

High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Working draft Equality Impact Assessment Report, A Summary of Consultation Responses

June 2017

A report to HS2 Ltd and the Department for Transport

Prepared by Dialogue by Design

Client	HS2
Company	Dialogue by Design
Title	High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Working draft Equality Impact Assessment Report, A Summary of Consultation Responses
Dates	last revised 13/07/2017
Status	Released
Classification	Open
Project Code	HST9
Author(s)	Matt Reynolds
Quality Assurance by	Helen Ashley

*If you would like this document in an alternative format,
please contact us.*

Dialogue by Design

252b Gray's Inn Road

London

WC1X 8XG

+44 (0)20 7042 8000

www.dialoguebydesign.co.uk

info@dialoguebydesign.co.uk



Contents

Executive summary	1
Chapter 1: About the consultation.....	4
1.1 Background.....	4
1.2 The consultation process	5
1.3 Public events	6
Chapter 2: Participation	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Response channels	8
2.3 Response types.....	8
2.4 Responses by question	9
2.5 Responses by sector	10
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	12
Chapter 4: Reading the report.....	13
4.1 Reading the report.....	13
4.2 Numbers in the report.....	13
4.3 Structure of the report.....	14
4.4 Appendices	14
Chapter 5: Responses in answer to Question 1 - route wide impact assessment	16
5.1 Introduction	16
5.2 Overview of responses	16
5.3 Discussion	16
5.3.3 Overall comments on the route wide assessment.....	16
5.3.11 Comments on route wide impacts	18
Chapter 6: Responses in answer to Question 2 - Community Area assessments	20
6.1 Introduction	20
6.2 Overview of responses	20
6.3 Discussion	20
6.3.3 Comments on CA1 – Fradley to Colton.....	21
6.3.36 Comments on CA2 – Colwich to Yarlet	24
6.3.72 Comments on CA3 – Stone and Swynnerton.....	27

6.3.104 Comments on CA4 - Whitmore Heath to Madeley	30
6.3.136 Comments on CA5 – South Cheshire	32

Chapter 7: Responses in answer to Question 3 - Literature Review35

7.1 Introduction	35
7.2 Overview of responses	35
7.3 Discussion	35
7.3.3 Comments on the Literature Review	35

Chapter 8: Responses which did not address the consultation questions37

8.1 Introduction	37
8.2 Overview of responses	37
8.3 Discussion	37
8.3.2 Comments on the consultation process and communications from HS2	37
8.3.12 Overall comments on the project and the proposed route	39
8.3.15 Overall comments on the consultation documents.....	39

Appendix A Participating organisations and elected representatives.41

Appendix B Detailed methodology45

Appendix C Codes by theme and by question50

Appendix D Glossary of terms.....70

Appendix E Equality and Diversity monitoring73

Appendix F Equality and Diversity monitoring form77

Executive summary

This report provides a summary of the responses to the Government's HS2 Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Working draft Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) Report consultation. The consultation took place between Tuesday 13 September and Monday 7 November 2016.

The purpose of the consultation was to inform the formal Equality Impact Assessment Report which will be published when the hybrid Bill is deposited, based on the views of those individuals and organisations who expressed their opinions on the Working draft report.

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 webform, email or the Freepost address set up for this consultation.

A total of 92 responses were received. 15 responses were received from organisations and elected representatives, the remainder were submitted by members of the public.

Chapter 1 provides a background to the consultation and chapter 2 gives a breakdown of the respondents to the consultation. Chapters 3 and 4 and Appendix B of this report offer a description of Dialogue by Design's approach to response handling, analysis and reporting.

Consultation responses

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

Due to three HS2 Phase 2a consultations running concurrently (working draft EQIA, Design Refinement consultation, working draft EIA), respondents may have referred to information provided in the other two consultations' documents. Respondents to the working draft EQIA consultation frequently reference the working draft EIA consultation documents. Whilst it is recognised that not all responses relate to EQIA issues they are included in this report for completeness and will be considered as part of the EIA.

Comments on Question 1 – route wide impact assessment

Chapter 5 addresses issues raised in relation to Question 1, in which respondents were asked to provide feedback on the route wide impact assessment. The majority of respondents to this question do not address the question directly. Instead, they provide views on the perceived impacts of the proposed scheme within the specific Community Areas (CA) which are covered

by Question 2. Of those who do address the question, several highlight a perceived lack of detail in the route wide assessment. Other points include perceived omissions of certain locations, lack of mitigation measures and vague language. Several respondents also highlight potential impacts on a route wide scale such as congestion on the wider traffic network resulting from construction traffic and road closures. Another prominent route wide effect respondents note is health, including social isolation, noise and air quality effects.

Comments on Question 2 – Community Area assessments

Chapter 6 addresses issues raised in relation to Question 2, in which respondents were asked to provide feedback on the CA assessments. Respondents to this question frequently reference the working draft EIA consultation documents as opposed to the working draft EQIA consultation documents. While respondents mostly make comments about their own specific areas and circumstances, it is possible to identify a number of recurring themes. The most prominent issue raised surrounds traffic and transport, specifically road closures and increased construction traffic on the local road networks. While some respondents comment on the impact on the road network alone, others link this to potential impacts on communities. One of the most frequently raised community issues is social isolation resulting from access problems. Respondents highlight older people and children as particularly at risk, due to their dependence on public and non-motorised travel. Some respondents also comment on the potential impact of construction disruption on local businesses including agricultural businesses. Other respondents highlight potential health impacts of construction disruption, including noise, air quality effects, stress and anxiety.

Comments on Question 3 – Literature Review

Chapter 7 addresses issues raised in relation to Question 3, in which respondents were asked to provide feedback on the Literature Review. As with Question 1, the majority of respondents to this question do not address the question directly. Instead, they provide views on the perceived impacts of the proposed scheme within the specific Community Areas which are covered by Question 2. Of those who do address the question, several comment that the Literature Review lacks detail and uses generic information. Some respondents criticise the style of the Literature Review, describing it as too long, complex, or academic. Other respondents suggest additional information sources they believe should be included in the formal Equality Impact Assessment Report.

Other comments

Chapter 8 of the report covers additional comments in relation to the HS2 project as a whole and the consultation process. Issues raised in Question 4, which asked for any further comments on the working draft EQIA Report, and outside of the question structure are covered where most relevant in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8. Some respondents are critical of the

consultation process, expressing concerns that those affected may have been unaware of the consultation or accompanying community events. Others consider that the consultation period was too short. Several respondents express either support for or opposition to HS2 in general.

Chapter 1: About the consultation

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 High Speed Two Ltd (HS2 Ltd) is the organisation responsible for developing and delivering the High Speed Two (HS2) project. HS2 Ltd is owned by the Department for Transport (DfT).
- 1.1.2 In November 2015 the Secretary of State for Transport announced his decision to bring forward plans for the West Midlands to Crewe section of the HS2 route, known as Phase 2a (the Proposed Scheme) to open in 2027, six years ahead of schedule. To obtain the legal powers to build and operate this part of the railway, the Government intends to deposit a hybrid Bill in Parliament by the end of 2017.
- 1.1.3 As a public body, HS2 Ltd is subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under the Equality Act 2010. The PSED requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different people during the design stage, construction and operation of the railway.
- 1.1.4 HS2 Ltd will develop a formal Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) Report which it intends to publish when the hybrid Bill is deposited. This will contribute towards both enabling and documenting HS2 Ltd's active fulfilment of its PSED during the design stage of the Proposed Scheme.
- 1.1.5 In advance of the formal EQIA Report HS2 Ltd developed a working draft EQIA Report. This presented draft equality information based on the stage of design of the Proposed Scheme at that time. It looked at whether HS2 would have a more significant effect, or a different effect, on groups of people because of their age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, or sexual orientation, and described HS2 Ltd's current understanding of the potential equality effects that may arise. It also explained how HS2 Ltd proposes to avoid or reduce any adverse equality effects that may occur over the life of the HS2 project. This was consulted on between 13 September 2016 and 7 November 2016.
- 1.1.6 Responses from the working draft EQIA consultation will be considered as the design and assessment is developed and during the production of the formal EQIA Report, which is intended to be published when the hybrid Bill is deposited in Parliament.
- 1.1.7 HS2 Ltd and DfT will separately publish a report explaining how the comments received have been used to inform the formal EQIA Report.

- 1.1.8 Dialogue by Design (www.dialoguebydesign.co.uk) is a specialist company that works with many organisations in the public and private sectors to handle responses to large or complex consultations.

1.2 The consultation process

- 1.2.1 The High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Working draft Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) Report consultation was managed by HS2 Ltd on behalf of the DfT. Dialogue by Design were commissioned by HS2 Ltd to set up consultation response channels for this consultation, including a consultation website and an email address, and to receive, collate, analyse and report on responses made via the response channels.
- 1.2.2 Two other consultations for Phase 2a ran in parallel with this consultation. These were the HS2 Phase 2a West Midlands to Crewe Working draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report consultation and the HS2 Phase 2a West Midlands to Crewe Design Refinement consultation.
- 1.2.3 This report summarises the consultation responses sent through the West Midlands to Crewe working draft EQIA consultation response channels, regardless of which consultation documents or proposals respondents referred to. Due to three HS2 Phase 2a consultations running concurrently (working draft EQIA, Design Refinement consultation, working draft EIA), respondents may have referred to information provided in the other two consultations' documents. Respondents to the working draft EQIA consultation frequently reference the working draft EIA consultation documents. . Whilst it is recognised that not all responses relate to EQIA issues they are included in this report for completeness and will be considered as part of the EIA.
- 1.2.4 HS2 Ltd and the DfT produced a number of documents and maps to enable people to provide informed responses to the working draft EQIA report consultation:
- **High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe - Working draft Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) Report**, providing the public and stakeholders with an opportunity to review the draft equality information for the Proposed Scheme;
 - **High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe - Working draft Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) Report – Response Form**, providing the public and stakeholders with an opportunity to comment on the draft equality information for the Proposed Scheme, four questions were presented in the response form to help guide responses;
 - **High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe - Working draft Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) Report – Diversity Form**, asking the

public and stakeholders to voluntarily provide information about themselves including questions relating to background, ethnicity and disability to help HS2 Ltd to gather information for diversity monitoring purposes;

- a leaflet providing basic information about the consultation, the proposals and details of how to access further information; and
- HS2 Phase 2a (West Midlands to Crewe) working draft plan and profile maps.

