

High Speed Rail: Investing in Britain's Future

Addendum - 2

September 2012

A report to HS2 Ltd and the Department for Transport
Prepared by Dialogue by Design

Email: info@dialoguebydesign.com
Website: www.dialoguebydesign.net



Although this report was requested by the Department for Transport (DfT), the findings and recommendations are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the DfT. The information or guidance in this document (including third party information, products and services), is provided by DfT on an 'as is' basis, without any representation or endorsement made and without warranty of any kind whether express or implied.

Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 4DR
Telephone 0300 330 3000
Website www.dft.gov.uk

© Queen's Printer and Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 2011, except where otherwise stated

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos or third-party material) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To reproduce maps, contact Ordnance Survey via their website www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/oswebsite/business/licences/ or write to Customer Service Centre, Ordnance Survey, Romsey Road, Southampton SO16 4GU.



Printed in Great Britain on paper containing at least 75% recycled fibre.

Contents

Chapter 1	Background	3
Chapter 2	Participation	5
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	Breakdown of unanalysed responses	5
2.3	Response sectors	7
Chapter 3	Methodology	8
3.1	Supplementary analysis	8
Chapter 4	Results and Conclusions	9
4.1	Results	9
4.2	Conclusions	9
Appendices		
Appendix 1	List of organisations and elected representatives included in this report	12
Appendix 2	Codes by theme and by question	14

Chapter 1 Background

- 1.1.1 On 28 February 2011 the Secretary of State for Transport launched a consultation on the Government's proposed high speed rail strategy and the proposed route for an initial high speed line from London to the West Midlands, with connections to the existing high speed rail line from London to the Channel Tunnel and the West Coast Main Line, along with an interchange connection to Heathrow Airport and Crossrail via a station at Old Oak Common. The consultation ran for five months, closing on 29 July 2011.
- 1.1.2 An independent specialist consultation company (Dialogue by Design) was commissioned to receive, collate and analyse responses to the consultation. The results of their analysis were presented in the document [High Speed Rail: Investing in Britain's Future, Consultation Summary Report](#) published on 10 January 2012. This analysis included 54,909 responses from members of the public and organisations.
- 1.1.3 In June 2012, HS2 Ltd discovered that 413 consultation responses (i.e. 0.75% of the total) from members of the public and organisations had inadvertently not been included in the initial analysis. Four hundred and seven of these responses were not transferred from HS2 Ltd/DfT to Dialogue by Design (DbyD). A further six responses were not analysed due to human error after they had been received by DbyD. When these omissions were discovered all 413 responses were analysed by DbyD and an [Addendum Report](#) was produced in July 2012.
- 1.1.4 In August 2012, DbyD discovered that responses to one or more of the seven consultation questions from 719 members of the public and organisations had inadvertently not been included in the initial analysis. Responses to one or more questions in these 719 submissions were not imported from data files sent by the website host into the DbyD analysis database. As a result, 21.5% of the information provided by these 719 respondents was not included in the analysis. This amounts to 0.38% of all the information submitted and analysed and reported on in the Consultation Summary Report published on 10 January 2012.
- 1.1.5 DbyD carried out an investigation into why these responses were not imported into the analysis database. The investigation indicated that this was due to a technical error generated by the programme that prepared responses submitted online for import into the DbyD analysis database.
- 1.1.6 Further quality checking carried out as part of the investigation revealed that responses from three respondents had been over-written due to a mismatch in the serial numbers between the data received from an action group website and responses already in the DbyD analysis database. These responses had therefore not been analysed as part of the original analysis.
- 1.1.7 In total 722 responses had some or all data not analysed. All data that was inadvertently not analysed has been recovered and analysed and the overwritten responses have been restored.

- 1.1.8 This report describes the DbyD analysis to look into whether there were any issues raised in the affected parts of these 722 responses which should have been addressed in the previous summary report.
- 1.1.9 DbyD has carried out a number of checks relating to its technical and manual processing stages. These checks give us confidence that the data transfer issues described above have not affected any other responses. They show that the omissions affect online responses only. They show too that there are no systemic errors in the processing, analysis or reporting of consultation responses that would affect the results described in the Consultation Summary Report published on 10 January 2012.

Chapter 2 Participation

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Fifty-four thousand, nine-hundred and nine (54,909) responses were analysed and informed the original [Consultation Summary Report](#).

2.1.2 Of these, 22,818 were received via the online consultation website and 1,435 were received via an action group website set up to respond to the consultation questions.

2.1.3 Table 2.1 shows a count of the number of responses to each question. This table shows that not every respondent answered all seven questions.

Table 2.1. Count of responses to each question analysed to inform the original Consultation Summary Report

Question	Count
Question 1: The strategy and wider context	38,442
Question 2: The case for high speed rail	37,886
Question 3: Delivery of the Government's proposed network	37,422
Question 4: Specification for the line between London and the West Midlands	37,081
Question 5: The Government's proposed route for HS2	36,994
Question 6: Appraisal of Sustainability	35,606
Question 7: Blight and compensation	35,790
Responses that did not directly respond to the question structure or added additional information	18,195

2.2 Breakdown of unanalysed responses

2.2.1 For 722 people, responses to one or more of the seven questions were not analysed and included in the original summary report. Table 2.2 shows the number of responses not analysed per question and what proportion this represents of the total number of responses to that question. For example, for question one, 38,442 responses were analysed for the original summary report. 129 responses were inadvertently not analysed. This represents 0.34% of the total number of responses analysed for that question in the initial Consultation Summary Report.

Table 2.2 Breakdown of the 722 unanalysed responses

Question	Total number of responses	Number of unanalysed question responses	Proportion of total responses
Q1	38,442	129	0.34%
Q2	37,886	160	0.42%
Q3	37,422	118	0.32%
Q4	37,081	116	0.31%
Q5	36,994	157	0.42%
Q6	35,606	186	0.52%
Q7	35,790	184	0.51%
Total	259,221	1050	0.41%

2.2.2 Table 2.3 shows the number of question responses not analysed, per respondent. For example, for 520 participants only one question was not analysed. Throughout the consultation, not every respondent provided comments in response to all seven consultation questions. This pattern was also evident in the unanalysed responses. For 20 respondents, their full response was not analysed.

Table 2.3 Number of question responses not analysed, per respondent

Number of participants	Number of question responses not analysed	(Number of participants) x (number of question responses)
520	1	520
130	2	260
44	3	132
14	4	56
7	5	35
2	6	12
5	7	35

2.3 Response sectors

2.3.1 For the purposes of reporting, the 722 respondents were classified by sector. This breakdown of sectors is given in Table 2.4 below. In line with the approach taken in the Consultation Summary Report, we have counted any organisation only once in the sector breakdown below, even when more than one response was received from any organisation (for this reason the table does not add up to 722). A list of organisations within these sectors is included in Appendix 1.¹

Table 2.4 Breakdown of the affected respondents, by sector

Sector	Count
Member of the public	666
Academic Includes universities and other academic institutions	1
Action group Includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals	1
Business – local or regional	9
Business – national or international	0
Elected representatives Includes MPs, MEPs, and local councillors	1
Environment, heritage, amenity or community group Includes environmental groups, schools, church groups, residents' associations, recreation groups, rail user groups and other community interest organisations	12
Local government Includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships	12
Other representative group Includes chambers of commerce, trade unions, political parties and professional bodies	4
Statutory agency	0
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation Includes transport bodies, transport providers, infrastructure providers and utility companies	4

¹ This list in Appendix 1 does not include members of the public, local or regional businesses, or any individuals or organisations who have requested confidentiality.

Chapter 3 Methodology

3.1 Supplementary analysis

- 3.1.1 The question responses that were not transferred into our analysis database have been analysed by DbyD consistently with the protocols described in the previous Consultation Summary Report (see Chapter 3). If there was any doubt as to whether part or all of a response had previously been received, this was still included in this analysis to ensure that any issues raised could be taken into consideration.
- 3.1.2 All responses were entered into a DbyD analysis database and their content coded using the same coding framework as in the initial analysis. The analysis team was briefed to pay particular attention to any responses, or parts of responses which could not be adequately covered within the existing coding framework. Any such issues were reviewed by the senior analysis team.
- 3.1.3 When an unanalysed response referred to another question (e.g. 'See my response to Question xx), the response referred to was also viewed to ensure no relevant data was omitted from the analysis.
- 3.1.4 In addition to this process of coding responses, an in-depth review was undertaken by our senior analysis team. The team compared the content of the unanalysed responses with the Summary Report to ensure that issues had been adequately addressed.

