

HS2 Phase Two: West Midlands to Crewe Property Consultation 2015

April 2016

A report to HS2 Ltd and the Department for Transport

Prepared by Dialogue by Design

Company	Dialogue by Design
Dates	last revised 20/04/2016
Classification	Open
Author(s)	Ian Thompson, David Hughes

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

Dialogue by Design

252B Gray's Inn Road

London

WC1X 8XG

+44 (0)20 7042 8000

www.dialoguebydesign.co.uk

info@dialoguebydesign.co.uk



Contents

Executive summary	1
Chapter 1: About the consultation.....	4
1.1 Background.....	4
1.2 The consultation process	5
1.3 Public events	6
Chapter 2: Participation	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Response channels	7
2.3 Response types.....	7
2.4 Responses by question	8
2.5 Responses by sectors	8
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	10
Chapter 4: Reading the report.....	11
4.1 Reading the report.....	11
4.2 Numbers in the report.....	11
4.3 Structure of the report.....	12
4.4 Appendices	12
Chapter 5: Responses in answer to Question 1.....	13
5.1 Introduction	13
5.2 Overview of responses	13
5.3 Discussion	13
5.3.3 Overall comments on the Phase One schemes and their application to Phase 2a	14
5.3.8 Comments on the geographical boundaries proposed for the rural support and homeowner payment zones.	14
5.3.19 Comments on the width of the rural support zone.....	17
5.3.29 Comments on other eligibility criteria for compensation and assistance	19
5.3.33 Comments on the timescale and process of compensation and assistance schemes	19
5.3.38 Other comments and considerations with regards to the consultation and assistance schemes.....	20
5.3.41 Comments on properties above deep tunnels.....	21
5.3.43 Comments on the express purchase scheme	21
5.3.45 Comments on the voluntary purchase scheme	22
5.3.53 Comments on the rent back scheme	23
5.3.56 Comments on the need to sell scheme	23
5.3.59 Need to sell scheme - eligibility criteria	24
5.3.75 Need to sell scheme - process and operation	26
5.3.82 Other comments on the need to sell scheme.....	27

5.3.86	Comments on the cash offer.....	28
5.3.90	Comments on the homeowner payment.....	28
5.3.98	Comments on the principles of compensation and assistance	30
Chapter 6:	Responses in answer to Question 2.....	32
6.1	Introduction	32
6.2	Overview of responses	32
6.3	Discussion	32
6.3.4	Comments on the proposed A500 boundary.....	32
Chapter 7:	Responses which did not address the consultation questions	34
7.1	Introduction	34
7.2	Overview of responses	34
7.3	Discussion	34
7.3.2	Comments on the consultation process and communications from HS2	35
7.3.14	Comments on the Exceptional Hardship Scheme.....	37
7.3.17	Comments on statutory compensation	37
7.3.20	Compensation and assistance alternatives	37
7.3.24	Impacts of HS2 and Construction	38
7.3.37	Overall comments on the project and the proposed route	40
7.3.44	Comments on mitigation and assessment of impacts	42
7.3.49	Comments on associated infrastructure	43
7.3.56	Comments on Safeguarding	45
7.3.60	Comments on the Extended Homeowner Protection Zone.....	45
Appendix A	Glossary of terms.....	47
Appendix B	Detailed methodology	50
Appendix C	Participating organisations and elected representatives.....	55
Appendix D	Codes by theme and by question	58
Appendix E	Equality and Diversity monitoring	73
Appendix F	Equality and Diversity monitoring form	76

Executive summary

This report provides a summary of the responses to the Government's HS2 Phase Two: West Midlands to Crewe Property Consultation 2015. The consultation took place between Monday 30 November 2015 and Thursday 25 February 2016.

The purpose of the consultation was to inform the Government's decision on whether the compensation and assistance schemes in place for Phase One need to be amended for the section of HS2 from the West Midlands to Crewe (Phase 2a), based on the views of those individuals and organisations who expressed their opinions on the proposals.

Consultation process

The consultation was owned and managed by High Speed Two Ltd (HS2 Ltd) and the Department for Transport (DfT). [Dialogue by Design](#) was commissioned to receive, collate, analyse and report on responses to the consultation made via the website, email or the Freepost address set up for this consultation.

A total of 121 responses were received. 19 responses were received from organisations and elected representatives, the remainder submitted by members of the public.

Chapters 3 and 4 of this report offer a description of Dialogue by Design's approach to response handling, analysis and reporting. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 summarise the issues raised by respondents during the consultation.

Consultation responses

This report summarises respondents' views by considering comments made in relation to two consultation questions, as well as responses submitted to the consultation which did not follow the question format. Chapter 5 discusses issues raised in relation to Question 1, in which respondents were asked to provide any circumstances which they think should be considered to make the proposed schemes more suitable for the Phase 2a section of HS2. Chapter 6 discusses issues raised in relation to Question 2, which asked for views on the proposed boundary of the rural support zone at the south side of the A500. Chapter 7 discusses issues raised that do not directly address either of the consultation questions, for example comments on the consultation process, or on the HS2 project in general.

Comments on Question 1

Few respondents comment specifically on the suitability of the compensation and assistance schemes developed for Phase One to be applied to Phase 2a. Some feel the schemes developed for Phase One are acceptable, subject to caveats about the criteria or the distance up to which they will be available, while others believe them to be inadequate generally and

feel they should be overhauled across the whole route. There are also suggestions that Phase 2a is more rural in character and that the additional impact of the 'Y' section of the route should be taken into account in the compensation arrangements.

There are a range of more specific comments on the compensation and assistance schemes overall, as well as comments on the individual schemes proposed: namely the express purchase scheme, rent back, the need to sell scheme, voluntary purchase scheme, the homeowner payment and the cash offer. In general, concern is expressed that the geographical area within which these schemes are available is not wide enough and that this and other criteria are applied too restrictively so that many property owners who will be affected will not be eligible for compensation or assistance. In some of these comments reference is made to the operation of the compensation and assistance schemes so far on Phase One of the route. For the need to sell scheme in particular, concerns are raised in relation to the criteria being restrictive and inflexible and requiring homeowners to prove a need to sell rather than assisting those who wish to sell as a result of HS2. Respondents also underline a number of principles they feel should underpin the compensation and assistance arrangements, including the fact that no individual should suffer financial loss as a result of the line and that their freedom to move house should not be restricted by the devaluation of their property.

Comments on Question 2

While some respondents who comment directly on the proposed A500 boundary are satisfied, on the whole many believe that the boundary should be extended. Reasons put forward often highlight opinions that the area north of the A500 is rural in nature, with some suggesting that the boundary should extend as far as Crewe. Many respondents who comment on the boundary are of the view that factors other than the horizontal distance from the line should be considered when assessing the impact of the proposed route, and compensation and assistance available. Many suggest that noise and visual impact will be greater in areas where the line is elevated and argue that the boundary should be extended in these areas.

Other comments

Some respondents make comments that do not directly relate to the consultation questions. Some of these respondents are critical of the premise of the consultation, or the consultation questions for not inviting comment on issues they feel to be most important in connection with compensation and assistance. Some also criticise the maps and other information available and HS2 Ltd's engagement with affected property owners.

Among comments on the statutory compensation provisions currently in place for Phase 2a, respondents state that these are overly restrictive and inadequate in assisting property owners. Alternatives to the schemes proposed for this phase are also put forward, in particular a property bond, which some respondents feel has not been given proper consideration.

Respondents highlight a number of impacts they feel have not been taken into account in the compensation and assistance mechanisms proposed. These range from property blight experienced through the disruption and disturbance of the construction phase, to the noise and visual impact of the line once in operation. They also comment on the route design and infrastructure for this section of the route, in particular expressing concern about the impact of the viaduct proposed, as well as making suggestions in relation to the Infrastructure Maintenance Depot and the proposed hub station at Crewe. Some respondents feel that the mitigation of the noise and visual impact has not been properly considered and in some cases put forward suggestions for amendments. As well as these more specific comments on the design, respondents also appraise Phase 2a and the project overall. Some are supportive in light of the economic benefits they believe it will bring while others are more critical, citing the cost and the impacts on the local area.

Finally there are a few comments on the process of safeguarding land, including the Extended Home Owner Protection Zone (EHPZ). Respondents are generally supportive of the approach proposed subject to a number of concerns including the potential impact on a specific planned development. It is also argued that the level of compensation and assistance available in the safeguarding zone should be extended more widely.

Chapter 1: About the consultation

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 In November 2015, the Government announced its plans for Phase Two of the HS2 route including stations in Crewe, the East Midlands, Leeds, Sheffield and Manchester, and set out the route and stations for the West Midlands to Crewe (Phase 2a).
- 1.1.2 On this date the government also proposed that subject to consultation, the property assistance and compensation schemes for Phase 2a would be the same as for Phase One. This consultation sought the views of the public, in particular those along or near the line of route of Phase 2a, on the proposal to implement the same long term property compensation and assistance schemes for this section as for Phase One. Once introduced, these measures would replace the current Exceptional Hardship Scheme for this section of HS2. They are:
- Express purchase
 - Extended homeowner protection zone
 - Rent back
 - Need to sell
- 1.1.3 Plus, in rural areas where the line runs on the surface:
- A rural support zone, offering the choice of voluntary purchase or cash offer
 - Homeowner payments
- 1.1.4 Each of these measures is in addition to the compensation that is required by law.
- 1.1.5 The Government also sought the views of the public on the proposals to apply the following specific measures to the properties above deep tunnels on Phase 2a. The proposed measures, as for Phase One, are:
- 'Before' and 'after' surveys
 - Settlement deeds
 - Purchase of subsoil rights
- 1.1.6 For more information on these schemes please refer to the consultation document which can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/hs2-phase-two-west-midlands-to-crewe-property-consultation-2015>

- 1.1.7 High Speed Two Ltd (HS2 Ltd) is the organisation responsible for developing and delivering the HS2 project. HS2 Ltd is owned by the Department for Transport (DfT).

1.2 The consultation process

- 1.2.1 HS2 Ltd and the Department for Transport produced a number of documents and maps to enable people to provide informed responses to the consultation:

- *HS2 Phase Two: West Midlands to Crewe Property Consultation 2015 Consultation Document*, setting out in full each of the proposed measures and providing background information on the HS2 scheme. It explained why the Government intended to go beyond the scope of the existing compensation code and how certain options could assist property owners affected by the project;
- A summary document, providing an overview of the proposals;
- A leaflet providing basic information about the consultation, the proposals and information on how to access further information;
- A map book containing 17 maps showing the proposed boundaries of the schemes and of the safeguarded area;
- A consultation response form; and
- A diversity monitoring form.

- 1.2.2 All documents were available to download from www.gov.uk and to order in hard copy either from a dedicated order line or through the HS2 Helpdesk directly. Copies of the consultation document, the summary document (including response and diversity monitoring forms) and the map book were available to view at libraries closest to the Phase 2a route.

- 1.2.3 HS2 Ltd and DfT raised awareness of the consultation process in a number of ways. Once the consultation had been launched HS2 Ltd commissioned Royal Mail to send a leaflet to each property within postcodes that are intersected by a boundary of 1000m either side of the centre line of Phase 2a route. This distance is used to publicise the majority of HS2 Ltd's consultations.

- 1.2.4 Letters were sent to Members of Parliament, Chief Executives and Leaders of Local Authorities, Parish council clerks along the Phase 2a line of route, statutory organisations and other stakeholders, to inform them of the launch of the consultation.

- 1.2.5 Posters advertising the consultation's information events were also sent to local libraries, village halls and places of local interest. HS2 Ltd used its social media presence to advertise the launch of the consultation.

- 1.2.6 Regional press releases and local advertisements in newspapers were issued to raise awareness of the consultation and public events.

1.3 Public events

- 1.3.1 HS2 Ltd organised a series of seven Information Events at community venues along the Phase 2a line of route between 14 and 29 January 2016. The events were intended as an opportunity for members of the public to view relevant maps and documents, and to speak with appropriately qualified members of staff about how the consultation proposals might apply to them. In total, the events attracted over 1,400 visitors.

Table 1.3.2: List of Information Events

Date	Location	Time
Thurs 14 Jan 2016	Hough Village Hall, Cobbs Lane, Hough, Cheshire CW2 5JN	12-8pm
Fri 15 Jan 2016	Kings Bromley Village Hall, Alrewas Road, Kings Bromley, Staffs DE13 7HW	12-8pm
Sat 16 Jan 2016	Yarnfield Village Hall, Meece Road, Yarnfield, Staffs ST15 0NR	10am-5pm
Wed 20 Jan 2016	Staffordshire Gatehouse Theatre, Eastgate Street, Stafford, Staffs ST16 2LT	12-8pm
Fri 22 Jan 2016	Colwich and Little Haywood Village Hall, Chilwell Avenue, Little Haywood, Staffs ST18 0QZ	12-8pm
Sat 23 Jan 2016	Whitmore and District Village Hall, Coneygreave Lane, Whitmore, Staffs ST5 5HX	10am-5pm
Fri 29 Jan 2016	The Madeley Centre, New Road, Madeley, Cheshire CW3 9DN	12-8pm

Chapter 2: Participation

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 This chapter provides an overview of participation in the consultation. It covers response types and 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 in consultation material and on the www.gov.uk website. The three response channels – a freepost address, an email address and an online response form – were free for respondents to use. The online response form and the email address (subject to the user's account settings) provided confirmation messages explaining that each response had been successfully received by Dialogue by Design. All respondents who provided an email address were contacted after the consultation confirming receipt of their response.