1.2.5 All documents were available to download from www.gov.uk and to order in hard copy through the HS2 Helpdesk. Complete sets of the documentation relating to the three consultations were available to view at libraries along the Phase 2a route and made available to take away at the associated information events.

1.2.6 Local authorities and Parish Councils were offered briefings following the launch of the consultations.

1.2.7 HS2 Ltd and the DfT raised awareness of the consultation process in a number of ways. Once the consultation had been launched HS2 Ltd commissioned Royal Mail to send a letter and a leaflet to addresses up to 1km each side of the line of route and 1km from the design refinement changes proposed in the areas around Crewe and Stone.

1.2.8 Letters were also sent to local authority, parish council and Citizens Advice Bureau offices along the Phase 2a line of route as well as statutory organisations and other stakeholders to inform them of the launch of the three consultations.

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

1.2.10 Advertisements in newspapers distributed along the Phase 2a route were issued to raise awareness of the consultations and public information events.

1.3 Public events

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

Table 1.3.2: List of Information Events

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

Chapter 2: Participation

2.1 Introduction

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

2.2 Response channels

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

2.3 Response types

- 2.3.1 A total of 92 responses were received to the consultation on the working draft EQIA report, in a number of different formats. Table 2.3.3 describes these in more detail.
- 2.3.2 In addition to the response types described in the table, Dialogue by Design also received other documentation that was categorised as a null response, according to the following classification agreed with HS2 Ltd. Null responses comprised: general enquiries such as requests for consultation documentation; duplicate submissions; or submissions which were obviously not intended as consultation responses. Fifteen records were categorised in this way and were not processed or analysed any further for the consultation. General enquiries were sent to HS2 Ltd to be processed.

Table 2.3.3: Count of different response types

Response type	Count
Online response form Responses submitted via the response form on the consultation website	44
Offline response form Completed response forms submitted via freepost or email	26
Letter or email Individual responses submitted via freepost or email	22
Total	92

2.4 Responses by question

- 2.4.1 Respondents could answer any number of the four questions that were included in the High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe - Working draft EQIA Report – Response Form. Table 2.4.2 shows a count of how many respondents provided responses to each question. Respondents who did not specifically address the consultation questions, or provided supplementary information beyond their answers to the questions are included within question 4.

Table 2.4.2: Count of responses to each question

Question	Total
Question 1: Please let us know your comments on the Phase 2a route wide impact assessment, set out in Section 5 of the working draft EQIA Report.	58
Question 2: Please let us know your comments on the Community Area (CA) assessments, set out in sections 6-10 of the working draft EQIA Report.	79
Question 3: Please let us know your comments on the Literature Review, presented in the appendix to the report.	46
Question 4: Are there any further comments you would like to make about the working draft EQIA Report? Also included here are responses that did not directly respond to the question structure or added additional information.	64

2.5 Responses by sector

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

Table 2.5.2: Breakdown of responses by sector

Sector	Count
Members of the public	73
Action groups (includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals)	4
Businesses (local, regional, national or international)	1
Elected representatives (includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors)	2
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)	6
Statutory agencies	2
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisations	1
Total	92

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1.1 This summary report does not:

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

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

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

1. Data receipt and digitisation of all submissions;
2. the development of an analytical framework;
3. the implementation of an analysis framework; and
4. reporting.

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

Chapter 4: Reading the report

4.1 Reading the report

- 4.1.1 This report summarises the responses to the High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Working draft EQIA Report consultation. This 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. For a detailed, quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue, the reader can refer to Appendix C.
- 4.2.4 Some responses were made partly or entirely without reference to specific consultation questions. The points made in these responses have been integrated into the chapters that cover the relevant themes identified.
- 4.2.5 In this report, specific views or issues are frequently presented without presenting a number of how many responses were made containing this view or issue. This is because this is a consultation summary report, which needs to provide a balance between qualitative findings and the numbers of respondents raising specific points. For a detailed, quantitative breakdown of the number of respondents raising each issue, the reader can refer to Appendix C.

4.3 Structure of the report

4.3.1 Chapter 5 address issues raised in relation to question 1:

‘Please let us know your comments on the Phase 2a route wide impact assessment, set out in Section 5 of the working draft EQIA Report.’

Chapter 6 addresses issues raised in relation to question 2:

‘Please let us know your comments on the Community Area (CA) assessments, set out in sections 6-10 of the working draft EQIA Report.’

Chapter 7 addresses issues raised in relation to question 3:

‘Please let us know your comments on the Literature Review, presented in the appendix to the report.’

Chapter 8 of the report addresses issues raised in relation to question 4:

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

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

Issues raised in question 4 and outside of the question structure are covered where most relevant in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 of this report.

4.3.2 Quotations from responses have been included in the following chapters to illustrate views discussed in the narrative. The quotations are taken from a mix of responses including organisations, elected representatives and members of the public. Quotations have been attributed where these are taken from a response from an organisation or an individual in a public role such as an MP. Quotations have not been attributed to private individuals other than indicating that they are from an individual’s response. No quotes have been included from confidential responses.

4.3.3 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 list of organisations and elected representatives that responded to the consultation (Appendix A);

- a detailed methodology explaining how responses were received, processed and analysed (Appendix B);
- a table listing all codes in the analysis framework and the number of times they were used in the analysis of responses to each of the consultation questions (Appendix C);
- a glossary of terms (Appendix D); and
- 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 - route wide impact assessment

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This chapter provides a qualitative summary of responses to question 1 in the consultation response form, which asks about the Phase 2a route wide impact assessment, set out in Section 5 of the working draft EQIA Report.

5.1.2 Question 1 asks:

‘Please let us know your comments on the Phase 2a route wide impact assessment, set out in Section 5 of the working draft EQIA Report.

We welcome any information you may have on potential equality impacts the scheme may have at a route wide level, and any opportunities you feel there may be to reduce these impacts.’

5.2 Overview of responses

5.2.1 Question 1 received 58 direct responses, however this chapter also covers issues raised by respondents that did not follow the structure of the consultation questions in their response, but were deemed relevant to the question.

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

5.3 Discussion

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

- overall comments on the route wide assessment; and
- comments on route wide impacts.

5.3.2 Most responses to this question do not address the question directly. Instead, they provide views on the perceived impacts of the Proposed Scheme within the specific CA. These comments are discussed in Chapter 6.

5.3.3 Overall comments on the route wide assessment

5.3.4 Several respondents state that there is a lack of detail regarding certain issues in the route wide assessment: this includes perceived impacts on the disabled, loss of housing and the elderly:

'Although paras 5.4.2 - 4 cite loss of housing where properties are required for the construction of the scheme, the EQIA ignores the wider and ongoing issue of already established route-wide property blight. Elderly and disabled people are more disadvantaged than the general population as they are already trapped in unsuitable properties, or isolated villages, unable to relocate.'

Individual submission

5.3.5 Cheshire East Council and Madeley HS2 Action Group comment that while equality impacts are identified, how HS2 Ltd will mitigate them is not fully addressed. One respondent believes that the language used in general across the route wide assessment is too vague to provide reassurance.

5.3.6 A small number of respondents, including Chebsey Parish Council, comment that the route wide assessment would be easier to understand if it had an executive summary.

5.3.7 A few respondents, including Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council, express concerns that some rural locations are omitted from the route wide assessment. These include Ingestre, Hoo Mill, Cold Norton and Woore:

'Cold Norton does not appear as a community of over 100 residents.'

Individual submission

5.3.8 A small number of respondents do not see the value of the document and are concerned about the cost of the assessment.

5.3.9 Conversely, a few respondents including Cheshire East Council describe the route wide assessment as a useful guide to how communities will be affected during the construction and operation of Phase 2a.

'The Route-Wide impact assessment (Section 5 of the working draft EQIA Report) is a thorough analysis of how HS2 may impact on communities during the life of the Project and following its completion. It is a useful and essential starting point in line with the 2010 Equality Act and Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED).'

CLlr Janet Clowes, Cheshire East Council

5.3.10 Cheshire East Council also suggest using the following policies and frameworks to aid the route wide assessment:

- The Public Health Indicator Framework, for social isolation, air quality and health;
- Housing Strategy for Vulnerable and Older Adults (Cheshire East Council); and

- Carer's Strategy (Cheshire East Council).

5.3.11 Comments on route wide impacts

- 5.3.12 Several respondents comment on perceived impacts on traffic and transport across the Phase 2a route. This includes concerns about potential noise, dust and congestion as a result of construction traffic.

'There will be considerable community impacts during the construction of HS2 caused by huge vehicles going along lanes, along the already over-trafficked A53 and A51...'

Individual submission

- 5.3.13 Other respondents express concerns about the impact of increased construction traffic on access to schools, healthcare facilities, workplaces and agricultural businesses.
- 5.3.14 One perceived impact is a potential increase in social isolation and loneliness in communities as a result of road closures or diversions. Public Health England specifically highlights this issue with regard to the elderly and disabled residents. They comment that these demographics are more dependent on public and assisted transport and ask how HS2 Ltd will mitigate these issues.

'It is suggested that the 'community infrastructure' equality concern explicitly picks up community connectedness and social cohesion, and its implications for health. For example, social isolation and loneliness, particularly for older and disabled people. What are the mitigations?'

