St. Bartholomew (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Church View Farm (13)	1	~	~	1
LO - Churchway Estate (01)	1	1	~	~
LO - Clarence Gardens (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Clarkson Row (01)	~	2	~	~
LO - Claydon (15)	1	~	1	2
LO - Claydon House (13)	4	~	~	2
LO - Claydon Woods (12/13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Cocksparrow Farm (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - Coke Bottom Farm (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Coldharbour (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - Coldharbour Way (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - Coleshill (19)	4	~	1	3

LO - Coleshill Deer Park (19)	~	~	~	1
LO - Coleshill Hall Farm (24)	1	1	~	2
LO - Coleshill Junction (19)	~	2	~	2
LO - Coleshill Manor (19)	~	~	~	2
LO - Coleshill Park Belt (19)	~	~	~	1
LO - Coleshill Pool Wood (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - Coleshill Pools (24)	1	~	~	2
LO - Coleshill Sewage Works (19)	1	~	~	1
LO - College Park, Kilburn (03)	~	~	~	3
LO - Colne Protected Water Zone (07)	2	~	~	2
LO - Colne Valley (07)	21	5	5	2,446
LO - Colne Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Colne Valley Country Park (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Colne Valley Lakes (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - Colne Valley Living Landscape Area (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Colne Valley Park (07)	~	1	1	~
LO - Colne Valley Regional Park (07)	23	~	~	7
LO - Colne Valley SSSI (07)	~	~	~	6
LO - Colwich (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Common Barn Farm (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - Common Farm (22)	3	~	~	6
LO - Common Farm (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - Compass theatre, Ickenham (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Coneycroft Farm (10)	2	~	~	1
LO - Coniston Estate (01)	~	1	~	3
LO - Constable House (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - A4091 Overbridge (20)	1	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - A413/ Amersham (08)	~	~	~	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - A452 Chester Road (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - A51/Tamworth Road Overbridge (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Amphill Square Estate (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Atlas Road (04)	3	~	~	5
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - B4115 Coventry Road Overbridge Compound (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - B4451 Kineton Road Overbridge (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Balsall Common Viaduct Satellite Compound (23)	1	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Banbury Road (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Barnby Street (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Bicester Road (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Birmingham Airport Satellite Compound (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Birmingham Int. Railway Station Compound (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Black Brook Viaduct (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Boddington Road (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Bottom House Farm Lane (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Brackley South Cutting (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Cappers Lane (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Car Giant (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chalfont St Giles (08)	~	~	~	2

LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chalfont St Peter (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chelmsley Wood (19)	~	~	1	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chesham Lane (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chesham Road	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chetwode/School End (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chiltern Tunnel	5	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chiltern Tunnel (08/09/10)	~	~	~	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chiltern tunnel north portal (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Chipping Warden (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Church Lane Overbridge (20)	6	~	44	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Coleshill Heath Road (19/24)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Colne Valley (07)	6	~	~	4
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Crackley Lane Overbridge (18)	2	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Curzon Street (26)	1	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Dalehouse Lane Overbridge Compound (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Dalehouse Overbridge Compound (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Diddington Lane (22/23)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Eastside Park (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Edgcote (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Euston Square Gardens (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Fulfen Wood Rail Underbridge Compound (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Greatworth Green Tunnel Satellite Compound (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Greenpark Way (05)	~	~	~	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Hams Hall (20)	3	~	5	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Harvey's Rough Viaduct/WCML Tie In (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Harvil Road (06)	~	~	~	4
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Havenfield Wood Vent Shaft Satellite Compound (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Hill Road (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Juniper Crescent (02)	1	1	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Langley Brook (20)	10	~	44	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Langley Brook Viaduct (20)	~	~	1	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Lavender Hall Lane (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Leather Lane (09)	4	~	~	4
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Leather Lane Overbridge Satellite Compound (09)	~	~	~	4
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Little Missenden Vent Shaft (09)	1	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Long Itchington Wood (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Lower Radbourne Main Compound (16)	1	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Lower Thorpe (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Mandeville Road (05)	~	~	~	4
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Mantle's Wood (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Mantles Wood Satellite compound (09)	~	~	~	6
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Marsh Lane (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Marston Lane (20)	~	~	~	2

LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Mouldings Green Farm	2	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Mouldings Green Farm (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Nash Lee Road B4010 Overbridge (11)	~	~	~	5
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - National Temperance (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Newton Purcell (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Old Oak Common (04)	~	~	~	12
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Old Oak Common Lane (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Oxford Road Overbridge (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Perry Hill/Temporary Railhead (13)	1	~	1	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Regent's Park Estate (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Risborough Road (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - River Avon Viaduct North (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - River Avon Viaduct South (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - River Itchen Viaduct (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Rocky Lane under bridge satellite compound (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - School Hill (13)	1	~	2	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - School Hill Satellite Maintenance Compound (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Shadow Brook Viaduct (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Small Dean Lane Main compound (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Small Dean Viaduct Launch satellite compound (10)	~	~	~	4
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - South Heath - Green Tunnel Southern Portal (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - South Heath Green Tunnel Satellite Compound (09)	1	~	~	7
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - South Heath Green Tunnel Southern Portal (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Stonebridge Roundabout Satellite Compound (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Stoneleigh Park Retaining Wall (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Stoneleigh Road Overbridge Compound (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Streethay (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Tameside Drive (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Tewnal's Lane (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Thame Valley (11-12)	~	1	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Thame Valley viaduct satellite site compound (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Trent and Mersey West underbridge (22)	2	~	1	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Victoria Road (04)	1	~	~	10
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Welsh Road West (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Wendover Dean Viaduct Satellite Compounds (10)	~	~	~	4
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Wendover Green Tunnel Satellite Compound (10)	1	~	~	3
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - West Gate main site (05)	1	~	~	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - West Ruislip (06)	~	~	~	2

LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - West Ruislip Railhead (06)	~	1	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - West Street (13)	4	~	2	2
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Whielden Lane	2	~	~	~
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Willesden Euro Terminal (04)	1	~	~	5
LO - CONSTRUCTION SITE - Wood End Lane Realignment Compound	~	~	1	~
LO - Coombe Hill (10)	~	3	~	15
LO - Coombe Hill (11)	5	~	~	~
LO - Coombe Hill SSSI (10)	1	1	~	1
LO - Coppice Ancient Woodland (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Coptall Farm (06)	~	~	~	3
LO - Cophall Covert (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - Corby District (14/15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Costons Brook (05)	1	~	~	~
LO - Costow House (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Cottage Farm (09)	4	~	~	2
LO - Cottage Farm (10)	~	~	~	5
LO - Cottage Hotel (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Couley Lodge (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - Coventry (18)	4	~	1	~
LO - Coventry (outside CFAs)	~	7	~	20
LO - Coventry Road Allotments (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - Cowley Farm (13)	~	1	~	~
LO - Cowley Lodge (13)	~	1	~	1
LO - Crabmill Farm (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Crackley (18)	6	2	~	5
LO - Crackley Farm (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Crackley Gap (18)	2	1	~	2
LO - Crackley Wood (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Crackley Wood North (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Crackley Woods Nature Reserve (18)	~	~	~	3
LO - Cranwell Farm (12)	3	~	~	3
LO - Cricket Field Cottages (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Cricklewood (03)	~	1	~	~
LO - Cropredy (15)	~	1	~	1
LO - Cross Farm (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Crosslands Farm (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - Crow's Castle Mound, Hints (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Cryfield (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Cubbington (17)	9	~	~	13
LO - Cubbington Sports and Social Club (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Cubbington Wood (17)	~	~	1	10
LO - Cubbington Woods (17)	1	1	~	~
LO - Cubitts Copse (13)	~	~	1	~
LO - Cudsdens Cottage (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Cudsdens Court (09)	2	~	1	8
LO - Cudworth (20)	~	1	~	~
LO - Culworth (15)	6	~	~	4
LO - Culworth Grounds Farm (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Culworth Mill (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Cumberland Basin (01)	~	~	~	1

LO - Cumberland Market (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Cumberland Market Estate (01)	~	~	~	2
LO - Curborough (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Curborough House (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Curdworth (20)	5	~	~	3
LO - Curzon Park (26)	1	~	~	~
LO - CUTTING - Camden (01)	2	~	5	20
LO - CUTTING - Cranebrook Hill (21)	1	~	~	~
LO - CUTTING - Cubbington (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - CUTTING - Euston (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - CUTTING - Finmere (13/14)	1	~	~	~
LO - CUTTING - South Heath (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - CUTTING - Thorpe Mandeville Cutting (15)	~	~	1	~
LO - CUTTING - Tilehouse (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - CUTTING - Windmill Hill (16)	2	~	~	~
LO - CUTTING - Wormleighton (15)	4	~	~	~
LO - Cuttlemill Farm and Fishery (20)	3	~	~	1
LO - CYCLEROUTE - 57 (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - CYCLEROUTE - A429 (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - CYCLEROUTE - Aylesbury Gemstone (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - CYCLEROUTE - Cardington/Melton Street (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - CYCLEROUTE - Chiltern Cycle Route (09)	2	~	~	4
LO - CYCLEROUTE - Chiltern Cycle Way (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - CYCLEROUTE - National Cycle Route 50 (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - CYCLEROUTE - Sustrans 51	~	~	~	1
LO - CYCLEROUTE - Sustrans 52 (18)	1	~	~	1
LO - CYCLEROUTE - Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 48 (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - CYCLEROUTE - Sustrans National Cycle Route 41 (17)	~	~	~	2
LO - CYCLEROUTE - Westbury Circular (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - CYCLEWAY - NCR52	1	~	~	~
LO - Dairy Ground Field, Greatworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Dalehouse Farm (18)	2	~	1	~
LO - Dalehouse Farmhouse (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - D'Anvers House (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Dar Lor (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Darwin Court (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - Darwin Court (03)	~	2	~	~
LO - Daventry (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Daw Mills Colliery (18)	2	~	~	1
LO - Days Hotel - Long Drive (06)	1	~	~	~
LO - Days Hotel (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Decoypond Wood (13)	1	~	~	2
LO - Decoypond Wood LWS (13)	~	~	~	6
LO - Defence Medical Services Whittington (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Denbigh Spinney LWS (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - Denham (07)	7	2	4	20
LO - Denham Airport (07)	1	1	1	~
LO - Denham Country Park LNR (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Denham Garden Village (07)	2	~	~	~
LO - Denham Green (07)	3	1	~	2

LO - Denham Green Sewage Treatment Works (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Denham Memorial Hall (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Denham Park Farm (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Denham Railway Station (07)	~	~	1	~
LO - Denham Water Ski Club (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - DEPOT - IMD - Steeple Claydon (13)	~	~	~	2
LO - DEPOT - IMD Calvert (13)	~	~	~	8
LO - DEPOT - Maintenance Loop Stoke Mandeville (11)	~	~	~	4
LO - DEPOT - Washwood Heath (26)	~	~	~	5
LO - Derbyshire (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	2
LO - Dew's Dell SBI (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Dews Farm (07)	1	~	~	5
LO - Diddington (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Diddington Farm (23)	4	~	~	2
LO - Diddington Hall (23)	3	~	~	3
LO - Digbeth (26)	~	~	~	7
LO - Digbeth Conservation Area (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Dinton (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ditchums (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - Doddershall (12)	4	1	~	3
LO - Doddershall House (12)	3	1	~	7
LO - Doddershall Wood (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - Dorney House (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Drayton Bassett (21)	4	2	~	8
LO - Drummond Street Neighbourhood Centre (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Dunsmore (10)	4	~	~	15
LO - Dunsmore ridge (10)	~	1	~	~
LO - Dunsmore Woodlands (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Dunton Hall (20)	3	~	~	2
LO - Dunton Island Junction (20)	~	~	~	2
LO - Dunton Stables (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - Durdent Court (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Durham Farm (10)	4	~	~	13
LO - Eagle and Tun Public House (26)	1	~	~	1
LO - Ealing (05)	3	~	~	11
LO - East Acton (04)	14	4	~	27
LO - East Acton Station (04)	6	~	~	~
LO - East Gate (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - East Lodge (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Eastcote (06)	~	1	~	~
LO - Eastcote (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - Easthill Farm (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Eastside (26)	~	1	~	7
LO - Eastside City Park (26)	~	~	~	9
LO - Eastside Locks (26)	~	~	~	3
LO - Echills Wood (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Edgcote (15)	2	~	~	4
LO - Edgcote Battlefield (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Edgcote House (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Edgcote Park (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Edgcote Villa (15)	~	~	~	1

LO - Edgcott (12)	~	~	~	5
LO - Edinburgh Castle Public House (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ellen Road (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - Ellesborough (10)	2	~	~	5
LO - Elm Tree Farm (13)	~	~	~	2
LO - Elm Tree Farm (14)	~	1	~	~
LO - Elm Village (02)	~	~	~	2
LO - Elwis Farm (09)	2	~	~	3
LO - Elwis Field Farm (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - English Folk Dance and Song Society HQ (03)	~	1	~	~
LO - Eskdale Estate (01)	1	~	~	4
LO - Eskdale Open Space (01)	~	~	~	6
LO - Etcetera Theatre (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - Euston (01)	71	9	9	138
LO - Euston Fire Station (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Euston Lodges (01)	~	~	~	2
LO - Euston Square (01)	1	~	~	7
LO - Euston Square Gardens (01)	5	1	~	12
LO - Euston Station (01)	2	1	~	13
LO - Euston West LCA (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Eversholt Street Neighbourhood Centre (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Eythrope (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - Eythrope Park (11/12)	1	~	~	~
LO - Fairford Leys (11)	7	1	1	10
LO - Falcon House (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Falcutt Hall Farm (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - Farjeon House (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Farthings Wood/LWS (09)	1	~	~	6
LO - Fazeley (20)	3	~	~	~
LO - Fazeley (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Fern Bank (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Field A/B Cowley Farm LWS/BNS (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Field Acres Farm (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Field Cottages (14)	28	~	~	~
LO - Fields Farm (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Fields Farm (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Finemere Meadows (12)	~	~	~	2
LO - Finemere Wood (12)	3	~	~	6
LO - Finemere Wood SSSI/BBOWT Nature Reserve (12)	1	~	~	4
LO - Finham Brook (18)	1	1	~	3
LO - Finmere (13/14)	10	3	2	7
LO - Finmere Aerodrome (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Finmere Landfill (14)	1	~	~	1
LO - Finmere Quarry (14)	1	~	~	1
LO - Finmere Quarry Landfill (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - Firfield Farm (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Firs Estate (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Firsdale Estate (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Fitzrovia Youth in Action (01)	1	1	~	~
LO - Fleet Marston (11)	3	3	~	12
LO - Flint Arrowhead, Canwell (21)	~	~	~	1

LO - Florence Nightingale Memorial Garden (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Folly Bridge portal (10/11)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH - M105 (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH - M107 (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH - M108 (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH - M114 (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH - M96 (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/ PRoW - AE20 (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/ PRoW - AE28 (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - 130b (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - 165x (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - 225/4/20 (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - 225/5/10 (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - 39 (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - 40 (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AC1 (15)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AC2 (15)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AE12 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AE18 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AE20 (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AE28 (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AE5 (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AG10 (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AMS/16/2 (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AMS/18/3 (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AN13 (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AN19 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AN22 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AN28 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AN37 (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AN4 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AN40 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AN42 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AX/007 (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AX/014 (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AX/015 (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AX37 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - AY12 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Aylesbury Ring (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BB11 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BB3 (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BB4 (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BD/002 (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BD/004 (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BD/007 (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BD/008 (14)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BD/010 (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BHA/2/1 (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BHA/2/2 (14)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BHA/3/1 (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Bottom House Farm Lane (08)	1	~	~	~

LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BR5 (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Bridleway 10 (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Bridleway 44 (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Bridleway 57/1 (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - bridleway U42 (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Bridleways (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BW303/22 (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BW303/4 (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - BW303/5 (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CAG/2/1 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Calendine Route Trail (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Centenary Way (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Chiltern Way (08/10)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Chiltern Way (10)	2	~	~	9
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CHW/11/1 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CHW/18/1 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CHW/24/2 (13)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Connect 2 Kenilworth (18)	~	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Connect 2 Kenilworth public footpath (18)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Connect2Kenilworth (18)	~	1	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Cottage Farm	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Coventry Way (18)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Cross Bucks Way (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CSG/28/4	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CSG/30/1 (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CSP/10/1	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CSP/16/1	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CSP/16/1 (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CSP/43/2 (07)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CSP/44/1 (07)	2	1	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CSP/44/2 (07)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CV22/1 (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - CW25/1 (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - DEN/2/1 (07)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - DEN/3/1 (07)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - E2413 (16)	~	1	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - E2994 (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - ELL/1/1 (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - ELL/2 (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - ELL/20/1 (11)	2	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - ELL/25/1	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - ELL/5/1 (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - ELL/8 (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - FMA/1/1 (11)	2	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - FMA/2/1 (11)	2	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Fosse Way (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - FP225/4 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - FP225/5 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Frith Hill	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/12/1	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/12/1 (09)	~	~	~	6

LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/13/3	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/13/3 (09)	2	~	~	7
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/13/8 (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/2/1	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/2/1 (09)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/21/1 (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/23/7	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/23/7 (09)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/26/1	3	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/26/1 (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/27/1 (09)	4	~	~	6
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/28/1 (09)	2	~	~	6
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/28/7	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/28/7 (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/3/1	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/32 (09)	3	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/33 (09)	3	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/33/1 (09)	2	~	~	5
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/33/2 (09)	3	~	~	5
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/33/3	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/33/3 (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/33/4 (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/33/5 (09)	1	~	~	5
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/34 (09)	3	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/5/2	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/79/1 (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/79/1&2 (09)	~	~	~	5
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/79/2 (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/80/1 (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/80/1&2 (09)	~	~	~	5
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/80/2 (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GMI/81/1 (09)	2	~	~	6
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Grand Union Canal Walk (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GUN/25/1 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GUN/28/1 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - GUN/36/2 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Harry Green Way (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Heart of England Way (21/22)	2	~	~	7
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Heron Path (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Ickneild Way Regional	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Ickneild Way Regional (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Kenilworth Greenway (18)	10	1	1	15
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Lady Alice's Walk (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Liberty Lane (09)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Little Missenden - Mantle's Wood	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - LM/40/2 (09)	~	~	~	4
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - LMI/17/1 (09)	3	~	~	4
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - LMI/17/2 (09)	2	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - LMI/21/1 (09)	5	~	~	5
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - LMI/21/2 (09)	2	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - LMI/27 (9/10)	~	~	~	2

LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - LMI/40/2 (09)	4	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - London Loop (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M144a (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M164 (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M165x (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M182 (23)	3	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M184 (23)	3	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M186 (18/23)	~	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M186 (23)	3	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M187 (23)	3	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M191 (23)	4	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M192 (23)	2	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M196 (23)	3	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M197 (23)	3	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M198 (23)	2	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M214 (23)	4	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M215 (23)	5	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M216 (23)	3	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M217 (23)	4	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M218 (23)	4	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M230A (23)	3	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M43 (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M450 (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M54 (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M56 (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M72 (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M75 (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M76/Hall Walk (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - M77 (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Mill Lane (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Millennium Way (17)	2	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Nash Lee Orchard (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - National Cycle Route 50	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - North Bucks footpath (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Offchurch Greenway (17)	1	1	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Old Shire Lane (07)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - PBI/5A/3 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - PBI/5F/7 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - PBI/6/2 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - PBI/6/3 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - PBI/9/3 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - PMB/8/10 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - PMB/8/11 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - QUA/24A/1 (12)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - QUA/26/1 (12)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - QUA/28A (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - QUA/28A/2 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - QUA/31/3 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - QUA/36/2 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - R146 (06)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Rickmansworth bridleway (07)	~	~	~	1

LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Ridgeway (10)	1	1	~	8
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Salt Lane Bridleway (16)	4	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SBH/16/1 (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SBH/19/7 (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SBH/2/4 (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SBH/27/1 (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SBH/32/1 (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SBH/34/1 (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/13/2 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/18/1 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/6/1 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/7 (13)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/7/1 (13)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/7/2 (13)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/8 (13)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/8/1 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/8/2 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/8/3 (13)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/8/4 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/9 (13)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/9/1 (13)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SCL/9/3 (13)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Shakespeare's Avon Way (17)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Shire Lane Bridleway	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Shire Lane Bridleway (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Sibleys Coppice (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SM101 (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SM116 (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SM116A (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SM200 (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SM33 (16)	2	1	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SM89 (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SM90 (16)	2	1	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/11/2 (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/15A/2 (11)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/16/1 (11)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/5/1 (11)	2	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/5/2 (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/5A (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/6/1/ (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/8/2 (11)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/8/3 (11)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - SMA/9/1 (11)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - South Bucks Way	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - South Bucks Way (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Sustrans Cycleway (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - T17	46	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - T17 (20)	~	1	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TLE/2/2 (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TLE/5 (9/10)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TLE/5/2 (10)	1	~	~	~

LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TUW/3/2 (14)	3	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TUW/4/2 (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TUW/5/1 (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TUW/7/1 (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TUW/9/2 (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TUW3 (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TWY/16 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TWY/16/1 (13)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TWY/17/1 (13)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TWY/18/2 (13)	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - TWY/4/1 (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - U34 (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - U42 (06)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - U45 (06)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - U46 (06)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - U47 (06)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - U81 (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W128 (17)	~	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W129d (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W129X (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W129y (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W129Y (17)	2	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W130 (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W130b (18)	~	~	~	3
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W164 (18)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W165X (18)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W167 (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W168 (18)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W168a (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W169 (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W171 (18)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W18/W185/W185a/W18535 (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - W192 (17)	1	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WAD/22/1 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WAD/3/4 (12)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WAD/4/2 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WAD/4A/1 (12)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WAD/5/1 (12)	2	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WAD/6/1 (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WAD/7A/5 (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WBB/17/1 (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/11/1	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/13A/1 (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/13B/2 (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/13C/1 (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/14/4	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/15/3 (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/36 (09/10)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/36/1	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/38/1 (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/39 (09/10)	~	~	~	2

LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/39/2	2	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/53/2 (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/55/1	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/57/1	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - WEN/6 (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - FOOTPATH/PRoW - Westbury Circular Ride (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - FOOTPATHS/PRoW - South Buckinghamshire Way (07)	~	~	~	3
LO - Fordbridge (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - Forest Close (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Fort Dunlop (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Fort Parkway (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Fosse Farm (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Fosse Way (16/17)	~	~	~	2
LO - Four Winds (18)	~	1	~	~
LO - Fox and Grapes Public House (26)	1	~	~	3
LO - Fox Covert (14/16)	4	~	~	~
LO - Fox Covert LWS (14)	~	~	~	3
LO - Fradley (22)	2	~	~	3
LO - Fradley Business Park (22)	1	1	~	2
LO - Fradley Gorse (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Fradley Junction (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Fradley Park Industrial Estate (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - Fradley Wood (22)	1	~	~	2
LO - Francis Crick Institute (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Fray's Farm Meadows SSSI (07)	1	~	~	1
LO - Frays Valley LNR (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Freeford Manor (21)	~	~	~	4
LO - Freightliner Terminal, Landor Street (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Freightliner Yard (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - Friends House (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Friends House Garden (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Fringford (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Frith Hill (09)	4	~	1	10
LO - Frith Hill Farm (09)	2	~	~	5
LO - Froghall Brickworks SSSI (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Front Close Field, Greatworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Fulham (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	2
LO - Full Moon Public House (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Fulwell (14)	1	~	~	3
LO - Furzehill Cottages (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Furzen Hill Cottages (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Furzen Hill Farm (18)	~	~	~	2
LO - Gatemead Farm (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Gatwick Airport (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Gawcott (13)	4	~	~	2
LO - Gaydon (outside CFAs)	~	1	~	~
LO - Gaydon (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Gerrards Cross (08)	~	~	~	3
LO - Gibbet Hall (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Gilbert Spinney (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Gilson (19)	6	1	2	5

LO - Gilson Lodge (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - Glebe Farm (12)	4	1	~	4
LO - Glebe House (11)	1	1	~	1
LO - Glyn Davies Wood (15)	1	~	~	1
LO - Godington (13)	~	~	~	2
LO - Golborne Ward (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Gold's Clump, Hints (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Goldspring Estate (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Good Hope Hospital (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Goodman Gateway (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Gooseberry Hall (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Gorse Farm	~	~	1	~
LO - Gorse Farm (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - Gorse Hill Mound, Hints (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Grand Lodge (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - Grand Lodge Waddesdon (12)	~	~	~	2
LO - Grand Union Canal Conservation Area	1	~	~	~
LO - Grand Union Canal Conservation Area (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Grant Thornton House (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Gravel Farm (14)	~	~	1	~
LO - Greasley Hall, Hints (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Great Central Railway LWS (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	3
LO - Great Halings Wood LWS (07)	~	~	~	3
LO - Great Missenden (09)	41	2	1	47
LO - Great Missenden Church (09)	2	~	1	4
LO - Great Missenden Conservation Area (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Great Missenden Library (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Great Missenden Railway Station (09)	2	~	1	~
LO - Great Missenden Tennis Club (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - Greatmoor (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - Greatmoor Sailing Club (13)	~	~	~	2
LO - Greatsea Wood LWS (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - Greatworth (15)	30	7	7	10
LO - Greatworth Fields (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - Greatworth Fields Farm (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - Greatworth Fields, Greatworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	4
LO - Greatworth Grange (15)	1	~	~	2
LO - Greatworth Hall (15)	11	~	~	6
LO - Greatworth Hall Cutting/Chipping Warden Airfield LWS (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Greatworth Hall Farmhouse (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Greatworth Park (15)	1	~	~	4
LO - Grebe Lake (13)	1	~	~	1
LO - Green Belt designated land (unidentified)	~	~	~	1
LO - Greenford (05)	1	~	~	6
LO - Greenford Mail Centre (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - Greenford Park (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Greenleaf Nursery (16)	2	1	~	1
LO - Grendon and Doddershall Meadows LWS (12)	1	~	~	3
LO - Grendon and Doddershall Woods (12)	1	~	~	4
LO - Grendon Underwood (13)	~	~	~	3
LO - Grimms Ditch (09)	9	~	~	~

LO - Grimms Hill	1	~	~	~
LO - Grimms Hill (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Grims Ditch (09)	~	3	1	23
LO - Grove (The) (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Grove Farm (10)	3	2	1	6
LO - Grove Quarry (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Haddenham (outside CFAs)	1	1	1	2
LO - Hale (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hall Farm (14)	~	~	~	3
LO - Halse Copse (15)	5	~	~	1
LO - Halse Copse Farm (15)	1	~	~	1
LO - Halse Copse Meadow LWS (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Halse Copse North (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Halse Copse South LWS (15)	~	~	~	4
LO - Halse Grande Farm (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - Halton (10)	4	~	~	10
LO - Hammersmith (04)	1	~	~	14
LO - Hammersmith Hospital (04)	3	1	~	18
LO - Hammonds Hall Farm (09)	2	~	~	1
LO - Hampden Meadow (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - Hampden Pond (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - Hampstead (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hampstead Heath (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hampstead Open Space (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hampstead Parish Church (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hampstead Road Open Space (01)	~	~	~	5
LO - Hampton Ammunition Depot (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hampton Pond (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hampton Station	1	~	~	~
LO - Hampton-in-Arden (23)	10	~	4	11
LO - Hampton-in-Arden Conservation Area (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hams Hall Distribution Park (20)	~	~	~	3
LO - Hanch Hall (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hanch Hall Farm (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hanch Wood (22)	1	~	~	1
LO - Handsacre (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hanger Hill (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - Harbury (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - Harefield	~	~	1	~
LO - Harefield (06)	7	3	1	~
LO - Harefield (07)	~	~	~	2,430
LO - Harefield Hall and the Lodge SBI (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Harefield Hospital (07)	1	1	~	7
LO - Harefield Lake (07)	1	~	~	1
LO - Harefield Marina (07)	1	~	~	3
LO - Harefield Moor Lake (07)	1	~	~	2
LO - Harefield Service Reservoir (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Harefield Village Conservation Area (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Hares Parlour LWS (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Harlesden (04)	~	2	~	8
LO - Harp Farm (16)	7	1	~	~

LO - Harrington Square (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Harrington Street Community Hall (01)	~	~	~	2
LO - Harrow (06)	~	~	~	2,397
LO - Hartlands Parkway (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hartley Farm (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - Hartwell (11)	6	1	1	8
LO - Hartwell Cottage (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hartwell Depot (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - Hartwell House and Estate (11)	7	3	1	17
LO - Hartwell Landfill (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Harvil Farm (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hatton Bank Farm (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Havenfield Wood (09)	2	~	~	6
LO - Haverstock Hill (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hawkslade (11)	~	~	~	4
LO - Hawley Lock (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hawley Road Open Space (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hawley Wharf (02)	5	2	~	18
LO - Hawtrey's Pit (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hayston (23)	~	1	~	~
LO - Hayston (unidentified)	~	~	1	~
LO - Hayward Industrial Estate (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Heart of England Aeromodellers (23)	2	~	~	2
LO - Heath End (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - Heath Park (24)	2	~	~	4
LO - Heathfield (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Heathrow	~	~	1	~
LO - Heathrow (06)	~	~	~	2,395
LO - Heathrow (outside CFAs)	~	1	~	~
LO - Heathrow Airport (outside CFAs)	1	~	~	10
LO - Heathrow Spur (07)	1	~	~	3
LO - Hedgemoor (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - Hedgemoor Wood (09)	2	~	~	10
LO - Helmdon (14)	1	~	~	2
LO - Helmdon Disused Railway SSSI (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - Helmdon SSSI (14)	~	~	~	5
LO - Hereford (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hertfordshire	2	~	~	~
LO - Hertfordshire (07)	~	2	~	~
LO - Hertfordshire (07/08)	~	~	~	3
LO - Hewins Wood (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - High Wycombe (9)	3	~	~	7
LO - High Wycombe General Hospital (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Higher Denham (unidentified)	~	~	~	1
LO - Highfield (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Highfurlong Brook flood plain (15)	1	~	~	1
LO - Hilgrove Estate (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hill Farm (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hill Farm (22)	3	~	~	~
LO - Hill Farm Wood (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hillingdon (05/06/07)	~	~	~	13