2.3 Response types

- 2.3.1 A total of 121 responses were received, in a number of different formats. Table 2.3.3 describes these in more detail.
- 2.3.2 In addition to the response types described in the table, Dialogue by Design also received other documentation that was categorised as a null response, according to the following classification agreed with HS2 Ltd. Null responses comprised: general enquiries (these were sent to HS2 Ltd to be processed); duplicate submissions; or submissions which were not obviously intended as consultation responses, such as requests for consultation documentation. Four records were categorised in this way and were not processed or analysed any further.

Table 2.3.3: Count of different response types

Response type	Count
Online response form Responses submitted via the response form on the consultation website	68
Offline response form Completed response forms submitted by post or email	15

Letter or email	38
Individual responses submitted by post or email	
Total	121

2.4 Responses by question

2.4.1 Respondents could answer one or both questions. Table 2.4.2 shows a count of how many respondents provided responses to each question. It also includes a figure for respondents who did not specifically address the consultation questions, or provided supplementary information beyond their answers to the questions.

Table 2.4.2: Count of responses to each question

Question	Total
Question 1: Are there any circumstances which you think should be considered to make the proposed schemes more suitable for the Phase 2a section of HS2?	98
Question 2: What are your views on the proposed boundary of the rural support zone at the south side of the A500?	79
Responses that did not directly respond to the question structure or added additional information.	33

2.5 Responses by sectors

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

Table 2.5.2: Breakdown of responses by sector

Sector	Count
Members of the public	102
Academic (includes universities and other academic institutions)	1
Action groups (includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals)	2
Businesses (local, regional, national or international)	1
Elected representatives (includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors)	4
Environment, heritage, amenity or community groups (includes environmental groups, schools, church groups, residents' associations, recreation groups, rail user groups and other community interest organisations)	3
Local government (includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships)	4
Real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations	4
Total	121

Chapter 3: Methodology

- 3.1.1 The Property Consultation 2015 was owned and managed by HS2 Ltd on behalf of the Department for Transport (DfT). Dialogue by Design was commissioned to provide a consultation website and email address for this consultation, and to receive, collate, analyse and report on responses to the consultation made via the website, email or the Freepost address.
- 3.1.2 Dialogue by Design (www.dialoguebydesign.co.uk) is a specialist company that works with many organisations in the public and private sectors to handle responses to large or complex consultations.
- 3.1.3 This summary report does not make recommendations or seek to draw conclusions from responses. Neither does it attempt to respond to comments made by respondents, nor seek to verify or pass judgement on the accuracy of comments made by respondents. Its purpose is to organise, analyse and report on what people said and provide results in a format that is as accessible as possible for the general public and for decision makers in Government.
- 3.1.4 There were four stages to the processing and analysis of the consultation responses:
1. Data receipt and digitisation of all submissions
 2. The development of an analytical framework
 3. The implementation of an analysis framework
 4. Reporting
- 3.1.5 Appendix B provides a detailed explanation of the methodology used in processing and analysing responses.

Chapter 4: Reading the report

4.1 Reading the report

- 4.1.1 This report summarises the responses to the Property Consultation 2015 for the Phase 2a West Midlands to Crewe HS2 route. The report summarises the issues raised by respondents and indicates where specific views are held by a large proportion of respondents.

4.2 Numbers in the report

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

4.3 Structure of the report

- 4.3.1 Chapter 5 address issues raised in relation to Question 1, 'Are there any circumstances which you think should be considered to make the proposed schemes more suitable for the Phase 2a section of HS2?'. Chapter 6 addresses issues raised in relation to Question 2, 'What are your views on the proposed boundary of the rural support zone at the south side of the A500?' and Chapter 7 of the report covers additional comments in relation to the HS2 project as a whole and the consultation process.
- 4.3.2 Quotations from responses have been included in the following chapters to illustrate views discussed in the narrative. Quotations have been attributed where these are taken from a response from an organisation. Quotations have not been attributed to individuals other than indicating that they are from an individual's response. No quotes have been included from confidential responses.
- 4.3.3 Quotations are taken directly from responses and any typos are the respondents' own. This report reflects what respondents say without judgement or interpretation. Comments from respondents that misinterpret or misunderstand the content of HS2 Ltd's or other organisations' proposals are therefore reported in the same way as any other comments. Similarly, this report does not seek to judge the accuracy of respondents' comments.

4.4 Appendices

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

Chapter 5: Responses in answer to Question 1

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This chapter provides a summary of responses to Question 1 in the consultation, which is about the suitability of the compensation and assistance schemes available for Phase One of HS2 for property owners affected by Phase 2a.

5.1.2 Question 1 asks: We believe that the compensation and assistance schemes that are available for Phase One of HS2 are also suitable for those living along the Phase 2a (West Midlands to Crewe) section of HS2. Are there any circumstances which you think should be considered to make the proposed schemes more suitable for the Phase 2a section of HS2?

5.2 Overview of responses

5.2.1 Question 1 received 98 direct responses, however this chapter also covers issues raised by respondents that did not follow the consultation questions in their response, but were deemed relevant to the question.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 This section provides a qualitative summary of the issues respondents raise in response to Question 1.

5.3.2 This chapter covers the following themes:

- Overall comments on the Phase One schemes and their application to Phase 2a
- Comments on each of the individual schemes available for Phase One, including:
 - Express purchase
 - Voluntary purchase
 - Rent Back
 - Need to sell
 - Homeowner payment
 - Cash offer
- Comments on the width of the rural support zone (RSZ)
- Comments on the principles underpinning compensation and assistance

5.3.3 Overall comments on the Phase One schemes and their application to Phase 2a

- 5.3.4 Few respondents comment specifically on the suitability of the schemes available for Phase One being made available for Phase 2a. Of those who do address this, some agree that the schemes available for Phase One are suitable to be applied to Phase 2a, in a few cases commenting that these appear to be fair. In most cases they note a caveat or reservation about the arrangements in terms of the criteria for eligibility.
- 5.3.5 One respondent emphasises the need for consistency across different phases of the route but also suggests that there may be some adjustments needed to the schemes which should be applied retrospectively to Phase One. Similarly, another also supports the consistent application of these schemes but requests that the evidence and recommendations of the Select Committee be considered in updating the arrangements.
- 5.3.6 By contrast, many respondents feel the compensation and assistance schemes on offer are inadequate generally in that they do not fairly reflect the impact of the project in terms of the number of property owners eligible and the amount of compensation and assistance available. One respondent argues that HS2 have prioritised cost-effectiveness over fair treatment of residents in the development of the schemes. Generally these comments relate to the route as a whole although a small number of respondents feel the impacts from Phase 2a should be considered differently.

'The "Y" section of this track has a much more adverse effect within this small area than the rest of the proposed rural area of the route and therefore compensation should reflect this situation'.

Individual submission

- 5.3.7 Similarly, a couple of respondents also feel that that the area covered by Phase 2a is more rural in character and that the compensation and assistance should take account of this.

5.3.8 Comments on the geographical boundaries proposed for the rural support and homeowner payment zones

- 5.3.9 In addition to the boundaries of the RSZ (see Chapter 6), many respondents comment on the proposed boundaries (or geographical area) within which the homeowner payment would be available. Of these the largest number argues that these boundaries are too limited and restrictive and as a result many properties which will be affected are not eligible for assistance payments or the purchase of their property under the terms of those schemes.

- 5.3.10 Some argue that the zones should be extended to a particular distance at which properties like their own are likely to be affected. Some suggest the outer zones of the RSZ and the homeowner payment zone should extend to 600m from the line in either direction, while others argue that properties within 1,000 metres (1km) of the line in Ingestre and Tixall will be affected by HS2 but will not be eligible for many of the proposed schemes.
- 5.3.11 Respondents also request that the boundaries for both the RSZ and the homeowner payment zone be extended to incorporate a particular town or village they feel will be affected. There are also a number of responses commenting on instances when the boundaries of different zones dissect a town or village, dividing communities into different zones. Some stress the inequity of properties and neighbours within such close proximity (on the same street for example) being eligible for different levels of compensation and assistance when arguably the potential impacts they face will be similar. Examples include the villages of Ingestre, Tixall and Hopton, all of which straddle the boundary of the outer homeowner payment band. A resident of the latter village, in which only a small number of properties will not be eligible, states that:

'Small village communities such as ours will be affected 'as a whole' in the same manner by HS2 and all residents should be entitled to payment under a fair scheme. In the future we would all follow the same route, using the same road in and out of the village in a journey to access the nearest train station onward to the HS2 line.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.12 Many respondents go further to argue that distance from the line is an arbitrary and unfair eligibility criteria as it does not reflect the potential impacts on different properties as a result of HS2. Some argue that the boundaries should be drawn to correspond more closely with noise or visual impacts or the actual extent of property devaluation.
- 5.3.13 Respondents also argue that the proposed boundaries do not take account of the varying impact of the line and highlight a number of considerations that they feel should be incorporated into the boundaries of the rural support and homeowner payment schemes. Among these the most frequently mentioned is the height of the line. Many respondents argue that for sections of the route where the track is elevated - particularly at the viaduct - the noise and visual impact will be greater for those nearby and carry further to a greater distance. Hopton, Chorlton and Great Haywood are areas highlighted in this regard:

'where the proposed HS2 route passes close to a rural village and is also on elevated section to accommodate the local geography, as is the case at Great Haywood where the HS2 route cross the A51 on an elevated 18m+ high embankment (plus 7-8m of track/electrics, that the proposed linear static safeguarding, rural support and homeowner payment zones are insufficient and should be extended up to at least 600 metres.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.14 In relation to Great Haywood another respondent expresses concern that the impacts on this community from the construction of the viaduct - in terms of visual impact, as well as noise and dust pollution - would also be greater.
- 5.3.15 A similar consideration is the topography and character of the landscape in different areas. A few respondents suggest that as their property is in an elevated position in relation to the proposed route this enhanced line of sight means that the line will have a greater impact on their outlook. They also argue that in areas of flat landscape sound will carry much further and the viaduct proposed in this section will be visible from a much greater distance. One respondent highlights the potential impact on Wychwood Park and Wychwood Village, as well as the neighbouring parishes and wards of Shavington and Weston. With reference to the village of Hopton another states:

'Our properties are built on a natural ancient ridge with spectacular uninterrupted views across the Staffordshire countryside and beyond. HS2 is approximately 250m from our property which only gives us the minimum level of compensation. The line is fully within our sight and has an extremely detrimental effect on our view.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.16 The cumulative or additional impact of the proposed route on communities already affected by infrastructure is another consideration highlighted in relation to the geographical boundaries of the RSZ and HOP schemes. In particular, a number of respondents note that properties along Chorlton Lane are already in close proximity to the West Coast Main Line which will exacerbate the impact of the HS2 route due to the height of the line where it crosses this infrastructure:

'properties along Chorlton Lane are particularly badly affected by HS2 as they are already affected by close proximity to the West Coast mainline. They will effectively lie in a position where the viaduct will rise 'over' existing features and create a significantly over-bearing construction in such a rural landscape – this is not adequately addressed in terms of compensation zones.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.17 A small number of respondents also note that property blight currently evident as a result of the announcement of the proposed route relates to whole villages, towns or postcode areas, arguing that for this reason all properties within a given community will be equally affected and these schemes should reflect this.
- 5.3.18 Respondents argue that eligibility for these schemes should be put forward on a case by case basis, taking account of the particular characteristics and situation of each property, the different ways these may be affected by the construction and operation of the line and the geographic variation in potential impacts. Similarly, one respondent suggests that if a property falls partly within the boundaries of two different schemes the owner should be eligible for the zone with the higher payment, regardless of the proportion of the property in this zone.
- 5.3.19 Comments on the width of the rural support zone**
- 5.3.20 As well as commenting on the individual compensation and assistance schemes available to property owners within the RSZ (the voluntary purchase scheme, the rent back scheme, the need to sell scheme and the cash offer), several respondents comment on the distance of the RSZ boundary from the line of route.
- 5.3.21 Some express satisfaction with the zone's boundary, saying it shows HS2 acknowledges the impact of large infrastructure in rural areas. Others support it in principle but say that the boundary does not take account of the flatness of the landscape, or that the boundary's application must be sufficiently flexible.
- 5.3.22 Some respondents say that the width of the RSZ 120m either side of the track is too narrow, particularly in relation to the impact of the route on communities from the additional infrastructure and construction activities. A few respondents suggest alternative boundary distances, including 180m, 300m or more, half a mile, or up to one mile.
- 5.3.23 The main objections to the 120m boundary relate to the belief that other factors, besides horizontal distance from the line, should be considered when assessing impact of the proposed route.