Public Health England

- 5.3.15 Another perceived community impact is the potential inequity of more affluent people being able to travel fast through the area, at the cost of local communities.
- 5.3.16 Some respondents identify potential health impacts of Phase 2a including noise, vibration and air pollution. A few of these respondents have specific concerns about how these factors impact on children, the elderly and disabled people.
- 5.3.17 A few respondents comment on property impacts across the Phase 2a route. Some comment that the elderly and disabled will be less able to sell and relocate. One respondent states that HS2 Ltd are destroying more properties than necessary.

- 5.3.18 A small number of respondents express concerns that the countryside alongside Phase 2a will be permanently damaged. They state that mitigation will not be effective in reducing these perceived impacts.
- 5.3.19 One respondent supports the socio-economic benefit of construction work for local workers. Conversely, another respondent expresses concern that alternative jobs will be difficult to find in the remote rural areas if jobs are lost as a result of Phase 2a, although they do not specifically explain how.

Chapter 6: Responses in answer to Question 2 - Community Area assessments

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This chapter provides a qualitative summary of responses to question 2 in the consultation response form, which asks about the CA assessments, set out in sections 6-10 of the working draft EQIA Report.

6.1.2 Question 2 asks:

‘Please let us know your comments on the Community Area (CA) assessments, set out in sections 6-10 of the working draft EQIA Report.

We welcome any information that you may have on the potential equality impacts the scheme may have at local community area level, and any opportunities you feel there may be to reduce these impacts.’

6.2 Overview of responses

6.2.1 Question 2 received 79 direct responses; however, this chapter also covers issues raised by respondents that did not follow the structure of the consultation questions in their response, but were deemed relevant to the question.

6.2.2 It is worth noting that respondents to this question frequently reference the working draft EIA consultation documents. This is due to three HS2 Phase 2a consultations running concurrently (working draft EQIA, Design Refinement consultation, working draft EIA).

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

6.3 Discussion

6.3.1 This section provides a qualitative summary of the issues raised in response to question 2. This is broken down into the separate CA sections:

- CA1 – Fradley to Colton;
- CA2 – Colwich to Yarlet;
- CA3 – Stone and Swynnerton;
- CA4 – Whitmore Heath to Madeley; and
- CA5 – South Cheshire.

6.3.2 Within each CA section, the following issues are discussed where mentioned by respondents:

- assessment;
- agriculture, forestry and soils;
- air quality;
- community;
- cultural heritage;
- ecology and biodiversity;
- health;
- landscape and visual;
- socio-economic;
- sound, noise and vibration;
- traffic and transport;
- water resources and flood risk; and
- other comments.

6.3.3 Comments on CA1 – Fradley to Colton

6.3.4 *Agriculture, forestry and soils*

6.3.5 Some respondents question how farmers will be able to access isolated parcels of land that are severed by the route of Phase 2a.

6.3.6 Kings Bromley Parish Council also express concern that HS2 Ltd are using high quality arable land as replacement floodplain storage.

6.3.7 One respondent expresses concern that the soil at Trentside Meadows is not of high enough quality for building a viaduct on.

6.3.8 *Air quality*

6.3.9 A small number of respondents highlight potential issues of dust and air pollution from construction traffic accessing the satellite compound and transfer node.

6.3.10 *Community*

6.3.11 Several respondents highlight the risk of potential social isolation as a result of road closure, diversions and construction traffic affecting access to local services. Similarly, The Parochial Church Council and Benefice Council of Great Haywood et al express concern that the local parishes will become more isolated from one another due to the physical boundaries and barriers Phase 2a will create.

'Finally our members express the view that HS2 (2a) will change the nature of our benefice of five parishes for good. Parts of Colton parish will be isolated from the rest of their traditional community focus and the two Northern parishes will have a physical boundary to cross that will redraw the lines of affiliation in their hearts and minds.'

The Parochial Church Council and Benefice Council of Great Haywood et al

- 6.3.12 The Parochial Church Council and Benefice Council of Great Haywood et al also express concerns around potential increased running costs due to longer journeys as a result of proposed road closures and diversions. They explain that it will cost more to travel and provide pastoral care to parishioners as well as potentially disrupt religious ceremonies such as baptisms, weddings and funerals.
- 6.3.13 Some respondents, including Kings Bromley Parish Council, express concerns that the cul-de-sac created by closing Common Lane would encourage anti-social behaviour such as drug-use, illegal camping and fly-tipping.
- 6.3.14 A few respondents highlight potential impacts on Richard Crosse Primary School. Specifically, road safety for children and parents with increased traffic flows as a result of road closures, diversions and construction traffic.
- 6.3.15 Ecology and biodiversity**
- 6.3.16 One respondent expresses concern about the removal of trees alongside Shaw Lane. They suggest that these trees are kept to maintain biodiversity.
- 6.3.17 Health**
- 6.3.18 A few respondents state that the area's large elderly population will be particularly affected by stress and anxiety as a result of construction traffic and disruption. They also highlight a perceived lack of mitigation for this impact.
- 6.3.19 Landscape and visual**
- 6.3.20 Kings Bromley Parish Council comment that if the maintenance loop is not built at Pipe Ridware, the line can be lowered and the visual impact will be reduced.
- 6.3.21 One respondent expresses concern about light pollution from construction in a rural area without much existing artificial lighting.
- 6.3.22 Socio-economic**
- 6.3.23 Several respondents, including the business themselves, highlight perceived impacts on Bromley Hayes Cattery due to potential noise increases. They comment that clients use their service due to the quiet rural location and that the noise, sound and dust of constructing Phase 2a will risk the viability of their business.

6.3.24 *Sound, noise and vibration*

6.3.25 A few respondents express concerns around potential construction noise in a currently quiet rural area.

6.3.26 *Traffic and transport*

6.3.27 Several respondents, including Kings Bromley Parish Council, comment on the potential impact of road closures or realignments on agricultural traffic. By extension, respondents often link this to the viability of and potential losses to these agricultural businesses. Uttoxeter Road, Blithbury Road and Stoneyford Lane are mentioned most frequently.

'The realignment of the B5014 Uttoxeter Road seems to be excessive & totally unnecessary.'

Individual submission

6.3.28 Some respondents comment on specific practical issues of agricultural vehicles clearing low bridges or navigating narrow roads without passing places.

6.3.29 Several respondents suggest mitigation measures for Common Lane. These include building a bridge to keep the road open, widening the road to ease access of construction traffic, and not using the lane for construction traffic at all.

'Keep Common Lane open permanently by building a bridge with the appropriate height to accommodate agricultural and other large vehicles access'

Individual submission

6.3.30 Some respondents, including Kings Bromley Parish Council, instead suggest moving the satellite compound north of the line to reduce the need of Common Lane as a construction route.

6.3.31 A small number of respondents state that the closure of Common Lane would affect non-motorised users such as walkers, runners and horse riders. Similarly, Colton Ramblers request that Public Rights of Way (PRoW) are kept accessible to all including young people, the elderly and disabled people.

6.3.32 Other transport mitigation suggestions include: changing the realignment of Lichfield Road to reduce land take, and building a bridge across Shaw Lane to maintain access from Lichfield Road to the A513.

6.3.33 A few respondents express concerns that combining Moor Lane and Newlands Lane into one road would impact on residents and local businesses but do not go into further detail.

6.3.34 *Water resources and flood risk*

6.3.35 Several respondents, including Kings Bromley Parish Council, identify construction routes which are liable to flooding during winter or following heavy rain. Most go on to suggest that these construction routes should be avoided or rerouted. Lichfield Road was a frequently mentioned example of this.

'The Lichfield Road at Pipe Ridware will go under the Trent Valley Viaduct where HS2 passes in to the Blithbury cutting. The road at this point is impassable during heavy rain as it suffers from heavy flooding. Therefore it is not considered as an appropriate access route in to the compounds in the area'

Individual submission

6.3.36 **Comments on CA2 – Colwich to Yarlet**

6.3.37 *Assessment*

6.3.38 Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council highlight several perceived limitations of the assessment of impacts, they state that:

- the following locations and facilities appear to have been excluded from the EQIA report:
 - Ingestre village;
 - Tixall village;
 - Tixall Church;
 - Ingestre Church;
 - Home Farm;
 - Millennium Green;
 - Anson Primary School; and
 - Ingestre Orangery.
- Brancote South Cutting should be Hanyards South Cutting to reflect the geographical location more accurately.

6.3.39 Upper Moreton Rural Activities Community Interest Company (UMRA) comment that barn owl activity is not listed, nor is the clients' use of PRoW. They also request that their grassland is considered in future drafts due to the abundance of flora and fauna such as butterflies and orchids.

'I believe that HS2 Ltd is not aware of the complexness of UMRA and the work it actually does. We can evidence that we too walk along Colwich Bridleway 23, which passes Moreton House holding.'

UMRA

6.3.40 *Air quality*

6.3.41 UMRA are concerned about potential impacts of dust and air quality changes from construction on their clients who have asthma-related problems. They state that the perceived increase in dust and air quality changes would affect the viability of taking their clients on daily walks and affect the daily routine of those with learning disabilities.

6.3.42 One respondent expresses concern about air quality impacting on those with existing cardiovascular conditions. Another respondent perceives that only the wealthy would be able to move away from the area, and this would create health inequality.

6.3.43 *Community*

6.3.44 Several respondents, including Jeremy Lefroy MP, express concerns about the potential increase in social isolation as a result of construction routes, road closures and diversions. A few respondents comment that the elderly, disabled and children may be particularly affected by social isolation as they are dependent on local transport to local services or schools, which may be disrupted. Marston village is mentioned frequently in relation to these concerns. Marston Against HS2 Ltd and Jeremy Lefroy MP state that the village may be rendered unviable.

'The village of Marston will, once the building and the completion of HS2 takes place, cease to exist.'

Marston Against HS2 Ltd

6.3.45 Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council highlight the perceived impact of travel disruption on those visiting community assets from outside of the village. These include Ingestre Church, Ingestre Hall Arts Centre and the riding stables.