Chapter 4 Results and Conclusions

4.1 Results

- 4.1.1 The full results of the analysis can be seen in Appendix 2 to this addendum report.
- 4.1.2 All the issues in the additional responses were able to be coded using the existing coding framework, with the exception of 12 new location codes. These are used to indicate where responses mentioned specific roads, villages or areas. The references to these locations in these additional responses are at a greater level of detail than included in the main body of the previous DbyD Consultation Summary Report, but as with other location references, HS2 Ltd is sharing this information with its design teams. This is consistent with the previous approach to locations, which was to individually code all location references, even where they were not referred to in the main body of the report. Around half of the 2000 codes in the framework refer to specific locations.
- 4.1.3 The new codes are:
- Aylesbury Station
 - Barton Hartshorne
 - Bingley
 - Bourne Brook Valley
 - Essex
 - Fellows Road
 - Friargate, Coventry
 - Ickenham Marshes
 - Park Hall Secondary School
 - Silverdale
 - Suffolk
 - Wardington
- 4.1.4 These new codes also appear in Appendix 2.

4.2 Conclusions

- 4.2.1 Following the analysis of the responses to the questions inadvertently not imported from the 722 responses, DbyD is of the opinion that they do not provide any information that was not already included in the previous Consultation Summary Report or would have made a difference to the substantive content or balance of that report, had they been analysed at the same time as the other 54,909 responses.

4.2.2 In addition to considering the responses to the questions inadvertently not imported from the 722 responses in isolation, we have also considered whether the combined analysis of these responses and those reported on in Addendum 1 would have altered the balance of findings in the original Consultation Summary Report. DbyD is of the opinion that in combination, Addendum reports 1 and 2 do not provide any information that was not already included in the previous Consultation Summary Report or would have made a difference to the substantive content or balance of that report, had they been analysed at the same time as the other 54,909 responses.

Appendices

As with our previous reports, this addendum includes appendices detailing the organisations and elected representatives whose responses are included, and tables showing the numbers of responses to which each code in the analysis framework was applied. These tables are identical in structure to those presented in the initial summary report, with the exception that where previously identified codes were not used they have not been included in the tables.

Appendix 1 List of organisations and elected representatives included in this report

1. Table A1.2 lists the names of organisations and elected representatives whose responses to the high speed rail consultation are included in this analysis. They are listed by sector, and alphabetically within each sector. Organisations that were classified as local or regional businesses have been excluded as this sector includes small businesses and responses that could be reducible to individuals.² Also, organisations and elected representatives have not been listed if they indicated that their response should be treated as confidential. It cannot be fully assured that all organisations have been accurately categorised as they did not classify themselves. The sectors are listed below in Table A1.1, and the organisations on the following page.

Table A1.1 Respondent sectors

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

* names not included in the following table

² It was assessed on a respondent-by-respondent basis whether a business responding to the consultation was classified as 'national or international' or 'local or regional'.

Table A1.2 Organisations whose responses were missing (in part or in total), by sector

Academic
University of the West of England - Travel Time Use Research Team
Action group
Whittington and Lichfield District StopHS2 Action Group
Business – national or international
None
Elected representative
None
Environment, heritage amenity or community group
Aberdeen City and Shire Economic Future (ACSEF)
Amateur Entomologists' Society
Amersham Group
Amersham Museum
Amersham Road Cycling Club
Cathedral and Church Buildings Division of the Church of England
Countryside Alliance
Maria Fidelis Convent School
North Bucks Bat Group
The Ramblers Association - Rugby Group
The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
The Wildlife Trust for Herts and Middlesex

Local government
Aylesbury Town Council
Cheshire & Warrington Local Enterprise Partnership on behalf of Cheshire & Warrington region
Croughton Parish Council
Essex County Council
Halton Borough Council
Lancashire County Council
Norfolk County Council
North Tyneside Council
Oving Parish Council
Plymouth City Council
Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Other representative group
Business West
Society for Transport Integration (Warsaw, Poland)
South Ruislip and Manor Branch Labour Party
Uxbridge and S Ruislip Labour Party
Statutory agency
None
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation
Passenger Transport Executive Group
Railway Engineers Forum (REF)
Railway Industry Association
The Chiltern Railway Company Limited

Appendix 2 Codes by theme and by question

1. The initial analysis of consultation responses was carried out using a coding framework consisting of 22 themes containing a total of over 2,000 codes, of which around half referred to specific locations mentioned by respondents. The same themes and codes were applied when analysing these new responses, and 12 new location codes were added. The themes and codes used in coding the responses analysed in order to produce this report are listed below in Table A2.1 and Table A2.2 respectively.
2. On the next page, the analysis themes are listed, using the order in which the coding framework was structured. The remainder of this appendix consists of a table in which all the codes used are listed. The order of themes mirrors Table A2.1; within the themes the codes are listed alphabetically. Table A2.2 also provides an overview of the number of responses to which each code was applied for each consultation question.

Table A2.1 Coding framework themes

Themes
1. Level of agreement
2. Strategic case and economics
3. Social and economic
4. Safety, security and resilience
5. Environment
6. Noise and vibration
7. Sustainability appraisal and climate change
8. Principles and specification
9. Mitigation
10. Blight proposals
11. Proposed route and locations
12. Proposed link – Heathrow
13. Proposed link – HS1
14. Y network and extensions
15. Y network phasing
16. Engineering and construction
17. Strategic alternatives – Rail
18. Strategic alternatives – Non-rail
19. References
20. Consultation
21. Other comments
22. Locations

Table A2.2 Count of Responses per Code per Question

1. Level of agreement

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Agree with question proposition	7	12	9	3	2	~	3
Agree with question proposition and HS2	10	~	~	~	~	~	~
Agree with question proposition with caveats	8	7	6	4	1	~	1
Agree with question proposition, but not HS2	13	~	~	~	~	~	~
Disagree with question proposition	11	123	60	82	80	~	72
Disagree with question proposition and HS2	50	~	~	~	~	~	~
No comment on question	~	1	1	~	~	1	~
No comment on question - no personal impacts	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Unsure/undecided	~	~	~	1	~	~	~

2. Strategic case and economics

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Bus/need case - question/disagree	22	91	19	41	38	17	16
Bus/need case - question need for economic growth	2	~	~	1	~	~	~
Bus/need case - lack of vision/not ambitious enough	3	~	2	~	~	~	~
Bus/need case - need for further research	4	2	4	3	~	3	~
Bus/need case - support	6	4	2	~	1	~	1
Bus/need case - train travel is outdated	6	~	~	~	~	~	1
Bus/need case - uncertainty/long term projections	9	27	1	~	1	3	1
Bus/need case - white elephant/vanity project	18	12	3	5	3	4	4
Bus/need case - will not support economic growth	~	4	1	4	2	~	~
Bus/need case - will not support economic growth (enhanced capacity/performance and/or HS2)	35	~	~	~	~	~	~
Bus/need case - will support economic growth	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Bus/need case - will support economic growth (enhanced capacity/performance and/or HS2)	8	~	~	~	~	~	~
Capacity - query/disagree with capacity requirements	6	3	~	4	4	~	1
Capacity - freight capacity will improve (on existing lines)	4	~	1	~	~	~	~
Capacity - freight capacity will not improve (oppose HS2)	7	1	~	~	~	2	~
Capacity - freight other comments	5	5	3	~	~	1	~
Capacity - freight should utilise HS2	~	~	~	2	~	~	~
Capacity - HS2 train capacity concerns	~	2	7	~	~	~	~
Capacity - needs to be addressed	20	14	3	1	7	4	1
Capacity - other comments/suggestions	5	15	12	10	3	~	~
Capacity - will not release capacity/relieve pressure on existing lines	2	2	7	3	~	1	~
Capacity - will release capacity/relieve pressure on existing lines	5	3	1	~	1	~	~
Capacity - will relieve pressure on other infrastructure	~	1	1	~	~	~	~
Capacity - will relieve pressure on West Coast main line	3	1	~	~	3	~	~