LO - Hillingdon (06/07)	~	3	~	~
LO - Hillingdon (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hillingdon Fire Station (06/07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Hillingdon Hospital (06/07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Hillingdon Hospital (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre (07)	26	8	1	2,435
LO - Hillingdon Trail (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - Hillsborough Court (01/02)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hints (21)	~	8	3	45
LO - Hints Green (21)	~	~	1	~
LO - Hints Hall (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hints Hall Park (21)	~	~	1	1
LO - Hints Manor (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hints Mill (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hints Quarry (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - Hints/Hints Conservation Area (21)	11	~	1	10
LO - HMP Wormwood Scrubs (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hodgemoor Wood SSSI	2	~	1	~
LO - Hodgemoor Wood SSSI (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - Hollow Way (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - Holly house (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Holly Lodge (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - Holywell Brook (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - Home Farm (14)	28	~	~	~
LO - Home Farm Shelswell (14)	1	~	~	1
LO - Hopscotch Asian Women's Centre (01)	~	1	~	~
LO - Horn Hill (07)	4	~	~	1
LO - Hornbrook Farm & Barn (23)	1	~	~	1
LO - Horse & Barge visitor moorings (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Horsley Brook Farm (21)	1	~	~	6
LO - Horsley Brook Racing Stables (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - House Copse North (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hovel Field Spinney (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - HP16 (unidentified)	~	1	~	~
LO - Huddlesford (22)	1	~	~	1
LO - Hunningham (17)	2	~	~	~
LO - Hunters Farm (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - Hunts Green (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - Hunts Green (21)	6	~	1	1
LO - Hunts Green Farm (10)	1	~	~	2
LO - Hyde (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - Hyde End (09)	6	~	~	4
LO - Hyde Farm (09)	6	1	~	10
LO - Hyde Heath - Wendover (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hyde Heath (09)	15	~	1	13
LO - Hyde Heath Common BNS (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hyde Heath Infant School (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hyde Heath LCA (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Hyde House Wood BNS (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Hyde Lane (09)	1	~	~	6
LO - Hyde Lane Verge BNS (09)	~	~	~	1

LO - Hyde Manor (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - Ian Rennie Memorial Woodland (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ibis Hotel Euston (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Ickenham (06)	13	6	7	2,447
LO - Ickenham Greenway (06)	1	~	~	~
LO - Ickenham Manor (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ickenham Marshes (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - Ickenham Park (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ickenham Village (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ickleford (07/08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ilett's Courtyard (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ilett's Farm (14)	~	~	~	3
LO - Image House Farm (unidentified)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ingle Hill Farm (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ireland Wood (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Island Project School (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Islington (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Iver (07)	1	~	2	~
LO - Iver (outside CFAs)	~	2	~	2
LO - Iver Heath (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Iver West (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Ivy House Dental Practice (02)	1	~	~	8
LO - Jaguar Land Rover Freight Terminal (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Jenkin's Wood (09)	4	~	~	6
LO - Jobs Hill (21)	1	~	~	2
LO - John Milton's Cottage and Garden (08)	1	~	~	2
LO - John's Gorse (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Jones Hill Wood (10)	2	~	~	14
LO - Jones Wood (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Jubilee Lake (13)	1	~	~	2
LO - Jubilee Playing Field (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - Jubilee Wood (18)	3	1	~	~
LO - Juniper Wood BNS (07)	~	~	~	3
LO - Keepers Wood	1	~	~	~
LO - Keepers Wood (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Kenilworth (18)	14	9	8	25
LO - Kenilworth Castle (18)	~	1	~	2
LO - Kenilworth Golf Course (18)	2	1	~	3
LO - Kenilworth Greenway (18)	1	~	~	4
LO - Kennel Farm (08)	2	~	~	~
LO - Kennel Farm (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Kensal (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Kensal Green (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Kensal Green Cemetery (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - Kensal Green Conservation Area (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - Kensal Triangle (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Kent Downs AONB (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Kentish Town (02)	1	~	~	7
LO - Kettering District (14/15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Kilburn (03)	9	~	~	~
LO - Kilburn (03/04)	~	~	~	7

LO - Kingfisher Banks (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - King's Ash (10)	1	~	~	1
LO - King's Ash ridge (10)	~	2	~	1
LO - Kings Bromley (22)	~	~	~	4
LO - King's Bromley (22)	3	~	~	~
LO - Kings Bromley Cattery (22)	2	~	~	~
LO - Kings Bromley Marina (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Kings Bromley Wharf (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - King's Cross (01)	3	1	~	4
LO - King's Head Public House (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Kings Hill Grange (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Kings Orchard Marina (22)	~	~	~	3
LO - Kingsbury (20)	1	~	~	3
LO - Kingsbury Water Park (20)	3	~	~	6
LO - Kingshall (09)	1	~	~	2
LO - Kingshill Baptist Church (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Kingshurst (19)	1	~	~	1
LO - Knowle Hill (18)	3	~	~	~
LO - Knowle Hill (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Korda Lake (07)	1	~	~	3
LO - Korda Lake Nature Reserve (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ladbroke (16)	11	1	5	9
LO - Ladbroke Farm (16)	2	~	~	~
LO - Ladbroke Fox Covert (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ladbroke Grove Farm (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ladbroke Hill Farm (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lake Farm (13)	~	1	~	3
LO - Lanchester Park (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Langdale Estate (01)	~	1	~	3
LO - Langley Brook (20)	26	~	~	3
LO - Langley Park (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Langly Walk (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Langtry Walk (03/04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Latimer (outside CFAs)	1	~	~	1
LO - Lavender Hall (23)	3	~	~	1
LO - Lavender Hall Farm & Barn (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lavender Hall Fishery (23)	4	~	~	2
LO - Lawn Hill (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - Lea Marston (20)	2	3	~	5
LO - Leam Valley (17)	4	~	~	4
LO - Leamington (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Leamington Plateau Fringe (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Leamington Spa (17)	6	1	1	9
LO - Lee and Buckland Common (10)	2	~	~	~
LO - Lee Buckland LCA (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Lee Common	2	~	~	~
LO - Lee Common (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - Leeds (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Leeds Junction (20)	2	~	~	~
LO - Leicestershire (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Leys Farm (18)	1	~	~	~

LO - Liberty Lane (09)	~	~	~	4
LO - Liberty Wood (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lichfield (22)	10	2	~	22
LO - Lichfield Cathedral (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Lichfield Cruising Club (22)	1	~	~	4
LO - Lichfield District (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lime Farm (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lincoln Farm (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - Lincoln's Farm Café (23)	4	~	~	2
LO - Linford Christie Stadium (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Little Beanit Farm (18)	~	~	~	3
LO - Little Chalfont (08)	~	~	~	4
LO - Little Halings Wood (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Little Kings Ash Farm (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - Little Kingshill (09)	4	~	~	4
LO - Little Kingshill Village Hall (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Little Lyntus Wood (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Little Missenden (09)	10	~	1	20
LO - Little Missenden Conservation Area (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Little Missenden-South Heath Green Tunnel (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - Little Owl Public House (24)	~	~	~	3
LO - Little Poors Wood (18)	~	~	~	2
LO - Little Side Field, Greatworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Little Wood Corner (09)	2	~	~	2
LO - Littleworth Cottage (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - LNWR War Memorial (01)	~	~	~	2
LO - Lodge (The), Rock Hill, Hints (21)	1	~	~	1
LO - Lodge Farm (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - London (01/02/03/04/05)	10	~	1	22
LO - London Irish Centre Camden (02)	1	1	~	~
LO - London Jewish Museum (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - London Zoo (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lone Oak (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Long Barrow (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Long Buckby (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Long Itchington (16)	~	~	~	4
LO - Long Itchington Wood (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - Long Itchington Wood SSSI (16)	~	~	~	4
LO - Long Lake (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Longwick Vale (10)	~	1	~	~
LO - Lostock Gralam (unidentified)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lotts Wood (09)	~	~	1	~
LO - Lotts Wood (13/14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lower Blackgrove Farm (12)	1	~	~	3
LO - Lower Boddington (15)	247	6	2	23
LO - Lower Bottom House Farm (08)	1	~	~	1
LO - Lower Grange (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lower Grange Farm (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lower Hartwell (11)	4	1	2	8
LO - Lower Hartwell Farm (11)	2	2	2	2
LO - Lower South Farm (12)	~	~	~	1

LO - Lower Thorpe (15)	7	~	~	9
LO - Lower Thorpe bowl barrow (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lower Thorpe Farm (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Lyntus Autotransformer Station (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Lyon Way Industrial Estate (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - Magpie Cottage (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Magpie Farm (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Maiden Lane Community Centre (01)	~	1	~	~
LO - Maiden Lane Community Centre (02)	1	~	1	~
LO - Maindel Lane Estate (01/02)	~	~	~	1
LO - Malt Shovel Public House (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Manchester (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Manor Brook House (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Manor Cottages (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Manor Farm (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Manor Farm (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Manor Farm (17)	~	~	~	3
LO - Manor Farm Business Park (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Manor House (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Manthorne Farm (13)	54	~	1	~
LO - Manthorne Farm Wood (13)	~	~	1	~
LO - Manthorpe Farm (13/14)	1	~	~	~
LO - Mantles Farm (09)	3	~	~	2
LO - Mantle's Green Cottage (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - Mantles Green Meadow (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - Mantles Wood (09)	37	1	~	48
LO - Mantle's Wood/LWS (09)	~	~	~	19
LO - Maple Cross (07)	~	~	~	3
LO - Maple Cross Junior Mixed School (07)	2	1	~	2
LO - Maria Fidelis Lower School (01)	~	~	~	4
LO - Marlow (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Marlowes Wood (18)	3	~	~	1
LO - Marpit Wood (22)	3	~	~	~
LO - Marsh (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Marsh Cottages (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Marsh Farm (23)	7	~	~	2
LO - Marsh Gibbon (13)	~	~	1	~
LO - Marsh Lane Nature Reserve (23)	3	~	~	4
LO - Marsh, Buckinghamshire (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Marston (20)	1	2	1	3
LO - Marston Green (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - Marston St Lawrence (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mary Green House (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mary Lodge (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Masshouse Circus (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mayertorne Cottage (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Meadow Leigh (09)	~	~	~	5
LO - Meadow Ley Barn & Bungalow (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - Meadowway (11)	1	~	~	2
LO - Melbicks Garden Centre (24)	~	~	~	4
LO - Mercian Boundary ditch (23)	1	~	~	~

LO - Mercote (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mercote Cottage (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mercote Farm (23)	3	~	~	2
LO - Mercote Hall (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mercote Mill Farm (23)	1	~	~	1
LO - Meriden (23)	~	~	~	4
LO - Meriden Mill Farm (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Metropolitan Park (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mid Colne Valley SSSI/SMI (07)	3	2	~	7
LO - Middle Bickenhill (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - Middle Bickenhill Manor Site (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - Middle Grove Farm (09)	5	~	~	4
LO - Middlesex (05/06)	~	2	~	~
LO - Middlesex (07)	~	~	~	4
LO - Middleton (20)	54	46	50	7
LO - Middleton Auto Transformer Station (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - Middleton Cheney (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - Middleton Hall (20)	~	~	~	2
LO - Middleton House Farm (20)	2	~	~	~
LO - Middleton Lakes (20)	~	~	~	3
LO - Middleton Pool (20)	~	~	~	3
LO - Middleton Pools SSSI (20)	1	~	~	1
LO - Midland Tavern Public House (26)	1	~	~	~
LO - Midland Terrace (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Midlands	1	~	~	~
LO - Mid-Warwickshire College (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mile Oak (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mill Farm (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mill Farm (23/24)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mill Farm Quarry and Pools LWS (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mill House Farm (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - Mill Racing Stables (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Millburn Grange (18)	1	~	1	1
LO - Millennium Point (26)	~	~	~	4
LO - Millfield (14)	~	~	~	3
LO - Millhurst Garden (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Milton Cottage (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - Milton Keynes (outside CFAs)	~	1	~	7
LO - Milton's Cottage (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - Minworth (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Minworth Sewage Works (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Misbourne (08)	1	~	~	1
LO - Misbourne Upper LCA (09)	~	~	~	5
LO - Misbourne Valley (08)	13	1	2	22
LO - Missenden (09)	~	~	1	1
LO - Missenden Abbey (09)	1	~	~	2
LO - Missenden Abbey Adult Education College (09)	1	~	~	1
LO - Missenden Abbey Management and Conference Centre (09)	1	~	~	3
LO - Mitre Wharf (04)	1	~	~	1
LO - Mixbury (14)	6	~	~	5
LO - Mixbury Conservation Area (14)	~	~	~	1

LO - Mixbury Lodge (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Moat Farm & Barn (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Moat Farm (11)	1	~	~	2
LO - Moat Farm (13)	~	1	~	~
LO - Moat House (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Moberly Sports and Leisure Centre (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Moor Covert (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - Mornington Crescent (01)	4	~	~	8
LO - Mornington Place (01)	~	~	1	4
LO - Morrisons supermarket (02)	2	~	~	~
LO - Mossycorner Spinney (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - Mouldings Farm (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - Mouldings Green Farm (23)	4	~	~	4
LO - Mount Vernon Hospital (06/07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mouthey Wood	1	~	~	~
LO - Mulberry Hill (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Mulberry Park Hill (09)	1	1	~	6
LO - Mullensgrove Farm (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - Munster Square (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Nailcote Farm (18/23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Nailcote Hall (18/23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Nailcote Hall Hotel (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Nash House (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Nash House (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - Nash Lee (11)	1	~	~	4
LO - Nash Lee Farm (11)	2	~	~	1
LO - National Exhibition Centre (NEC) (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - National Motorcycle Museum (23/24)	2	~	~	2
LO - National Temperance Hospital (01)	4	1	~	24
LO - Netley Primary School (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Network Rail nature reserve (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - New Farm (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - New Horizon Youth Centre (01)	~	1	~	~
LO - New Horizons Youth Centre (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - New Kingswood Farm	1	~	~	~
LO - New Kingswood Farm (18)	~	~	~	4
LO - New Pond Parade shops - West End Rd (06)	1	~	~	~
LO - New St Pancras Church (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Newland Park (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - Newlands Cottage (20)	~	1	~	~
LO - Newlands Farm (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - Newton Purcell (14)	52	1	~	8
LO - Newyears Green Covert (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Nightingale Wood BNS (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - North Acton (04)	3	1	~	~
LO - North Acton (05)	~	~	~	8
LO - North Acton Station (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - North Acton Station (05)	~	~	~	2
LO - North Cubbington (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - North Cubbington Wood (17)	~	~	~	3
LO - North Ealing (05)	1	~	~	~