6.3.46 Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council is also concerned about the potential impacts of road closures and diversions on the Riding for The Disabled Association, and the health benefits they provide clients, and on Little Ingestre House Care Home. They report that many of the employees of this establishment rely on public transport and the council perceive the employees' health and safety will be affected by walking on a busy road without pavements.

- 6.3.47 In terms of mitigation, Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council suggest building a tunnel instead of a cutting to reduce impacts on local communities.
- 6.3.48 One respondent requests that the A34 is not closed at any point to maintain access to local hospitals.
- 6.3.49 *Cultural heritage***
- 6.3.50 UMRA are concerned that, if relocated, they would not have their medieval ridge and be able to teach clients about this feature.
- 6.3.51 *Ecology and biodiversity***
- 6.3.52 UMRA highlight potential ecological impacts on their grasslands including wild flowers, butterflies, birds and bats. They request that this habitat is relocated to another area.
- 6.3.53 Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council is concerned about the impact on historic marshes from balancing pond drainage.
- 6.3.54 *Health***
- 6.3.55 A small number of respondents highlight the potential health impacts of stress from construction disruption on both humans and animals.

'There is no question that the construction of the HS2 through Stone, Swynnerton, Whitmore and Madeley will cause vast disturbance and distress both to humans and animals.'

Individual submission

- 6.3.56 One respondent comments that the elderly may be particularly at risk of stress impacts but does not go into further detail.
- 6.3.57 *Landscape and visual***
- 6.3.58 UMRA and Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council express concerns about the visual impact of the line, along with associated infrastructure like embankments, balancing ponds and substations. Both stakeholders request additional mitigation in the form of screening or landscaping.
- 6.3.59 Jeremy Lefroy MP enquires why it is possible to tunnel the route in Buckinghamshire and not at Hopton and Marston within his constituency.
- 6.3.60 *Socio-economic***
- 6.3.61 Jeremy Lefroy MP expresses concerns that local chartered surveyors are working without pay for clients affected by Phase 2a.

6.3.62 UMRA comment that proposed alterations to the sole access route to their facilities could affect the viability of their business. They explain that one day a week, when courses begin, there are large volumes of traffic. In terms of mitigation, they request relocation to a temporary building to avoid potential disruption from construction noise, dust and air quality changes.

6.3.63 Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council comment on the potential impact on those employed at Great Haywood Marina and Ingestre Park Golf Club, but do not detail what this impact may be. Another respondent is concerned that Phase 2a will impact on the canals as a tourist destination.

6.3.64 *Sound, noise and vibration*

6.3.65 A couple of respondents express concerns around potential construction and operational noise in a currently quiet rural area.

6.3.66 *Traffic and transport*

6.3.67 A small number of respondents specifically identify the potential impact of construction traffic on Marston Lane, leading to disruption and increased journey times.

6.3.68 A couple of respondents express general concerns about temporary and permanent bridleway diversions without going into further detail. One respondent suggests HS2 Ltd provide public open spaces and footpaths for local residents to use for recreation.

6.3.69 Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council highlight the potential impact of construction traffic on bus services at Hoo Mill Crossroads. They go on to request that access to the villages is maintained and that heavy goods vehicle traffic is limited on narrow lanes.

6.3.70 *Other comments*

6.3.71 A small number of respondents comment that the local property market has already been affected by Phase 2a. Jeremy Lefroy MP believes that HS2 Ltd's Exceptional Hardship Scheme (EHS) takes advantage of local people due to the high level of bureaucracy and that many of his constituents disagree with their compensation arrangements.

6.3.72 *Comments on CA3 – Stone and Swynnerton*

6.3.73 *Assessment*

6.3.74 A few respondents challenge the assessment of equality impacts in the area. These criticisms include vague use of language, the omission of the village of Cold Norton and the lack of attention to transport disruption. Swynnerton and Chebsey Parish Councils are concerned by the short list of identified impacts and that the area is defined as 'low need' according to Staffordshire County Council's 'risk index' which looks at 12 indicators of deprivation.

6.3.75 *Agriculture, forestry and soils*

6.3.76 Some respondents comment on potential impacts of Phase 2a on local agriculture. This includes land take of greenfield land for the railhead.

'Stone Railhead compound is ill sited on a green field site rich agricultural land in a rural environment.'

Individual submission

6.3.77 *Air quality*

6.3.78 A small number of respondents express general concerns about air quality on local residents. A couple of respondents highlight potential impacts on children and young people. One respondent suggests building a tunnel at Swynnerton to reduce potential negative impacts on air quality.

6.3.79 *Community*

6.3.80 Some respondents, including Swynnerton Parish Council, identify perceived impacts on local educational facilities. This includes work on the A34 and the possible closure of Yarnfield Lane affecting children and parents' access to schools, causing them to take longer journeys. Another respondent is concerned that construction noise may impact on children and young people's learning.

'The proposed work on the A34 and subsequent closures (whether short or long-term) on Yarnfield Lane, and roads in Swynnerton, will significantly impact on school traffic.'

Swynnerton Parish Council

6.3.81 A few respondents comment that reduced transport links from road closures or diversions may reduce local property values.

6.3.82 A couple of respondents believe that the viability of Yarnfield Sports Centre may be affected due to blocked access. They also comment that children may be denied access to sports clubs for this reason.

6.3.83 A small number of respondents, including Chebsey and Swynnerton Parish Councils, comment on potential access to healthcare, especially for a population with a high proportion of elderly. One respondent specifically highlights the limited hours of the local A&E department which could be overwhelmed by a permanent rail centre.

6.3.84 The Parochial Church Council of St Mary's Church Swynnerton expresses concern that increased traffic may dissuade elderly parishioners from attending services.

6.3.85 Ecology and biodiversity

6.3.86 Some respondents state that wildlife in general will be destroyed by the scheme without going into further detail. One respondent specifically highlights the potential impacts on ancient woodlands.

6.3.87 Health

6.3.88 In a few isolated cases, respondents commented on perceived potential health impacts. These include increased stress from construction disruption, particularly for the elderly, as well as the perceived carcinogenic effects of electric power lines.

6.3.89 Landscape and visual

6.3.90 Some respondents express concerns about potential light pollution at all hours from the railhead. They comment this will be particularly noticeable in a quiet rural area.

6.3.91 A small number of respondents express general concerns about the visual impact of Phase 2a on the local area, without going into further detail.

6.3.92 Socio-economic

6.3.93 A small number of respondents are concerned about the potential impact of road closures and diversions on local businesses. These include post offices, pubs, the Yarnfield Conference Centre and the BT National Training Centre.

6.3.94 One respondent believes that HS2 Ltd offering construction jobs to local people is inappropriate due to the small size of the local workforce.

6.3.95 Sound, noise and vibration

6.3.96 Several respondents express concerns that there would be noise from the railhead at all times of the day. A few respondents make more general comments about the noise of construction traffic. One respondent suggests building a tunnel at Swynnerton to reduce potential operational noise.

6.3.97 Several respondents, including Marston Against HS2 Ltd, oppose the location of the railhead at Stone due to its potential impacts on the community of Yarnfield. They argue that an existing industrial area would be a more appropriate site than a quiet rural area.

6.3.98 Traffic and transport

6.3.99 Many respondents comment on potential impacts on the local road network as a result of construction traffic, road closures and diversions in relation to this CA. Yarnfield Lane is mentioned frequently. Key concerns include increased traffic on the narrow country lanes causing accidents, as well as blocking access to emergency service vehicles. Marston Against HS2 Ltd suggest that HS2 provide emergency air ambulance cover to mitigate this.

'If Yarnfield Lane was closed there would be only one entrance/exit to the village which is a small country lane.'

Individual submission

6.3.100 Some respondents suggest mitigation measures to reduce perceived traffic impacts. These include building a tunnel at Swynnerton, keeping certain roads open (such as the A51) or enforcing weight limits. One respondent suggests coordinating local road improvements ahead of HS2 being built to reduce potential impacts.

6.3.101 Chebsey and Swynnerton Parish Councils believe that the loss of PRoW will impact on residents' quality of life.

6.3.102 *Water resources and flood risk*

6.3.103 One respondent is concerned that Meece Road is liable to flooding in winter as this would be the only route to Yarnfield in the event of the closure of Yarnfield Lane.

6.3.104 *Comments on CA4 - Whitmore Heath to Madeley*

6.3.105 *Assessment*

6.3.106 A couple of respondents, including Madeley HS2 Action Group, note that the Madeley Centre is only mentioned for its meeting rooms and not the care facilities it provides for the elderly.

6.3.107 *Agriculture, forestry and soils*

6.3.108 One respondent suggests HS2 Ltd build a longer tunnel to avoid impacts on Snape Hall Farm.

6.3.109 *Air quality*

6.3.110 A few respondents comment on potential air quality impacts resulting from construction traffic. Some highlight that the elderly may be particularly susceptible.

6.3.111 *Community*

6.3.112 Several responses express concerns about access to community resources becoming limited by construction traffic, road closures or diversions. This includes access to GP surgeries as well as bus routes to and from schools. Some respondents comment that these impacts would particularly affect the elderly and those needing medical attention.

- 6.3.113 Some respondents are concerned about potential impacts on their properties. This includes proximity to compounds, loss of property value and the perceived impact of construction workers using driveways for access. Madeley HS2 Action Group suggests that elderly residents in Bar Hill should have their properties purchased and receive compensation.
- 6.3.114 A small number of respondents believe that certain communities would receive an unfair level of impact compared to other communities; examples include Whitmore Heath and Bar Hill.
- 6.3.115 One respondent suggests HS2 Ltd offer free topsoil to residents arising from construction.
- 6.3.116 Ecology and biodiversity**
- 6.3.117 Several respondents criticise the potential removal of ancient woodlands and argue that it is irreplaceable.

'No mitigating factors can replace ancient woodland.'