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Competitiveness - Britain is behind other European countries	2	~	1	~	~	~	1
Competitiveness - other countries having HS rail does not mean UK has to	23	1	~	~	~	~	~
Competitiveness - will increase competitiveness/productivity	5	2	~	~	~	~	~
Competitiveness - will not increase competitiveness/productivity	2	1	~	7	1	3	~
Connectivity - connecting regional centres not required (oppose HS2)	2	~	~	~	~	~	~
Connectivity - connecting regional centres positive (support HS2)	5	1	~	~	1	~	~
Connectivity - need for link with Europe/international accessibility	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Cost - account for compensation	1	1	~	~	2	~	10
Cost - benefits will be greater than projected	1	2	~	~	~	~	~
Cost - budget will overrun/delays/major project problems	12	24	7	16	6	2	10
Cost - question/disagree cost/benefit figures/analysis	14	63	10	19	9	20	15
Cost - effective/value for money	1	2	1	~	~	~	~
Cost - effective/value for money in long-term	3	2	~	~	~	~	~
Cost - maintenance	1	2	~	~	~	~	~
Cost - must be on time/on budget	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Cost - project funding suggestions	~	3	3	~	4	~	1
Cost - relative to alternatives	32	21	~	9	15	9	2
Cost - return on investment	6	19	~	8	1	3	3
Cost - subsidies concerns (general/rail fares)	8	38	1	1	2	3	3
Cost - too expensive in context of cuts/spending review	24	25	7	2	4	4	8
Cost - too expensive/not cost effective/not value for money	31	66	28	11	34	31	21
Cost - value the environment/non financial aspects	3	6	~	3	25	9	5
Demand - question demand for inter-city rail travel	6	1	~	4	~	~	~
Demand - question/disagree passenger projections/demand	31	67	11	22	10	12	4
Demand - for rail is increasing generally	7	2	~	~	~	1	~
Demand - HS2 will improve business travel (support HS2)	2	~	~	~	~	~	~
Demand - IT makes business travel less necessary (oppose HS2)	28	31	2	4	1	5	2
Demand - other comments/suggestions	~	1	1	1	~	~	~
Demand - will increase/be higher than projected	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Frequency - query/not needed	1	2	~	~	~	~	~
Frequency - increased frequency positive	1	~	~	~	1	~	~
Frequency - not sufficient/need more than 14 trains per hour	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Job creation - question/disagree figures/HS2 will not create jobs	9	3	~	~	~	~	~
Job creation - HS2 will create jobs/access to jobs	2	~	~	1	~	~	~
Journey times - question/reject journey times/speeds	~	13	~	5	5	~	~

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Journey times - current times acceptable (oppose HS2)	14	5	5	~	3	~	~
Journey times - need to consider full journey/savings not relevant (oppose HS2)	20	26	2	8	6	1	1
Journey times - productive use of current train travel time (oppose HS2)	12	65	2	8	24	2	1
Journey times - question need for speed (oppose HS2)	24	13	4	5	15	8	5
Journey times - reduced times positive (support HS2)	8	6	2	~	~	~	~
Journey times - savings not substantial enough (oppose HS2)	19	19	6	19	8	4	1
Rail fares - currently too expensive (oppose HS2)	6	5	1	~	~	2	~
Rail fares - HS2 will only benefit wealthy passengers (oppose HS2)	7	26	~	~	1	5	1
Rail fares - need to be affordable (support HS2)	1	~	~	1	~	~	~
Rail fares - other comments/suggestions	3	9	2	2	~	~	~
Rail fares - will be too expensive for HS2	8	10	2	6	1	6	4
Reliability - more reliable service positive (support HS2)	2	3	~	~	~	~	~
Reliability - of existing services	9	5	~	~	~	~	~
Reliability - question reliability of HS2	2	16	~	2	~	~	~

3. Social and economic

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Concern - cumulative development/other infrastructure (i.e. impact of motorways plus HS2)	3	~	~	2	2	1	~
Concern - disruption (general)	2	3	~	5	1	~	~
Concern - future generations	4	1	~	2	4	3	3
Concern - impact on cultural heritage	~	3	~	3	17	25	3
Concern - impact on development land/planning designations (planning blight)	~	~	~	~	2	3	~
Concern - impact on local people/communities	6	4	2	25	40	93	8
Concern - impact on rural areas/communities	2	~	~	~	2	8	5
Concern - impact on towns/villages	2	2	2	3	12	18	5
Concern - impact on urban areas	~	~	~	4	1	2	~
Concern - impacted communities will not benefit	12	1	2	7	13	6	14
Concern - proximity to children/schools	~	~	~	4	14	~	2
Concern - proximity to people/communities	~	4	1	2	32	13	20
Concern - proximity to respondents home/property	2	~	~	2	9	1	9
Concern - recreation/local amenities	1	~	~	7	15	11	5
Equality - majority will benefit/national interest	~	~	~	~	~	1	2
Equality - majority will not benefit	33	20	~	5	4	6	4
Equality - other	~	~	~	~	2	1	5
Health - general	1	~	~	~	1	7	1
Health - impact of pollution	1	~	~	~	11	~	~
Health - stress/emotional impact	3	~	1	~	2	3	7
Local business - negative impact	2	3	3	4	25	10	3
Local business - positive impact	3	1	1	~	~	~	~

North-South divide - will exacerbate/too London-centric	40	35	7	1	1	~	~
North-South divide - will promote more equitable development	4	1	~	~	~	~	~
Operation - capacity at city centres/stations/surrounding areas	5	7	~	3	2	1	~
Operation - disrupting roads/splitting communities	~	~	~	4	3	9	4
Operation - speed/frequency/timing of services	~	1	~	1	~	~	~
Property - compensation	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
Property - demolition of properties	2	~	~	4	5	7	3
Property - foundations	~	~	~	~	3	1	4
Property - general blight	1	~	1	3	11	22	~
Property - other concerns/impacts	~	~	~	~	3	1	1
Property - values will decrease/property blight	5	3	~	1	6	2	4
Quality of life - will decrease	2	4	~	2	2	7	3
Quality of life - will increase	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Regional - link with London positive (for regional cities)	2	1	~	~	~	~	~
Regional - regional job creation question/disagree	9	2	~	~	~	33	~
Regional - regional job creation positive	2	~	~	~	~	~	~
Regional - regional jobs negative impact	~	~	~	1	~	1	~
Regional - supports devel - North of England	~	1	1	~	~	~	~
Regional - supports devel - West Midlands/Birmingham	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Regional - supports regeneration/development (general)	2	2	1	~	1	~	~
Regional - will not support development where train does not stop	6	12	~	1	1	3	1
Regional - will not support regeneration/development (general)	5	9	2	~	1	1	3
Regional - will relieve pressure on the south-east	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Regional equity - few places benefit	12	5	6	3	6	9	4
Tourism - negative impact	2	~	~	10	16	~	4
Tourism - will attract visitors/stimulate tourism	1	~	~	~	~	~	~

4. Safety, security and resilience

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Assessment - question/inadequate/more assessment or information needed	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Emergencies - access/impacts	~	~	~	1	2	2	1
General/other	~	4	1	1	~	2	~
Health and safety - general comments	~	1	~	1	1	~	~
Resilience - severe weather conditions	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Safety - concern about animals	~	~	~	~	2	1	~
Safety - concern about aviation	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Safety - concern about frequency of trains	~	~	~	9	~	~	~
Safety - concern about local people	~	1	~	~	~	1	1
Safety - concern about speed of trains	~	4	~	6	1	~	~
Safety - rail is safer	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Safety - relating to design/construction e.g. tracks, tunnels	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

Security - terrorism concerns	1	~	1	~	~	~	~
Security - vandalism concerns	~	1	~	1	~	1	~

5. Environment

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Assessment - EIA requirements/suggestions	~	1	~	~	1	4	~
Assessment - inadequate	1	2	~	6	21	87	1
Assessment - Need for EIA or SEA	~	~	1	4	12	63	1
Concern about future development	~	~	~	~	10	8	3
Concern about pollution (of HS2 or in general)	~	~	~	4	~	~	~
Concern about pollution generally	5	~	~	~	16	4	~
Designated area - Ancient Woodlands	1	~	~	9	18	16	1
Designated area - Archaeological sites	~	~	~	~	3	3	~
Designated area - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	3	4	4	48	62	32	8
Designated area - Conservation Areas (SAC)	~	~	~	1	2	~	1
Designated area - Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA)	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
Designated area - Green belt	~	~	~	4	23	22	1
Designated area - Heritage Site	~	~	~	1	2	~	~
Designated area - Listed buildings	1	~	2	3	23	4	1
Designated area - Local wildlife site	~	~	1	1	5	~	1
Designated area - National Park	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
Designated area - Nature Reserves	~	~	~	2	2	1	~
Designated area - Other	~	~	~	~	17	28	2
Designated area - Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM)	~	~	~	17	20	~	~
Designated area - Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	~	~	~	20	16	8	1
Designated area - Special Protection Areas (SPA)	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Environmental case - question/oppose	6	~	1	~	8	2	1
Environmental case - support	3	~	~	~	~	~	~
Generally negative to environment	16	29	2	7	58	78	7
Generally positive to environment	1	~	~	~	1	1	2
Geography - concern UK is a small country/no space	21	8	2	17	2	2	2
Geography - UK geography suited to HSR	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Natural - impact agricultural land/farming	2	4	1	3	31	24	8
Natural - impact air quality	~	~	~	~	2	1	1
Natural - impact biodiversity/wildlife	5	2	2	14	30	54	6
Natural - impact countryside/landscape	14	13	7	20	62	93	9
Natural - impact flooding/flood risk	~	~	~	~	1	8	~
Natural - impact on aquifer/water supply	~	~	~	4	13	27	~
Natural - impact on footpaths/rights of way	~	~	1	4	30	31	4
Natural - impact rivers/canals/lakes	1	~	~	5	14	9	1
Natural - impact soil	~	~	~	1	2	~	~
Visual - concern about light pollution	~	~	~	1	3	2	~
Visual - negative impact	~	~	~	8	47	33	2
Visual - positive impact	~	~	1	~	~	~	~