LO - North Kensington (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - North Lee BNS (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - North Leys (11)	2	~	~	1
LO - North London (01/02/03/04/05)	2	1	~	2
LO - North Solihull (24)	2	~	~	2
LO - North Warwickshire (19/20)	1	~	~	~
LO - North West London (03/04/05)	~	~	~	1
LO - North Wood (20)	6	~	~	2,392
LO - Northampton (15)	3	~	~	~
LO - Northampton (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	3
LO - Northamptonshire (14/15)	~	~	~	7
LO - Northamptonshire Uplands NCA (14/15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Northmoor (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Northmoor Hill Wood LWS (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Northolt (05)	6	1	3	7
LO - Northolt Airport (05, close to)	~	~	~	1
LO - Northolt Corridor (05)	~	~	~	5
LO - Northolt Junction	1	~	~	~
LO - Northwood (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	7
LO - Notting Hill (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Nuneaton (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	2
LO - NW1 (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - NW1 (02)	2	~	~	~
LO - Oak Dairy Farm (21)	1	~	~	2
LO - Oak Farm (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Oak Farm (21)	1	~	~	2
LO - Oak Tree Farm (21)	2	~	~	2
LO - Oakley Square (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Oatley Hall (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - Odnall End (23)	3	~	~	1
LO - Odnall End Farm (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Offchurch (17)	8	1	~	13
LO - Offchurch Greenway (17)	~	~	~	4
LO - Old Amersham	2	~	~	~
LO - Old Ellesborough Road Cottages (10)	~	~	1	1
LO - Old Hall (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Old Hall Farm (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Old Mill Care Home (Cublington 17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Old Moat Farmhouse (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - Old Oak Childrens Centre (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - Old Oak Common (04)	17	1	2	65
LO - Old Oak Common IMD - Heathrow Express (4)	~	~	~	1
LO - Old Oak Common Sidings Birch Wood (04)	~	~	~	7
LO - Old Oak Common station (04)	~	5	~	~
LO - Old Oak Estate (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - Old Oak Lane Conservation Area (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - Old Oak Sidings Nature Conservation Area (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - Old Orchard (unidentified)	~	~	~	1
LO - Old Rectory (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Old Saltleians Rugby Club (19)	1	1	~	~
LO - Old Stable Cottage	27	~	~	~

LO - Old Stables Cottages	1	~	~	~
LO - Olympia Motorcycle Track (24)	~	~	~	3
LO - Origin Park (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ouse Valley Extension BOA (14/15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Over Ground Field, Greatworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Oxbow Wood (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Oxford (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	2
LO - Oxfordshire	1	~	1	~
LO - Oxfordshire (13/14)	~	~	~	4
LO - Packington Estate (23)	1	~	~	3
LO - Packington Hall (24)	1	~	~	1
LO - Packington Moor (21)	~	2	1	~
LO - Packington Moor Farm (21)	~	~	~	6
LO - Packington Moor Wedding Venue (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Packington Race Course (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Padbury Brook (13)	1	~	1	2
LO - Padbury Streams BOA (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Park East	1	~	~	~
LO - Park Farm (09)	1	1	~	~
LO - Park Farm (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Park Farm (24)	1	~	~	2
LO - Park Hall Academy (19)	~	1	~	1
LO - Park Hall Estate (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Park Hall Farm (25/26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Park Hall Nature Reserve (25/26)	~	~	~	5
LO - Park Hall Wood (25/26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Park Lodge (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - Park Lodge Hotel (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Park Royal (04)	2	~	~	~
LO - Park Royal (04/05)	~	~	~	16
LO - Park Royal Industrial Estate (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - Park Royal Station (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - Park Royal/ Willesden Junction (04)	~	~	~	3
LO - Park Street Gardens (26)	1	~	~	5
LO - Park Village (01)	~	~	~	4
LO - Park Village East (01)	7	2	2	31
LO - Park Village East Gardens (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Park Village West (01)	1	~	~	4
LO - Parkside (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - Pasture Farm (23)	2	~	~	2
LO - Patrick Farm (23)	9	~	~	6
LO - Patrick Farm Meadow (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Patricks Farm (23)	~	~	~	3
LO - Pelican Cricket Ground (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Pembroke Castle	~	1	~	~
LO - Pendigo Lake (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - Penn (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Pennington Flash (??)	~	~	~	1
LO - Perivale (05)	1	~	~	6
LO - Perivale Estate (05)	~	~	~	2
LO - Perivale Wood (05)	~	~	~	2

LO - Perry Hill	1	~	~	~
LO - Phoenix Cottage - Stoneleigh (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Piked Ground Field, Greatworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Pinner (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	2,397
LO - Pipers Wood (09)	1	~	1	4
LO - Pipers Wood (13/14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Pitchcott (12)	~	~	~	2
LO - Polesworth (19/20/21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Pool Orchard (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Poolhouse Farm (18/23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Portway Farm (13)	8	4	1	5
LO - Potter Row (09)	5	2	~	14
LO - Poundon (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Preston	1	~	~	~
LO - Preston Bissett (13)	1	~	~	1
LO - Prestwood (09)	~	~	~	7
LO - Prestwood (9)	7	~	~	~
LO - Prestwood Local BOA (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - Priestfield Arboretum (09)	1	~	~	2
LO - Primrose Gardens (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - Primrose Hill (03)	29	2	1	16
LO - Primrose Hill Conservation Area (03)	~	1	~	~
LO - Primrose Hill Railway Tunnel - East (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - Princes Risborough (11)	~	1	~	4
LO - Princess Mary Gate (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Princethorpe Woodlands (unidentified)	~	~	~	1
LO - Priors Farm (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Priors Hardwick (16)	4	~	~	1
LO - Priors Hardwick/ Wormleighton T Junction	1	~	~	~
LO - Priors Marston (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - Putlowes (11)	4	3	~	3
LO - Putlowes Cottages (11)	2	2	2	2
LO - Putlowes Farm (11)	3	2	2	3
LO - Putlowes Housing Estate (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - Quainton (12)	3	5	~	17
LO - Quainton Hill (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - Quarrendon (11)	1	~	~	2
LO - Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Field (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - Queens Park (04)	2	~	~	~
LO - Queen's Park (04)	~	~	~	6
LO - Queen's Park Estate Conservation Area (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - Radbourne Ironstone Fringe (16)	2	~	~	~
LO - Radstone (14)	4	~	1	8
LO - Radstone Church (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - Radstone Fields (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - Radstone Fields Housing Development (14)	~	~	~	3
LO - Radstone House (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Radstone SSSI (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - RAF Croughton	1	~	~	~
LO - RAF Eastcote (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - RAF Field, Greatworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	2

LO - RAF Halton (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - RAF Halton Safeguarding Zone (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - RAF Northolt (06)	~	~	~	3
LO - RAF West Ruislip (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - RAILHEAD - Hams Hall (20)	~	~	1	1
LO - RAILWAY - Acton-Northolt (05)	2	1	~	11
LO - RAILWAY - Aylesbury-Buckingham Line	1	~	~	~
LO - RAILWAY - Aylesbury-Claydon LNE	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Bicester-Bletchley Line	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Birmingham-Tamworth	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Birmingham-Water Orton (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - RAILWAY - Brodesley Rail Branch (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - RAILWAY - Chiltern Line	6	2	1	20
LO - RAILWAY - Chiltern Line (to Paddington) (04)	~	1	~	~
LO - RAILWAY - Claydon LNE Junction (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - 'Coventry Corridor' (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Coventry-Kenilworth (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Cricklewood to Acton Junction Line (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Cricklewood to Acton Wells Line (04)	~	~	~	4
LO - RAILWAY - Crossrail 1	~	1	~	5
LO - RAILWAY - Derby Line (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Dudding Hill Line	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - EWR	2	1	~	5
LO - RAILWAY - Great Central Main Line	1	~	~	~
LO - RAILWAY - Great Western Main Line	2	~	~	10
LO - RAILWAY - Heathrow Express	~	~	~	5
LO - RAILWAY - Leamington-Coventry Line	~	~	1	1
LO - RAILWAY - Lichfield - Alrewas	1	~	~	~
LO - RAILWAY - London-Aylesbury Line	1	~	~	~
LO - RAILWAY - London-Birmingham	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Marylebone - Aylesbury Line	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Marylebone - Aylesbuty Line	2	~	~	~
LO - RAILWAY - Marylebone-Aylesbury Line	~	1	~	~
LO - RAILWAY - North London Line	4	5	~	9
LO - RAILWAY - Northolt Junction - Old Oak Common (04)	~	1	~	~
LO - RAILWAY - Paddington Line	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - Princes Risborough to Aylesbury Line (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - RAILWAY - West Coast Main Line	~	4	~	15
LO - RAILWAY - West Coast Mainline	7	~	~	~
LO - RAILWAY - Whitacre Link	~	~	~	2
LO - Railway Cottages (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - RAILWAY EWR - DO NOT USE (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Railway Inn (23)	1	~	~	2
LO - Ram Hall (23)	3	~	~	1
LO - Ram Hall Farm & Barn (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - Ram Hall Farm (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - Ranston Covert Wood (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ravenshaw Cottage (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ravenshaw Wood (22)	1	1	1	3
LO - Reading (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Redhill Farm (15)	~	~	~	1

LO - Regent's Canal Conservation Area (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - Regents Park (01)	19	~	~	7
LO - Regent's Park Conservation Area (01)	1	1	~	1
LO - Regents Park Estate (01)	14	~	1	~
LO - Regent's Park Estate (01)	~	7	~	32
LO - Regent's Park Estate Open Space (01)	~	~	~	2
LO - Regnart Buildings (01)	~	~	~	4
LO - Richings Park (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Rickmansworth	1	~	~	~
LO - Rickmansworth (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	2
LO - Ridding's Hill (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Riley Hill (22)	2	~	~	~
LO - Rileyhill (22)	~	~	1	~
LO - Riseborough Line Crossing (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Ash Beds Brook (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Avon	1	~	~	9
LO - RIVER - Barton Hartshorn	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Bayley Brook (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Bayleys Brook (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Bear Brook (11)	2	1	2	3
LO - RIVER - Black Bourne Brook (21)	1	2	~	~
LO - RIVER - Black Bourne Brook/Black Brook (21)	~	~	~	4
LO - RIVER - Blythe (23)	10	1	~	~
LO - RIVER - Blythe/Gallows Brook (21)	~	~	~	3
LO - RIVER - Blythe/SSSI (23)	~	~	~	6
LO - RIVER - Boddington Feeder (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Bonny Brook (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Bourne Brook (21/22)	4	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Bourne Brook (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Brent (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Canley Brook (18)	6	1	1	6
LO - RIVER - Cherwell (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - RIVER - Chess Stream	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Cole (19)	~	~	~	5
LO - RIVER - Colne (07)	9	4	~	16
LO - RIVER - Crackley Brook (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Curborough Brook (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Darnford Brook (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Dunlop Conduit (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Fairford Leys	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Finham Brook (18)	1	~	1	2
LO - RIVER - Fleet (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Gallows Brook (21)	2	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Great Ouse	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Great Ouse (14/15)	~	~	~	5
LO - RIVER - Hampden Pond Spring (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Helmdon Brook (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Heron Path Stream (10)	1	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Highfurlong Brook	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Highfurlong Brook (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Hollywell Brook (24)	~	~	~	3

LO - RIVER - Hornbrook (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Ickenham Stream	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Ickenham Stream (06)	~	~	~	4
LO - RIVER - Itchen	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Itchen (16)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Langley Brook	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Langley Brook (20)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Leam (17)	2	~	~	5
LO - RIVER - Lot Brook (16)	~	1	~	~
LO - RIVER - Lot/Lod Brook (16)	6	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Lower Hartwell Ditch (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Mad Bess Brook (06/07)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Mare Brook (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Misbourne	19	~	1	~
LO - RIVER - Misbourne (07/08/09)	~	7	~	30
LO - RIVER - Miss Stream	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Mixbury Brook (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Muxwell Brook (12)	1	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Nene (14/15)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Newyears Green Bourne	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Newyears Green Bourne Stream (06)	~	~	~	5
LO - RIVER - Onse (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Ouse	2	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Ouse (14/15)	~	~	~	3
LO - RIVER - Ouzel	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Oxbow (21)	~	1	~	3
LO - RIVER - Padbury Brook (13)	2	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Pingle Brook (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Pinn (06)	~	~	~	9
LO - RIVER - Plants Brook (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Radbourne Brook (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Radstone Brook (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Ray	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Ray (12)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Rea (26)	~	~	~	3
LO - RIVER - Sedrup Brook (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Sedrup Ditch (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Shadow Brook (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - RIVER - Sowe (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Stoke Brook (11)	1	~	~	5
LO - RIVER - Tame (20/21/25/26)	~	~	~	9
LO - RIVER - Thame	~	~	2	~
LO - RIVER - Thame (11)	3	3	~	10
LO - RIVER - Tove (14/15)	~	~	~	2
LO - RIVER - Walmey Ash Brook (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Washwood Heath Brook (25/26)	~	~	~	3
LO - RIVER - Well Head Spring (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Wendover Stream (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Wilstone Brook (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Witchell Spring (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - RIVER - Yeading Brook (06)	~	1	~	3

LO - River Blythe Meadows (23/24)	~	~	~	1
LO - River Thames BNS (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - A13	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A34 (outside CFAs)	~	1	~	1
LO - ROAD - A355 (08)	8	~	~	20
LO - ROAD - A361	4	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - A361 (15)	~	~	~	14
LO - ROAD - A38	5	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A38 (20/21/22)	2	~	~	11
LO - ROAD - A388 (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A40	9	3	3	34
LO - ROAD - A4000	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - A4010	~	~	1	8
LO - ROAD - A4010 (11)	7	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A404	~	~	~	8
LO - ROAD - A404 (8)	2	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - A4040	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - A4091	~	47	48	4
LO - ROAD - A4091 (20/21)	49	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A4097	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - A4097 (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A41	11	3	2	16
LO - ROAD - A412	13	2	2	19
LO - ROAD - A4128 (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A413	43	6	10	79
LO - ROAD - A418	10	3	3	10
LO - ROAD - A42	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - A421	13	1	4	~
LO - ROAD - A421 (13/14)	~	~	~	11
LO - ROAD - A422	~	~	~	11
LO - ROAD - A422 (15)	6	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A423	8	~	4	~
LO - ROAD - A423 (16)	~	4	~	10
LO - ROAD - A425	8	~	4	~
LO - ROAD - A425 (16)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - A429	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A429 (18)	~	1	1	8
LO - ROAD - A43	4	~	2	15
LO - ROAD - A43 (15)	5	~	~	8
LO - ROAD - A44 (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A4421	~	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - A4421 (14/15)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A444	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - A445 (17/18)	1	1	~	5
LO - ROAD - A446	3	~	1	10
LO - ROAD - A45	5	2	~	12
LO - ROAD - A452	16	~	~	15
LO - ROAD - A452 (18)	~	~	~	8
LO - ROAD - A453	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - A4540	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - A456	1	~	~	~

LO - ROAD - A456 (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - A46	4	~	3	~
LO - ROAD - A46 (18)	~	~	~	15
LO - ROAD - A47	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - A485	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - A5	2	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - A5091	4	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - A51	2	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - A51 (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - A5127	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - A515	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - A515 (22)	5	1	~	2
LO - ROAD - A52	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Abbey Hill (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Adderley Road (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Addison Road (13)	4	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Adelaide Road	6	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Adelaide Road (03)	~	5	~	6
LO - ROAD - Agar Grove	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Agar Grove (02)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Ainsworth Way (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Airport Way (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Akeman Street (11)	2	2	~	2
LO - ROAD - Akerman Street (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Albany Street (01)	3	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Albert Street	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Albert Street (26)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Albion Street (18)	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Alexander Road (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Alexandra Place	1	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Alexandra Place (03)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Alexandra Road (03)	1	1	~	1
LO - ROAD - Alum Rock Road (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Amersham bypass (8)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Amersham Ring	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Ampthill Square (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Anton Way	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Anton Way (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Appletree Lane (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Appletree Road (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Arbury Banks (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Arley Road (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Arlington Road (01)	1	4	~	22
LO - ROAD - Aston Church (26)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Astral Row (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Atlas Road (04)	4	1	~	9
LO - ROAD - Attleboro Lane (19)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Attleboro Lane (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Attleborough Lane (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Augustus Street (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Aylesbury Road (10)	~	1	~	3