'The boundary of the RSZ (and HOP zones) should reflect the impact on an area, rather than be based purely on distance from the line of route.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.24 Several respondents comment that noise and visual impact will be greater in areas where the line is elevated, for example where the line runs on a viaduct. Respondents request that the 120m boundary is widened accordingly in these areas. Particular locations referenced include Hough and Chorlton.
- 5.3.25 A related concern is the sightline from properties to the proposed route. Respondents refer to their properties located in elevated positions or by open fields, and therefore with a clearer view of the proposed route. Wychwood Village and Wychwood Park are mentioned as being in particularly elevated positions, whilst one respondent mentions that noise impact will be greater around the Cheshire Plains where sound carries further. Respondents ask that these variances, and the extent to which they can be mitigated, are factored in when setting the zone boundary.

'Wychwood Village and Wychwood Park share an elevated position that looks over the Cheshire Plain landscape over which the current proposed route is planned.'

Wybunbury Parish Council

- 5.3.26 One respondent comments on the current proposal to stop the zone at tunnel entrances. This respondent believes that properties beyond the tunnel entrance will still experience noise and visual blight as a consequence of construction, and that the zone boundary should be extended to recognise this.
- 5.3.27 Several respondents call for a more flexible approach to assessing compensation and assistance claims than a distance-based boundary. They say that each area is different and so it is only fair to consider each location on a case-by-case basis. There is also some concern that the boundary is only in place to simplify administration for HS2 Ltd. One respondent specifies that flexibility should be applied, particularly to the properties located on the boundary of the RSZ.
- 5.3.28 A few respondents hesitate to comment on the boundaries without further information. One respondent seeks a clearer definition of the safeguarding area, another would like further information on the design of the line, and a third respondent asks for the properties affected by this proposal to be identified.

5.3.29 **Comments on other eligibility criteria for compensation and assistance**

- 5.3.30 There are a number of comments arguing for compensation and assistance schemes to be made available to all property owners as opposed to only owner occupiers as currently proposed. Some of these respondents argue in particular that owners of rental property will be negatively impacted financially by HS2 and should be compensated for this.

'There will be an impact on rental levels, longer void periods, and in some cases the inability to let property altogether. In the latter case the properties will stand empty and potentially be subject to vandalism, whilst the landowner still has to pay all the management costs (including business rates) and preventing vandalism and dereliction. In order to retain investment in agricultural, residential and commercial property, freehold owners must have access to these voluntary schemes.'

CLA

- 5.3.31 Another respondent comments on a different criterion for eligibility, namely the requirement to demonstrate having had 'no prior knowledge' of the project when purchasing their property, which can be demonstrated by the owner having done so before the 28th January 2013. They argue that this restriction is unfair given the limited information that was available on Phase Two at this time and suggest that a more appropriate date would be 4th November 2014 - the date the safeguarding consultation on the initial preferred route was launched.
- 5.3.32 Commenting on the eligibility criteria more generally, a number of respondents underline the need for flexibility in the application of the criteria of the various schemes, considering the individual circumstances of each property - and how they are likely to be affected - on a case by case basis. Many of these outline the circumstances of their own property or community, often in relation to the height of the line or line of sight considerations as summarised above.

5.3.33 **Comments on the timescale and process of compensation and assistance schemes**

- 5.3.34 There are a number of comments relating to the process by which claims will be decided and administered. Without reference to a particular scheme, some respondents express concern that the process must be simple, in one case suggesting that support be provided to property owners during the application process.
- 5.3.35 In relation to the valuation of claimants' properties, a number of respondents support the use of independent valuers. Some respondents additionally stress the necessity for valuers with local knowledge, in order to ensure that they have a good understanding of the local property market.

- 5.3.36 A number of respondents also argue that homeowners should have access to an independent appeals process for the RSZ and need to sell schemes; suggesting that this would ensure that the application process remains fair and transparent. One of these believes this should apply to valuations:

'Any decisions on eligibility and property valuations should also be subject to independent appeal. Otherwise the scheme's that have been proposed are unjust and subject to abuse. It is wrong for the Secretary of State to have absolute discretion on whether to purchase or not.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.37 There are a number of comments on the timescale within which assistance is available under the discretionary schemes. In particular respondents underline the need for compensation and assistance to take account of the extended impacts of the construction phase. In particular, some respondents are critical of the use of the term 'temporary blight' in connection with the construction phase, emphasising the long timeframe of the construction period. Some state the view that property values have already been affected along this phase of the route, with one respondent arguing that property blight began with the announcement of the initial preferred route:

'If the Government is correct that generalised blight is temporary and will evaporate once the railway is in operation, this still means that residents close to Phase 2a will have had to endure 16 years of blight and, for approximately half that time, the additional disruption arising from the construction of the railway, during which the blight will intensify.'

Individual submission

5.3.38 Other comments and considerations with regards to the consultation and assistance schemes

- 5.3.39 A number of other issues are raised in responses which respondents feel have not been considered in the proposed schemes. Among these, a number of respondents underline the need to offer compensation to fund replacement buildings or facilities that may be lost as a result of the construction of the line. Another respondent emphasises that this funding needs to be offered sufficiently far in advance:

'There is still not an adequate scheme for delivering compensation sufficiently far enough in advance to tackle the issue of replacement buildings or facilities. If a buildings or facilities are going to be lost, or they are unable to be used there needs to be a clear mechanism to ensure that compensation is provided sufficiently far in advance to allow for those buildings to be replaced.'

5.3.40 Another respondent emphasises the need for timely payment of compensation and assistance in light of the statutory rate of interest at 0%.

5.3.41 Comments on properties above deep tunnels

5.3.42 There are a couple of comments about the reduced measures proposed for owners of properties above deep tunnels. One respondent believes that any such property owner who is concerned about the effect of tunnelling on their property should be entitled to request a 'before' survey - rather than this being limited to those properties deemed to be 'at risk'. Similarly, a group of local authorities argues that these surveys should be available to all properties with a Settlement Deed, with all investigation costs covered by HS2. They also suggest that provision be made for multiple further surveys and that the requirement to report damage within two years be removed:

'The authorities are of the view that the requirement for an owner/landlord to notify the nominated undertaker of any perceived damage within two years is too stringent. It should be recognised that cumulative defects could take time to become apparent and therefore there should be no limitation on timescales.'

Joint response from Staffordshire County Council, Lichfield District Council, Stafford Borough Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council

5.3.43 Comments on the express purchase scheme

5.3.44 Within responses to Question 1 there are a number of comments expressing support for the express purchase scheme. These respondents generally state that they find the scheme acceptable and that they welcome that it has already been introduced prior to the consultation. A joint response from a number of local authorities expresses specific support for the criteria and application of this scheme for being open and inclusive.

'The authorities welcome the fact that homeowners are not required to demonstrate reasonable endeavours to sell their property, and that small businesses are able to benefit from express purchase'

Joint response from Staffordshire County Council, Lichfield District Council, Stafford

5.3.45 Comments on the voluntary purchase scheme

- 5.3.46 A few respondents comment on the schemes available within the RSZ, particularly the voluntary purchase scheme. Some consider the payments offered to those in the RSZ are insufficient, with some adding that the offers should be more similar to those offered in the safeguarded area. Suggestions include the provision of a disturbance allowance and removal costs.
- 5.3.47 One respondent criticises the use of the word 'voluntary' in naming the voluntary purchase offer, stating that some will feel they are 'forced' to sell their property due to the impact of the line. A couple of respondents ask that the financial support (including reimbursement of stamp duty, legal fees and moving costs) accompanying the express purchase scheme should also be offered to those wishing to sell in the RSZ. A couple of respondents refer to the timescale for assistance under this scheme, arguing that payments are not available soon enough given that many properties are affected already.
- 5.3.48 In relation to the valuation of properties under the scheme, a couple of respondents underline the need for the two valuers taken from the panel appointed by HS2 Ltd to be independent. Some suggest that each party should be able to appoint their own valuer. One of these respondents also notes that information is needed on what will happen in the case of a dispute over the valuation.
- 5.3.49 There are also a couple of comments on the interaction of this scheme with the cash offer scheme, with respondents arguing that property owners who apply for the cash offer should not be prevented from applying for the voluntary purchase scheme at a later date given that their circumstances may change in this time:

'Owner-occupiers could have previously applied for and received a cash payment but subsequently decided that the burden of living in such proximity to the construction of the line is unbearable. They should then have the option to apply for the voluntary purchase scheme on the understanding that the original cash offer would be repayable (with reasonable interest)'

Individual submission

- 5.3.50 By contrast, a respondent describes the scheme as ‘objectionable’ as in their view it deviates from the stricter provisions of statutory compensation. Another respondent believes the criteria for the scheme are too restrictive and that as a result not all owner-occupiers affected by the construction of the route will be eligible. Another suggests that the express purchase (or safeguarding) zone be extended to 300m.
- 5.3.51 A couple of respondents also comment on the criteria and eligibility for the scheme in the context of properties that fall partly within the safeguarding zone, arguing that these should be treated as if fully within the zone, regardless of the proportion of the property within the boundary. One of these feels that greater clarity is needed on how such cases will be decided.
- 5.3.52 A small number of respondents comment on the home loss payment associated with this scheme equal to 10 per cent of the value of the property. They argue that the amount should not be capped at £53,000 as this is unfair on owners whose property value is greater than this amount and who will therefore receive a less proportionate amount of compensation. These respondents also note the amount at which value is capped for the cash offer (£100,000) is much higher.
- 5.3.53 Comments on the rent back scheme**
- 5.3.54 In only a small number of comments on the rent back scheme, some respondents express support for the scheme, generally with a caveat or consideration attached. Some state that the proposals for this scheme seem sensible, while suggesting that provision be made to ensure continuity of occupancy while properties are assessed for minimum legal standards for renting.
- 5.3.55 Similarly, another respondent states that while they judge the scheme to be helpful for property owners seeking to build replacement property, they feel it will have limited application beyond this. They also suggest that clarification is needed as to whether the rental term of six months is negotiable, as otherwise this could undermine the flexibility afforded to property owners to adapt to changes in property value.
- 5.3.56 Comments on the need to sell scheme**
- 5.3.57 Some respondents are supportive of the need to sell scheme whilst noting concern about one or more of the criterion used to assess eligibility (see below). One respondent states that while the scheme will go some way to addressing the concerns of affected homeowners outside of the RSZ, they do not consider it to be a satisfactory alternative to a property bond scheme.

5.3.58 By contrast, many respondents state the proposed scheme is inadequate, usually on the grounds that they feel it is too restrictive in terms of criteria and eligibility. Some state support for the recommendation of the Select Committee on HS2 that the scheme be reformed or 'overhauled'.

5.3.59 **Need to sell scheme - eligibility criteria**

5.3.60 Many respondents commenting on the criteria for the proposed need to sell scheme express opposition to the requirement the scheme places on property owners to prove that their property is affected. They feel that this would make the scheme needlessly restrictive and place a burden on homeowners in terms of the time, effort and potential distress in proving their property is affected. Respondents also argue for the principle that the scheme should be available to all who wish to sell as a result of HS2, rather than having to prove a compelling need.

'We find the conditions of the 'need to sell' scheme far too constrictive and compensation should be offered to anyone who wishes to move out of these blighted areas at any time during construction, and they should be offered a fair market price for their properties.'

Individual submission

5.3.61 A specific point raised in relation to the criteria for the proposed scheme is that provision should be made for property owners above a certain age - in most cases 65 years old - to qualify automatically for the scheme as they believe it would be unfair for people of this age to have to remain in their homes during the construction period.

5.3.62 Other comments and suggestions in relation to the proposed criteria include that specific consideration should be given to noise in deciding applications as Staffordshire will be particularly affected in this regard:

'The need to sell scheme has to consider increased noise- not as an average over a 24 hour period but the actual noise when trains pass, compared with the present noise level. It's reasonable that even a very small increase in noise level or visual impact need to be considered and reimbursed for as part of the rural support zone and need to sell scheme. Staffordshire is a county with a lower noise level than other counties along the HS2 route, the visual impact of HS2 is likely to be more in Staffordshire than other counties.'