Individual Submission

- 6.3.118 A couple of respondents, including Manor Road HS2 Action Group, suggest building bridges for wildlife such as deer to cross the route.
- 6.3.119 Health**
- 6.3.120 Some respondents argue that elderly residents should be compensated for the stress and anxiety they would face during the construction period.
- 6.3.121 Landscape and visual**
- 6.3.122 A couple of respondents highlight potential light pollution impacts from construction compounds. They comment that the elderly may be particularly affected but do not specify how.
- 6.3.123 Whitmore Heath Action Group suggests lowering the viaduct at Meece to reduce its visual impact.
- 6.3.124 Manor Road HS2 Action Group suggests building a longer tunnel to reduce environmental impacts. They also express concern that the proposed noise barriers are not attractive, and should be covered with earth and planting.
- 6.3.125 Socio-economic**
- 6.3.126 A couple of respondents express concerns about the viability of Woore's only shop, specifically how construction traffic may affect road safety for pedestrians traveling to it.

6.3.127 *Sound, noise and vibration*

6.3.128 A few respondents comment on potential noise impacts resulting from construction work. Some highlight that the elderly may be particularly susceptible to noise. One respondent also comments on the potential noise from trains exiting tunnels during operation.

6.3.129 Whitmore Heath Action Group suggest lowering the viaduct at Meece to reduce perceived noise intrusion.

6.3.130 *Traffic and transport*

6.3.131 Many respondents express concerns about the impact of construction traffic and road closures on a local road network made up of narrow country lanes in relation to this CA. The A53 is mentioned frequently. A few respondents identify perceived impacts on specific types of road users such as commuters and emergency vehicles.

'Access for Emergency Services may be delayed or prevented.'

Individual Submission

6.3.132 Some respondents suggest measures to mitigate potential impacts on the local road network. This includes lowering the track to avoid raising the A53, banning construction traffic from Manor Road and building a tunnel to avoid the closure of Snape Hall Road.

6.3.133 Several respondents comment on the perceived impacts of Phase 2a on non-motorised users. Manor Road HS2 Action Group expresses concerns about footpaths being lost. A couple of other respondents, including Madeley HS2 Action Group, are concerned that horse riders will be diverted onto an A road. A few respondents suggest bridges to mitigate these impacts.

6.3.134 *Water resources and flood risk*

6.3.135 One respondent is concerned that a viaduct will block access to a drainage ditch for cleaning and render farmland unusable.

6.3.136 *Comments on CA5 – South Cheshire***6.3.137** *Assessment*

6.3.138 A couple of respondents, including Cheshire East Council, comment that the list of impacts is useful but has potential limitations. They comment that the categories of impacts are not adequately described and suggest further work to determine if certain protected characteristics are particularly affected.

6.3.139 Community

- 6.3.140 Several respondents, including Cheshire East Council, highlight potential impacts on community access as a result of construction traffic, road closures and diversions. These respondents focus particularly on the potential impacts upon elderly residents and those with mobility issues who are more dependent on public transport. Some respondents also mention potential difficulties accessing schools, colleges and village halls.

'The elderly are therefore likely to be adversely affected by HS2 due to the resulting travel disruption and delays.'

Individual Submission

- 6.3.141 One respondent is concerned about the perceived impact that burglaries will increase due to the proximity of construction sites to residents.
- 6.3.142 Weston and Basford Parish Council comment specifically on the potential isolation elderly people in the area may face as they are more dependent on access to local services.
- 6.3.143 In terms of mitigation, Weston and Basford Parish Council and Cheshire East Council suggest a community compensation fund for initiatives such as improved broadband internet. Cheshire East Council specifically suggests linking compensation to the Smart Cities Agenda.

6.3.144 Health

- 6.3.145 A few respondents are concerned that pollution and noise may affect those with heart conditions.
- 6.3.146 A small number of respondents highlight potential stress resulting from Phase 2a, specifically from construction traffic or moving home.

'Physical affect on people and property close to the HS2 line and construction sites, causing health problems to people with existing heart conditions - pollution and stress'

Individual Submission

6.3.147 Landscape and visual

- 6.3.148 One respondent highlights the potential visual impacts of high viaducts.

6.3.149 Socio-economic

- 6.3.150 Cheshire East Council are supportive of HS2 Ltd's measures to employ local people for construction work.

6.3.151 *Sound, noise and vibration*

6.3.152 A small number of respondents express general concerns about construction noise disrupting the lives of residents.

6.3.153 *Traffic and transport*

6.3.154 Some respondents express concerns that certain roads are not suitable for construction traffic due to narrow width and lack of space for pedestrians. Chorlton Lane and Den Lane are most frequently mentioned. Suggested mitigation measures include widening Chorlton Lane or building a footbridge for pedestrians.

6.3.155 *Other comments*

6.3.156 A few respondents express general concerns about the reduction in property values resulting from Phase 2a.

'Value of property will reduce or housing may be lost.'

Individual Submission

6.3.157 Cheshire East Council comments that older residents have been confused about what compensation they are entitled to. They also state that village and ward councils would like this addressed. Cheshire East Council is also concerned that landowners have allegedly had to pay up-front legal fees and then claim these back when they believed HS2 Ltd would pay for these fees up-front. They argue that this is inequitable as some landowners may not be able to afford this process.

Chapter 7: Responses in answer to Question 3 - Literature Review

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This chapter provides a qualitative summary of responses to question 3 in the EQIA consultation response form, which asks for comments on the Literature Review, presented in the appendix of the working draft EQIA Report.

7.1.2 Question 3 asks:

‘Please let us know your comments on the Literature Review, presented in the appendix of the report. Please highlight any additional literature or information you feel should be included.’

7.2 Overview of responses

7.2.1 Question 3 received 46 direct responses, however this chapter also covers issues raised by respondents that did not follow the structure of the consultation questions in their response, but were deemed relevant to the question.

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

7.3 Discussion

7.3.1 This section provides a qualitative summary of the issues respondents raise in response to question 3.

7.3.2 The majority of respondents to this question do not address the question directly. Instead, they provide views on the perceived impacts of the Proposed Scheme, either across the whole of Phase 2a or within the specific CAs. These comments are discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

7.3.3 Comments on the Literature Review

7.3.4 Several respondents comment on a perceived lack of detail in the Literature Review. They state that only the most obvious information is identified or that the information is generic.

- 7.3.5 Chebsey Parish Council are concerned as they believe that the report uses more national statistics than locally specific statistics.
- 7.3.6 Some respondents criticise the style of the Literature Review, describing it as too long, complex, or academic. One respondent finds the phrasing of the section on women offensive and requests this to be changed. They do not specify how they find it offensive.
- 7.3.7 A few respondents comment on the position of the Literature Review within the wider EQIA document. They are concerned that it could be hard to find and seen as less important.
- 7.3.8 Cheshire East Council suggest the following additional literature and information they feel should be included:
- The Local Plan;
 - The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA);
 - Ward Profiles;
 - Parish Council Local Housing Needs Assessments; and
 - Local employment data.
- 7.3.9 A small number of respondents support the Literature Review, highlighting its usefulness and high quality.
- 7.3.10 Conversely, a few respondents do not see the necessity of the Literature Review. They comment that it identifies issues but does not suggest measures to mitigate them.

Chapter 8: Responses which did not address the consultation questions

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 This chapter provides a qualitative summary of responses to question 4 in the EQIA consultation response form, which asks for any further comments on the working draft EQIA Report.

8.1.2 Question 4 asks:

‘Are there any further comments you would like to make about the working draft EQIA Report.’

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

8.2 Overview of responses

8.2.1 A total of 64 respondents either responded to question 4 or did not arrange their response according to the structure of the consultation questions. Where respondents raised issues in question 4 which were relevant to questions 1, 2 and 3, these have been reported on in the appropriate chapters above. Likewise, any comments included in answer to consultation questions 1 to 3 that discussed issues outside the scope of those questions are presented here.

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

8.3 Discussion

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

- comments on the consultation process and communications from HS2;
- overall comments on the project and the proposed route; and
- overall comments on the consultation documents.

8.3.2 **Comments on the consultation process and communications from HS2**

8.3.3 Several respondents comment that they became aware of the consultation through word of mouth and not through HS2 Ltd’s official communications (detailed in section 1.2 above).

- 8.3.4 Respondents are concerned that other affected residents may be unaware of the consultation and community events. Similarly, a few respondents state that they were unaware, until told by a neighbour, that they were affected by the proposed scheme as nobody from HS2 Ltd had contacted them. Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council suggest using a list of affected addresses they sent to HS2 Ltd for future consultation mail outs to mitigate this perceived issue.
- 8.3.5 Some respondents, including Chebsey Parish Council and Jeremy Lefroy MP, comment that the consultation period was too short to consider all of the documents and write a response. Several respondents suggest extending future consultation periods beyond the legally required period. Weston and Basford Parish Council specifically highlight that those without computers or broadband internet may need more time. Madeley HS2 Action Group believes that the consultation process discriminates against the elderly who generally have less internet access.

'The consultation period became very short as inadequate consultation occurred resulting in many Parishes and Parishioners having less than a week to consider very detailed documentation.'

Chebsey Parish Council

- 8.3.6 A small number of respondents challenge the consultation's Freepost response channel. They believe that Freepost is not date stamped, and as a result it would be impossible to know when responses have been received and accepted. Due to uncertainties in how the freepost process worked, respondents suggest expanding the response channels to include recorded delivery, or increasing the consultation period to include the freepost delivery time within the consultation period.
- 8.3.7 A few respondents comment on events organised by HS2 during the consultation. 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. Respondents also express concerns that elderly residents may have been unaware of the events, or unable to attend due to impaired mobility.
- 8.3.8 A small number of respondents identify perceived specific errors or omissions on the consultation maps, while others comment that the documents are hard to comprehend in general.