LO - ROAD - B4009	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - B4009 (11)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - B4010	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - B4101 - Waste Lane (18)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - B4102	4	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - B4113	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - B4113 (18)	~	~	~	13
LO - ROAD - B4114 (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - B4115 (18)	1	~	1	22
LO - ROAD - B4117 (19/24)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - B4118 (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - B425 (14/15)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - B4438	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - B4451	~	1	3	~
LO - ROAD - B4451 Kineton Road	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - B4453	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - B4455 (17)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - B4525	16	1	12	9
LO - ROAD - B4526 (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - B466	1	~	1	1
LO - ROAD - B467	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - B485	~	~	2	~
LO - ROAD - B485 ()	~	~	6	~
LO - ROAD - B485 Chesham Road (09)	14	~	~	30
LO - ROAD - Bacombe Lane (10)	8	3	~	534
LO - ROAD - Badminton Close (05)	1	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Ballinger Road (09)	5	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Banbury Lane (15)	~	~	2	7
LO - ROAD - Banbury Road (15)	~	4	236	10
LO - ROAD - Banbury Road (15/16)	5	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Bangle Lane (21)	3	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Barker Drive (02)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Barnby Street (01)	2	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Barretts Lane (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Bartholomew Row (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Bartholomew Street (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Barton Hartshorn Road (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Bascote Road (16)	3	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Bashley Road (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Baulk Lane (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Bayham Street (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Beacombe Lane (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Bedford Road (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Beethoven Street (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Bennetts Avenue (05)	1	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Bergholt Mews (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Best Avenue (18)	1	~	1	1
LO - ROAD - Bethune Road (04)	1	1	~	2
LO - ROAD - Bicester Road (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Bickenhill Lane (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Bickenhill Parkway (24)	~	~	~	1

LO - ROAD - Bideford Avenue (05)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Birches Lane (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Birmingham Ring Road (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Birmingham Road (19)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Blackdown Roundabout (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Blackfriars Lane (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Blackgrove Road (11/12)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Blackgrove Road (12)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Blakeney Mews (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Bluebell Drive (24)	1	1	~	2
LO - ROAD - Bodymoor Heath Road (20)	1	1	~	2
LO - ROAD - Bordesley Street (26)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Bottom House Farm Drive (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Bottom House Farm Lane (08)	1	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Boundary Road (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Bowood Lane (10)	4	~	~	9
LO - ROAD - Brackley Lane (14)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Brackley Road (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Bradford Street (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Bradnock's Marsh Lane (23)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Bradnocks Marsh Roundabout (23)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Brarybrook Street (4)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Breakspear Road	~	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Breakspear Road South (06)	8	1	~	17
LO - ROAD - Breakspear Road, Ickenham (06)	~	~	2	~
LO - ROAD - Brick Kiln Lane (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Bridgewater Road (06)	~	1	~	2
LO - ROAD - Bridlesway Avenue (10/11)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Brockhurst Lane (06)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Brockhurst Lane (21)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Bromford Lane	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Brown's Road (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Brudenell Drive (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Brunel Road (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Brunel Road (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Buck Street (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Buckingham Road (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Buckingham Road (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Buckinghamshire Road (8)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Bullbaiters Lane (09)	4	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Bury Street (06)	2	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Byfield Road (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - C97	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Cadbury Drive (25)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Calves Close (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Camden High Street	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Camden High Street (01/02)	~	3	~	~
LO - ROAD - Camden High Street (02)	8	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Camden Lock Place (02)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Camden Road (02)	7	1	~	11
LO - ROAD - Camden Square (02)	~	~	~	1

LO - ROAD - Camden Street (02)	~	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Camley Street (01)	3	~	~	8
LO - ROAD - Camley Street (02)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Cappers Lane (22)	3	~	4	5
LO - ROAD - Cardigan Street	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Cardington Street (01)	2	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Carr Road (05)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Castle Park Road (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Castlehaven Road (02)	1	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Cedar Way (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Centenary Way (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Chalcot	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Chalcot Square (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Chalfont Lane (07)	10	1	2	14
LO - ROAD - Chalfont Road (08)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Chalk Farm Road (02)	1	1	~	3
LO - ROAD - Chalk Lane (09)	2	~	1	5
LO - ROAD - Chandos Road (04)	~	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Channel Gate Road (04)	3	1	~	5
LO - ROAD - Chapel Lane (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Charndon (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Charndon Junction (13)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Chase Road (04)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Chesham Lane (08)	4	~	1	12
LO - ROAD - Chesham Road (09)	14	~	1	20
LO - ROAD - Chesham Road/B485 (09)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Chester Road	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Chester Road (25)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Chetwode Road (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Church Hill (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Church Lane (20)	5	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Church Lane (21)	~	5	47	1
LO - ROAD - Church Street (09)	1	~	2	4
LO - ROAD - Churchway (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Civic Way (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Claremont Road (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Clarkson Road (01)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Clarkson Row (01)	2	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Claydon Lane (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Cleveland Street	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Clyfford Road (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Cobourg Street (01)	4	1	~	24
LO - ROAD - Coldharbour Lane (11)	2	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Coldharbour Way (11)	3	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Coleshill Heath Road (24)	4	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Coleshill Road (25)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Common Lane (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Common Lane (22)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Common Lane (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Conway Crescent (05)	1	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Coombe Hill (11)	1	~	~	~

LO - ROAD - Coppermill Lane	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Cophall Lane (08)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Cophall Road (08)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Cornets End Lane	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Cornets End Lane (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Cornets Lane (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Coton Road (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Coventry Road (17)	~	1	1	~
LO - ROAD - Coventry Road (18)	5	~	1	11
LO - ROAD - Coventry Way (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Crackley Lane (18)	2	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Cranbrook Hill (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Crewe Lane (18)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Crewe Place (04)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Crofters Way (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Cromwell Lane (18)	5	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Crowberry Lane (20)	6	5	5	~
LO - ROAD - Cryfield Grange (18)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Cudsdens Court (09)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Cudsons Court (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Culworth Road (15)	~	1	~	15
LO - ROAD - Curzon Circus (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Curzon Street (26)	~	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Cuttle Mill Lane (20)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Dalehouse Lane (18)	5	2	2	12
LO - ROAD - Damson Parkway (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Dark Lane, Hints (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Darnford Lane (21)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Darnford Lane (22)	5	~	4	~
LO - ROAD - Deep Mill (09)	2	~	1	4
LO - ROAD - Delancey Street (01)	~	1	~	4
LO - ROAD - Denham Lane (07)	6	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Denham Lane (08)	2	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Denham Way (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Dews Lane (08)	~	1	~	1
LO - ROAD - Diddington Lane (22/23)	13	~	~	8
LO - ROAD - Digbeth High Street (26)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Dobbins Lane (10)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Dollman Street (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Doric Way (01)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Drayton Lane (21)	2	~	~	9
LO - ROAD - Drews Lane (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Drummond Street (01)	22	9	~	47
LO - ROAD - Du Cane Road (04)	2	~	~	12
LO - ROAD - Duddleston Mill Road (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Dukes Road (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Dunsmore Lane (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - E2424 / Wills Pastures Lane (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - E2994 (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - E6037 (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - East Acton High Street (04)	~	~	~	1

LO - ROAD - East Way (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Eastcote Lane (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Eastcote Road (06)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Eaton Avenue	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Edgcote Road (15)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Edgcott Road (12)	1	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Ellen Road (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Ellesborough Road (10)	9	6	2	16
LO - ROAD - Ensleigh Gardens (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Euston Road (01)	2	2	1	16
LO - ROAD - Euston Street (01)	~	1	~	9
LO - ROAD - Eversholt Street (01)	2	2	~	7
LO - ROAD - Exmouth Mews (01)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Fairfield Drive (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Faraday Avenue (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Farmer Ward Road (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Farnborough Road (25)	1	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Farrier Street (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Fazeley Street (26)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Fazely Street (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Featherbed Lane (14)	4	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Featherbed Road (14)	3	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Fellows Road (01/02/03)	5	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Fernhead Road (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Field End Road (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Finchley Road (03)	1	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Flats Lane (21)	2	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Fog Lane (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Fosse Way (16)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Fosse Way (18)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Fradley Junction (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Freeman Street (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Frith Hill (09)	11	4	3	21
LO - ROAD - Frith Hill South Heath Leg (09)	2	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Fulwell Lane (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Fulwell Road (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Gawcott Road (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Gilson Drive (19)	2	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Gilson Road (19)	~	~	1	3
LO - ROAD - Gilson Road/B4117 (19/24)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Glasshouse Lane (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Glebe Road (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Gloucester Avenue (03)	6	2	1	5
LO - ROAD - Gloucester Road (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Godgetts Lane (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Goodhall Street (04)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Gordon Street (01)	1	~	1	1
LO - ROAD - Gorelands Lane (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Gorsey Lane Junction (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Gower Place (01)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Gower Street (01)	~	~	~	2

LO - ROAD - Grafton Place (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Grafton Way (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Granby Terrace (01)	2	2	~	7
LO - ROAD - Grand Union Canal Walk (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Great Missenden High Street (09)	1	~	1	3
LO - ROAD - Great Missenden Station Approach (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Greathworth Fields (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Greenford Road (05)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Greenpark Way (05)	~	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Greenway (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Gypsy Lane (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Gypsy Lane (25)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hale Lane (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Hale Road (10)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Haley Road (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hallmeadow Road	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Hallmeadow Road (23)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Halton Lane (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Hampstead Road (01)	7	1	~	28
LO - ROAD - Hampton Lane (23)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Hangar Lane (05)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hangar Lane Gyratory	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hanger Lane (05)	~	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Hanger Lane east bridge (05)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Hanger Lane Gyratory (05)	~	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Harrington Street (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Harris Road (06)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Harrow Road (04)	1	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Harvil Road (06)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Harvil Road (06/07)	4	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Harvill Road (06)	~	~	~	16
LO - ROAD - Hawley Crescent (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Hawley Road (02)	4	~	~	10
LO - ROAD - Helmdon Road (15)	1	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Hemlock Road (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Herlwyn Avenue (06)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Heron Path (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Hidcote Road (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - High Street Ruislip	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - High Street, Gt. Missenden (09)	~	~	2	~
LO - ROAD - Highland Road (18)	1	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Hill Lane (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Hill Lane (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Hill Road (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Hill Road Lane (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hobb Lane (18/23)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Hodgetts Lane (18/23)	~	~	~	9
LO - ROAD - Hodgetts Lane (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hog Trough Lane (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Hogetts Lane (18)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hogg End (15)	~	~	~	2

LO - ROAD - Holland Terrace (04)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Holloway Road	~	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Hornhill Road (08)	1	~	~	8
LO - ROAD - Hoylake Crescent (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Huddesford Drive (23)	1	1	1	~
LO - ROAD - Huddesford Lane (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Hunningham Lane (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Hunningham Road	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Hunningham Road (17)	4	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hurst Road	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hurst Road (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Hyde Heath Lane (09)	4	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Hyde Heath Road (09)	16	2	1	22
LO - ROAD - Hyde Lane (09)	11	1	1	15
LO - ROAD - Hythe Road (04/05)	~	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Ickenham High Street	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Ickenham Parade (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Ickenham Road (06)	3	~	1	5
LO - ROAD - Ickniel Way (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Inchbrook Road (18)	1	1	1	1
LO - ROAD - Inverness Street (01)	1	4	~	16
LO - ROAD - Isis Close (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - IVI25 Slip Road (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Ivor Street (01/02)	1	~	~	9
LO - ROAD - Javelin Avenue (25)	3	1	~	2
LO - ROAD - Jeffrey Street (02)	12	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Jeffreys Street (02)	~	~	~	27
LO - ROAD - Jerry's Lane (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Joiners Lane (08)	1	~	1	5
LO - ROAD - Joyners Lane (08)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Juniper Crescent (01)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Juniper Crescent (02)	~	1	~	1
LO - ROAD - Keepers Lane (09)	3	~	1	4
LO - ROAD - Kelsey Lane	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Kelsey Lane (23)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Kelvin Road (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Kenilworth Road (17)	5	~	~	8
LO - ROAD - Kenilworth Road (18)	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Kentish Town Road (02)	7	1	~	26
LO - ROAD - Kilburn High Road (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Kilburn Lane (04)	1	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Kilburn Road (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - King Henry Road	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - King Henry's Road (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Kings Lane (09)	16	3	2	26
LO - ROAD - King's Road (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Kingsbury Road (20)	4	~	3	5
LO - ROAD - Knowle Hill (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Knox Grave Lane (21)	3	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Ladbroke Bypass (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Ladbroke Grove (04)	~	~	~	2

LO - ROAD - Ladbroke Hill Lane	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Ladygate Lane (06)	3	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Lambourne Avenue (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Langtry Walk (03)	4	1	~	1
LO - ROAD - Lappetts Lane (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Lapwing Drive	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Lapwing Drive (23)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Lavender Hall Lane (23)	7	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Leamington Road (18)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Leather Lane (09)	21	2	2	26
LO - ROAD - Lee Road (12)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Leicester Lane (18)	2	~	1	8
LO - ROAD - Leigh Road (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Leisure Drive (15/16)	2	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Liberty Lane (09)	2	~	~	9
LO - ROAD - Lichfield Road, Whittington (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Lionel Avenue (10/11)	2	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Lionel Close (10)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Little Packington Lane (24)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Loddy Lane	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - London Road	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - London Road (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - London Road (09/10)	~	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Long Drive (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Long Itchington Road	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Long Itchington Road (16)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Long Lane (06)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Loudon Road (03)	5	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Loudoun Road (03)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Lower Boddington Road (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Lower Hartwell Lane (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Lower Road (11)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Lycroft Avenue (24)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Lycroft Road (24)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Lyon Way (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - M1	4	3	2	8
LO - ROAD - M16 (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - M25	17	4	2	34
LO - ROAD - M40	16	5	2	23
LO - ROAD - M42	10	3	~	16
LO - ROAD - M5	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - M6	7	~	~	14
LO - ROAD - Mackworth Street (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Maitland Park Terrace (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Mandeville Road (05)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Mandeville Road (05/06)	~	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Marriotts Avenue (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Marriott's Avenue (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Marsh Gibbon Road (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Marsh Lane (11)	6	~	1	9
LO - ROAD - Marsh Lane (23)	4	~	~	3