6. Noise and vibration

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Assessment - inadequate/further assessment/more information	~	~	~	3	22	66	~
Assessment - noise/decibel levels/measurement (figures)	~	~	~	~	5	50	3
Assessment - should be based on pass by/maximum noise not an average	~	~	~	~	5	46	~
Impact - aerodynamics	~	~	~	~	~	22	~
Impact - frequency/timing of services	~	1	~	3	9	7	7
Impact - general concern noise	2	1	1	19	83	123	18
Impact - noise impact on health	~	~	~	~	2	39	3
Impact - noise impact on wildlife	~	~	~	~	2	7	~
Impact - overhead cables	~	~	~	~	~	28	~
Impact - speed	~	~	~	7	2	29	2
Impact - vibration (general)	~	~	~	3	23	3	2
Impact - vibration/noise - tunnels	~	~	~	~	1	2	~
Impact enforcement	~	~	~	~	~	27	~
Noise is less than/comparable to e.g. motorways, flight paths	1	~	~	~	1	~	1
Noise is not a concern/is manageable	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Predictions - question noise predictions	~	~	~	2	3	66	~
Predictions - HS2 sound simulation (events)	~	~	~	2	1	5	~

7. Sustainability appraisal and climate change

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Appraisal - question/inadequate/flawed/more info	~	~	~	3	4	128	3
Appraisal - comment/suggestion	~	~	~	~	~	11	~
Appraisal - implementation	~	~	~	~	~	4	~
Appraisal - methodology	~	~	~	~	1	75	~
Appraisal - support/adequate	~	~	~	~	~	2	~
CO2 - question climate change happening/not man-made	2	~	~	~	~	1	~
CO2 - question measurement/figures	~	~	~	9	~	43	~
CO2 - consider total journey	1	1	~	1	~	5	~
CO2 - construction emissions (concern)	5	1	~	15	9	47	1
CO2 - HS2 will NOT/may not reduce emissions/will increase emissions	15	6	8	24	9	130	1
CO2 - HS2 will reduce emissions	2	2	2	~	~	~	~
CO2 - include other CO2 mitigation measures	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
CO2 - other comments	5	1	4	~	2	7	~
CO2 - total project impact (footprint)	2	~	~	~	1	10	~
Energy - general (rising costs etc)	9	3	1	1	~	5	~
Energy - HS2 energy consumption	9	7	~	22	12	71	~
Energy - HS2 fuel source/type	~	~	~	1	2	44	~
Energy - HS2 will reduce fossil fuel dependence	2	1	~	~	~	~	~
Energy - suggestion	1	~	~	~	~	6	~
Modal shift - aviation will not reduce	6	15	15	2	7	61	1
Modal shift - aviation will reduce	3	1	6	~	~	1	~
Modal shift - HS2 increases travel	2	10	~	~	1	17	~
Modal shift - LHR link will reduce aviation	~	~	~	~	6	~	~

Modal shift - LHR link wont reduce aviation usage	1	~	4	~	9	2	~
Modal shift - other comment	~	8	2	2	~	1	~
Modal shift - road usage will not reduce	6	10	2	1	9	13	1
Modal shift - road usage will reduce	~	1	1	~	~	1	~
Modal shift - suggestion	3	~	~	1	~	~	~
Modal shift - will encourage modal shift	1	1	2	1	~	~	~
Modal shift - will not/may not happen	1	9	2	~	10	7	1
Sustainability - question concept/importance	2	~	~	~	~	1	~
Sustainability - general/other	1	2	~	~	~	4	~
Sustainability - HS2 inappropriate for agenda/targets	9	~	~	5	12	26	3
Sustainability - HS2 must achieve agenda/targets	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Sustainability - is sustainable/benefits outweigh costs	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Sustainability - most sustainable option/route	~	~	~	~	~	3	~
Sustainability - not most sustainable option	11	~	~	1	7	58	~
Sustainability - not sustainable/costs outweigh benefits	1	~	~	~	~	54	~
Sustainability - of rail travel (support)	6	1	~	1	1	5	~
Sustainability - rail/high speed rail (question/oppose)	~	~	~	~	~	38	~
Sustainability - support four principles	~	~	~	~	~	3	~
Sustainability - support generally	2	~	~	~	~	2	~
Sustainability - won't achieve sust consum & prod'n	~	~	~	~	~	14	~
Sustainability - won't create sustainable communities	~	~	~	~	~	18	~
Sustainability - won't enhance natural & cultural environment	~	~	~	~	~	32	~

8. Principles and specification

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
(1) Capacity - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
(1) Speed - concerns/object	2	2	~	52	14	5	~
(1) Speed - comments/suggestions	3	1	~	31	12	~	1
(1) Speed - increases noise	2	~	~	15	1	~	~
(1) Speed - performance not speed	~	2	~	2	~	~	~
(1) Speed - support	~	2	~	6	~	1	1
(2) Capacity - concerns/object	~	3	~	33	~	~	~
(2) Capacity - comments/suggestions	~	1	~	6	~	~	~
(2) Capacity - support	~	~	~	3	~	~	~
(3) Environment - question/not meeting principle/concerns about impacts	~	~	~	74	1	~	~
(3) Environment - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	12	~	~	~
(4) Controlling cost -concerns/object	~	~	~	27	~	~	~
Agree with principles/specification	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Agree with principles/specification with caveats	~	~	~	3	~	~	~
Disagree with principles/specification	~	~	~	31	5	~	~
General - concerns about feasibility of service	6	19	18	23	~	1	~
General - missing principle - social impacts	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
General - not enough information	~	~	~	1	~	~	~

General - not meeting/wont meet own principle(s)	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
General - suggestions/comments	~	~	~	2	~	1	~
General - too few options considered/remit too limited	~	1	~	5	~	~	~
General - trade off/too much focus on	~	~	~	28	~	~	~
Principles - high speed trains only	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Principles - integration with classic network	~	4	~	10	3	~	~
Principles - integration with other transport networks	~	~	~	3	1	~	~
Principles - long distance, city to city - query/object	~	5	~	11	1	~	~
Principles - long distance, city to city - support	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Principles - segregation from classic network over time	1	~	~	3	~	~	~
Specification - EU Directive Interoperability/broad gauge	~	1	~	1	~	~	~
Specification - HS2 trains on existing lines	~	~	~	1	~	~	~

9. Mitigation

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Acknowledge impacts/concerns (support HS2)	~	~	~	~	2	1	~
Construction mitigation - inadequate	~	~	~	~	18	23	~
Construction mitigation - suggestion	~	~	~	~	5	~	~
Environmental mitigation - inadequate	~	~	~	12	18	10	2
Environmental mitigation - not detailed enough/more information	~	~	~	~	3	~	~
Environmental mitigation - suggestion	~	~	~	~	9	3	~
Environmental mitigation - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Mit measures - (Q5) inadequate/disagree	~	~	~	~	62	~	~
Mit measures - (Q5) support/agree	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Mit measures - (Q5) support/agree with caveats	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
Mit measures - are excessive/too much focus on mitigation	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Mit measures - assessment of HS2 inadequate	~	~	~	~	27	43	1
Mit measures - inadequate	~	~	~	1	~	27	9
Mit measures - concern about cost	~	2	1	3	2	~	~
Mit measures - concern passenger experience/concern will be reduced	1	~	~	2	~	~	~
Mit measures - equity views	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
Mit measures - implementation/concern will not happen	~	~	~	1	10	32	1
Mit measures - mitigation not needed/oppose HS2	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Mit measures - no amount adequate	~	~	~	~	18	11	1
Mit measures - not detailed enough/more information	~	~	~	~	13	24	~
Mit measures - suggestions/comments	1	~	1	2	23	12	2
Mit measures - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Mit measures - visual impact of mit measures (concern)	~	~	~	~	15	~	~
Noise mitigation - inadequate	~	~	1	1	46	64	2
Noise mitigation - not detailed enough/more information	~	~	~	~	7	~	~