5.3.63 Respondents also comment on the five stated criterion for the scheme, namely:

- 5.3.64 **Criterion 1 - Property Type:** Some respondents oppose the £34,800 rateable value limit included in this criterion, arguing that this is an arbitrary figure that does not reflect rural businesses.
- 5.3.65 One respondent argues that this criterion should not restrict the scheme to owner-occupiers but take account of the financial impact on individuals with investment property and second homes as assets.
- 5.3.66 **Criterion 2 - Location:** Some respondents express opposition to this criterion as they feel that the location of the property should not be reflected in the scheme criteria. Some respondents also argue that the rationale behind this criterion is inconsistent with the scheme having no fixed boundary and that it should therefore be dropped.
- 5.3.67 Another respondent highlights properties above tunnels, and stresses the importance that owners of these properties are able to apply for the need to sell scheme, drawing attention to evidence from the Select Committee and the CBRE that such properties have been affected by property blight.
- 5.3.68 **Criterion 3 - Effort to Sell:** Many respondents oppose the requirement within this criterion to demonstrate that no offers have been received within 15% of the property's unblighted asking price, arguing that by accepting an offer below the asking price, they will effectively have to accept a loss in value in their property, if they wish to sell their property as a result of HS2.
- 5.3.69 One respondent requests that greater clarity is needed on how this criterion is applied after an initial asking price is dropped or when a seller has been advised to set a sale price lower than the unblighted value in order to secure a sale.
- 5.3.70 There are also a couple of comments in support of particular aspects of the policy behind this criterion: namely that a property needs to have been on the market only 3 months and the recognition that estate agents requesting up-front fees is a sufficient indication of blight.
- 5.3.71 **Criterion 4 - No prior knowledge:** Only one respondent comments on this criterion, simply outlining their understanding of the rationale behind it; that as those who bought after the preferred route announcement would have either paid the blighted value, or paid the unblighted value imprudently, they should therefore not be entitled to compensation.

- 5.3.72 **Criterion 5 - Compelling reason to sell:** Many respondents who comment on this criterion are concerned that the examples listed in the guidance could be seen as an exhaustive list of the compelling reasons to sell. They highlight other potential circumstances which they feel should be considered, such as property owners who are already retired and wishing to downsize or wishing to move nearer to family or to change schools. One respondent argues that more extensive examples of possible circumstances that might trigger a compelling need to sell should be included in the guidance.
- 5.3.73 Some also object to this criterion in principle, arguing that those who will be affected by HS2 should not need to provide a compelling need to sell.
- 5.3.74 In more general terms, a number of respondents argue that the criteria for the scheme are too restrictive and do not take account of the individual's specific circumstances. A number of respondents outline their own personal circumstances in relation to the scheme, for example a retired couple planning to downsize and property owners who worry they will lose money on the value of their property as a result of the Effort to sell criterion. They stress the importance of flexibility and reviewing applications on a case by case basis.

5.3.75 **Need to sell scheme - process and operation**

- 5.3.76 Some comment that the requirements and process of the proposed scheme are too complex and restrictive. A number of respondents who do so believe that the up-take of the scheme within Phase One has been low and argue that this is evidence that the scheme is too restrictive. Comments on the up-take of the scheme often cite evidence given to the HS2 Select Committee:

'evidence from the initial operation of NTS on Phase 1 shows that its complex, intrusive and adversarial procedures have resulted in little uptake and caused considerable frustration, annoyance and distress.'

Ingestre and Tixall Parish Council

- 5.3.77 One respondent suggests that more guidance and assistance should be made available to assist homeowners with the application process, while another emphasises that the process should be as simple as possible, with only the most essential information required from applicants.
- 5.3.78 A number of respondents also comment on the uptake of the scheme in Phase One. For example they make the suggestion that further analysis of rejected applications could be undertaken in order to improve the process.

- 5.3.79 Some also emphasise the length of time taken to process applications for the Phase One NTS and stress that reasonable timescales should be observed in processing applications in order that affected property owners do not have to wait too long for their application to be processed. One respondent highlights the importance of discretion being used in deciding when it is appropriate for financial and medical records to be requested from applicants, and suggests a 'common sense approach' to deciding whether this is necessary.
- 5.3.80 Respondents also underline the need for an independent review process to be built into the process as an alternative to judicial review in order to ensure decisions are fair and transparent. One respondent notes that:

'This is the acceptable standard in "consumer" protection schemes established by the Government. Without the natural justice of an established and independent appeals process any Need to Sell rejections are likely to be subject to Court challenge on the grounds of unfairness of process.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.81 Finally, one respondent comments in detail on the valuation of properties in order to provide an unblighted value, arguing that more valuers with good knowledge of the local property market should be used for this, and that averaging both valuations would give a fairer value for larger properties with less comparable properties in the local area.

'Many properties are relatively easy to give an un-blighted value, as there are many similar properties which are not blighted. The average of two valuations from local valuers should provide a good estimate of the un-blighted value.'

HS2 Action Alliance

5.3.82 Other comments on the need to sell scheme

- 5.3.83 One respondent comments that eligible property owners should be entitled to additional expenses for Stamp Duty on the replacement property, professional fees and removal expenses.
- 5.3.84 Another argues that any changes made to the need to sell scheme (as well as any of the other discretionary compensation and assistance schemes) following this consultation should be applied retrospectively to Phase One as well.
- 5.3.85 One respondent notes that a separate scheme should be available for those who have already sold, suffering an uncompensated loss.

5.3.86 Comments on the cash offer

- 5.3.87 One respondent is supportive of the cash offer in principle as a scheme aiming to assist homeowners to remain in their home. However they note a reservation that it is not available beyond 120m, suggesting that this may limit its utility:

'The authorities are doubtful that many people would wish to remain so close to the line and would prefer to see this measure applied to a wider area. Nonetheless, that choice is for individuals to make and it is recognised that people affected by HS2 but wishing to remain in their homes have an alternative to selling their property.'

Joint response from Staffordshire County Council, Lichfield District Council, Stafford Borough Council and Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council

- 5.3.88 One respondent argues that the rationale for the cash offer is unclear. Specifically, they question whether the payment is intended to compensate for distress and inconvenience, noting that if so the amount would not need to be related to property value and a sliding scale based on distance would be more appropriate, as with the homeowner payments. They also request that if the single boundary approach is maintained there be some flexibility to take account of any properties which will be affected but will be outside of this distance.
- 5.3.89 As with other schemes a number of respondents argue that eligibility for the cash offer should be extended to all owner-occupiers in order to reflect the loss in the reversionary value of these properties.

5.3.90 Comments on the homeowner payment

- 5.3.91 Respondents comment on a number of aspects of the proposed homeowner payments. Some state that the amount of the proposed payments is insufficient and not in proportion to the impact of the line. One respondent whose property is within the middle band believes that the amount proposed will not cover the loss in property value they expect to face as a result of HS2. One respondent also argues that the amounts for each band should take into account inflation since they were originally announced for Phase One. Another, whose property falls in the homeowner payment zone, is dissatisfied with the proposed payment and believes the express purchase would be more appropriate.
- 5.3.92 A number of respondents object to the homeowner payment scheme being presented as an early share in the benefits of HS2, as they view it as compensation for the impacts of the line or the loss of value. A number of respondents state that the payment amount should be proportional to property value in order to reflect the varying impact of devaluation.

'The Scheme proposes a flat rate payments varying by the colour of the band in which the property falls. Because these payments are on a flat rate basis within each band the payment is regressive as it does not properly reflect a fair distribution of benefit which is clearly intended to offset the impact on the owner's property.'

Individual submission

- 5.3.93 As for other schemes and the compensation and assistance proposals as a whole, some respondents argue that the proposed homeowner payment scheme should not be limited to owner-occupiers but made available to all property owners, including businesses as these will also be affected.
- 5.3.94 Again as with the other schemes, respondents also comment on the proposed geographical limit within which the scheme will be available. Some simply state that this is too narrow and limited whereas others specify that the distance within which the payments are available should be increased to a certain distance. A number of these suggest this should be 400 metres from the line whereas one respondent feels that 500 metres would better reflect the potential impact of construction.
- 5.3.95 A number of respondents also question the rationale behind the proposed bands for the payments, arguing for example that these should be subdivided into a greater number of bands each covering a shorter distance. One respondent notes that the level of payment varies greatly between the proposed payment bands and argues that this does not reflect the similarity in the potential impacts faced by properties across these areas. Similarly, a small number of homeowners whose properties are partly within two of the payment bands are critical of the rule that 25% of the property must be within a band to be eligible. They argue that as the impacts they face will be the same as those nearby they should be eligible for the higher band of payment.

'25% of plot being within a zone is irrelevant. If you touch a zone, you should be classed as that lower zone as you should not need to restrict where or how you live in your home or garden. The impact on living is the same whether you are 5% in a zone or 80% in a zone.'

- 5.3.96 As with the RSZ (see paragraphs 5.3.13 and 5.3.15) and the express purchase scheme (see paragraph 5.3.43), respondents also state the view that the boundaries proposed for the homeowner payment do not take account of the line being elevated in places and other variations in topography and landscape which will mean that the impact of the route will be greater in some areas than others, particularly in terms of noise.

5.3.97 Again as with other the RSZ schemes, respondents argue that the proposed zones are arbitrary and that eligibility should be assessed on a compensation basis, with reference to the characteristics of individual properties and potential impacts.

5.3.98 Comments on the principles of compensation and assistance

5.3.99 Without reference to specific schemes, many respondents underline principles they feel should be reflected in compensation and assistance arrangements in terms of the level of compensation provided, eligibility and additional payments that should be included. At the most general level, the importance of compensation being available to homeowners that adequately reflects loss in property value or other impacts they face is underlined in a number of responses. Some respondents stress that compensation and assistance schemes must be 'fair and equitable'.

5.3.100 In some cases they emphasise the importance of compensation and assistance arrangements reflecting the full, unblighted market value of their home should they wish to move. Some add that it should also cover additional costs, such as legal fees and other costs involved in moving as well as mitigation and improvement measures such as double glazing for those who choose to remain in their properties.

5.3.101 A related point put forward in a number of responses is that no individual should suffer personal financial loss as a result of an infrastructure project like HS2 which is deemed to be in the public interest.

5.3.102 Many respondents also state that assistance provided should ensure that homeowners have the freedom and ability to sell should they wish to as a result of HS2. In some cases respondents feel that this freedom of choice has already been constrained as a result of the devaluation of their property.

5.3.103 One respondent argues that provision should be made in the compensation and assistance arrangements for property owners to relocate to a property with similar characteristics or in a similar area or setting. They emphasise that many homeowners choose to live in an area because of its landscape and environmental amenity and that in some cases these benefits will be undermined by HS2.

'It is only right that a scheme is put in place to help relocate those homeowners who for no fault of their own will have their home environment disrupted or changed. Many people live within green belt areas because their outlook is pretty much guaranteed as major development in open countryside or areas of natural beauty and [conservation] is highly unlikely'

Individual submission

- 5.3.104 Conversely, some respondents argue that compensation and assistance should also be available to enable all those property owners who wish to stay in their property to do so, stressing that this should take full account of the likely impacts during the construction phase as well as once the line is operational.

Chapter 6: Responses in answer to Question 2

6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 This chapter provides a summary of responses to Question 2 in the consultation, which is about the proposed boundary of the rural support zone (RSZ) at the south side of the A500.
- 6.1.2 Question 2 asks: What are your views on the proposed boundary of the rural support zone at the south side of the A500? For details for the RSZ, see Chapter 5 of the consultation document, pages 14-15.

6.2 Overview of responses

- 6.2.1 Question 2 received 79 responses, however this chapter also covers issues raised by respondents who did not follow the structure of the response form but commented on the RSZ.

6.3 Discussion

- 6.3.1 This section provides a qualitative summary of the issues respondents raise in response to Question 2. For a detailed, quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue, the reader can refer to Appendix D. This section consists of comments on the proposed A500 boundary. All other comments on the RSZ are included in Chapter 5.
- 6.3.2 Many respondents to this question do not address the question directly. Instead, they provide views on the distance of the RSZ from the line, or comment on the RSZ scheme more generally (these comments are addressed in sections 5.3.8 and 5.3.19).
- 6.3.3 In some cases it is unclear which boundary the respondent is referring to. In cases of doubt, it is assumed that the respondent is referring to the proposed A500 boundary as featured in the question.
- 6.3.4 Comments on the proposed A500 boundary**
- 6.3.5 While one respondent is happy with the zone's location between Crewe and Fradley, twelve respondents query or oppose the proposed boundary at the south side of the A500.

- 6.3.6 Some say that the boundary should extend north beyond the A500 as they consider that area to be rural in nature. One respondent refers to the West Coast Main Line running through the RSZ, stating that areas outside the zone are much less noisy and should therefore be given rural status. Another points to the presence of agricultural land north of the A500 as evidence of its rural nature. A few suggestions are provided for how to define the difference between rural and urban:

‘Perhaps evidence such as the presence of street lighting or traffic speed limits or the lack there of, of them could be used as indicators of urbanisation.’

Individual submission

- 6.3.7 In terms of alternative boundary limits, one respondent requests that the boundary be extended to include the ancient woodland on the north side of the tunnel entrance by Whitmore Heath. Others suggest that the boundary should reach Crewe, with one response pointing out that this would add only a small number of rural properties to those included in the RSZ.

‘The setting is more rural than urban and the Councils’ view is that excluding these from the RSZ and from the Homeowner Payment Zone just because they lie north of the A500 is rather arbitrary and unfair.’

Staffordshire County Council, Lichfield District Council, Stafford Borough Council,
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council

- 6.3.8 Others object to the idea of a boundary at all, suggesting instead that cases both north and south of the A500 should be considered on an individual basis.