LO - ROAD - Marsh Lane East	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Marsh Road (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Marston Green	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Marston Lane	~	~	3	~
LO - ROAD - Marston Lane (20)	~	2	~	2
LO - ROAD - Marston Lane/M450 (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Marylebone (01/02)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Masshouse Circus (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Mayflower Close (11)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Meadoway (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Meckworth Street	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Meeting House Lane (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Melton Street (01)	2	1	~	8
LO - ROAD - Melvina Road (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Mercote Mill Access Road (23)]	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Mere Road (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Meriden Lane (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Meriden Road (23)	10	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Meriden Street (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Merle Avenue	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Middle Bickenhill Lane (24)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Midland Terrace	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Midland Terrace (04)	4	1	~	20
LO - ROAD - Milburn Grange Farm Access Road (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Mill Lane (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Missenden Road (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Moor Street (26)	2	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Moor Street Queensway (26)	~	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Moorefield Road (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Moorfield Road (07)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Moorhall Road (07)	2	1	~	6
LO - ROAD - Mop End Lane	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Mornington Crescent (01)	~	~	~	12
LO - ROAD - Mornington Place	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Mornington Place (01)	~	1	~	9
LO - ROAD - Mornington Street (01)	7	5	~	22
LO - ROAD - Mornington Terrace (01)	6	4	~	11
LO - ROAD - Mossycomer Lane (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Mulberry Hill (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Nags Head Lane	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Nailcote Lane (23)	3	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Nash Lee Lane (11)	6	4	2	9
LO - ROAD - Nash Lee Road (11)	3	3	~	15
LO - ROAD - Nash Lee Roundabout (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - New Canal Street (26)	~	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - New Years Green Lane (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - North Gower Street (01)	3	1	1	4
LO - ROAD - North Lee Lane (11)	2	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - North Pole Road (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Northampton Road (14)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Northumberland Street (26)	~	~	~	1

LO - ROAD - Oat Close (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Oatleys Road (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Offchurch (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Offchurch Lane (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Offchurch Village Street (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Old Amersham High Street (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Old Kenilworth (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Old Kingsbury Road (20)	1	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Old Oak Common Lane (04)	24	6	1	42
LO - ROAD - Old Oak Lane (04)	1	~	3	18
LO - ROAD - Old Rectory Lane (07)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Old Risborough Road (11)	2	1	~	3
LO - ROAD - Old Road (16)	~	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Old Road (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Old Shire Lane (07)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Old Station Rd (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Old Station Road (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Old Uxbridge (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Oldfield Lane (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Ossulston Street (01)	~	1	~	2
LO - ROAD - Oxford Road (11)	3	1	~	6
LO - ROAD - Park Lane (20)	34	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Park Lane (23)	6	1	~	5
LO - ROAD - Park Royal Road (04)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Park Street (26)	~	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Park Village East (01)	13	5	1	15
LO - ROAD - Park Village West (01)	~	2	~	2
LO - ROAD - Parkway (01)	~	5	~	~
LO - ROAD - Parkway (01/02/03)	8	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Parkway (02)	~	~	~	8
LO - ROAD - Paternoster Row (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Peerless Drive (07)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Perry Hill (13)	22	1	1	12
LO - ROAD - Perry Road (13)	3	~	1	1
LO - ROAD - Phoenix Road (01)	2	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Ploughman's Close (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Polygon Road (01)	~	1	~	1
LO - ROAD - Portley's Lane	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Portway Road (13)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Potter Row (09)	17	1	1	27
LO - ROAD - Potter Row (09/10)	11	~	3	~
LO - ROAD - Pound Street (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Pratt Street (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Premier Corner (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Primrose Hill Road (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Prince Albert Road (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Prince of Wales Road (02)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Priors Maston Road (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Priory Road (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Prowse Place (02)	2	~	~	10
LO - ROAD - Quainton Road (12)	1	~	~	~

LO - ROAD - Queen Catherine Road (13)	4	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Rabournead Drive (05)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Radbourne Lane (16)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Radstone Road (14)	~	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Randolph Street	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Red Lane	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Red Lane Junction (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Regents Park Road (03)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Rickmansworth Lane (08)	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Ridgeway Lane (17)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Rignall Road (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Risborough Road (11)	1	1	~	9
LO - ROAD - Robert Street (01)	2	1	~	3
LO - ROAD - Rock Hill (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Rockery Lane (21)	5	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Rockware Avenue (05)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Rocky Lane (10)	7	1	1	12
LO - ROAD - Rookery Lane (21)	~	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Rosemary Hill (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Rossendale Way (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Rousden Street	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Rowley Way (03)	2	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Royal College Street (02)	1	1	~	9
LO - ROAD - Rugby Road	~	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Rugby Road (17)	~	1	1	~
LO - ROAD - Rugby Road/B4453 (17)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Ruislip Gardens Parade (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Ruislip High Street (06)	2	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Ruislip Manor High Street(06)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Salisbury Close (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Salt Lane (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Salt Lane Bridleway (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Salusbury Road (04)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Salusbury Road (4)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Savay Lane (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - School End (13)	61	~	2	~
LO - ROAD - School Hill (13)	4	1	1	6
LO - ROAD - School Lane, Hints (21)	2	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - School Road (04)	1	1	~	5
LO - ROAD - Scrubs Lane	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Scrubs Lane (04)	3	~	~	19
LO - ROAD - Sedrup Lane (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Seeney Lane	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Seeney Lane (20)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Shaftesbury Gardens (04)	1	~	~	20
LO - ROAD - Shaftesbury Gardens (04) (DO NOT USE)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Shaw Lane (22)	2	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Shire Lane (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Shirral Drive (21)	1	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - Sibley's Coppice (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Sidmouth Drive (06)	~	~	~	1

LO - ROAD - Small Dean Lane (10)	3	~	~	6
LO - ROAD - Smalldean/Wendover Bridleway	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Snake Lane (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - South Street (10)	~	~	~	522
LO - ROAD - Spencer Lane	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Spencer Lane (23)	4	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Spitfire island	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Spring Lane (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - St Georges Terrace (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - St James Place (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - St James Road (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - St Leonards Road (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - St Leonard's Road (04)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - St Pancras Way (02)	~	~	~	7
LO - ROAD - St Paul's Crescent (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Stanhope Street (01)	1	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Starcross Street (01)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Station Approach (06)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Station Road (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Station Road (12)	3	1	~	11
LO - ROAD - Station Road (23)	2	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Steeple Claydon	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Stephenson Street	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Stephenson Street (04)	4	1	~	20
LO - ROAD - Stephenson Way (01)	~	~	~	10
LO - ROAD - Stivichall Junction (A45/A46) (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Stoke Mandeville Bypass (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Stoke Mandeville Road (11)	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Stoke Place (04)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Stonebridge roundabout (23)	1	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Stonefield Way (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Stonehaven Road (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Stoneleigh Road (18)	1	~	1	4
LO - ROAD - Sulgrave Road (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Sutton (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Sutton Road (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Swakeleys Avenue (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Swakeleys Road (06)	3	1	~	6
LO - ROAD - Swakeleys Roundabout (06)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Swan Lane (09)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Sweeney's Lane (20)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Tameside Drive (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Tamworth Road (21/22)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Telford Way (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Tenby Gardens (05)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Thame Road (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - The Broadway (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - The Green (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - The Greenway (06)	4	~	1	2
LO - ROAD - The Lee (09)	4	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Thickthorn Junction (A452/A46) (18)	~	~	~	1

LO - ROAD - Thornstile Close (17)	1	1	1	~
LO - ROAD - Thornton Crescent (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Tilehouse Lane (07)	~	1	~	9
LO - ROAD - Tilehouse Lane (7)	3	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Tilehouse Way (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Tollbar End Junction (A45/A46) (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Torbay St (02)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Tottenham Court Road	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Tring Road (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Truesdale Drive (07)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Truggist Lane (23)	5	~	~	8
LO - ROAD - Tuppenhurst Lane (22)	1	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Turners Wood Lane (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Turweston Road North (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Twyford Junction (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Tyburn Road	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Upper Rosemary Hill (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Upper Woburn Place (01)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Uxbridge Road (06)	1	~	~	5
LO - ROAD - Valley Road (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Vardell Street (01)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Varnell Street (01)	3	1	~	~
LO - ROAD - Vicarage Hill (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Vicarage Lane (25)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Victoria Gardens (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Victoria Road	~	~	1	~
LO - ROAD - Victoria Road (04)	10	7	~	34
LO - ROAD - Victoria Road (06)	2	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Village Road	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Waddesdon Bypass (12)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Waddesdon Hill (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Waggoner's Lane (21)	2	1	~	7
LO - ROAD - Wales Farm Road (04)	1	~	~	12
LO - ROAD - Warden Hill (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Warren Road (06/07)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Warren Road (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Warwick Road (15)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Warwick Road (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Washwood Heath Road - (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Waste Lane (18/23)	2	~	~	9
LO - ROAD - Waste Lane (23)	6	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Water Orton Road (19)	~	1	2	3
LO - ROAD - Watling Street (21/22)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Waverly Road (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Weaver's Way (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Weedon Hill (09)	2	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Wells House Road (04)	17	6	6	34
LO - ROAD - Welsh Farm Road	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Welsh Lane (15)	3	~	2	1
LO - ROAD - Welsh Road (15)	~	~	1	5
LO - ROAD - Welsh Road (16/17)	5	~	~	3

LO - ROAD - Wendover Bypass	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Wendover High Street (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Wendover roundabout (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Wesley Road (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - West End Road (06)	1	1	~	6
LO - ROAD - West Hyde Lane (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - West Hyde Road (08)	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - West Street (13)	6	~	1	1
LO - ROAD - Western Avenue (04)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Western Avenue Gyratory (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Wharf Road (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Whielden Lane (08)	~	~	~	3
LO - ROAD - Whielden Street (08)	4	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - White Bear roundabout	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Whitefield Lane (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Whitemoor Road (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Whitfield road	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Whittington Barracks	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Whittington Common Road (22)	1	~	4	2
LO - ROAD - Willesden Junction (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - William Road (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Wills Pastures Road (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Wilton Park Relief Road (08)	1	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Windmill Hill (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Windmill Lane (16)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Wood End Lane (22)	8	1	1	5
LO - ROAD - Wood Lane (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - ROAD - Wood Lane (09)	3	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Woodland Road (08)	~	~	~	4
LO - ROAD - Wyckhams Close	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - York Way	2	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - York Way (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - ROAD - Yorkminster Drive (19)	3	~	~	~
LO - ROAD - Yorkminster Drive (19/24)	~	~	1	2
LO - ROAD - Yorkminster Drive (24)	~	1	~	~
LO - Road Barn Farm (10)	~	~	~	6
LO - Road Farm (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Roald Dahl Museum (09)	1	~	1	4
LO - Roberts Wood (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Rochester Square (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - Rockingham Forest	~	~	~	1
LO - Romer Wood LWS (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - Rookery Wood (21)	9	2	~	6
LO - Rosehill Barns (13)	28	~	~	~
LO - Rosehill Farm (13)	31	~	~	1
LO - Rosehill Farmhouse (13)	23	~	~	~
LO - Rosehill Stables (13)	25	~	~	~
LO - Rough Knowles Wood (18)	1	~	~	1
LO - Rough Leasow Wood (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Roundhill Wood (21)	7	1	~	6
LO - Rowan Farm	~	~	~	1

LO - Rowan Farm (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - Rowen Farm (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - Rowley Way Estate (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - Rowley Way Estate (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - Roxane / Crystalline bottling plant, Lichfield (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Royal British Legion (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Royal Mail Depot (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - Royal Veterinary College (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - Rugby (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	4
LO - Ruislip (06)	3	1	2	2,415
LO - Ruislip Fire Station (06)	~	~	~	6
LO - Ruislip Gardens (06)	3	2	1	9
LO - Ruislip Gardens Estate (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - Ruislip Gardens Station (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ruislip Golf Club (06)	~	~	1	~
LO - Ruislip Golf Course (06)	2	~	~	2,417
LO - Ruislip High School (06)	1	1	~	2
LO - Ruislip Lido (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ruislip Rifle Club (06)	2	~	~	2,417
LO - Ruislip Shooting Club (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ruislip Woods (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Rushmere Wood (10)	1	~	~	2
LO - Rushmoor Wood (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - Rushmed Residential Home (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - Rye Meadow (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Salcey Forest	~	~	~	1
LO - Saltley (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - Saltley Business Park (22)	~	1	~	~
LO - Saltley Business Park (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - Saltley Depot - Network Rail (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Samuel Lithgow Youth Centre (01)	~	1	~	~
LO - Samuel Lithgow Youth Centre (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Sauray Lakes (unidentified)	~	~	~	1
LO - Savay (07)	1	~	~	3
LO - Savay Farm (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Savay Lake (07)	2	~	~	4
LO - Schering Plough (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Acton High School (04)	~	~	~	5
LO - SCHOOL - Bambinos Nursery (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Beachborough School (13)	4	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Beachborough School (14)	~	~	~	4
LO - SCHOOL - Berkswell Primary School (23)	1	1	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Breakspear Primary & Junior School	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Burton Green Primary School (18)	1	~	1	~
LO - SCHOOL - Camden School for Girls (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Cherry Trees Nursery (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Children's Room Day Nursery (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Chiswick School (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Coleshill School (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Cubbington Church of England Primary (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Cubbington CoE Primary School (17)	~	~	~	1

LO - SCHOOL - Dewent Water Primary	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Finnere School (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Frank Barnes School for Deaf Children (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Great Missenden CoE Combined School (09)	1	~	1	~
LO - SCHOOL - Hawley Junior School (02)	~	~	~	3
LO - SCHOOL - Hawley Primary and Infants School (02)	1	1	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Hayes Meadow Primary (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Holy Trinity and St Silas CofE Primary School (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Hounslow Heath Primary (13/14)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Hyde Heath Infact School (09)	2	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Hyde Heath Pre-School (09)	2	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Island Project School (23)	2	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Jack in the Box Nursery (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - SCHOOL - John Keble School (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - John Perryn School (04)	2	1	~	5
LO - SCHOOL - Kenilworth School (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Kingsbury School (20)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Lee Common CofE School (10)	1	1	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Leaside Nursey (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Leigh Junior Infant & Nursery School (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Little Acorns Kindergarten (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Little Acorns Nursery School (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Little Missenden (09)	2	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Maple Cross Junior Mixed School (07)	2	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Maria Fidelis Convent School (01)	1	~	~	6
LO - SCHOOL - Misbourne Secondary School (09)	1	~	1	~
LO - SCHOOL - North Leamington School (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Old Oak Primary (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Our Lady and St Teresa's Catholic Primary (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Our Lady's RC Primary	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Park Hall Academy (19)	1	~	1	~
LO - SCHOOL - Robertswood School (08)	4	~	1	4
LO - SCHOOL - Ruislip Gardens Primary School (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Southam College (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - St Aloysius Schools (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - St Michaels CofE Primary (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - St Paul's CofE Primary School (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - St Stephen's CofE School (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Stoke Mandeville Primary School (11)	~	~	1	~
LO - SCHOOL - Swiss Cottage (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - The Gateway (09)	1	~	1	~
LO - SCHOOL - Trinity School (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - UCL Academy (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Warwickshire College (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Water Orton Primary School	4	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Water Orton Primary School (19)	~	~	1	2
LO - SCHOOL - Wendover Campus BESD School (10)	1	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Wendover House School	2	~	~	~
LO - SCHOOL - Wendover House School (10)	~	~	~	6
LO - SCHOOL - Wendover Pre-school (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - SCHOOL - Whiteheath Infant and Junior (06/07)	~	~	~	1