Noise mitigation - suggestion	~	~	~	1	18	1	~
Noise mitigation - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Noise mitigation - visual impact of mit measures (concern)	~	~	~	~	4	32	~
Social mitigation - inadequate	~	~	~	~	21	~	~
Social mitigation - suggestion	~	~	~	~	2	~	4
Visual mitigation -inadequate	~	~	~	2	7	1	1
Visual mitigation - suggestion	~	~	~	~	13	~	1

10. Blight Proposals

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
How much - full property value	~	~	~	~	~	~	69
How much - not enough	~	~	~	~	5	~	14
How much - property value plus extras	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
How much - should not be too generous	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
How much - valuation mechanism/level	~	~	~	~	1	~	56
Impact - community	~	~	~	~	~	1	25
Impact - construction	~	~	~	~	1	~	75
Impact - countryside/amenity/visual impact	1	~	~	~	1	~	41
Impact - disruption/annoyance	~	~	~	~	~	~	19
Impact - dust/pollution	~	~	~	~	~	~	20
Impact - generalised blight	~	~	7	1	2	3	8
Impact - impacts overstated/estimated	~	~	~	~	~	1	3
Impact - impacts understated/estimated	~	~	~	~	~	~	33
Impact - livelihood/business	~	~	~	~	~	1	21
Impact - lives/quality of life	~	~	~	1	~	~	23
Impact - loss of home/garden	~	~	~	~	~	~	22
Impact - mortgages	~	~	~	~	~	~	10
Impact - noise/vibration	~	~	~	~	2	1	60
Impact - not just property value	~	~	~	~	~	~	20
Impact - other	~	~	1	~	~	~	5
Impact - property values	~	~	~	~	3	1	144
Impact - retirement/equity in home	~	~	~	~	~	1	14
Impact - traffic/ travel disruption	~	~	~	~	~	~	15
Impact - uncertainty/anxiety	~	~	~	~	~	~	10
Principle - ability to move house	~	~	~	~	2	~	98
Principle - any blight unacceptable	~	~	~	~	~	~	11
Principle - assisting those whose properties lose significant value	~	~	~	~	~	~	59
Principle - case by case basis	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
Principle - fairness / transparency	~	~	~	~	~	1	96
Principle - functioning of property market	~	~	~	~	1	~	82
Principle - Gov owning large numbers of properties	~	~	~	~	~	~	46
Principle - mitigate first	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Principle - no amount would be adequate	1	~	~	~	1	1	8
Principle - of compensation - agree	~	~	~	~	~	~	15
Principle - of compensation - disagree	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Principle - polluter/govt pays	~	~	~	~	~	~	23
Principle - reassuring now fair compensation will be paid	~	~	~	~	~	~	66
Principle - stay in homes and communities	~	~	~	~	~	~	59

Scheme - acceptable	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Scheme - comments/ideas/suggestions	2	~	~	~	~	~	35
Scheme - cost of compensation	~	~	~	3	~	~	9
Scheme - examples of compensation schemes	~	~	~	~	~	~	38
Scheme - implementation concerns	~	~	~	~	2	~	53
Scheme - legal issues	~	~	~	~	1	1	7
Scheme - motives/perceptions of compensation	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Scheme - not acceptable	~	~	~	1	~	~	69
Scheme - not detailed/clear enough	~	~	~	~	1	~	75
Scheme - not fair	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Scheme - too restrictive/inflexible	~	~	~	~	~	~	55
What - Bond Based Scheme - Question/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
What - Bond Based Scheme - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	5
What - Bond Based Scheme - support with caveats	~	~	~	~	~	~	77
What - Compensation Bond Scheme - Question/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	21
What - Compensation Bond Scheme - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
What - Current EHS Scheme - question/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	19
What - Current EHS Scheme - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
What - Hardship-based property purchase scheme - question/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	26
What - Hardship-based property purchase scheme - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
What - not just statutory	~	~	~	~	~	~	25
What - safeguarding land	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
What - statutory blight	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
What - statutory blight/compulsory purchase	~	1	~	~	~	~	8
What - statutory compensation	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
What - statutory provisions - acceptable	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
When - announce scheme now/soon	~	1	~	~	~	~	63
When - blight happening now/pre construction	~	~	~	~	~	4	70
When - compensation too slow	~	~	~	~	~	~	49
When - proposals too slow	~	~	~	~	~	~	9
When - schemes too short/blight ongoing	~	~	~	~	~	~	7
Where - does not extend far enough (from route)/suggest proximity	~	~	~	~	1	~	21
Where - property above tunnel	~	~	~	~	~	~	5
Where - proximity to line	~	~	~	~	~	~	13
Who - all property owners	~	~	~	~	~	1	60
Who - everyone/not just worst affected should be fully compensated	~	~	~	~	~	~	13
Who - non home owners/ tenants/shared ownership	~	~	~	~	2	~	5
Who - only worst/directly affected	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Who - phase 2/differences	~	~	~	~	~	~	5

11. Proposed route and locations

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Birmingham Airport interchange - concerns	~	~	1	1	2	~	~
Birmingham Airport interchange - suggest/comment	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
Birmingham CC Station - concerns	1	1	1	1	3	1	2

Birmingham CC Station - suggest/comment	~	~	1	4	~	1	~
Birmingham CC Station - support	~	~	~	2	2	~	~
Birmingham CC station - too remote/not central enough	2	7	1	2	5	~	~
Birmingham interchanges - suggest/comment	~	1	~	~	4	~	~
Infrastructure maintenance depot	~	~	~	1	~	1	1
Interchanges/spurs - query/object	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Interchanges/spurs - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
London station - Euston - concerns	1	6	4	3	24	3	2
London station - Euston - suggest/comment	1	~	1	1	4	~	~
London station - Euston - support	~	~	~	~	4	~	~
London station - other suggestions/comments	1	3	1	2	11	~	~
London station - suggest Paddington	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
London station - suggest St Pancras	1	~	~	~	3	1	~
Old Oak Common interchange - concerns	~	3	3	2	2	~	~
Old Oak Common interchange - suggest/comment	~	1	1	~	5	~	~
Old Oak Common interchange - support	~	~	5	~	2	~	~
Proposed route - agree with caveat	~	1	~	~	2	~	~
Proposed route - agree/support	~	~	~	~	4	~	1
Proposed route - disagree (Q5)	~	~	~	~	71	~	~
Proposed route - disagree/query	1	2	~	~	~	19	2
Route - amendments to route - question/object	~	~	~	~	1	~	1
Route - amendments to route - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	1	~	1	~
Route - away from populated areas	~	~	~	~	9	~	1
Route - equity views	~	8	~	1	4	~	1
Route - follow existing - oppose/concerns	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Route - follow existing rail corridors	~	2	1	1	1	~	~
Route - follow existing transport corridors	1	3	5	25	7	~	~
Route - follow existing/does not	1	~	~	27	27	4	~
Route - follow Great Central Railway (GCR) route	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Route - follow motorways	3	3	2	1	4	~	~
Route - most direct/straight - oppose	~	2	~	20	3	~	~
Route - most direct/straight - support	~	1	1	~	3	~	~
Route - prefer alternative HS2 route proposals (1.5, 2.5, 4)	~	1	~	~	2	~	~
Route - prefer alternative route/network configuration	3	1	1	~	7	~	~
Route - will become bottleneck	~	4	~	~	~	~	~
Selection process - agree/support	~	~	~	~	3	~	~
Selection process - comments/suggestions	1	1	1	~	10	6	3
Selection process - disagree/question	~	~	1	~	46	12	3
Selection process - too few route options/need more information/assessment	2	~	4	~	10	2	~
Selection process - too much focus on speed/cost	2	1	1	~	36	1	~
Specific section - question/object	~	1	~	14	44	10	3
Specific section - comment/suggestion	~	3	1	~	15	7	1