‘There is no point in arbitrarily extending the Rural support zone to the north of the A500 at Crewe. Each application for support or compensation for HS2 Phase 2a should be considered at the appropriate time on an individual basis’

Individual submission

Chapter 7: Responses which did not address the consultation questions

7.1 Introduction

- 7.1.1 This chapter provides a summary of the responses that do not directly address either of the two consultation questions, including comments on the HS2 project as a whole and the consultation process.

7.2 Overview of responses

- 7.2.1 A total of 33 respondents did not structure their response according to the consultation questions, however where these respondents raised issues relevant to the consultation questions these have been reported on in the appropriate chapter above. Likewise, any comments included in answer to the two consultation questions that discussed issues outside the scope of the consultation have been presented here.

7.3 Discussion

- 7.3.1 This section provides a qualitative summary of the issues respondents raise in the consultation. For a detailed, quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue, the reader can refer to Appendix D. This section consists of ten subsections relating to themes arising that do not directly address the consultation questions. These themes are:

- Comments on the consultation process
- Comments on the exceptional hardship scheme
- Comments on statutory compensation
- Compensation and assistance alternatives
- The impacts of HS2 and construction
- Overall comments on the project and the proposed route
- Comments on mitigation and assessment of impacts
- Comments on associated infrastructure
- Comments on Safeguarding
- Comments on the Extended Homeowner Protection Zone

7.3.2 Comments on the consultation process and communications from HS2

7.3.3 Some respondents criticise the consultation on the grounds that they believe the schemes proposed for Phase One are not adequate and therefore should not be used as the starting point for Phase 2a.

'Because the compensation and assistance schemes for Phase 1 are inadequate to start with, I believe that the basis of the current consultation is flawed'

Ingestre and Tixall Parish Council

7.3.4 More than a few respondents note their view that the proposals were not amended in accordance with the views of respondents to previous consultations on property schemes. Conversely one respondent welcomes changes that have been made to the schemes.

7.3.5 Some respondents are critical of Question 1. They note that rather than discussing the principle that compensation and assistance schemes should be the same for Phase One and Phase 2a, they would rather provide their views on the schemes themselves, or HS2 itself. One respondent notes that they would not be able to respond to the questions without a detailed understanding of the implementation of the schemes to Phase One:

'Asking me to comment on whether adjustments to the scheme to take account for any special ways in which "the local area is impacted or has different needs.." is beyond my capability without being in a position to compare all aspects of phase 1 against like aspects of phase 2.'

Individual submission

7.3.6 Several respondents comment that the wording of Question 2 is confusing, with some unaware that the A500 would form the boundary between urban and rural. Some respondents suggest that its inclusion in the consultation was a diversion from the issues which respondents want to address.

7.3.7 Other respondents state their view that the results of the consultation would not influence the final schemes.

7.3.8 A few respondents comment on communications and events organised by HS2 during the consultation. While some respondents reflect positively on the events, some are critical. These respondents often highlight questions which they feel were not adequately answered at events, or suggest that engineers present at the events did not have adequate local knowledge to design an appropriate scheme, or are deliberately ignoring the views of residents.

'We attended the Kings Bromley consultation event on 15/01/16, which was excellently administered and very informative.'

Individual submission

'Language used is not user friendly and even on attending the consultation meeting, found questions could not always answered wholly or directly.'

Individual submission

7.3.9 Some respondents criticise a lack of communication with those affected by the scheme:

'HS2 Ltd has been hopeless at communicating with those worst affected by the scheme - those losing land, buildings and houses. There has been little negotiation on the mitigation of the impacts on businesses and no proper assessment of the overall agricultural impact.'

Individual submission

7.3.10 A few respondents raise issues on which they believe there is not enough information provided. These issues include: disruption arising from construction and the policing of regulations on construction; the boundaries of the track; and environmental management. Some respondents also suggest that the success rate and details of applications to all discretionary schemes should be published, not just the need to sell scheme, so that the success of these schemes can be judged.

7.3.11 A small number of respondents also request more information on mitigation measures, particularly soundproofing support, and mitigation such as green tunnels, as applied to sections of the line within cuttings.

7.3.12 A number of respondents make requests for further engagement, either on their individual situation, on sites of particular interest, or in general terms. One respondent proposes more engagement with farmers, farming unions and the Cheshire East Rural Partnership in relation to compensation for farmland.

7.3.13 Some respondents highlight recent or proposed developments which either do not appear on HS2 maps, or are documented inaccurately. These respondents encourage further direct engagement in order to address any issues arising from these developments. One respondent also suggests that the consultation maps are vague and show little detail; whilst another respondent suggests that more clarity is needed on the relationship between the proposals and existing statutory documents.

7.3.14 Comments on the Exceptional Hardship Scheme

7.3.15 Some respondents highlight perceived shortcomings in the operation of the outgoing EHS scheme in particular areas. A number of respondents feel that the criteria and process involved with the exceptional hardship scheme are unnecessarily restrictive, with some respondents arguing that there should be greater flexibility and discretion on assistance, taking account of cases where owners have a genuine reason as opposed to need to move.

7.3.16 Others point to the low uptake of the scheme as evidence of its inadequacy in assisting those affected.

7.3.17 Comments on statutory compensation

7.3.18 As well as the discretionary compensation and assistance schemes put in place for Phase One of HS2, some respondents also comment on the statutory blight regime.

7.3.19 These respondents are of the view that the current compensation and assistance proposals derive largely from the Compensation Code and the statutory blight regime and state that this is inadequate to deal with the impact of HS2 on property owners. A number of respondents note that the statutory blight provisions as set out in the Compensation Code derive largely from Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973 and feel these are outdated and not fit for purpose. While recognising that this is beyond the scope of the consultation, they argue that the Compensation Code should be revised and updated as a matter of priority while plans for HS2 are still being developed.

7.3.20 Compensation and assistance alternatives

7.3.21 Some respondents highlight their preference for a property bond over the needs to sell scheme in order to instil confidence in the housing market, often emphasising high levels of support for a property bond in previous consultations.

'The Parish Council, along with the majority of respondents to previous property consultations, strongly supported a Property Bond scheme.'

Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council

7.3.22 One respondent states their view that the decision to reject the property bond was taken in order to save the Government money at the expense of local residents, whilst another highlights the importance of transparency on the decision to reject a property bond.

- 7.3.23 One respondent cites a number of potential benefits they feel would result from the implementation of a property bond, including a reduction in the cost of compensation (with modelling by Price Waterhouse Coopers cited in support of this). They argue that the Government should consider implementing a pilot of such a scheme:

'HS2/DfT might have a Property Bond as a pilot scheme: how else will the Government ever be certain how the market actually responds? Either the Government needs to accept the judgement of experts (which it has not) or it needs to pilot a scheme to get real practical experience.'

HS2 Action Alliance

7.3.24 Impacts of HS2 and Construction

- 7.3.25 Respondents often highlight a number of impacts that they anticipate HS2 will cause, for which they believe the proposed schemes do not adequately compensate or assist. Of particular concern are property values, or the saleability of properties, impacts arising from construction including noise, and high levels of stress and anxiety arising caused by the project.

'If an offer within 15% of its realistic unblighted asking price is received and is refused then a householder cannot apply for the NTS scheme. This means that someone with a £300k property could lose £45k'

Individual submission

- 7.3.26 Many respondents refer to their individual circumstances, highlighting difficulty in selling their property. Others note a reduction in the value of their property as a result of HS2, restricting their ability to move or obtain an appropriate mortgage, remaining unable to apply for assistance as they do not feel they can suitably demonstrate a compelling need to sell. Some respondents highlight properties over tunnels as particularly affected by blight. Some respondents highlight the length of time that property prices have been affected by HS2 due to uncertainty regarding compensation and assistance.
- 7.3.27 Respondents also highlight the impact of HS2 on communities, citing examples where some property owners find themselves eligible for compensation and assistance while others do not.

'5 of the 10 properties that reside have been offered scheme's to be purchased and the remaining 5 not under the present proposals. This will have a destructive impact upon the close [knit] community we have as residents of this unique environment.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.28 Many respondents discuss reductions in property prices in terms of their personal circumstances. Many of these respondents highlight previously held plans to downsize in order to release capital for their retirement. They often suggest that they will no longer be able to pursue these plans as a result of reduced property prices.
- 7.3.29 Respondents who highlight potential construction impacts often cite noise, dust and traffic impacts as concerns. Some respondents also suggest that the nature of this section of the route would be more adversely affected by construction impacts for a number of reasons. These suggestions include proximity to the 'Y' section of the route, and the rural nature of the area including a number of narrow roads and open countryside, exacerbating these impacts. Also of specific concern is the length of the construction period and the construction of the viaduct resulting in noise, visual and dust impacts extending across a wider area.

'The building of the viaduct would involve working at a height where there would be additional pollution from dust being scattered over a wider area. The workings would be visible from a greater distance and be more prominent than at ground level. The sound of any construction work would also be far more prominent due to the height above the surrounding countryside'

Individual submission

- 7.3.30 On the contrary, one respondent predicts that the noise level will not be significantly increased, as trains will slow to reach Crewe station and the number of trains running on the existing line is expected to decrease.
- 7.3.31 Some respondents also note existing infrastructure and development projects in the area which in combination with HS2 would increase the potential impacts. These include development work on the West Coast Main Line, with particular concern for residents situated between the two lines, as well as the M6 Motorway. A few respondents also highlight concerns for traffic, safety and noise impacts arising from temporary worker accommodation.
- 7.3.32 A small number of respondents also highlight additional environmental concerns in their response. Of particular concern is the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) at Pasturefields, particularly the potential impact of construction on groundwater at the site. Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is also highlighted by one respondent. Potential light pollution is also a concern to some respondents due to its possible impacts on birds and bats in the area.

- 7.3.33 Some respondents highlight historic sites, including listed buildings, a conservation area and historic landscapes which could be adversely affected by HS2. Some respondents also wish HS2 to take into account the impact on ancient hedgerows in Stockwell Heath.
- 7.3.34 Others respondents highlight the general amenity of the area, which they believe would be adversely affected by HS2:

'The Stafford Constituency enjoys a mixture of countryside and town and enjoys some of the finest views in the region. It is also one of the worst affected constituencies by the proposals for Phase Two of HS2 (Birmingham to Manchester), now known as Phase 2a.'

Jeremy Lefroy, MP for Stafford

- 7.3.35 Many respondents highlight the levels of stress and anxiety they have felt as a result of HS2, often as a result of uncertainty over the level of compensation and assistance they might be entitled to, or due to the additional burden of having to claim for compensation and assistance available.
- 7.3.36 A few respondents highlight impacts to businesses which they believe should be compensated. These include the loss of buildings and facilities, and the possible imposition of tax on buildings lost, reductions in take up of holiday let and rental properties, blight affecting commercial properties, and potential impacts on agricultural output. Other respondents also highlight the potential impact on the local economy where business premises are lost, or businesses are adversely affected by construction.
- 7.3.37 Overall comments on the project and the proposed route**
- 7.3.38 A few respondents express support for the HS2 project, in some cases specifically expressing support for the proposed route of Phase 2a.

'As you know Cheshire East Council continues to support your plan to deliver a high speed rail link in the UK, along with a new HS2 Hub Station at Crewe.'

Cheshire East Council

- 7.3.39 However, in most cases these respondents also note a concern about the impacts in a particular area, requesting certain measures be considered or that they be engaged further in the future. A couple of agencies involved with the planning and development of a strategic site at Basford West express enthusiasm about the economic benefits of the route to the area around Crewe, while noting concern about the potential impact on their planned development (see section 7.3.49 for comments on associated infrastructure). A number of respondents express concern about the proposed viaduct on this section of the route:

'It is a source of great concern locally that one of the options being considered for the entry of HS2 into Crewe might be to build an enormous viaduct in this rural area. This would be totally out of keeping with the surrounding countryside and would fragment this rural community. It would close our road to Nantwich, adding to our time and fuel costs and make many daily communications in the area very difficult.'

Weston and Basford Parish Council

- 7.3.40 In relation to the phasing of the route's construction, one respondent states their enthusiasm for the route and the accompanying Growth Strategy. However they argue that the proposed plans for a hub station should be modified and brought forward in order to fully maximise the benefits to the local economy. Another respondent criticises the decision to proceed with a hybrid bill for Phase 2a before Phase One has been fully agreed and construction commenced.
- 7.3.41 By contrast a number of respondents are critical of the project, questioning the need case for HS2 and expressing concern about the overall cost of the project in relation to other spending priorities. One respondent expresses particular concern around transparency in relation to whether and how the environmental impacts and mitigation have been factored into cost considerations.
- 7.3.42 In some of these comments respondents' opposition to the project is more specifically related to the proposed route of Phase 2a, often in relation to the impacts of the line on their property or community. Some of these respondent state the view that while rural communities along the proposed route will be affected by the line they will not draw any long term benefit from its operation. One respondent states:

'HM Government has diminished my assets and disrupted my plans for retirement for what is an unsustainable vanity project that adds no value to me and fellow residents of Staffordshire.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.43 Some respondents also suggest amendments to the route to avoid particular impacts on the community or the environment. For example one respondent suggests the line be moved to the East of Madeley, while another suggests an amendment to avoid an impact on the SSSI near Pasturefields:

'To state the obvious all this could be avoided if the route had taken a slightly more direct approach from Rugeley to a point where it could then cross less contentious countryside along the Trent Valley just west of Weston then rejoining the route near Stone. It would take the kink out of the route and be more financially and environmentally beneficial.'