LO - SCHOOL - Wilberforce Primary School (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - SCHOOL - Windy Arbor Junior and Infant School (24)	~	~	~	2
LO - SCHOOL - Wren Day Nursery (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - School End (13)	5	~	~	~
LO - School Hill (13)	~	~	~	4
LO - Second Wood (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Sedrup (11)	4	4	~	8
LO - Sedrup conservation area (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Selbourne Gardens (05)	1	~	~	~
LO - Seven Stars Cottages (13)	1	~	~	1
LO - Shadow Brook (23)	1	~	~	1
LO - Shaftesbury and Cerebos Park (04)	1	~	~	~
LO - Shaftesbury Gardens	~	~	~	1
LO - Shardeloes (08)	2	~	1	11
LO - Shardeloes Farm (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Shardeloes Gardens (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - Shardeloes Lake (08)	6	1	1	9
LO - Shardeloes Kitchen Garden (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - Shaw's Theatre (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Sheepcotes (09)	2	~	~	~
LO - Sheepcotes Cottage	~	~	~	5
LO - Sheepcotes Cottage (09)	3	~	~	~
LO - Sheepcott Cottage (09)	~	~	1	~
LO - Sheepcotts Farm (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - Sheephouse (12)	~	~	~	3
LO - Sheephouse Wood (12)	~	~	~	13
LO - Sheephouse Wood (12/13)	3	~	~	~
LO - Sheephouse Wood SSSI (12)	~	~	~	9
LO - Sheffield (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Shelswell Arms (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Shelswell Inn (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - Shenstone (20/21/22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Shepherd's Bush (04)	1	~	~	18
LO - Shepherds Furze Farmhouse (13)	~	~	~	4
LO - Shepherd's Fuze Farm (13)	3	2	~	~
LO - Shipton Lee (unidentified)	1	~	~	~
LO - Shirral Deer Park (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Shropshire (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Shrubs Wood LWS (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Shustoke Reservoir (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - Sibleys Coppice (09)	10	~	1	~
LO - Sibley's Coppice woodland (09)	~	~	~	12
LO - Sibley's Coppice/LWS (09)	~	~	~	14
LO - Sibleys Rise (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Silver Birches (09)	1	1	~	~
LO - Silverdale Estate (01)	~	~	~	4
LO - Silverdale Tenants Hall (01)	1	1	~	21
LO - Sita UK Waste Management Site (24)	1	~	~	~
LO - Siverdale Estate (01)	2	~	~	~
LO - Sixteen Acre (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - Sixteen Acre Wood (23)	1	~	~	1

LO - Skipping's Farm (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Slaish Wood (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Slough Wood (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Small Dean (10)	3	2	~	6
LO - Smalldean Farm (10)	~	1	1	1
LO - Smith's Wood (19)	2	~	~	~
LO - Smith's Wood (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Smith's Wood Estate (19)	1	~	~	~
LO - Snakes Hill (21)	~	1	~	3
LO - Solihull (24)	1	~	~	13
LO - Somers Town (01)	1	~	~	6
LO - South Aylesbury (11)	2	~	~	2
LO - South Buckinghamshire Hospital (08)	2	~	~	11
LO - South Bucks (09)	~	~	~	4
LO - South Cubbington Wood (17)	6	~	~	9
LO - South Downs National Park (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - South Hampstead (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - South Hampstead and Kilburn Partnership (SHAK) (03)	~	1	~	~
LO - South Hampstead Station (03)	4	~	~	~
LO - South Harefield (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - South Heath (09)	37	8	11	48
LO - South Heath Garden Centre (09)	4	~	~	3
LO - South Heath green tunnel - (09/10?)	~	~	~	1
LO - South Hurst (18)	1	~	1	1
LO - South Hurst Cottage (18)	2	~	1	~
LO - South Hurst Farmhouse (18)	1	~	~	2
LO - South Kilburn (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - South Kilburn Conservation Area (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - South Kilburn Estate (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - South Northamptonshire (14/15)	~	~	1	3
LO - South Ruislip (06)	3	1	~	5
LO - South View Farm (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Southam (16)	9	2	2	8
LO - Southam Quarry (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - Southam Road Verge LWS (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Spella House (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Spilsmere Wood LWS (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Spinney Close Field, Greatworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Spring Farm (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - Springfield Farm (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - Springfield Farm (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - Springhill Cottages (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Sprinters Leisure Centre (09)	3	~	~	3
LO - St Aidans (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - St Aldon's (4)	1	~	~	1
LO - St George's Square (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - St James's Chapel (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - St James's Gardens (01)	11	9	~	36
LO - St James's Gardens Cemetery (01)	5	~	2	13
LO - St John the Baptist Church (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - St John the Baptist Church (15)	1	~	~	~

LO - St John The Baptist Church (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - St John's Church (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - St John's Wood (03)	2	~	~	1
LO - St Lawrence Church (14)	2	~	~	~
LO - St Lawrence, Radstone (14)	~	~	~	4
LO - St Leonard's Church (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - St Mary & St Nicholas (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - St Mary and Margaret Church and Graveyard (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - St Mary's cemetery (04)	2	~	~	~
LO - St Mary's Church (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - St Mary's Church (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - St Mary's Church (11)	4	~	~	13
LO - St Mary's Church (13)	~	~	~	3
LO - St Mary's House (13)	2	1	~	6
LO - St Mary's, Chetwode (13)	2	~	~	~
LO - St Mary's, Twyford (13)	1	~	~	3
LO - St Mary's, Wendover (10)	4	~	~	~
LO - St Michael Church (26)	1	~	~	~
LO - St Pancras (02)	1	~	~	5
LO - St Pancras Church (01)	1	~	~	1
LO - St Paul's Church (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - St Paul's Horn Hill (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - St Peter and St Paul's Church (09)	1	1	~	1
LO - St Peter and St Paul's Church (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - St. Mary's Church (10)	~	~	~	5
LO - St. Mary's Church (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - St. Peter's Church (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stables Market (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - Staffordshire (21/22)	~	~	~	10
LO - Stalbridge House (01)	1	~	~	3
LO - Standalls Farm (11)	1	~	~	1
LO - Stanley Hill (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stanley Sidings (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - Stare Lodge (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stareton (18)	1	~	~	2
LO - STATION - Amersham (08)	3	~	~	~
LO - STATION - Amersham Station (08)	~	~	~	3
LO - STATION - Aylesbury Park (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - STATION - Aylesbury Vale (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - STATION - Banbury (15, close to)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Berkswell (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - STATION - Berkswell Railway Station (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Berkswell Station (23)	~	~	~	3
LO - STATION - Bickenhill (23)	2	~	~	~
LO - STATION - Bickenhill Station (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Birmingham Interchange (24)	2	~	~	4
LO - STATION - Birmingham International (24)	~	~	~	2
LO - STATION - Burton Road	1	~	~	~
LO - STATION - Camden Road (02)	1	1	~	14
LO - STATION - Camden Road Station (02)	~	~	~	3
LO - STATION - Camden Town (01)	~	~	~	10

LO - STATION - Camden Town (02)	1	1	~	~
LO - STATION - Chalk Farm (02)	1	1	~	~
LO - STATION - Chalk Farm Station (02)	~	~	~	6
LO - STATION - Clapham Common (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Curzon Street (26)	~	~	~	10
LO - STATION - East Acton Station (04)	~	1	~	19
LO - STATION - Eastcote (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - STATION - Euston (01)	2	~	~	26
LO - STATION - Euston Square (01)	1	~	~	4
LO - STATION - Great Missenden (09)	1	~	~	2
LO - STATION - Great Missenden Railway Station (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - STATION - Ickenham (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - STATION - Kentish Town South (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Kings Cross (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - STATION - King's Cross /St Pancras(01)	~	~	~	4
LO - STATION - Lichfield (22)	1	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Moor Street (26)	1	~	~	5
LO - STATION - Mornington Crescent (01)	~	1	~	~
LO - STATION - Mornington Crescent Station (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - New Street (26)	1	1	~	2
LO - STATION - North Acton Station (04)	~	~	~	9
LO - STATION - Old Oak Common	3	~	~	~
LO - STATION - Old Oak Common (04)	~	2	~	17
LO - STATION - Paddington (02)	~	~	~	3
LO - STATION - Primrose Hill (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Quainton Road (12)	1	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Queens Park (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Ruislip (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - STATION - Ruislip Manor (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - STATION - Shepherds Bush (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - South Hampstead (03)	~	~	~	2
LO - STATION - South Kentish Town (02)	~	~	~	5
LO - STATION - South Kentish Town Station (02)	~	~	~	3
LO - STATION - St. Pancras (01)	~	~	~	3
LO - STATION - Stoke Mandeville (11)	2	~	~	~
LO - STATION - Stratford International (outside CFAs)	~	1	~	~
LO - STATION - West Hampstead (01-03)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - West Ruislip (06)	1	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Willesdon Euro Terminal (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - STATION - Willesdon Junction (04)	~	~	~	12
LO - STATION - York Way	1	~	~	~
LO - Station Cottages (13)	1	~	~	~
LO - Station Cottages (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stechford (25)	~	3	~	1
LO - Steeple Claydon (13)	31	48	51	23
LO - Stephenson Statue (01)	~	~	~	2
LO - Stockley Park (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	2,395
LO - Stoke Grove (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stoke House (11)	1	~	~	3
LO - Stoke Mandeville (11)	18	3	2	30
LO - Stoke Mandeville Church (11)	~	1	~	~

LO - Stoke Mandeville Hospital	2	~	~	~
LO - Stoke Mandeville Hospital (11)	~	1	4	9
LO - Stoke Mandeville Old Church (11)	1	~	~	4
LO - Stoke Mandeville Stadium (11)	~	1	~	~
LO - Stoke on Trent (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	5
LO - Stoke-on-Trent (outside CFAs)	~	1	~	~
LO - Stone (11)	3	~	~	3
LO - Stone House (21)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stone Pit Field, Greatworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Stonebridge (23)	~	~	~	2
LO - Stonebridge Golf Centre (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stonebridge Island (23)	~	~	~	4
LO - Stonecourt Farm (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stonecourt Farm (14)	~	1	~	~
LO - Stonecroft farm (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stonehouse Farm (18)	2	1	1	2
LO - Stoneleigh (18)	4	2	~	33
LO - Stoneleigh Abbey (18)	1	1	~	20
LO - Stoneleigh Conference and Exhibition Centre (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stoneleigh Conservation Area (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stoneleigh Deer Park (18)	~	~	~	3
LO - Stoneleigh Deer Park Golf Course (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Stoneleigh Equine Centre (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stoneleigh Grand Ring (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stoneleigh Park (18)	3	1	~	25
LO - Stoneleigh Park LCA (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stoneleigh Park PLWS (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stoneleigh Showground/Royal Agricultural Ground (18)	1	~	1	2
LO - Stoneton Manor Farm (16)	5	~	~	~
LO - Stoneton Windfarm (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Stourbridge Junction (unidentified)	1	~	~	~
LO - Stratford (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	2
LO - Stratford-On-Avon (16)	1	~	~	1
LO - Stratton Arms (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - Strawberry Hill Farm (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Streethay (22)	8	~	~	9
LO - Streethay Farm (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - Streethay Manor (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Streethay Marina (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Sulgrave (15)	6	~	~	1
LO - Sunflower (13)	2	~	~	~
LO - Sunflower Farm (13)	33	~	~	1
LO - Sunnyside Farmhouse (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Surma Centre (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Sutton Coldfield (20)	~	~	~	2
LO - Sutton Spinney (17)	~	~	~	2
LO - Swakeley's House (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Swakeleys Roundabout (06)	~	~	~	1
LO - Swinfen and Packington (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - Swinfen Park (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Swiss Cottage (03)	5	~	~	3

LO - Swiss Cottage Community Centre (03)	1	1	~	~
LO - Swiss Cottage Leisure Centre (03)	1	1	~	~
LO - Swiss Cottage Library (03)	2	1	~	1
LO - Tame Valley (25/26)	~	~	~	4
LO - Tamworth (21)	4	2	~	8
LO - Taplow House (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Temperence Hospital (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - Tenby Gardens (05)	~	~	~	3
LO - Terrick (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - Terrick (10/11)	2	~	~	~
LO - Terrick Hartwell (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Terrick House (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Thame	1	~	~	~
LO - Thame (12)	~	2	~	~
LO - Thame (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	3
LO - Thame Valley BOA (11/12)	~	~	~	1
LO - Thames Valley (01-13)	~	~	~	2
LO - The Airfield (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Burrows (13)	54	~	~	~
LO - The Crown Estate (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Engineer (pub) (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - The Engineer Pub (03)	~	1	~	~
LO - The Etons (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - The Furrows (06/07)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Grand Lodge (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Hale (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Hale (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - The Hermitage (13)	56	~	~	1
LO - The Island Triangle Community (TITRA) (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Lansdowne (pub) (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - The Lansdowne Pub (03)	~	1	~	~
LO - The Lee (10)	7	2	1	11
LO - The Lee Cricket Ground (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Lodge (21)	1	~	~	~
LO - The Lodge (Doddershall) (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Lodge/New Cottage (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - The Mill (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - The Oaks (11)	1	~	~	2
LO - The Oaks Farm (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Orchard (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - The Orchard Public House (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Pembroke Castle (pub) (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - The Pirate Castle (02)	1	1	~	~
LO - The Riding School (01)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Roundhouse (02)	1	1	~	~
LO - The Shelswell Inn (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - The Tetris Building (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Three Conies (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Three Ways (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - The Winchester Project (03)	1	1	~	~
LO - The Woodman (26)	~	~	~	1

LO - The York and Albany (01)	1	~	~	2
LO - Thinktank (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - Thistle Hotel Euston	1	~	~	~
LO - Thorney (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Thorpe Mandeville (15)	7	1	1	12
LO - Thorpe Mandeville Manor (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Thorpe Valley (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Three Bears Cottage (09)	1	~	~	~
LO - Three Shires Farm (15)	1	~	~	1
LO - Thwaites' Factory (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Tibbets Farm (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Tilehouse Gravel Pits BNS (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Tingewick Meadows and Woods BOA (12/13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Toby Carvery Public House (24)	~	~	~	3
LO - Tomhay Wood (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Top Lodge (23)	1	~	~	~
LO - Towcester (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Tower House	~	~	~	1
LO - Trafford Bridge (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - Trafford Bridge Farm (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Trafford Bridge Marsh LWS (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Trafford House Farm (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Trent Valley (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - Triple Eight Race Engineering (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Troy House (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Truggist Hill (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - Truggist Hill Farm (23)	~	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Aston le Walls (15)	3	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Bacombe Lane	1	~	~	~
LO - TUNNEL - Bacombe Lane (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Bascote Heath (16)	2	~	~	~
LO - TUNNEL - Beechwood Tunnel	~	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Beechwood Tunnel (23)	~	3	~	~
LO - TUNNEL - Berkswell/Balsall Common Tunnel	2	~	~	~
LO - TUNNEL - Berkswell/Balsall Common Tunnel (23)	~	~	~	3
LO - TUNNEL - Bradford Tunnel (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Bromford (25)	~	~	~	2
LO - TUNNEL - Bromford Tunnel (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Burton Green (18)	5	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Chalfont Common (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Chiltern (07)	8	~	~	9
LO - TUNNEL - Chiltern tunnel northern portal (09)	~	~	~	3
LO - TUNNEL - Chilterns (09)	~	6	~	~
LO - TUNNEL - Chipping Warden	~	~	~	3
LO - TUNNEL - Colne (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - TUNNEL - Curzon Street Tunnel (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Ealing (05)	2	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Greatworth (15)	3	~	~	3
LO - TUNNEL - Greatworth Green Tunnel (15)	~	~	1	~
LO - TUNNEL - Liberty Lane (09)	~	~	~	1