- 8.3.9 Some respondents make requests for further engagement, either on their individual situation, on sites of particular interest, or for specific stakeholders. A few respondents allege that HS2 Ltd have not engaged with certain stakeholders such as the North Staffordshire Bridleway Association and Eccleshall Parish Council. Other respondents request engagement with affected residents in Shropshire beyond the Staffordshire boundary.
- 8.3.10 Some respondents, including Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council, are concerned that their responses to previous consultations have not been considered. Others believe that their responses to the current consultation may be ignored or not considered by the appropriate people.
- 8.3.11 A few respondents make positive comments about the consultation process. Cheshire East Council comment that HS2 Ltd have gathered feedback from their councillors. Jeremy Lefroy MP and Network Rail expressed their appreciation for being involved.
- 8.3.12 Overall comments on the project and the proposed route**
- 8.3.13 A few respondents express support for the HS2 project, giving reasons such as improving connectivity, increasing capacity and benefiting the local area.

'As you are aware Cheshire East Council has always taken a supportive stance on HS2 and recognises the benefits that it will bring to Crewe and the sub-region.'

Cheshire East Council

- 8.3.14 By contrast some respondents are critical of the project, questioning the need for HS2 and expressing concern about the overall cost of the project in relation to other public spending priorities. One respondent relates this to the working draft EQIA report by suggesting that to reduce equality impacts the project must be abandoned.
- 8.3.15 Overall comments on the consultation documents**
- 8.3.16 Network Rail and Cheshire East Council support the aims of the working draft EQIA Report in general, specifically a commitment to diversity and inclusion.
- 8.3.17 One respondent questions who the Equality Lead is that HS2 Ltd have appointed and what their role involves.

- 8.3.18 Respondents to the working draft EQIA consultation frequently reference the working draft EIA consultation documents, particularly in response to question 2. Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council requests consultation on the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), in relation to mitigating the potential effects of construction traffic. A few respondents, including Manor Road HS2 Action Group and Whitmore Heath Action Group, suggest that HS2 Ltd adopt the Alternative Option 1, originally proposed by Atkins, connecting Phase 2a with the WCML south of Baldwins Gate.
- 8.3.19 Some respondents to the working draft EQIA consultation reference the Design Refinement consultation documents. A few respondents, including Kings Bromley Parish Council, support the proposed railhead and maintenance facility near Stone, explaining that this would remove the impacts from the maintenance loop at Pipe Ridware. A few respondents, including Marston Against HS2 Ltd, oppose the proposed railhead and maintenance facility near Stone, highlighting potential impacts such as traffic congestion, noise and light pollution.

Appendix A Participating organisations and elected representatives

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

Table A1: Respondent sectors

Sector
Members of the public ¹
Academic (includes universities and other academic institutions)
Action groups (includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals)
Businesses (local, regional, national or international)
Elected representatives (includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors)
Environment, heritage, amenity or community groups (includes environmental groups, schools, church groups, residents' associations, recreation groups, rail user groups and other community interest organisations)
Local government (includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships)
Other representative group (includes chambers of commerce, trade unions, political parties and professional bodies)
Statutory agencies
Real estate, housing associations or property-related organisations
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisations (includes transport bodies, transport providers, infrastructure providers and utility companies)
Other
Prefer not to say

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

Table A2: Respondents

Action groups
Madeley HS2 Action Group
Manor Road HS2 Action Group
Marston Against HS2 Ltd
Whitmore Heath Action Group
Businesses
Upper Moreton Rural Activities Community Interest Company (UMRA)
Elected representatives
Cllr Janet Clowes, Cheshire East Council
Jeremy Lefroy, MP for Stafford
Environment, heritage, amenity or community groups
Colton Ramblers
Parochial Church Councils and Benefice Council of Great Haywood, Colwich, Colton, Blithfield and Abbots Bromley
Rector and PCC St. Mary's Church, Swynnerton
Local government
Chebsey Parish Council
Cheshire East Council
Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council
Kings Bromley Parish Council
Weston and Basford Parish Council
Swynnerton Parish Council

Statutory agencies
Highways England
Public Health England
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation
Network Rail

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 webform were processed by data entry staff in order to prepare for import into the Dialogue by Design analysis database.
- B4 For submissions containing images, maps and other non-text content, a reference to a PDF version of the original submission was made available to analysts, so that this information could be viewed when necessary.

Responses via the webform

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

Responses received via email

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

Responses received via the Freepost address

- B8 A Freepost address operated for the duration of the consultation for respondents to submit hard-copy consultation responses. Upon receipt, letters and paper-based response forms were logged and given a unique reference number. They were then scanned and imported into the data analysis system.

- B9 At the data entry stage, all printed submissions, were transcribed using optical character recognition software, which can recognise printed text without the need for manual data entry. Each of these files was then opened and reviewed by our transcription team in order to correct any misrecognition. Handwritten responses were typed into the database by data entry staff.
- B10 The transcription process was quality controlled by a transcription supervisor, who reviewed a percentage of the transcriptions and indicated their quality using a comprehensive scoring system. The transcription quality score is a ranked scale, differentiating between minor errors (such as insignificant typographical errors), and significant errors (such as omitted information or errors that might cause a change in meaning).
- B11 The quality control process involved a random review of each team member's work. At least 5% of the submissions they transcribed were reviewed by response type. In cases where a significant error was detected, the quality control team reviewed 10% of the relevant team member's work on that response type. If a second significant error was detected, the proportion reviewed was raised to 100%.

Responses submitted to HS2 Ltd or the Dft

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

Late submissions

- B13 The consultation period ended at 23:45 on 7 November 2016. Dialogue by Design received one hard copy response after the deadline. This response was stored securely but not processed or analysed.

Verification of submissions

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

Development of an analytical framework

- B17 In order to analyse the responses, and the variety of views expressed, an analytical or coding framework was created. The purpose of the framework was to enable analysts to organise responses by themes and issues, so that key messages as well as specific points of detail could be captured and reported on.
- B18 The process of developing the framework for this consultation involved a team of Dialogue by Design senior analysts reviewing an early set of responses for each consultation question, and formulating an initial framework of codes. At this point Dialogue by Design discussed the initial framework with representatives from HS2 Ltd and the DfT. Their feedback was used as part of the finalisation of the coding framework.
- B19 A three-tier approach was taken to coding, starting with high-level themes, splitting into sub-themes and then specific codes. Table B1 provides a full list of the top-level themes used and Table B2 provides an extract from the coding framework showing the use of themes, sub-themes and codes. The full coding framework is available in Appendix C.
- B20 Each code is intended to represent a specific issue or argument raised in responses. The data analysis system allows the senior analysts to populate a basic coding framework at the start (top-down) whilst providing scope for further development of the framework using suggestions from the analysts engaging with the response data (bottom-up). We use natural language² codes since this allows analysts to suggest refinements and additional issues, and aids quality control and external verification.

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

Table B1 *List of themes from coding framework*

Theme
Community areas
Consultation process
Design and route
Equality Impact Report
General
Impacts
Locations
Other

Table B2 *Extract from the coding framework*

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

Implementation of the analysis framework

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

Appendix C Codes by theme and by question

- C1 The analysis of consultation responses was carried out using a coding framework consisting of 10 themes containing 343 codes, of which 198 refer to specific locations mentioned by respondents. The themes and codes are listed below in Table C1 and Table C3 respectively. Table C2 shows key acronyms used within Table C3.
- C2 Table C3 provides an overview of the number of responses to which each code was applied within each consultation question. Some themes and a number of codes were created specifically for one consultation question, others were applied across multiple consultation questions.
- C3 For reference, a total of 92 responses were received to the consultation.
- C4 The column 'Total' in Table C3 provides the number of submissions to which that code was applied, not the total number of times the code was applied (e.g. if one submission has a code applied to its response to Question 1 and to Question 2, it is only counted once for the 'Total' column).

Table C1 *Coding framework themes*

Theme
Community areas (CA)
Consultation process (CP)
Design and route (DE)
Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EA)
Equality Impact Assessment Report (EQ)
General (GE)
Impacts (I)
Locations (LO)
Other (OT)
Q3 Railhead and maintenance facility near Stone (Q3)

Table C2 *Key acronyms*

Key Terms	
CA	Community area(s)
CT-05-101 (example)	Reference to HS2 construction map
PRoW	Public Right(s) of Way
RW	Route-wide assessment (Chapter 5 of the working draft EQIA report)
SV-01-101 (example)	Reference to HS2 sound contour map

Table C3 *Count of comments per code per question³*

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
Community areas					
CA - (1) Fradley to Colton	2	15	2	10	18
CA - (2) Colwich to Yarlet	4	9	2	4	13
CA - (3) Stone and Swynnerton	17	21	8	12	32
CA - (4) Whitmore Heath to Madeley	6	14	1	9	19
CA - (5) South Cheshire	7	8	1	6	10
CA - No CA applied	21	14	32	25	51
Consultation process					
CP - Consultation - criticise	9	5	2	15	22

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

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
CP - Consultation - suggestion	6	7	~	9	18
CP - Consultation - support	2	~	~	3	4
CP - Documentation - criticise	2	1	2	2	7
CP - Events - comments/references	2	~	~	4	6
Design and route					
DE - Balancing ponds	~	1	~	2	3
DE - Boreholes/geology	~	~	~	1	1
DE - Bridge/overbridge	~	1	2	1	3
DE – Compounds	3	5	2	4	9
DE – Connections	1	~	~	~	1
DE - Costs – concerns	1	1	~	2	3
DE - Design/mitigation suggestions	5	8	3	7	18
DE - Height of line	2	4	3	4	8
DE - IMD Crewe location benefits/support	1	2	2	4	5
DE - IMD Crewe location concerns/oppose	1	~	~	~	1
DE - IMD other comments/suggestions	~	1	~	~	1
DE - IMD Stone location benefits/support	~	1	~	2	3
DE - IMD Stone location concerns/oppose	6	6	3	4	12
DE - Maintenance loops	~	1	~	2	3
DE - Oppose proposals/route	5	6	2	2	14