Individual submission

7.3.44 Comments on mitigation and assessment of impacts

7.3.45 A number of respondents state their view that the mitigation currently proposed is inadequate. Generally these comments relate to the potential impact of the line in specific areas of the route, particularly where the line is elevated as in areas such as Chorlton and Basford. One respondent from this area suggests that:

'Screening of the line of route by traditional methods (the planting of indigenous species woodland, hedgerows and shrubs) will not be effective given the elevation of this section of track. Hence the prospect of reducing noise, improving aesthetics and providing a thriving habitat for wildlife is impractical.'

Individual submission

7.3.46 Some respondents argue more generally that the potential impacts of the line on local communities have not been properly assessed or considered (for a summary of particular impacts highlighted see section 7.3.24). Among specific comments and suggestions relating to mitigation, one respondent stresses the need to consider the impact of construction on local traffic and the local road infrastructure in Wybunbury Ward, Cheshire East.

7.3.47 Some respondents suggest potential environmental impacts to be considered in greater detail with a view to developing mitigation proposals. For example one respondent emphasises the potential visual and noise impact within the Wychwood area:

'It is important to visit both Wychwood Park and Wychwood Village at the earliest opportunity, with community representatives, in order to best understand the landscape, the expansive views across the countryside and to experience how the current train noise travels in different weather conditions.'

Individual submission

- 7.3.48 A number of specific comments and suggestions on mitigation relate to the difficulty of mitigating possible noise and visual impacts from elevated sections of the line, particularly in relation to the viaduct proposed at Chorlton. Respondents suggest that the viaduct and high embankment in this area be redesigned at a lower level or that the maintenance depot in Crewe is relocated to remove the need to elevate the track in this area. A number of others argue that this section of the line should be placed in a tunnel in order to minimise the impact on residents. One respondent questions whether a feasibility study has been carried out for this part of the route, while another suggests that given the soil type in this area, placing the line in a tunnel in this area would be cheaper and more technically feasible than a viaduct. The latter respondent also expresses concern that alternative suggestions for mitigation and design are not being given proper consideration.

'When talking at the meeting I feel that this alternative has not been fully considered and that the engineers (who were absent from the meeting) are not amenable to any changes in design, something they should consider as on many occasions and outside suggestion can be a better and cheaper option as I have witnessed on many occasions.'

Individual submission

7.3.49 Comments on associated infrastructure

- 7.3.50 As well as comments on specific sections of the route, there are a number of comments on two aspects of associated infrastructure involved in the plans for this section of the route, namely the proposed maintenance depot in the Basford area as well a potential hub station at Crewe.
- 7.3.51 In relation to the maintenance depot, two respondents express concern about the potential impact of the development on the strategic employment site at Basford West. They highlight the importance of the Basford West site to employment and regional growth objectives and the corresponding impact on these areas should the development be affected. One of these respondents questions the necessity of the depot, arguing that insufficient evidence or justification has been provided by HS2 to support this. Both these respondents question the siting process, arguing that insufficient evidence has been provided to support the proposed site and that alternative sites for a depot in this area have not been given sufficient consideration:

'No analysis is provided of alternative options for the depot and of why it has come to be located here notwithstanding the impact on permitted and commenced development known to HS2. For example a possible alternative would be the use of Basford Sidings which lie to the east of the Basford West site. It is understood that these sidings are currently underused and as such could be utilised as an existing rail infrastructure facility for an Infrastructure Maintenance Depot.'

Taylor Wimpey UK Limited

7.3.52 Meanwhile one respondent notes that Cheshire East Council is working with HS2 Ltd to minimise the impact of the planned depot on residents, businesses and developers. They urge that a decision is made as soon as possible to provide certainty to those who may be affected in the area.

7.3.53 In relation to a hub station at Crewe, a number of respondents are supportive of this proposal. One respondent notes that they would support plans for a hub station as a way of ensuring that affected communities are able to draw some benefit from the line.

7.3.54 One respondent states their view that the development of the hub station should be brought forward in order to maximise the economic benefits from this section of the route, whilst another notes that although they are supportive of a hub station, they would prefer it to be sited to the south of Crewe:

'...as this would, in engineering terms, negate the need for high embankments and would greatly reduce the height of the currently proposed viaduct (and property blight associated with this). They also support the re-location of the HS2 Infrastructure Maintenance Depot in order that land at Basford is available to accommodate the Hub Station.'

Cllr Janet Clowes Cheshire East Council

7.3.55 Another respondent, also supportive of the hub station in light of the potential economic benefits to the area, is critical of the exclusion of plans for this station from the scope of the consultation, arguing that stakeholders should have a chance to influence this important aspect of the route's planning and design.

7.3.56 Comments on Safeguarding

- 7.3.57 As with the rural support zone, respondents comment on the boundaries proposed for the safeguarding zone. A number of respondents question the demarcation of this zone in terms of the compensation and assistance available, arguing that the schemes available within the safeguarded area should be available throughout all of the zones and bands covered by the discretionary assistance schemes (i.e. up to a distance of 300m either side of the line). Some argue that the impacts to property owners throughout this area will be similar and so those outside of the safeguarded zone, as currently proposed, should also be eligible for the more generous provisions for compensation, including moving costs. Some of these respondents outline their own circumstances and their reasons for wishing to move house.
- 7.3.58 One respondent suggests that the safeguarding zone is too narrow and does not reflect the potential impact of construction:

'The statutory compensation zone is very narrow and CADRAG has expressed grave concern that it fails to take any account of the widespread blight caused by the proposals, the construction phase and the aftermath following completion of the line'

Culcheth and District Rail Action Group (CADRAG)

- 7.3.59 By contrast, a small number of respondents believe that the area of land safeguarded for is too large in relation to the planned Infrastructure Maintenance Depot. They express concern about the potential impact of safeguarding in this area on consented development on the Basford West site. In light of this they request that the alignment of the Safeguarded Area is amended to exclude the entirety of the Basford West site, including associated development and the spine road which they believe will be affected.

7.3.60 Comments on the Extended Homeowner Protection Zone

- 7.3.61 A number of respondents also comment on the Extended Homeowner Protection Zone intended to account for changes to the safeguarding zone in relation to the route design and construction needs. Among these, a respondent supports the proposal and agrees that five years is a reasonable timeframe for the proposed zone to remain in place. Another respondent is also supportive of the EHPZ but notes that this area appears to be inconsistent in terms of distance from the line and argues that the rationale behind this should be explained in greater detail. Another respondent is similarly supportive of these provisions, whilst requesting that the restrictions in paragraph 5.2.9 of the consultation document (relating to instances where the safeguarding zone may be changed as a result of the route being changed or placed in deep tunnel) should be removed.

7.3.62 Another respondent states their opposition to the rule set out in this section that 25% of a given property should remain in the safeguarded zone for it to qualify for the express purchase scheme. They also argue that land safeguarded at this stage should remain safeguarded.

Appendix A Glossary of terms

Blight Notice – A means for qualifying property owners affected by statutory blight to apply to the Government to purchase a property on compulsory purchase terms before it is needed for construction.

Cash offer – A Government proposal for owner-occupiers within the rural support zone who do not choose to sell property of the government. Under the proposal, owner-occupiers could receive a lump-sum payment equal to 10% of the full un-blighted market value of their property (subject to a proposed minimum of £30,000 and a maximum of £100,000).

Compensation code - A collective term for the principles, derived from Acts of Parliament and case law, relating to compensation for compulsory acquisition.

Department for Transport (DfT) – The Government department responsible for transport policy in the UK (where not devolved).

Exceptional hardship scheme – The existing interim measure introduced to assist homeowners who have an urgent need to sell but, because of HS2, cannot do so or can do so only at a substantially reduced price.

Express purchase scheme – A scheme whereby the Government will accept Blight Notices from eligible property owners whose properties are substantially within the safeguarded area, even if it is not yet clear whether the property would actually be needed for the construction or operation of the railway.

Extended homeowner protection zone - The areas that were previously safeguarded by the Secretary of State, which are no longer, but which have on a discretionary basis retained the benefit of being able to apply for express purchase or serve a blight notice until 25 June 2019.

Generalised blight - The adverse effect on the value of a property that can be caused by planning proposals so that an owner-occupier is unable to realise the market value that would have been obtainable had the owner's land not been affected by the proposals, because prospective purchasers, having learned of the planning proposals, either may not proceed with the purchase or may only offer a lower price.

High Speed One (HS1) – The high speed railway running from the Channel Tunnel to London St. Pancras, also known as the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL).

High Speed Two (HS2) Phase One – The high speed railway planned between London and the West Midlands.

High Speed Two (HS2) Phase Two – The proposed second phase of the high speed railway from the West Midlands to (on its west route) Manchester and (on its east route) to Leeds.

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

Homeowner payment – A Government proposal for a payment for eligible owner-occupiers between 120m and 300m from the railway in rural areas, with the exception of those adjacent to deep tunnel areas. The scheme proposed a lump sum cash payment of between £7,500 and £22,500, depending on a property's proximity to the route.

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

Need to sell scheme – A scheme to assist property owners, enabling them to ask the Government to purchase their home for its full un-blighted market value. An independent panel will consider each application according to five criteria: property type, location, effort to sell, no prior knowledge and compelling reason to sell. There will be no outer boundary to this scheme.

Owner-occupier – Someone who owns a property (either outright or with a mortgage) as a freehold or on a fixed-term lease (with at least three years unexpired) and has it as their principal residence or place of business, subject to certain qualifiers. This definition is laid out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Part 1 compensation - Compensation which may be claimed under the Land Compensation Act 1973 if the value of your property goes down because of the physical effects of the use of the railway. This can be claimed after the railway has been in public use for one year.

Qualitative data – Non-numeric information, such as conversation, text, audio or video.

Quantitative data – Information that can be expressed in numerical terms, counted, or compared on a scale.

Rent back scheme – A scheme for people who sell their homes to the Government under any of the HS2 compensation schemes that would find it helpful to remain in residence as tenants subject to a commercial letting suitability assessment.

Rural support zone - The rural support zone (RSZ) is the area outside the safeguarded area and up to 120m from the centre line of the HS2 railway in rural areas. A choice of two discretionary schemes is available in the RSZ. The application process is the same for both. You do not need to choose an option until your property has been valued.

Safeguarding – A planning tool which aims to ensure that new developments which may conflict with planned infrastructure schemes do not affect the ability to build or operate the scheme or lead to excessive additional costs.

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

Statutory blight - A legal term which refers to land in certain specific situations (such as land subject to a safeguarding direction), as set out in Schedule 13 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It is to be distinguished from 'generalised blight'.

Stamp Duty – Stamp Duty Land Tax (SDLT), more commonly known as 'stamp duty', is generally payable on the purchase or transfer of property or land in the UK where the amount paid is above a certain threshold. Broadly speaking, SDLT is charged as a percentage of the amount paid for property or land when it is bought or transferred.

The consultation – The Property Consultation 2015 undertaken by the Government and HS2 Ltd on the Government's proposals for a package of discretionary measures to compensate and assist owner-occupiers property along the route of HS2 from West Midlands to Crewe, known as Phase 2a.

The Consultation document (*HS2 Phase Two: West Midlands to Crewe Property Consultation 2015*) – A document published by the Government setting out assistance and property compensation proposals for owner-occupiers of properties close to the Phase 2a route of HS2.

Voluntary purchase scheme – a scheme whereby eligible owner-occupiers of property within the rural support zone rural support zone will be able to ask the Government to purchase their property at 100% of its un-blighted open market value.

Appendix B Detailed methodology

Data receipt and digitisation

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

Responses via the website

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

Responses received via email

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

Responses received via the Freepost address

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

transcription team in order to correct any misrecognition. Handwritten responses were typed into the database by data entry staff. The contents of identical organised responses were imported into the database and transcribed using an automated process, but contact details and any variations were typed in by our transcription team.

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

Responses submitted to HS2 Ltd or the DfT

- B12 HS2 Ltd and the DfT took reasonable measures to ensure that responses mistakenly sent to their offices rather than to the advertised response channels were transferred to Dialogue by Design via the specific consultation email address. At the end of the consultation period, any paper responses received by HS2 Ltd or the DfT were transferred to Dialogue by Design.

Late submissions

- B13 The consultation period ended at 23:45 on 25 February 2016. No responses were received after this.