LO - TUNNEL - Long Itchington Wood (16)	~	~	2	3
LO - TUNNEL - M25 portal	~	~	~	3
LO - TUNNEL - Mantle's Wood (09)	3	~	~	10
LO - TUNNEL - Mantles Wood gap north portal	1	~	~	3
LO - TUNNEL - Mantles Wood gap south portal	~	~	~	3
LO - TUNNEL - Northolt (07)	1	1	~	6
LO - TUNNEL - Primrose Hill - OOC (02/03/04)	~	~	~	6
LO - TUNNEL - Ruislip (06)	4	~	~	4
LO - TUNNEL - South Heath Green (09)	6	1	~	15
LO - TUNNEL - Tilehouse Lane	~	~	~	1
LO - TUNNEL - Turweston (14)	~	~	~	3
LO - TUNNEL - Ufton (16)	2	~	~	~
LO - TUNNEL - Wendover Green Tunnel (10)	5	~	~	516
LO - TUNNEL - Wendover Green Tunnel Southern Portal (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - TUNNEL - Wendover Tunnel	~	~	~	2
LO - TUNNEL - West Ruislip Portal (06)	~	~	~	2
LO - TUNNEL - West Ruislip Tunnel (06)	~	~	~	3
LO - Turners Wood (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Turweston (14)	14	1	2	18
LO - Turweston Glebe (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Turweston Manor Grassland (14)	3	~	~	~
LO - Turweston Manor Grasslands LWS (14)	~	~	~	6
LO - Turweston Playing Field (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Turweston Village (14)	~	~	1	~
LO - Twisted Oak Stables - Birmingham (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - Twyford (13)	29	12	5	32
LO - Twyford BNS (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Twyford Down (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Twyford Mill (13)	2	2	~	~
LO - Twyford Mill Racing Stables (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Twyford Parocial Church (13)	1	1	1	~
LO - Twyford Recreation ground (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ufton (16)	2	~	~	3
LO - Ufton Fields Nature Reserve (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - Ufton Vale Farmlands (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Ufton Woods (16)	2	~	~	1
LO - University - CV4 7AL	1	~	~	~
LO - University Hospital, Coventry (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - University of Warwick (18)	~	~	1	1
LO - Upper Boddington (15)	237	2	2	5
LO - Upper Bottom House Farm (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - Upper Dean (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - Upper Greatmoor Fam (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - Upper Hartwell (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - Upper Hartwell conservation area (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Upper Hollis	1	~	~	~
LO - Upper Radbourne Farm (16)	1	~	~	~
LO - Upper Ray BOA (12/13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Upper South Farm (12)	2	~	~	3
LO - Upper Thorpe (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - Upper Wendover Dean Farm (10)	~	~	~	1

LO - Upton (outside CFAs)	~	1	1	2
LO - Uxbridge (07)	~	~	~	2,398
LO - Uxbridge Golf Course (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Uxbridge Lock (07)	1	~	~	~
LO - Valley Fields (17)	1	~	~	3
LO - Vaughan Williams Memorial Library (02)	~	~	~	1
LO - VENT SHAFT - Adelaide Road (03)	3	1	~	5
LO - VENT SHAFT - Alexandra Place (03)	~	~	~	2
LO - VENT SHAFT - Alexandra Place / Langtry Walk (03)	2	1	~	~
LO - VENT SHAFT - Amersham (08)	5	~	~	14
LO - VENT SHAFT - Bottom House Farm Lane (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - VENT SHAFT - Chalfont St Giles (08)	~	~	~	5
LO - VENT SHAFT - Chalfont St Peter (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - VENT SHAFT - Chesham Lane (08)	~	~	~	2
LO - VENT SHAFT - Greenpark Way (05)	~	~	~	2
LO - VENT SHAFT - Little Missenden (08/09)	4	~	~	~
LO - VENT SHAFT - Little Missenden (09)	~	~	2	8
LO - VENT SHAFT - Little Missenden A413	~	~	~	5
LO - VENT SHAFT - Mandeville Road (05)	2	~	1	5
LO - VENT SHAFT - Salisbury Road (04)	3	~	~	~
LO - VENT SHAFT - Salisbury Road/Queens Park (04)	~	~	~	6
LO - VENT SHAFT - South Ruislip (06)	~	~	~	3
LO - VENT SHAFT - Westgate	~	~	1	~
LO - VENT SHAFT - Westgate (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Versions Farm (14)	~	~	~	4
LO - VIADUCT - Balsall Common (23)	2	1	~	3
LO - VIADUCT - Black Bourne Brook (21)	~	1	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - Black Bourne Brook/Black Brook (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - VIADUCT - Bourne Brook (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - Cappers Lane	1	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - Cappers Lane (22)	~	~	~	4
LO - VIADUCT - Chattle Hill (19)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Chetwode (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Coleshill Junction (19)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Colne Valley (07)	4	2	1	11
LO - VIADUCT - Crackley Brook (18)	1	~	1	2
LO - VIADUCT - Curborough Viaduct (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - Curzon Approach (26)	1	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Drayton Bassett (21)	2	~	~	2
LO - VIADUCT - Edgcote (15/16)	~	~	~	2
LO - VIADUCT - Finham Brook (18)	~	~	~	2
LO - VIADUCT - Gallows Brook (21)	1	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Godington (13)	2	~	~	4
LO - VIADUCT - Great Ouse (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Harefield (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - High Furlong Brook	2	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - High Furlong Brook (15)	~	~	~	2
LO - VIADUCT - Hunts Green (20)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Langley Brook	~	~	1	~
LO - VIADUCT - Langley Brook (21)	3	3	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Lawley Street (26)	1	~	~	~

LO - VIADUCT - Leam (17)	2	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Longhole (16)	~	~	~	4
LO - VIADUCT - M42 (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - M6 (24)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Marsh Farm	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - NLL (02)	1	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - Padbury Brock (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Park Hall (25/26)	~	~	~	2
LO - VIADUCT - Pyford Brook (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - River Avon (18)	~	~	~	2
LO - VIADUCT - River Blythe (23)	4	~	~	2
LO - VIADUCT - River Great Ouse (14)	2	~	~	4
LO - VIADUCT - River Tame (25)	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Saltley (26)	1	~	~	4
LO - VIADUCT - Saltley Viaduct (22)	~	1	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - Shadow Brook (23)	4	~	~	2
LO - VIADUCT - Small Dean (10)	~	1	~	522
LO - VIADUCT - SmallDean (10)	7	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - South Dean (10)	1	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - Thame Valley (11)	~	~	~	3
LO - VIADUCT - Thorpe Mandeville (15)	1	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - Turweston (14)	1	~	~	4
LO - VIADUCT - Twyford West (13)	1	1	~	3
LO - VIADUCT - Welwyn	~	~	~	1
LO - VIADUCT - Wendover Dean (10)	~	1	~	519
LO - VIADUCT - Wendover Dean (11)	6	~	~	~
LO - VIADUCT - Westbury (14)	2	~	~	6
LO - Vicar's Coppice (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Victoria (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Victoria Business Park (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Victoria Industrial Estate (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Victoria Road ATS (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - Visage Building (03)	~	~	~	1
LO - Waddesdon (12)	6	~	1	15
LO - Waddesdon Common LWS (12)	~	~	~	1
LO - Waddesdon Manor (12)	4	1	1	4
LO - Waddesdon Manor Park (12)	~	~	~	3
LO - Wakefield	~	~	~	1
LO - Wall (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Walnut Tree Meadow (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - Walsall (unidentified)	1	~	~	~
LO - Walton Court (11)	3	~	~	4
LO - Warden Farms (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wardington (15)	~	~	~	4
LO - Warren Farm (14)	3	~	~	6
LO - Warren Farm landfill area	1	~	~	~
LO - Warton (unidentified)	1	~	~	~
LO - Warwick	2	~	1	~
LO - Warwick (17/18)	~	~	~	8
LO - Warwick Barr Conservation Area (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - Warwick University (18)	4	3	~	4

LO - Warwickshire (17/18/19/20)	3	4	~	29
LO - Washbrook Farm (15)	1	~	~	3
LO - Washwood Heath (26)	2	1	~	8
LO - Washwood Heath Sidings (26)	~	~	~	2
LO - Water Orton (19)	10	1	2	16
LO - Watergate Farm (13)	~	~	2	~
LO - Watford (outside CFAs)	1	~	~	4
LO - Waverley Equestrian Training Centre (17)	1	~	~	~
LO - Waverley Wood (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Waybeards Cottages (07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wayside Farm (12)	2	~	~	2
LO - Weedon Hill	~	~	~	1
LO - Weedonhill Complex (09)	~	~	~	1
LO - Weedonhill Woods (13/14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Weeford (21)	~	1	~	4
LO - Weights and Measures Gym (09)	4	~	~	5
LO - Welland House (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wellcome Collection (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Wells House Road (04)	~	~	~	3
LO - Wellwick Farm (10)	1	~	~	3
LO - Wellwick Manor (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Welsh Road Farm (17)	1	~	~	1
LO - Welsh Road Farmhouse (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wendover (10)	55	16	6	602
LO - Wendover Arm Canal (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wendover Church (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - Wendover Conservation Area (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wendover Cricket Club (10)	~	1	~	~
LO - Wendover Cricket Club/Ground (10)	10	~	~	~
LO - Wendover Cricket Ground (10)	~	~	~	526
LO - Wendover Dean (10)	5	3	~	29
LO - Wendover Dean Farm (10)	~	~	~	3
LO - Wendover Foothills (10)	~	1	~	~
LO - Wendover Gap (10)	1	~	~	1
LO - Wendover Health Centre (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wendover House School (10)	~	~	~	2
LO - Wendover Rifle Range (biological notification site) (10)	~	~	~	4
LO - Wendover Wood	1	~	~	~
LO - Wendover Woodlands BOA (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wendover Woods (09)	~	~	~	4
LO - Wesleyan Chapel (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - West Euston Partnership H-Pod (01)	1	1	~	~
LO - West Gate Junction (05)	~	~	~	2
LO - West Hampstead (03)	1	~	~	~
LO - West Hyde (07)	~	~	~	4
LO - West Hyde and Maple Cross Youth Centre (07)	4	1	~	2
LO - West London (03/04/05)	~	~	~	1
LO - West Midlands Fire Service HQ (26)	~	~	~	1
LO - West Ruislip (06)	6	3	4	15
LO - West Ruislip Golf Club (06)	1	~	~	2
LO - Westbury (14)	3	~	~	11

LO - Westbury Cricket Club (14)	1	~	~	~
LO - Westbury Mill (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Westbury Plantation (14)	~	~	~	2
LO - Westbury Village (14)	~	~	~	1
LO - Westgate (05)	1	~	~	~
LO - Westhill House (15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Weston Turville	1	~	~	~
LO - Weston Turville (11)	~	~	~	2
LO - Weston Turville reservoir (10)	7	~	~	~
LO - Weston Turville Reservoir SSSI (10)	~	2	~	524
LO - Weston Under Wetherley (17)	2	~	~	~
LO - Weston Wood (17)	~	~	~	2
LO - West's Cottage	~	~	~	1
LO - Westway Cross Shopping Centre (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - Westway Industrial Estate (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Westway Retail Park (05)	~	~	~	1
LO - Westwood Business Park (18)	~	~	1	1
LO - Westwood Heath (18)	1	~	~	~
LO - Wetherley Woods (17/18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Whaddon Hill Farm (11)	2	2	2	3
LO - Wheatley Wood (08)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wheeley Moor Farm (19/24)	1	~	~	3
LO - White City (04)	~	~	~	2
LO - White House Farm (21)	~	~	~	2
LO - Whiteheath School (06/07)	~	~	~	1
LO - Whiteleaf (10)	~	1	~	~
LO - Whites Close Field, Greathworth Hall (15)	~	~	~	3
LO - Whitethorn Farm (11)	1	~	~	~
LO - Whitethorn Field Medi-Clinic (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Whitfield (14)	3	~	~	3
LO - Whitfield Racecourse (14)	1	~	~	1
LO - Whitley (18)	~	~	~	1
LO - Whitney (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Whittington (22)	5	~	~	7
LO - Whittington and Fisherwick (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Whittington Arms (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Whittington Barracks (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Whittington Heath (22)	~	~	~	3
LO - Whittington Heath Golf Club (22)	5	~	~	5
LO - Whittington Heath Lowland SBI (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Whittington Hill Farm (22)	2	~	~	~
LO - Whittington Hill House (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - Whittlewood Forest (14/15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Widewater Lock (07)	~	~	~	2
LO - Widewater Lock Conservation Area (07)	~	~	~	3
LO - Widmore Farm (14)	2	~	~	2
LO - Willenhall (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - Willesden Junction (04)	1	1	~	7
LO - Willesden Junction Station	1	~	~	~
LO - Willowmead (11)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wills Pastures (16)	1	~	~	~

LO - Windmill Farm (19)	~	~	~	1
LO - Windmill Hill (16)	7	~	~	4
LO - Winnington Wood (unidentified)	~	~	~	1
LO - Winslow (12/13/14)	~	~	~	3
LO - Winters Tale Farmhouse (13)	1	1	~	~
LO - Witchell (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Witchell Cricket Ground (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Witchell Pond (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wolf Run (17)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wolfson House (01)	1	~	~	1
LO - Wolverhampton	1	~	~	~
LO - Wood End Farm (22)	3	~	1	~
LO - Wood Farm (16)	1	~	~	1
LO - Woodend (22)	2	~	~	~
LO - Woodend Barn Farm (22)	1	~	~	~
LO - Woodend Common Barn (22)	~	~	~	1
LO - Woodend Common Barn Farm (22)	3	~	~	4
LO - Woodend Lock Cottage (22)	2	~	~	2
LO - Woodend Lock Wood (22)	~	~	~	2
LO - Woodend Long Barn (22)	3	~	~	4
LO - Woodford Halse (14/15/16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Woodham (13)	~	~	~	1
LO - Woodland Cottages (12)	~	~	~	2
LO - Woodland Farm Cottages (12)	1	~	~	~
LO - Woodland Park (08)	1	~	~	~
LO - Woodlands Farm (12)	1	~	~	2
LO - Woodlands Park (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Woodman Public House	1	~	~	~
LO - Woodman Public House (26)	~	~	~	5
LO - Woodside House (16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Worcestershire (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - World's End (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wormleighton (15)	~	2	2	3
LO - Wormleighton (16)	3	~	~	~
LO - Wormleighton Cutting (15/16)	3	~	~	1
LO - Wormleighton Estate (15/16)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wormleighton Maintenance Loop (15/16)	3	~	~	1
LO - Wormwood Scrubs (04)	6	1	~	22
LO - Wormwood Scrubs Park (04)	2	~	~	15
LO - Wormwood Scrubs Railway Embankment (04)	~	~	~	1
LO - Wyatt's Covert (7)	2	~	~	~
LO - Wyatt's Covert LWS (7)	~	~	~	2
LO - Wycombe District (10)	~	~	~	1
LO - Yardley Forest (14/15)	~	~	~	1
LO - Yardley Whittlewood Ridge NCA (14/15)	~	~	~	1
LO - York and Albany restaurant and bar (01)	1	~	~	~
LO - Yorkshire (outside CFAs)	~	~	~	1
LO - Young Person's Theatre Company (02)	1	~	~	~