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
DE - Prefer previous design	~	~	~	1	1
DE - Stations (including hub)	1	~	1	1	3
DE - Transfer Node	2	3	2	3	5
DE - Tunnel/green tunnel	~	5	~	7	12
DE – Viaduct	2	3	~	4	9
Environmental Impact Assessment Report					
EA - Alternatives Report - criticise	~	~	~	1	1
EA - Alternatives Report - alternatives - suggestions	~	1	~	~	1
EA - Alternatives Report - rail alternatives/Atkins - high cost option/option 1	~	2	~	4	6
EA - Comments - Draft Code of Construction Practice	1	~	~	~	1
EA - Mitigation - visual/negative impacts	~	1	~	~	1
Equality Impact Assessment Report					
EQ - Baseline - inadequate/limitations	2	~	~	1	3
EQ - CA2 Assessment - inadequate/limitations	~	3	~	~	3
EQ - CA3 Assessment - inadequate/limitations	~	6	~	~	6
EQ - CA4 Assessment - inadequate/limitations	~	1	~	~	1
EQ - CA5 Assessment - inadequate/limitations	~	2	~	~	2
EQ - CA5 Assessment - support	~	1	~	~	1
EQ - Further information requested	~	~	~	4	4

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
EQ – Introduction	1	~	~	~	1
EQ - Literature Review - criticise	~	~	10	1	11
EQ - Literature Review - lack of detail	~	~	8	~	8
EQ - Literature Review - support	~	~	1	~	1
EQ - Literature Review - support with caveat	~	~	2	~	2
EQ - Overall - inadequate/limitations	1	1	~	14	15
EQ - Overall – support	2	~	~	2	3
EQ - Overall - support with caveats	~	~	~	1	1
EQ - route wide (RW) - inadequate/limitations	14	2	~	4	18
EQ - route wide (RW) - suggestions	3	~	~	3	6
EQ - route wide (RW) - support	3	~	~	1	4
General					
GE - Alternative suggestions	2	1	1	2	3
GE - General opposition (HS2)	7	6	3	3	8
GE - General support (HS2)	~	~	~	2	2
Impacts					
I - Agriculture, forestry and soils	5	10	~	6	18
I - Agriculture, forestry and soils - mitigation	1	~	~	~	1
I - Air quality, dust and dirt	9	12	4	6	17
I - Air quality, dust and dirt - mitigation	~	1	~	~	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
I - Community - access issues	9	11	3	2	20
I - Community - crime/safety/personal security/anti-social behaviour	6	4	2	5	11
I - Community - cumulative impact	1	2	~	1	2
I - Community - facilities - healthcare	6	6	1	3	12
I - Community - facilities - housing development	2	2	2	~	2
I - Community - facilities - leisure facilities	2	8	3	5	10
I - Community - facilities - other	5	4	2	1	7
I - Community - facilities - places of worship	1	2	1	2	5
I - Community - facilities - schools/educational	6	9	5	8	13
I - Community - general/disruption/viability	8	17	4	7	26
I - Community - growth/development plan	~	3	~	~	3
I - Community – isolation	8	14	1	6	23
I - Community - mitigation/compensation	5	6	~	14	21
I - Community - no benefit/cost vs benefits	5	~	~	~	5
I - Community - public open spaces/recreation/local amenity	3	3	~	2	5
I - Construction - mitigation	~	~	1	~	1
I - Construction - disruption	1	4	~	1	5
I - Construction - earthworks	2	~	~	~	2
I - Construction - length of time	~	~	~	3	3

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
I - Construction - local experience	3	2	2	2	6
I - Construction - workforce/contractors	~	2	1	~	3
I - Construction - working hours/operations	~	~	~	2	2
I - Cultural heritage	1	3	1	~	5
I - Ecology/biodiversity	6	8	3	3	13
I - Ecology/biodiversity - mitigation	~	3	~	2	5
I - Ecology/biodiversity - woodlands	~	2	~	2	4
I - Health/wellbeing - air quality	~	3	3	~	4
I - Health/wellbeing - electromagnetic fields	1	~	~	~	1
I - Health/wellbeing - general	5	8	5	9	14
I - Health/wellbeing - mitigation	~	2	~	~	2
I - Health/wellbeing - peace/tranquillity/quality of life	6	5	2	6	13
I - Health/wellbeing - pets/animals	2	2	2	3	3
I - Health/wellbeing - stress/anxiety	7	10	3	6	17
I - Impacted groups - children/young people	6	11	5	9	21
I - Impacted groups - impaired accessibility	3	4	2	4	9
I - Impacted groups - landowners	3	2	2	6	7
I - Impacted groups - older people/vulnerable	12	17	2	7	26
I - Impacted groups - other	~	2	~	2	4
I - Impacted groups - residents/local people	15	16	3	13	31

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
I - Impacted groups - respondent's circumstances/property	7	8	~	8	20
I - Impacted groups - specific health conditions	1	1	~	~	2
I - Impacted groups - unemployed people	2	~	~	~	2
I - Impacted groups - women	~	1	~	1	1
I - Land quality	~	1	~	~	1
I - Landscape and visual - environment/general	9	7	4	7	19
I - Landscape and visual - land take (brownfield/greenfield)	1	1	~	~	2
I - Landscape and visual - light pollution	6	7	4	3	12
I - Landscape and visual - mitigation/compensation	~	2	~	9	11
I - Sound, noise and vibration	13	15	7	8	27
I - Sound, noise and vibration - assessment	~	~	~	1	1
I - Sound, noise and vibration - mitigation	~	3	~	1	4
I - Property - land/assets	~	1	~	1	2
I - Property - loss of housing	3	1	~	2	5
I - Property - mitigation/compensation	4	7	~	3	12
I - Property - other property impacts	1	3	~	5	8
I - Property - value/ability to sell/blight	9	6	4	3	12
I - Socio-economic - effects on existing businesses/livelihoods	10	14	6	9	24

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
I - Socio-economic - mitigation/compensation	1	~	~	1	2
I - Socio-economic - opportunities	2	~	1	1	4
I - Traffic and transport - construction traffic	11	14	3	7	26
I - Traffic and transport - emergency services	5	8	3	4	13
I - Traffic and transport - journey times/commuting	2	5	3	~	8
I - Traffic and transport - mitigation/compensation	8	13	2	10	25
I - Traffic and transport - non-motorised users	7	6	2	5	11
I - Traffic and transport - PRow/footpath	~	9	1	2	10
I - Traffic and transport - public transport	1	3	1	2	7
I - Traffic and transport - road safety	9	9	5	8	16
I - Traffic and transport - roads (congestion/closure etc.)	21	43	8	16	58
I - Traffic and transport - waterways	~	1	~	~	1
I - Waste and material resources	~	~	~	1	1
I - Water resources and flood risk	1	6	1	4	11
I - Water resources and flood risk - mitigation	~	~	~	2	2
Locations					
LO – Alleynes	~	2	~	~	2
LO - Anson Primary School	~	1	~	1	2
LO – Ashley	~	~	~	1	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO – Aston	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Baden Hall	~	2	~	~	2
LO - Baldwins Gate	~	1	~	2	3
LO - Bar Hill	3	3	~	2	5
LO - Barn Farm	1	1	1	2	2
LO – Basford	~	1	~	1	2
LO – Beech	~	2	~	~	2
LO - Bentley Hall Farm	~	2	~	1	3
LO – Birmingham	1	~	~	~	1
LO – Blakenhall	1	1	~	1	1
LO - Bromley Hayes Cattery	2	3	2	4	5
LO - Brook Farm Lane	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Burton-on-Trent	1	1	1	1	1
LO – Chebsey	1	~	1	1	2
LO – Cheshire	1	~	~	~	1
LO – Chorlton	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Clifford's Wood roundabout	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Cold Norton	1	1	~	1	2
LO - Coles Heath	~	1	~	~	1
LO – Colton	~	3	~	1	4

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO – Colwich	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Common Lane Farm	1	1	1	2	2
LO – Crewe	6	2	2	5	11
LO - Crosse Primary School	1	~	~	~	1
LO – Croxton	~	~	~	1	1
LO - CT-05-202	2	1	1	~	2
LO - CT-05-233	~	~	~	1	1
LO - CT-06-225	~	1	~	~	1
LO - CT-06-226	~	1	~	~	1
LO - CT-06-230	~	1	~	~	1
LO - CT-06-231	~	1	~	~	1
LO - CT-06-232	~	1	~	~	1
LO - CT-06-233	~	1	~	~	1
LO – Eccleshall	~	2	~	1	3
LO - Eccleshall Football Club	~	2	~	~	2
LO - Fog Cottages	1	1	~	~	2
LO - Footpath - Colwich Bridleway 23	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Footpath - Madeley Bridleway	~	2	~	~	2
LO - Footpath - Red Line Bridleway	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Footpath - Tixall Bridleway and Public Footpath	~	1	~	~	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO - Fradley Wood	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Gonsley Farm	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Great Haywood	1	2	1	1	3
LO - Hadley Gate Fields Farm	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Hamstall Ridware	~	1	~	~	1
LO – Hanyards	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Hill Chorlton	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Holly Cottage	2	2	2	~	3
LO - Hoo Mill	1	~	1	1	1
LO – Hopton	~	2	~	1	3
LO - Hough Village Hall	1	~	~	~	1
LO – Ingestre	1	2	1	1	2
LO - Ingestre Church	1	1	1	~	2
LO - Ingestre Hall	1	1	~	~	2
LO - Ingestre Millennium Green	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Ingestre Orangery	~	1	~	1	2
LO - Ingestre Park Golf Club	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Ingestre Pavilion	1	~	~	1	1
LO - Ingestre Stables	~	1	1	1	2
LO - Ingestre Wood	~	~	~	1	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO - Ingestre Park Golf Club	~	3	~	~	3
LO - Kings Bromley	1	2	2	3	3
LO – Lakesedge	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Lea Court	2	~	~	~	2
LO – Lichfield	1	1	1	2	2
LO - Lionlodge Covert	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Little Ingestre Care Home	~	1	1	~	2
LO - Lount Farm	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Lower Den Farm	~	1	~	~	1
LO – Madeley	3	3	~	4	9
LO - Madeley Park Wood	~	~	~	2	2
LO – Marston	1	4	~	1	5
LO - Marston cottages	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Mayfield Children's Home	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Meece Brook Viaduct	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Mill Meece	~	2	~	~	2
LO – Moorhall	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Moreton Brook	~	2	~	~	2
LO - Moreton Brook Viaduct	~	1	~	~	1
LO - North Stoke	~	1	~	~	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO - Norton Bridge	4	~	~	5	7
LO - Ordnance Survey map references	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Park Wood Housing Estate	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Pipe Ridware	~	3	~	2	5
LO – Potteries	~	1	~	1	1
LO - Quintons Orchard	~	1	~	2	3
LO - Richard Crosse Primary School	1	2	2	4	4
LO - River Blythe	~	1	~	~	1
LO - River Lea	~	~	~	1	1
LO - River Trent	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - A34	7	6	2	4	11
LO - Road - A51	5	6	~	3	12
LO - Road - A513	~	1	~	2	3
LO - Road - A515	~	1	~	2	3
LO - Road - A518	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - A519	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - A525	2	4	~	~	4
LO - Road - A53	5	1	1	2	8
LO - Road - B5013	~	2	~	1	3
LO - Road - B5014	~	5	~	2	7