Verification of submissions

- B14 At the end of the consultation period, once any misdirected responses had been transferred from the DfT and HS2 Ltd to Dialogue by Design, a duplicates check was carried out on responses entered into the database. Where responses were exactly the same, one (or more if necessary) was removed and not processed.
- B15 On completion of digitisation, where responses were exactly the same and it was clear that they were from the same individual or organisation, one (or more if necessary) was tagged as a duplicate and not processed further.
- B16 Responses recorded as being from the same organisation were also checked to see whether the same response had been sent by different individuals from the same organisation.
- B17 Although the verification process identified and removed exact duplicate submissions sent by the same person in different formats, the process did not seek to remove identical submissions from different respondents.

Development of an analytical framework

- B18 In order to analyse the responses, and the variety of views expressed, an analytical or coding framework was created. The purpose of the framework was to enable analysts to organise responses by themes and issues, so that key messages as well as specific points of detail could be captured and reported on.
- B19 The process of developing the framework for this consultation involved a team of Dialogue by Design senior analysts reviewing an early set of responses for each consultation question, and formulating an initial framework of codes. At this point Dialogue by Design met representatives from HS2 Ltd and the DfT, to discuss the initial framework. Their feedback was used as part of the finalisation of the coding framework.
- B20 A three-tier approach was taken to coding, starting with high-level themes, splitting into sub-themes and then specific codes. Table B1 provides a full list of the top-level themes used and Table B2 provides an extract from the coding framework showing the use of themes, sub-themes and codes. The full coding framework is available in Appendix D.
- B21 Each code is intended to represent a specific issue or argument raised in responses. The data analysis system allows the senior analysts to populate a basic coding framework at the start (top-down) whilst providing scope for further development of the framework using suggestions from the analysts engaging with the response data (bottom-up). We use natural language¹ codes since this allows analysts to suggest refinements and additional issues, and aids quality control and external verification.

Table B1 *List of themes from coding framework*

Theme
Assistance schemes
Cash offer
Compensation
Consultation process
Homeowner payment

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.

Locations
Need to sell
Project and Mitigation
References
Rural support zone
Express purchase
Exceptional Hardship Scheme
Safeguarding
Sale and rent back
Voluntary purchase scheme

Table B2 *Extract from the coding framework*

Theme	Sub-theme	Code
Assistance schemes	All schemes (proposals)	Inadequate
		support with caveat
	Boundaries	too narrow/arbitrary (all affected)
		extend/too narrow (suggest distance)
		considerations - splitting communities
		considerations - line of sight
		considerations - height of line
	Process	AS - Process - should be quicker/simpler
		AS - Process - use independent/local valuers
	Timescale	AS - Timescale - consider long term blight
		AS - Timescale - not available soon enough

Implementation of the analysis framework

- B22 The coding framework was developed centrally by senior analysts. Other members of the analysis team were then familiarised with the detail of the coding framework, so they could start applying codes to individual responses. Modifications to the framework, such as adding codes or splitting themes, could only be implemented by senior analysts, although analysts were encouraged to provide suggestions.
- B23 The application of a code to part of a response was completed by highlighting the relevant text and recording the selection. A single submission could receive multiple codes. All responses to the consultation questions, as well as other responses that did not directly address the consultation questions, were coded using the same framework.
- B24 Where similar issues were raised, 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).
- B25 The quality of the coding was internally checked by the senior analysts. The team of senior analysts reviewed a percentage of the other analysts' work using a similar approach to that described above for the transcription stage. Anomalies in the approach to coding that were picked up through the quality checking process resulted in review of that analyst's work and the codes applied.
- B26 HS2 Ltd carried out a separate and independent quality assurance exercise to assure themselves that the coding was accurate and reflective of the responses made to the consultation. HS2 Ltd performed this by coding a sample of responses drawn from across the different response types and then comparing them to the coding applied by Dialogue by Design.

Appendix C Participating organisations and elected representatives

C1 Table C2, starting on the next page, lists the names of all the organisations which submitted responses to the Property Consultation 2015. They are listed by sector, and alphabetically within each sector. Also, organisations have not been listed if they indicated that their response should be treated as confidential. It cannot be fully assured that all organisations have been accurately categorised as not all respondents classified themselves. Categorisation of responses was carried out separately from coding and does not affect the way in which coding is carried out. The sectors are listed below in Table C1.

Table C1: Respondent sectors

Sector
Members of the public ²
Academic (includes universities and other academic institutions)
Action groups (includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals)
Businesses (local, regional, national or international)
Elected representatives (includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors)
Environment, heritage, amenity or community groups (includes environmental groups, schools, church groups, residents’ associations, recreation groups, rail user groups and other community interest organisations)
Local government (includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships)
Real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations

² Members of the public are not included in the following table

Table C2: Respondents

Academic
The Yarlet Trust
Action groups
Culcheth and District Rail Action Group (CADRAG)
HS2 Action Alliance
Businesses
Taylor Wimpey UK Limited
Elected representatives
ClIr Janet Clowes, Cheshire East Council
ClIr Steven Edgar, Cheshire East Council
Jeremy Lefroy, MP for Stafford
Environment, heritage, amenity or community groups
Culcheth Community Group
The Landmark Trust
Local government
Cheshire East Council
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council
Staffordshire County Council, Lichfield District Council, Stafford Borough Council, Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council - Joint response
Weston and Basford Parish Council
Wybunbury Parish Council
Real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations
Central Association of Agricultural Valuers

CLA
Spawforths on behalf of Goodman
Tatton Estate

Appendix D Codes by theme and by question

- D1 The analysis of consultation responses was carried out using a coding framework consisting of 15 themes containing 289 codes, of which 78 refer to specific locations mentioned by respondents. The themes and codes are listed below in Table D1 and Table D3 respectively. Table D2 shows key acronyms used within Table D3.
- D2 Table D3 provides an overview of the number of responses to which each code was applied within each consultation question. Some themes and a number of codes were created specifically for one consultation question, others were applied across both consultation questions.
- D3 For reference, a total of 121 responses were received to the consultation
- D4 The column 'Total' in Table D3 provides a total of the number of times a code was applied per submission (e.g. if one submission has a code applied to its response to Question 1 and to Question 2, it is only counted once for the 'Total' column).

Table D1 *Coding framework themes*

Theme
Assistance schemes (AS)
Cash offer (OF)
Compensation (CO)
Consultation process (CP)
Exceptional Hardship Scheme (EH)
Express purchase (EP)
Homeowner payment (HP)
Locations (LO)
Need to sell (NS)
Project and Mitigation (PM)
References (RE)
Rural support zone (RS)
Safeguarding (SA)

Sale and rent back (SR)
Voluntary purchase scheme (VP)

Table D2 *Key acronyms*

Key Terms	
EHPZ	Extended homeowner protection zone
EP	Existing Proposals
SA	Safeguarded area
RSZ	Rural Support Zone

Table D3 *Count of comments per code per question³*

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Non fitting	Total
Assistance schemes				
AS - All schemes - additional payments	~	~	1	1
AS - All schemes - interaction of schemes	~	~	2	2
AS - All schemes (proposals) - additional payments	3	2	~	3
AS - All schemes (proposals) - full unblighted market value	7	~	1	8
AS - All schemes (proposals) - inadequate	36	1	10	41
AS - All schemes (proposals) - support with caveat	5	2	~	7
AS - Alternatives - other suggestions	4	~	1	5
AS - Boundaries - considerations - height of line	13	2	~	13

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

AS - Boundaries - considerations - line of sight	4	~	~	4
AS - Boundaries - considerations - splitting communities	1	~	3	4
AS - Boundaries - extend/too narrow (suggest distance)	9	3	6	15
AS - Boundaries - other considerations/suggestions	3	~	3	6
AS - Boundaries - too narrow/arbitrary (all affected)	27	4	3	33
AS - Comments on operation (Phase 1)	5	~	3	7
AS - Criteria - no prior knowledge - oppose/suggest date	1	~	1	1
AS - Criteria - not just owner occupiers	4	~	4	7
AS - Need for flexibility/case by case	5	~	2	6
AS - Other considerations/suggestions	5	~	5	9
AS - Process - comments on decision making process	3	~	~	3
AS - Process - should be quicker/simpler	2	~	1	2
AS - Process - use independent/local valuers	3	~	~	3
AS - Respondent's circumstances/property	22	~	8	29
AS - Timescale - consider long term blight	5	~	1	6
AS - Timescale - not available soon enough	4	~	3	7
Cash offer				
OF - Criteria - link to distance from line	~	~	1	1
OF - Criteria - not just owner-occupiers	~	~	2	2
OF - Need for flexibility/case by case	~	~	1	1
OF - Other comment	~	~	1	1
OF - Scheme - support	~	~	1	1
Compensation				
CO - Alternatives - Property Bond	8	~	5	12

CO - Impacts - access	4	1	4	8
CO - Impacts - amenity/local environment	6	6	6	16
CO - Impacts - biodiversity/wildlife	1	~	~	1
CO - Impacts - blight from tunnels	~	~	2	2
CO - Impacts - community	4	2	5	10
CO - Impacts - construction	21	8	6	31
CO - Impacts - cumulative/proximity to other infrastructure	4	1	1	6
CO - Impacts - current (ongoing)	10	2	3	12
CO - Impacts - distress/anxiety	15	1	6	21
CO - Impacts - dust pollution	2	~	~	2
CO - Impacts - groundwater/water courses	2	~	~	2
CO - Impacts - health	2	~	1	3
CO - Impacts - heritage/character (inc listed buildings)	5	1	1	6
CO - Impacts - investment/life plans	12	2	4	17
CO - Impacts - light pollution	3	2	~	4
CO - Impacts - livelihood/income (farm or business)	7	2	1	10
CO - Impacts - local economy/business	~	~	2	2
CO - Impacts - loss of buildings/facilities	2	~	1	2
CO - Impacts - noise	20	13	7	34
CO - Impacts - personal/family circumstances	~	~	1	1
CO - Impacts - planned/future developments	2	~	2	4
CO - Impacts - property value/saleability	46	11	14	62
CO - Impacts - quality of life	8	2	2	11
CO - Impacts - safeguarding blight	~	~	3	3

CO - Impacts - traffic/local transport	4	1	2	7
CO - Impacts - visual	17	12	5	27
CO - Principle - freedom to move/ability to sell	11	3	2	13
CO - Principle - full/fair (impacts must be compensated)	9	6	7	17
CO - Principle - No individual loss	3	2	2	7
CO - Principle - relocation to similar property/area	1	~	~	1
CO - Principle - stay in home/area	4	2	~	4
CO - Principle - tax considerations	1	~	3	3
Consultation process				
CP - Comments on previous property consultation	5	~	2	6
CP - Documentation/maps - criticism	2	~	4	6
CP - Events - comments/references	10	3	5	18
CP - Form/question(s) - criticise	3	6	2	11
CP - Information - insufficient/inadequate	7	2	1	10
CP - Information - sufficient/helpful	~	~	1	1
CP - More info - infrastructure and mitigation	~	~	2	2
CP - More info - operation of existing schemes	~	~	1	1
CP - Other comment	7	~	1	8
CP - Process - challenge	12	2	3	17
CP - Process - support	1	1	3	5
CP - Process request - eligibility	2	~	2	4
CP - Process request - further engagement	2	4	10	15
Exceptional Hardship Scheme				
EH - Inadequate (reform statutory compensation)	5	~	~	5

EH - Comments on operation	3	~	5	8
EH - Criteria - too restrictive	~	2	1	3
EH - More info - timescale	~	~	1	1
EH - Process - should be quicker/simpler	1	~	~	1
EH - Scheme - inadequate (reform statutory compensation)	~	~	3	3
Express purchase				
EP - Criteria - too restrictive	3	~	~	3
EP - Home loss payment too low	2	~	~	2
EP - Scheme - inadequate	~	~	1	1
EP - Scheme - interaction with other schemes	2	~	~	2
EP - Scheme - support	5	~	1	5
Homeowner payment				
HP - Boundaries - considerations - height of line	3	~	~	3
HP - Boundaries - considerations - line of sight	2	~	~	2
HP - Boundaries - considerations - noise	1	~	~	1
HP - Boundaries - considerations - splitting communities	~	~	1	1
HP - Boundaries - extend/too narrow (suggest distance)	5	~	3	8
HP - Boundaries - question/oppose bands	8	~	~	8
HP - Comment on properties in two bands	3	~	~	3
HP - Criteria - all property owners	1	~	~	1
HP - Criteria - not just owner-occupiers	~	~	3	3
HP - Need for flexibility/case by case	5	~	~	5
HP - No views/not affected	1	~	~	1
HP - Payments - insufficient	6	1	4	11

HP - Payments - should be proportionate to value	2	~	~	2
HP - Respondent's circumstances/property	6	1	~	7
HP - Scheme - interaction with RSZ	~	1	1	2
HP - Timescale - not available soon enough	1	~	~	1
Locations				
LO - A51	1	~	~	1
LO - Bar Hill, Madeley	1	1	~	2
LO - Basford	4	3	2	9
LO - Basford West	~	~	2	2
LO - Black Drive, Ingestre	1	~	~	1
LO - Blakenhall	1	~	1	2
LO - Blythbury	1	~	~	1
LO - Casey Lane, Basford	~	~	2	2
LO - Checkley	1	~	1	2
LO - Checkley Brook	2	~	~	2
LO - Checkley Lane	2	~	~	2
LO - Cheshire	~	1	~	1
LO - Cheshire East	~	~	2	2
LO - Cheshire Plain	1	1	~	2
LO - Chorlton	5	3	2	8
LO - Chorlton Lane, Malpas	1	~	~	1
LO - Crewe	2	5	4	10
LO - Culcheth	~	~	1	1
LO - Culcheth Linear Park	~	~	1	1