12. Proposed link - Heathrow

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Agree with LHR link/spur	~	2	15	~	~	~	~
Agree with LHR link/spur (oppose HS2)	~	~	4	~	8	~	~
Agree with LHR link/spur with caveats	~	~	8	~	1	~	~
Disagree with LHR link/spur	2	~	37	1	~	1	1
Disagree with LHR link/spur (support HS2)	~	~	1	~	~	1	~
Disagree with LHR spur/prefer through route (support HS2)	~	~	1	~	1	~	~
LHR capacity/location/third runway concerns	~	1	9	1	2	2	~
LHR spur - causing delays/longer journey times	~	~	2	~	1	~	~
LHR spur - need more info/assessment inadequate	2	~	10	~	~	~	~
LHR spur - suggest/comment	~	5	17	~	1	~	~
Oppose - airports in the North/regions/LHR link not needed	~	~	12	~	~	~	1
Oppose - question/oppose passenger projections/inadequate demand	1	~	23	1	~	~	~
Oppose - existing LHR connections adequate	~	~	10	~	2	~	~
Oppose - if Thames Estuary Airport is developed LHR link not required	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Oppose - improve (existing) LHR connections	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Oppose - LHR spur too expensive/concern about cost/question/oppose economic case	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Oppose - other reasons for opposing LHR link/spur	~	~	21	~	1	1	~
Prefer LHR interchange at Old Oak Common	~	~	5	~	1	~	~
Prefer LHR link in Phase 1/soon	~	1	6	~	~	~	~
Prefer LHR link in Phase 2/support for phasing	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Prefer LHR through route/direct not spur	~	2	6	~	1	~	~
Prefer LHR with alternative alignment	~	1	2	~	~	~	~
Prefer LHR with loop provision	1	~	3	~	~	~	~
Support - improves access to LHR/improves access from North	~	~	6	~	~	~	~
Support - other reasons for supporting LHR link/spur	~	~	4	~	~	~	~

13. Proposed link - HS1

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Agree with HS1 link	~	3	28	~	~	~	~
Agree with HS1 link (oppose HS2)	~	~	6	~	~	~	1
Agree with HS1 link with caveats	~	~	13	~	2	~	~
Cite HS1 as disappointment	13	47	6	7	12	5	2
Cite HS1 as success	1	2	~	~	1	~	1
Disagree with HS1 link	~	~	24	~	~	~	~
Disagree with HS1 link (support HS2)	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
General comments HS1/Channel Tunnel	4	6	3	2	2	~	1
Link - border control issues/customs facilities	1	~	6	~	1	~	~
Link - comments/suggestions	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Link - double track preferable to single track	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Link - improve HS1/HS2 link plans	1	3	9	~	5	~	~
Link - need more info/assessment inadequate	~	~	8	~	~	~	~
Link - pedestrian links (Euston to St Pancras)	~	~	4	~	~	~	~

Link - prefer link in phase 1/soon	~	1	2	~	1	~	~
Link - prefer St Pancras/direct connection	~	2	4	~	1	1	~
Link - suggestions/comments	~	1	11	~	2	~	~
Oppose - existing HS1 connections adequate	~	~	3	~	~	~	~
Oppose - feasibility of proposed link	~	~	11	~	2	~	~
Oppose - HS1 link too expensive/cost concern/question economic case	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Oppose - impact of proposed link on existing services	~	~	9	~	~	~	~
Oppose - improve (existing) HS1 connections	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Oppose - journey time to Europe too long	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Oppose - other reasons for opposing HS1 link	~	~	6	~	1	~	~
Oppose - question passenger projections/inadequate demand	~	~	20	~	~	~	~
Support - other reasons for supporting HS1 link	~	1	2	~	~	~	~
Support - through trains from North to Europe	1	2	6	~	~	1	~
Support - through trains to Europe	~	~	8	~	1	~	~

14. Y network and extensions

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Extent - links/plans - question/inadequate	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Extent - network needs to extend further - does not go far enough	1	2	~	~	~	~	~
Extent - propose alternative network configuration	~	8	3	3	1	~	~
Extent - support links/connections	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Extent - support stage 1/London to Birmingham	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Extent - support Y network/stage 2	2	1	2	~	~	~	~
Integrate with Birmingham Airport	~	1	1	~	~	~	~
Integrate with existing rail services	~	9	6	~	4	~	1
Integrate with Manchester Airport	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Integrate with other airports	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Integrate with ports	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Integrate with transport hubs/networks	~	3	2	~	1	~	~
Link with Crossrail support	~	~	~	~	3	~	~
Link with/stop at [location named]	2	3	1	1	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Aylesbury	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Link with/stop at Bicester	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Birmingham	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Brackley	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Bristol	1	3	~	~	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Cardiff	1	2	~	~	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Coventry	~	~	~	2	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Edinburgh	1	2	~	~	1	~	~
Link with/stop at Glasgow	1	3	~	~	1	~	~
Link with/stop at Leeds	1	1	~	1	1	~	~
Link with/stop at Leicester	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Liverpool	1	1	~	~	1	~	~
Link with/stop at Manchester	1	1	~	1	1	~	~
Link with/stop at Milton Keynes	4	~	1	8	5	~	~
Link with/stop at Newcastle	1	2	~	~	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Nottingham	2	~	~	~	~	~	~

Link with/stop at Sheffield	1	1	~	~	~	~	~
Need for parkway station(s) on route	1	1	~	~	1	~	~
Need for parkway stations - concerns/oppose	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Need for speed along HS2 route (i.e. don't stop too often)	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Need less stops on HS2 route	~	1	2	~	~	~	~
Need more stops along HS2 route/too few stops	10	9	1	6	3	7	3
Need to connect cities in the North	1	1	~	~	1	~	~
Need to connect with city centres/doesn't currently	1	2	~	~	~	~	~
Need to connect with other locations	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Need to consider East-West travel	6	4	1	2	~	~	~
Need to reach East	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Need to reach East Midlands	2	1	~	1	~	~	~
Need to reach North	~	4	~	~	~	~	~
Need to reach North-East	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Need to reach North-West	~	2	1	~	~	~	~
Need to reach Scotland	~	4	3	1	1	~	~
Need to reach South-East	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Need to reach South-West	~	4	~	~	1	~	~
Need to reach Wales	~	4	~	~	2	~	~
Phase 2 - specific comments/suggestions	1	2	8	~	2	~	~

15. Y network phasing

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Agree with phased roll-out	~	~	15	~	~	~	~
Agree with phased roll out-with caveats	~	~	11	~	~	~	~
Disagree with phased roll-out	~	~	14	~	~	~	1
Disagree with phased roll-out (support HS2)	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Management - ownership/management/planning of scheme	1	~	~	1	~	1	~
Phasing - build full network immediately	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Phasing - concern (other concerns)	~	~	14	~	~	~	~
Phasing - concern about completion	2	2	17	~	1	1	1
Phasing - concern about cost/funding	~	~	3	1	~	~	~
Phasing - concern about disruption	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Phasing - concern about existing capacity issues	~	~	3	~	~	~	~
Phasing - concern about timescale	~	1	12	~	~	~	1
Phasing - concern about transparency	~	~	3	~	~	~	~
Phasing - concerns/comments Hybrid bill	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Phasing - need plan/powers for Phase 2 now	1	~	4	~	~	~	~
Phasing - suggestions	~	1	9	~	~	~	1
Phasing - support (other reasons)	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Phasing - support as learn from Phase 1	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Phasing - support as operational benefits	~	~	4	~	~	~	~
Phasing - support but as quickly as possible	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Phasing - support for financial reasons	~	~	6	~	~	~	~
Start phased roll-out in North	~	2	5	~	~	~	~
Start phased roll-out in Scotland	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Timing - build network quicker	1	1	6	~	~	~	~
Timing - overall timescale very long	14	13	4	~	1	9	29

Timing - will take longer to complete	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
---------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