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO - Road - B5026	2	3	2	3	4
LO - Road - B5066	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Baswich Lane	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Road - Bellamour Way	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Bishton Lane	1	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Blackheath Lane	1	1	~	1	1
LO - Road - Blithbury Road	~	6	~	~	6
LO - Road - Casey Lane	~	2	~	~	2
LO - Road - Cemetery Lane, Weston	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Road - Chorlton Lane	1	1	~	2	3
LO - Road - Cobbs Lane	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Road - Common Lane	2	3	2	4	5
LO - Road - Crawley Lane	1	~	~	4	4
LO - Road - Dawsons Lane	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Road - Den Lane	3	3	1	~	4
LO - Road - Eccleshall Road	4	2	3	3	7
LO - Road - Hanyards Lane	1	1	~	1	1
LO - Road - Holdiford Road	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Road - Hoo Mill crossroads	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Hoo Mill Lane	1	2	~	1	2

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO - Road - Ingestre Road	~	1	1	~	2
LO - Road - Ingestre Village Road	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Road - Lichfield Road	~	5	~	~	5
LO - Road - M6	1	2	~	3	6
LO - Road - Manor Road	~	2	~	1	3
LO - Road - Marston Lane	~	3	~	~	3
LO - Road - Meece Road	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Road - Mill Lane	2	2	~	1	4
LO - Road - Moor Lane	~	3	~	1	4
LO - Road - Newcastle Road	1	3	~	~	4
LO - Road - Newlands Lane	~	4	~	1	5
LO - Road - Norton Road	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Parkwood Drive	~	1	~	1	2
LO - Road - Pipe Lane	~	~	~	2	2
LO - Road - Pipewood Lane	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Red Lane	~	3	~	~	3
LO - Road - Rugeley Road	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Road - Sandon Road	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Shavington bypass	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Road - Shaw Lane	~	~	~	2	2

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO - Road - Snape Hall road	2	3	~	2	5
LO - Road - Stab Lane	1	3	~	1	3
LO - Road - Stoneyford Lane	~	6	~	1	7
LO - Road - Tittensor Road	1	3	~	2	4
LO - Road - Tixall Lane	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Road - Tixall Road	~	1	1	1	1
LO - Road - Trent Drive	1	1	~	~	2
LO - Road - Uttoxeter Road	~	5	~	1	6
LO - Road - Walton roundabout/junction	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Road - Waybutt Lane	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Road - Weston Lane	~	3	~	~	3
LO - Road - Yarnfield Lane	7	8	3	5	15
LO - Road - Yoxall Road	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Rose Cottage	~	2	~	~	2
LO – Sheffield	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Snape Hall	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Snape Hall Farm	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Springfields Primary School	2	2	2	2	2
LO - St Clements Court	1	~	~	~	1
LO - St John's Primary School	~	1	~	~	1

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO - St Mary's	~	1	~	~	1
LO – Stafford	1	2	~	~	2
LO - Stafford Crematorium	1	~	~	~	1
LO – Staffordshire	1	~	~	~	1
LO – Standon	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Stockwell Heath	~	2	~	1	3
LO - Stoke-on-Trent	3	3	~	~	4
LO – Stone	8	12	4	9	20
LO - SV-01-108	1	~	~	~	1
LO – Swynnerton	4	9	2	4	14
LO – Tittensor	~	1	~	1	2
LO – Tixall	1	~	1	1	1
LO - Tixall Church	~	~	1	1	1
LO - Trent and Mersey Canal	~	~	~	1	1
LO - Trent Valley	~	2	~	~	2
LO - Trentside Meadows	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Upper Moreton Farm	1	1	~	1	1
LO - Upper Moreton Rural Activities	~	1	~	~	1
LO – Walton	~	~	1	1	2
LO – WCML	2	5	~	3	8

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
LO - Westbridge Park	~	2	~	~	2
LO - Weston Church Hall	1	~	~	~	1
LO – Whitmore	~	2	~	3	5
LO - Whitmore Conservation Area	~	~	1	~	1
LO - Whitmore Heath	~	2	~	1	3
LO - Whitmore Wood	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Woodhouse Farm	~	~	~	1	1
LO – Woore	2	~	~	~	2
LO – Wrinehill	~	1	~	~	1
LO - Wynbury Ward	1	~	~	~	1
LO - Yanfield Conference Centre	~	~	~	2	2
LO – Yarlet	1	2	~	~	3
LO – Yarnfield	8	9	3	7	18
LO - Yarnfield Park Training and Conference Centre	2	2	2	~	2
LO - Yarnfield Sports Centre	2	2	2	~	2
Other					
OT - Cited evidence	~	~	1	2	3
OT - Context to organisation/response	1	3	1	21	22
OT - Level of public opposition	1	1	~	5	7
OT - No comment	11	12	16	12	29

Code	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4 and Non-fitting	Total (see C4 p.49)
OT - Refer to attachment	1	2	~	7	10
OT - Refer to other project/compensation scheme	2	~	~	3	5
OT - Refer to other question response	1	4	1	6	11
OT - Refer to other stakeholder/organisation	1	2	1	3	4
OT - Refer to previous response/correspondence	1	~	~	3	4
OT - Reference HS2 documentation	10	8	3	5	18
Q3 Railhead and maintenance facility near Stone (Q3)					
Q3 - Oppose proposal	7	6	3	4	13
Q3 - Support proposal	~	1	~	2	3

Appendix D Glossary of terms

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

Balancing pond - Part of a drainage system that is used to temporarily store, and thereby attenuate, the flow of surface water run-off.

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

Community area (CA) - Defined areas along the proposed HS2 Phase 2a route (e.g. South Cheshire community area). They are used as a geographical basis for reporting local community and environmental impacts and effects in the environmental impact assessment report.

Cutting - A linear excavation of soil or rock to make way for a new railway or road. Cuttings help reduce the noise and/or visual impact of passing trains or road vehicles.

Department for Transport (the Dft) - Government department responsible for transport issues in the UK (where powers have not been devolved).

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

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

Exceptional hardship scheme (EHS) - 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.

Formal Equality Impact Assessment Report (EQIA) - A predictive assessment, considering in advance of implementation the potential impacts arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme, and the potential effects of these for protected characteristic groups. The EQIA serves to inform design, mitigation and other relevant project-related decisions.

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

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

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

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

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

Literature Review - The section of the report which provides summary of key research evidence drawn from recent national and regional evidence reviews, research findings and policy documents, to inform understanding of the sensitivity of protected characteristic groups to potential effects of the Proposed Scheme, and their specific needs in relation to potential effects.

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

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

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

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

Protected Characteristics Groups - Groups identified in the Equality Act 2010 as sharing a particular characteristic against which it is illegal to discriminate.

Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) - Under the Equality Act 2010, a public authority, in the exercise of its functions (and a person exercising public functions) is subject to the PSED. The PSED requires public bodies to have due regard to three aims, to: eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act; advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.

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

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

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

route wide assessment - The section of the report which provides a summary of the potential route wide effects for equality of the Proposed Scheme during construction and operation. It also sets out general committed mitigation measures and further proposed mitigation measures.

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

Transfer node - A location where bulk deliveries or excavated materials leave or enter the construction worksites from public roads.

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

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

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

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

Appendix E Equality and Diversity monitoring

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

National identity

Question 1 asked How would you describe your national identity?

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

The respondent who selected 'Other' identified as Irish.

Ethnicity

Question 2 asked How would you describe your ethnicity?

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

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

Disability

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

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

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

Gender

Question 4 asked What is your gender?

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

Religion and belief

Question 5 asked What is your religion or belief?

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

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

Marriage and Civil Partnerships

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

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

Age

Question 7 asked What is your age?

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

Sexual orientation

Question 8 asked What is your Sexual Orientation?

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

Appendix F Equality and Diversity monitoring form




High Speed Two Phase 2a: West Midlands to Crewe Working Draft Equality Impact Assessment Report **About you**

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

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

September 2016

Page 1 of 4



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

Please complete the information below and return this form with your response, either by email to DraftEquality2a@dialoguebydesign.co.uk or by post, using the Freepost address below.

FREEPOST DRAFT EQUALITY 2A

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

Q1. How would you describe your national identity?

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

Q2. How would you describe your ethnicity?

Asian

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

Black

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

Mixed ethnic background

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

White

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



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

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

Yes No Prefer not to say

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

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

Q4. What is your gender?

Male Female Prefer not to say

Q5. What is your religion or belief?

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

Q6. Are you married or in a civil partnership?

Yes No Prefer not to say

Q7. What is your age?

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

Q8. What is your sexual orientation?

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.