LO - Den Lane	1	~	1	2
LO - Golborne Spur	~	~	2	2
LO - Gonsley Farm Barns	2	~	~	2
LO - Great Haywood	4	~	~	4
LO - Haywards Lane	1	~	~	1
LO - Hopton	6	1	1	8
LO - Hough	2	1	~	3
LO - Ingestre	8	~	4	9
LO - Ingestre Church	1	~	~	1
LO - Ingestre Golf Club	1	~	~	1
LO - Ingestre Hall	1	~	~	1
LO - Ingestre Pavilion	1	~	1	2
LO - Ingestre Stables	1	~	~	1
LO - Jack Mills Way, Basford	~	~	1	1
LO - Killamarsh	~	~	1	1
LO - Kings Bromley	1	~	~	1
LO - Larch Avenue, Basford	~	~	2	2
LO - Lea	1	~	~	1
LO - Leigh Golf Course	~	~	1	1
LO - Little Haywood Village Hall	1	~	~	1
LO - M25	~	1	~	1
LO - M6	1	2	~	3
LO - Map references	2	~	1	3
LO - Mill Lane	2	~	~	2

LO - Mount Edge, Hopton	~	~	1	1
LO - Nantwich	~	~	1	1
LO - Norton Bridge	~	2	~	2
LO - Nursery Way	1	~	~	1
LO - Oakleigh	~	1	~	1
LO - Pasturefields	2	~	~	2
LO - Pendle Gardens, Culcheth	~	~	1	1
LO - Pipe Ridware	1	~	~	1
LO - Pipe Wood Lane	~	1	~	1
LO - River Trent	1	~	~	1
LO - Rugeley	2	~	~	2
LO - Shavington	1	~	~	1
LO - Shugborough Hall	1	~	~	1
LO - South Cheshire	~	2	~	2
LO - St Clements Court	1	~	~	1
LO - Stafford	~	~	3	3
LO - Staffordshire	3	1	1	5
LO - Stockwell Heath	2	1	~	2
LO - Stone	1	~	~	1
LO - The Grange Farm	1	~	~	1
LO - Tixall	4	~	4	6
LO - Trent Valley	1	~	~	1
LO - Trowell	~	~	1	1
LO - Walton	1	~	~	1

LO - Warrington Road, Culcheth	~	~	1	1
LO - Waybutt Lane	1	~	~	1
LO - Weston	3	~	1	4
LO - Weston Lane, Basford	~	~	1	1
LO - Whitmore Heath	~	1	~	1
LO - Wigshaw Lane, Culcheth	~	~	1	1
LO - Wrinehill	2	~	~	2
LO - Wybunbury	2	~	~	2
LO - Wychwood Park	5	1	1	6
LO - Wychwood Village	2	1	~	2
LO - Yarnfield	1	~	~	1
Need to sell				
NS - Comments on operation	3	~	1	4
NS - Criteria - above tunnels	~	~	1	1
NS - Criteria - all who wish to sell	5	~	1	6
NS - Criteria - oppose need to prove	10	2	~	10
NS - Criteria - other comments/suggestions	4	~	~	4
NS - Criteria - over 65/old age	5	~	1	6
NS - Criteria (1) Type - not just owner-occupiers	~	~	1	1
NS - Criteria (1) Type - oppose £34800 limit	1	~	1	2
NS - Criteria (2) Location - comments	~	~	2	2
NS - Criteria (2) Location - oppose	~	~	1	1
NS - Criteria (3) Effort to Sell - comments	2	~	~	2
NS - Criteria (3) Effort to Sell - oppose	9	~	8	17

NS - Criteria (4) No prior knowledge - comments	~	~	1	1
NS - Criteria (5) Compelling reason - comments	6	~	1	7
NS - Need for flexibility/case by case	3	~	1	4
NS - Other comments/suggestions	1	~	3	4
NS - Process - independent appeals/review	2	~	1	3
NS - Process - independent/local valuers	~	~	1	1
NS - Process - other comments/suggestions	3	~	~	3
NS - Process - should be quicker/simpler	2	~	1	3
NS - Process - too complicated/should be simpler	7	~	1	7
NS - Respondent's circumstances/property	8	~	3	11
NS - Scheme - additional payments	1	~	1	1
NS - Scheme - inadequate	6	~	5	8
NS - Scheme - support	1	~	~	1
NS - Scheme - support with caveat	2	~	~	2
NS - Scheme - too restrictive	2	~	5	7
Project and Mitigation				
PM - Comment on hub station	1	~	3	4
PM - Comment on settlement deed	~	~	1	1
PM - Consideration of alternatives	~	1	~	1
PM - Engineering considerations	~	1	~	1
PM - Equity issues	1	~	~	1
PM - Further assessment - environmental impacts	2	~	~	2
PM - Further assessment - impact of tunnel	~	~	1	1
PM - Further assessment - other	2	~	1	3

PM - Further assessment - route and impacts	2	1	~	3
PM - Infrastructure - maintenance Depot	~	~	3	3
PM - Mitigation - access	3	~	~	3
PM - Mitigation - inadequate (specific area)	5	2	~	7
PM - Mitigation - specific suggestions	6	1	~	7
PM - Mitigation (environment/visual)	4	~	1	5
PM - Mitigation (noise)	~	~	1	1
PM - Mitigation (noise) - inadequate	4	~	~	4
PM - Request tunnel (specific location)	2	3	1	4
PM - Scheme/route - benefits to local economy	~	~	1	1
PM - Scheme/route - comment on specific section	2	1	2	5
PM - Scheme/route - need case	1	~	1	2
PM - Scheme/route - no benefit to affected communities	5	~	1	6
PM - Scheme/route - oppose	7	2	11	20
PM - Scheme/route - oppose viaduct	~	~	2	2
PM - Scheme/route - phasing	1	~	1	2
PM - Scheme/route - suggest alternative	~	~	1	1
PM - Support scheme/proposed route	~	2	~	2
PM - Support scheme/proposed route with caveat	~	~	3	3
References				
RE - Attachments	~	~	3	3
RE - Cited evidence	2	~	5	6
RE - HS2 Select Committee	6	~	5	7
RE - Local planning policy	~	~	2	2

RE - other organisation/stakeholder response	5	~	1	6
RE - Other project/compensation scheme	3	3	2	7
RE - Other question response	~	6	~	6
RE - Other report	1	1	1	2
RE - Previous HS2 consultations	~	~	1	1
RE - Previous response/correspondence	2	~	5	7
RE - PWC report	1	~	1	2
Rural support zone				
RS - Boundary - agree/support with caveat	~	6	~	6
RS - Boundary - considerations - height of line	5	11	~	14
RS - Boundary - considerations - line of sight	4	5	2	10
RS - Boundary - considerations - splitting communities	~	~	1	1
RS - Boundary - considerations - tunnel entrances	~	1	2	2
RS - Boundary - considerations - viaduct/infrastructure	~	2	~	2
RS - Boundary - distance is arbitrary/all affected	4	9	~	12
RS - Boundary - extend (suggest distance)	1	6	3	10
RS - Boundary - extend/too narrow	8	10	2	19
RS - Boundary - flexibility needed (case by case)	~	9	2	11
RS - Boundary - more info/detail needed	~	4	~	4
RS - Boundary - variations (specific area)	~	~	3	3
RS - No views/not affected (Q2)	~	22	~	22
RS - North/south boundary - extend further	~	4	~	4
RS - North/south boundary - oppose (suggest limit)	~	1	~	1
RS - North/south boundary - query/oppose	~	12	~	12

RS - North/south boundary - urban/rural distinction	3	6	1	10
RS - North/south division - support	~	2	~	2
RS - Respondent's circumstances/property	3	5	~	8
RS - Schemes - additional payments	2	1	~	2
RS - Schemes - insufficient payment	6	2	2	8
RS - Schemes - interaction with other schemes	1	~	~	1
RS - Schemes - not available soon enough	~	3	~	3
RS - Schemes - should be entitled to same as SA	1	1	~	2
Safeguarding				
SA - Boundary - considerations - planned developments	~	~	2	2
SA - Boundary - extend (suggest distance)	~	~	1	1
SA - Boundary - extend/suggest distance	5	~	~	5
SA - Boundary - extend/too narrow	~	~	1	1
SA - EHPZ and safeguarding interaction	2	~	1	3
SA - Process - comments	1	~	1	2
SA - Respondent's circumstances/property	~	~	1	1
SA - Schemes - support	1	~	~	1
SA - Schemes - support with caveat	3	~	~	3
SA - Specific area comments/amendments	~	~	2	2
Sale and rent back				
SR - More information required	1	~	~	1
SR - Need for flexibility/case by case	1	~	~	1
SR - Process - suggestion	1	~	~	1
SR - Scheme - inadequate	~	~	3	3

SR - Scheme - support	2	~	1	3
SR - Scheme - support with caveat	3	~	~	3
Voluntary purchase scheme				
VP - Process - independent/local valuers	1	~	1	2
VP - Scheme - additional payments	1	~	1	1
VP - Scheme - interaction with other schemes	2	~	~	2
VP - Timescale - not available soon enough	1	~	~	1

Appendix E Equality and Diversity monitoring

As part of the consultation, respondents were asked to complete an equalities and diversity monitoring form through the consultation website, or on a printed form. For confidentiality and data protection purposes, these forms were collected separately from consultation responses.

The forms did not ask for contact details and therefore cannot be linked to individual consultation responses. For this reason we are also unable to confirm with certainty that those who completed the diversity form also responded to the consultation. Completing the form was voluntary. We received 57 diversity monitoring forms, compared to 121 consultation responses. For these reasons the results presented below are only indicative and do not fully represent a complete description of respondents.

Where no respondents selected one of the given options on the form, it is not displayed in the results. A copy of the paper response form, which includes all possible options for each question, can be found in Appendix F. A breakdown of the results is presented below:

National identity

Question 1 asked How would you describe your national identity?

National identity	Count of responses
British	29
English	21
Welsh	1
Other	1
Prefer not to say	4

One respondent who selected other identified as Swedish

Ethnicity

Question 2 asked How would you describe your ethnicity?

Ethnicity	Count of responses
Asian – Indian	1
White - English	48
White – Scottish	1
White – Welsh	1

Other white background	1
Prefer not to say	5

One respondent who selected other white background, identified as Swedish

Disability

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

Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?	Count of responses
Yes	5
No	43
Prefer not to say	9

Among the five respondents who answered yes to this question there was one hearing impairment, four mobility disabilities and one manual dexterity disability.

Gender

Question 4 asked What is your gender?

Gender	Count of responses
Female	16
Male	36
Prefer not to say	3

Religion and belief

Question 5 asked What is your religion or belief?

Religion or belief	Count of responses
Christian	16
Sikh	1
None	14
Prefer not to say	7

Marriage and Civil Partnerships

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

Married or in a civil partnership	Count of responses
Yes	41
No	8
Prefer not to say	6

Age

Question 7 asked What is your age?

Age	Count of responses
25-29	1
30-34	2
35-39	3
40-44	2
45-49	8
50-54	4
55-59	6
60-64	6
65+	16
Prefer not to say	7

Sexual orientation

Question 8 asked What is your Sexual Orientation?

Sexual Orientation	Count of responses
Bisexual	1
Heterosexual / straight	47
Prefer not to say	7

Appendix F Equality and Diversity monitoring form

Presented below is an example of the diversity form used during the consultation

HS2 Phase Two:
West Midlands to Crewe
Property Consultation 2015
About you

hs2 engine for growth

As part of our commitment to considering diversity in the delivery of HS2 we want to understand who is responding to our consultations.
Information you give us will help us improve future engagement activities.

CS403F_1

www.gov.uk/hs2

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

Please complete the information below and return this form with your response, either by email to hs2propertyconsultation2015@dialoguebydesign.co.uk or by post, using the Freepost address below.

Freepost HS2 PROPERTY CONSULTATION 2015

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

Q1. How would you describe your national identity?

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

Q2. How would you describe your ethnicity?

Asian

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

Black

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

Mixed ethnic background

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

White

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

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

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

Yes No Prefer not to say

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

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

Q4. What is your gender?

Male Female Prefer not to say

Q5. What is your religion or belief?

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

Q6. Are you married or in a civil partnership?

Yes No Prefer not to say

Q7. What is your age?

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

Q8. What is your sexual orientation?

- Bisexual Gay man Gay woman
- Heterosexual/straight Prefer not to say

Data Protection

All information supplied will be held by HS2 Ltd and will remain secure and confidential and will not be associated with other details provided in your response. The data will not be passed on to any third parties or used for marketing purposes in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.