16. Engineering and construction

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Associated infrastructure (power, telecoms)	~	~	~	~	7	9	1
Bridges - concern about impacts	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
Bunds - concerns	~	~	~	~	3	~	~
Const impacts - disruption to roads/traffic/accessibility	3	2	2	4	12	31	5
Const impacts - dust and dirt	1	~	~	3	15	28	~
Const impacts - environmental damage	2	~	2	2	5	38	1
Const impacts - general/other	~	~	4	2	21	36	6
Const impacts - health and safety/risks	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Const impacts - local business/communities	~	1	~	~	18	37	~
Const impacts - noise	3	~	~	4	4	39	1
Const impacts - spoil/movement of earth/waste	2	~	~	2	7	13	1
Const impacts - to existing rail services	~	~	3	~	4	~	~
Construction - code of practice/standards	~	~	~	~	2	~	1
Construction - engineering/geology - concern	~	~	~	~	9	2	~
Construction - facilities/accommodation for/impact of builders	~	~	~	~	1	2	~
Construction - timetable/duration	1	1	~	1	5	25	16
Construction - work hours	~	~	~	~	1	24	~
Construction - worksites	~	~	~	~	~	23	~
Contracts - tender process/other comments	~	~	1	1	~	~	~
Contracts - use of foreign labour/contractors/suppliers	3	2	~	2	~	3	1
Contracts - use of local/UK labour/contractors/suppliers	2	3	~	~	~	~	~
Contracts - who benefits/transparency	1	4	~	3	~	1	2
Cuttings - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	1	5	~	~
Cuttings - concern about impact	~	~	~	1	6	11	~
Cuttings - support use	~	~	~	~	4	1	2
Design - comments/suggestions (general)	3	1	1	2	6	1	~
Design - support good/appropriate design	~	~	~	2	3	~	1
General - disruption	~	9	~	~	1	~	~
Green tunnels/cut cover - concern about impact	~	~	~	~	3	2	~
Green tunnels/cut cover - support use	~	~	~	~	4	~	2
Green tunnels/cut cover - use in specific area/stretch of route	~	~	~	1	3	~	~
Height of line - concern	~	~	~	3	18	10	1
HS2 - future proofing (capacity, speed, technology)	~	4	~	2	1	~	~
HS2 - width of rail roadway/track requirements	~	1	~	5	1	3	~
HS2 train - length/size of the train	~	~	~	5	~	~	~
HS2 train - on board design/facilities	1	~	~	1	~	~	~
HS2 train - possible need for higher speeds	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
HS2 train - technology will be out of date	1	~	~	1	~	~	~
HS2 train - type of train/alternative technology	~	1	~	13	19	~	1
Landscaping - concern	~	~	~	~	2	6	~
Maintenance/resilience - comments/concerns (other than cost)	~	~	~	8	~	~	~
Tunnels - concern about impacts	~	~	~	1	5	9	1

Tunnels - concerns about cost	1	~	~	5	6	1	~
Tunnels - equity views	~	~	~	~	8	~	1
Tunnels - impact on natural environment	~	~	~	~	10	10	~
Tunnels - impact on properties	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Tunnels - support greater use/not used enough	~	~	1	2	11	1	1
Tunnels - support use	~	~	~	~	10	1	1
Tunnels - use in AONB/environmentally sensitive areas	~	~	~	10	18	2	~
Tunnels - use in built up areas	~	~	~	1	1	1	1
Tunnels - use in specific area/stretch of route	~	~	~	~	37	1	1
Vent shafts - concerns	~	~	~	~	4	2	~
Viaducts - concerns	~	~	~	6	12	11	4
Viaducts - support	~	~	~	1	1	~	~

17. Strategic alternatives - Rail

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Existing network is effective	27	10	11	2	12	2	1
Existing network is not effective (oppose HS2)	3	4	1	~	1	1	~
Existing network is not effective (support HS2)	1	1	~	~	~	~	1
Existing network should not be upgraded/minimise disruption (support HS2)	4	2	~	~	~	~	~
Impact of HS2 on existing rail services	13	31	3	5	12	3	3
Impact of HS2 on funding other rail/transport projects (concern)	8	11	6	~	1	1	1
Improve existing - in phases	8	16	1	~	~	~	~
Improve existing - less first class carriages	5	8	~	~	~	~	2
Improve existing - longer platforms/trains	11	22	~	1	~	1	1
Improve existing - signalling	5	3	~	~	1	~	~
Improve existing - specific improvements - suggestions	11	36	7	8	~	5	3
Improve existing - ticket pricing/fares	4	1	1	~	~	1	~
Improve existing - upgrades in progress/past improvements	16	6	~	1	1	1	~
Improve existing lines - electrification	2	4	2	~	~	2	~
Improve existing lines as well (support HS2)	6	1	3	~	1	~	1
Improve/invest in local/commuter/intra-city rail lines	15	20	3	2	~	2	~
Improve/utilise existing network instead (oppose HS2)	39	67	17	19	27	21	5
Other comments on existing rail services	5	13	1	3	2	~	1
Prefer alternative train technology/design (alternative rail system to HS2)	1	1	~	1	~	~	~
Prefer new conventional speed rail lines	1	~	1	~	~	~	~
Prefer Rail Package 2 (oppose HS2)	13	28	6	2	10	~	1
Prefer Rail Package 2 plus (oppose HS2)	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Reopen old lines instead	2	3	1	~	~	3	~

18. Strategic alternatives - non-rail

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Air - air travel is preferable	1	~	~	~	2	2	~
Air - concerns/comments about aviation	1	3	2	~	1	3	~

Air - Impact of HS2 on air travel (concern)	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Air - improve aviation	1	~	1	~	~	~	~
Air - regional airports - LHR link will damage	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Air - regional airports - support	~	~	5	~	~	~	~
Air - suggestions	1	1	5	~	~	~	~
Alternative - HS2 is preferable to alternatives	4	5	~	~	~	~	~
Alternative - invest in North/regions (oppose HS2)	8	2	1	~	~	3	~
Alternative - other spending priorities	11	4	1	4	2	3	~
Alternative - strategy/approach	8	1	1	1	2	2	4
Alternative - support living/working locally	7	~	~	~	~	10	~
Alternative - support reduction in travel	16	3	1	~	~	7	1
Alternative - utilise/develop IT instead (oppose HS2)	27	10	2	1	1	2	~
Alternatives - not properly considered/more information needed/better options (rail/nonrail)	6	38	4	16	8	8	1
Bus - improve the bus network	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
General - existing transport infrastructure is adequate (oppose HS2)	1	1	10	~	1	~	1
General - impact of HS2 on transport network	2	~	~	~	3	1	1
General - improve local transport services	6	3	1	~	~	1	~
General - improve the transport network generally	4	4	5	~	1	5	2
General - need for integrated transport strategy	6	6	6	2	3	1	2
General - transport infrastructure problems	2	2	~	~	~	~	~
Roads - concerns about roads	8	1	1	~	~	1	~
Roads - driving is preferable	4	~	~	~	2	5	1
Roads - electric vehicles/green technology	2	~	~	~	~	39	~
Roads - Impact of HS2 on roads	5	~	~	~	~	2	~
Roads - improve the road network	5	2	~	~	~	2	~
Roads - suggestions	1	~	1	~	~	2	~

19. References

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Comments on transport policy	3	~	~	~	3	~	~
Government publications/white papers	2	1	~	~	1	3	12
HS2 reports/technical studies	1	2	~	1	6	9	3
Other information (e.g. non HS2 reports/studies/articles)	7	16	1	4	12	29	21
Other studies - Arup plans/studies	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Other studies - Atkins study	2	2	~	1	~	~	~
Other studies - Eddington Transport study	3	3	~	~	~	~	~
Other studies - Imperial College report	2	1	1	~	~	~	~
Other studies - Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA)	~	3	~	~	1	~	~
Other studies - Mawhinney Review	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Other studies - McNulty review	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Other websites (not HS2)	4	~	~	1	1	2	1
Refer to 51m response	~	1	~	1	~	~	~
Refer to Aarhus Convention	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Refer to Arup plans/studies	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
Refer to attachment	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Refer to Command Paper	~	~	~	~	~	1	~

Refer to DfT	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Refer to Dr. Beeching / Beeching report	5	2	~	1	~	~	1
Refer to Evergreen III / Airtrack	1	3	~	1	2	~	~
Refer to House of Commons Transport Committee	1	1	~	~	8	1	~
Refer to influential lobbies/interests	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Refer to level of public/local opinion (oppose HS2)	4	9	~	~	14	11	11
Refer to NIMBY debate	4	~	~	2	6	~	10
Refer to objectors (support HS2)	3	2	~	~	4	2	5
Refer to other country examples	23	17	~	14	10	9	11
Refer to other organisations submission	~	~	~	1	2	~	~
Refer to other question	3	15	1	11	8	8	6
Refer to other transport projects	7	17	~	10	31	11	36
Refer to own submission(s) - process/documents/organisation	~	10	1	1	1	3	2
Refer to revised DfT figures	~	~	~	9	~	~	~
Refer to stakeholder/organisation/local action group	3	~	~	3	9	32	12
Refer to TfL comments	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Refer to UK heritage/railways/engineering	2	~	~	2	2	4	3
Reference to European legislation/policy/conventions	2	~	2	2	9	11	~
Reference to legislation	2	1	1	4	8	16	8
Reference to planning contradictions	~	~	~	1	2	~	1
Reference to planning guidance	~	~	2	5	7	3	1
Reference to policy	3	~	2	2	5	7	6

20. Consultation

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
Comment - documentation	4	5	~	4	3	1	4
Comment - events	~	6	~	4	4	1	2
Comment - media coverage	~	~	~	~	~	1	1
Comment - process	1	~	~	~	~	~	1
Comment - question	2	~	~	~	2	~	2
Comment - timescale	~	1	~	~	1	~	~
Communicate case for HS2 more effectively	1	2	~	~	1	~	3
Consultation on route/selection process	~	~	~	9	~	~	1
Follow up requested	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Further consultation needed	1	1	1	1	3	4	4
Further consultation not needed	~	~	~	~	1	~	24
General question of/objection to consultation	~	1	~	3	4	~	~
General support of consultation	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
More information needed	1	14	7	5	16	1	~
More information on impacted communities	1	~	~	1	15	46	12
Need for public enquiry/review/referendum	1	~	~	1	~	1	3
Phase 2 - need more consultation	2	~	2	~	1	~	~
Phase 2 - need more information/assessment	1	4	8	2	3	9	2
Query/oppose - cost	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Query/oppose - documentation	6	10	~	8	39	117	20
Query/oppose - events	2	1	~	6	7	2	4
Query/oppose - invitations	~	~	~	~	1	~	5

Query/oppose - process	3	3	2	2	9	61	4
Query/oppose - question	13	4	~	~	8	2	8
Query/oppose - question influence of consultation	2	~	~	3	5	6	4
Query/oppose - question/biased	1	1	~	~	~	~	~
Query/oppose - timescale	~	3	1	~	~	32	2
Query/oppose - website	~	2	~	1	~	~	2

21. Other comments

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
General criticism of DfT	1	2	~	1	6	7	~
General criticism of Government	1	11	~	1	11	19	30
General criticism of HS2 Limited	~	~	~	2	8	11	4
General opposition to HS2	4	~	1	3	12	2	15
General support for DfT	~	~	~	~	~	1	1
General support for Government	1	~	~	~	~	1	1
General support for HS2	1	~	~	~	~	~	1
Lack of transparency	1	1	~	2	~	1	2
Other issues	2	2	5	~	2	5	4
UK economy	4	~	~	~	~	1	4

22. Locations

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7
(HS2 Drawing/figure)	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
(Postcode)	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
A413	~	~	~	14	5	~	~
A418	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
A453	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Adelaide Road	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Amersham	~	~	~	~	3	2	~
Amersham Old Town	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Amersham to Aylesbury	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Aylesbury	2	~	~	3	3	3	3
Aylesbury Station	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Aylesbury Vale	~	~	~	~	2	~	1
Banbury	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Barton Hartshorne	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Bascothe Heath	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Belsize Park	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Berkswell	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Berkswell Station	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Bicester	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
Bickenhill	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Bingley	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Birmingham	1	3	1	1	1	3	1
Birmingham Airport	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Bourne Valley	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
Bourne Brook Valley	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Brackley	~	~	~	1	2	~	~
Bristol	~	1	~	~	1	~	~
Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve	~	~	~	~	1	~	~

Buckinghamshire	1	~	~	1	3	24	1
Buckinghamshire Railway Centre	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Burton Green	~	~	~	~	1	~	1
Bury End	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Calvert	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Calvert Green	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Cambridge	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Camden	~	~	~	1	4	1	2
Canwell	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Cardiff	~	1	~	~	1	~	~
Chalfont St Giles	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Chalk Farm	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Chelmley Wood	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Chesham	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
Chess Valley	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Chetwode	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
Chiltern Line	~	1	~	1	2	~	~
Chilterns	4	1	3	24	50	51	6
Chilterns aquifer	~	~	~	~	3	8	~
Chipping Warden	~	~	~	~	2	1	~
Coleshill	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Colne Valley	~	~	~	1	~	1	~
Colne Valley SSSI	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Coventry	1	6	~	2	1	~	1
Coventry to Kenilworth	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Crewe	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Cubbington	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Denham	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
Derby	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Doddershall	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Drummond Street	~	~	~	~	3	~	~
Durden Court	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Ealing	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Edgcote Battlefield	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Edinburgh	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Essex	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Euston	~	2	~	1	2	1	2
Exeter	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Fellows Road	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Finemere Wood	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Fleet Marston	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Friargate, Coventry	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Gilson	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Gilson Road	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Glasgow	~	2	~	1	~	~	~
Great Missenden	~	~	~	2	1	~	~
Greatworth	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Greatworth Hall	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Greenford	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Hampstead Road (near Euston)	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Hampton	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Hampton in Arden	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

Hanger Lane	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Harefield	~	~	~	~	~	2	~
Hartwell House	1	~	~	~	2	1	~
Heathrow	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Helmdon disused railway SSSI	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Hemel Hempstead	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
High Wycombe	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Hillingdon	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Hints	~	~	~	~	2	1	1
Home Counties	~	~	~	~	~	3	~
Hopwas Hays Wood	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Ickenham Marshes	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Kenilworth	~	1	~	~	~	~	3
Kenilworth Greenway	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
Kensal Green Cemetery	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Kent	~	1	~	~	1	~	~
Kilburn	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
Kingsbury Water Park	~	~	~	~	2	1	~
Lake District	~	~	~	~	9	~	~
Leamington Spa	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Ledburn	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Leeds	~	3	2	~	~	~	1
Lichfield	1	~	~	1	1	~	~
Little Missenden	~	~	~	~	~	2	~
Liverpool	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
London	~	~	~	1	3	1	~
Long Itchington Woods	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Lower Boddington	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
M1	~	1	~	7	1	~	~
M25	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
M40	1	~	~	8	3	~	~
M42	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
M6	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
Manchester	1	4	1	~	~	~	1
Maria Fidelis school	~	~	~	~	12	~	1
Meriden Gap	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Middleton Hall	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Midlands	2	3	~	~	~	1	~
Milton Keynes	2	3	1	1	1	~	~
Misbourne Chalk River	~	~	~	2	10	4	~
Misbourne Farm	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Misbourne Valley	~	~	~	~	8	~	~
Missenden	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
NEC	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
New Street	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
Newcastle	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Norfolk	1	~	~	~	1	~	~
North Buckinghamshire	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Northampton	1	1	~	~	~	~	~
Northamptonshire	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
Northolt	~	~	~	~	2	~	1

Norwich	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Nottingham	2	2	~	~	~	~	~
Offchurch	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
Old Amersham	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
Old Oak Common	~	2	~	~	1	~	~
Oxford	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Oxford Canal	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Oxfordshire	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Packington	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Park Hall Secondary School	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Peak District	~	~	~	~	9	~	~
Perivale Wood Conservation Area	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Plymouth	~	1	1	~	~	~	~
Preston	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Primrose Hill	~	~	1	~	2	~	1
Priors Hardwick	~	~	~	~	3	3	3
Quainton	~	~	~	~	4	~	2
Queens Park	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
Queens Park Estate	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
RAF Northolt	~	~	~	1	~	1	~
Regents Park	~	~	~	1	2	1	~
Regents Park Estate	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Ridgeway National Trail	~	~	~	~	~	19	~
Rookery	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Roundhill	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Rugby	~	1	~	1	~	~	1
Rugeley	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Ruislip	~	~	~	3	4	~	2
Ruislip Gardens	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Savay Lake	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Sheephouse Wood	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Sheffield	1	2	~	~	~	~	~
Sherwood aquifer	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Silverdale	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Snow Hill	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Solihull	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
South East	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
South Warwickshire	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
South Yorkshire	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Southam	~	~	~	~	5	~	~
St James Gardens	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
St Pancras	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Staffordshire	~	1	~	~	1	1	1
Stoke	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Stoneleigh	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Stratford	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
Suffolk	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Tamworth	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Torbay	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Turweston	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Twyford	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Tyne and Wear	~	1	~	~	~	~	~

Waddesdon	1	~	~	~	4	~	1
Waddesdon Manor	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
Wardington	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Warrington	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Warwickshire	~	~	~	2	4	8	4
Washwood Heath	~	~	~	~	~	1	1
Water Orton	~	~	~	~	5	1	~
Water Orton Primary School	~	~	~	~	2	~	~
Water Orton Rugby Club	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Watford Junction	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Wendover	~	~	~	1	21	3	7
West London	~	~	~	2	1	~	~
West Midlands	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
West Ruislip	~	1	~	~	1	~	~
Whittington Army Barracks	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Whittington Heath Golf Club	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Wolverhampton	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Wormleighton	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
York	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Yorkshire Dales	~	~	~	~	9	~	~