dialogue**by**design
making consultation work

High Speed Rail: Investing in Britain's Future

Addendum

July 2012

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

hs2

Department for **Transport**

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

Contents

dialoguebydesign

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 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 the 10th January 2012 and available online at http://www.dft.gov.uk/publications/hs2-consultation-summary/ . This analysis included 54,909 responses from members of the public and organisations.

1.1.3   Four hundred and thirteen (413) consultation responses from members of the public and organisations (i.e. 0.75% of the total responses) were inadvertently excluded from the initial analysis. Four hundred and seven (407) of these responses (i.e. 0.74%) were not transferred from HS2 Ltd/DfT to Dialogue by Design (DbyD), a further six responses (0.01%) were excluded due to human error after they had been received by DbyD. When these omissions were discovered in June 2012 all 413 responses were analysed by DbyD. This report describes the DbyD analysis process and checks carried out to look into whether there were any issues raised by these 413 respondents which should have been addressed in the previous summary report. While none of these responses were included in the original DbyD analysis, a number of them were considered by the DfT/HS2 Ltd team during their internal analysis at the time of the consultation. In addition to the analysis of these omitted responses carried out by DbyD in producing this addendum report, the DfT/HS2 Ltd team have undertaken their own process of review.

1.1.4   HS2 Ltd looked into the reasons why these responses were not successfully transferred to DbyD for analysis. Their conclusion is that one batch of emails originally sent to highspeedrail@dft.gsi.gov.uk was not successfully transferred to DbyD. Quality Assurance checks into other batches of emails received by this account indicate that the transfer process was otherwise effective, as were the other means of responding to the consultation, including postal responses and online responses using the consultation website.

1.1.5   DbyD has also looked into the human errors that resulted in six of the responses it received not being included in the analysis. The outputs of this exercise are being fed into the ongoing development of DbyD's protocols and quality assurance measures in order to reduce incidences of human error in all of its projects.

Chapter 2   Participation

2.1   Introduction

2.1.1   This section provides an overview of the 413 responses included in this supplementary analysis. It covers response types as well as information about respondents.

2.2   Response types

2.2.1   The table below describes the type of responses included in this analysis.

Table 2.1   Count of different response types

Response type	Count
Letter or email Responses submitted by post or email not using the response form structure	132
Report Detailed, extensive reports submitted by post or email	3
Organised submissions (with and without variation) Responses of which many identical or near identical copies were submitted	278
Total	413

2.3   Response sectors

2.3.1   For the purposes of reporting, respondents were classified by sector. A breakdown of these is given in Table 2.2 below. A list of organisations within these sectors is included in Appendix 1.[1]

Table 2.2   Breakdown of respondents by sector

Sector	Count
Member of the public	372
Academic Includes universities and other academic institutions	0
Action group Includes rail and action groups specifically campaigning on the high speed rail network proposals	4
Business – local or regional	3
Business – national or international	5
Elected representatives	1

---

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

dialogue**by**design

Sector	Count
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	7
Local government Includes county councils, district councils, parish and town councils and local partnerships	6
Other representative group Includes chambers of commerce, trade unions, political parties and professional bodies	8
Statutory agency	0
Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation Includes transport bodies, transport providers, infrastructure providers and utility companies	7
Total	413

Chapter 3   Methodology

3.1   Supplementary analysis

3.1.1   These omitted responses were processed and 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 to a DbyD analysis database and their content coded using the same coding framework as in the initial analysis. The analysis team were 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   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 omitted responses with the Summary Report to ensure that issues had been adequately addressed.

dialogue**by**design

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 20 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:
- A4421
- Broadwells Wood
- Cottisford
- Featherbed Lane
- Fringford
- Fulwell
- Hodnell Manor
- Hunningham Road
- Lavender Hall Farm
- Long Itchington Road
- Lower Farm, Stoneythorpe
- Mossycorner Lane
- Offchurch Greenway
- Quarrendon
- Spilsmere Wood
- Stoneton
- Stoneythorpe Hall
- The Oaks Farm/ Warren Farm
- Village Street, Offchurch
- Welsh Road Farm

4.1.4   These new codes also appear in Appendix 2.

4.2   Conclusions

4.2.1   Following the analysis of the additional four hundred and thirteen (413) 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.

dialoguebydesign

Appendices

As with the previous report, this addendum includes appendices detailing the organisations 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 included in this report

1. Table A1.2 lists the names of organisations whose responses to the high speed rail consultation are included in this analysis. Responses which have identified themselves as from an organisation are included here. 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 have not been listed if they indicated that their response should be treated as confidential. As respondees were not asked to classify themselves, sectors have been assigned by DbyD. 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'.

dialoguebydesign

Table A1.2   Responding organisations by sector

Academic
None

Action group
Chiltern Ridges Action Group[3]
HP22 6PN Wendover Action Group
HS2 Action Alliance[4]
Offchurch HS2 Action Group

Business – national or international
AXA Real Estate Investment Managers
Foster and Partners
Global Foresight Network
Henry Boot Construction Limited
URS Scott Wilson

Elected representative
Jeremy Wright - Member of Parliament for Kenilworth and Southam

Environment, heritage amenity or community group
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England - Warwickshire Branch
Derby and South Derbyshire Friends of the Earth
Manchester Friends of the Earth
North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
The Garden History Society, The Georgian Group and The Association of Gardens Trusts
Warwickshire Gardens Trust
Wildlife Trusts[5]

Local government
Cherwell District Council
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
Hughenden Valley Parish Council
Kings Bromley Parish Council

Leeds City Council
Nottingham City Council

Other representative group
Birmingham Forward
Federation of Small Businesses, Thames Valley
Leeds, York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
Marketing Birmingham Ltd.
The Freshfield Foundation
The Green Party, Transport Speaker Alan Francis
The New Economics Foundation
Transform Scotland

Statutory agency
None

Transport, infrastructure or utility organisation
ABTA - The Travel Association
Heathrow Hub Ltd[6]
London (Heathrow) Airline Consultative Committee (LACC) airlines and the Heathrow Airline Operators Committee (ADC)
Manchester Airport
Rail Planning Consulting
Railway Engineers Forum
The Rail Estate Consultancy Limited

---

[3] The main body of the Chiltern Ridges Action Group response was included in the initial analysis, however the appendices were not.

[4] The HS2 Action Alliance response to Question 7 was included in the initial analysis, however the response to Questions 1-6 was not.

[5] A different response from the Wildlife Trusts was considered in the initial analysis.

[6] A partial response from Heathrow Hub was considered in the initial analysis

Appendix 2   Codes by theme and by question

1. The intial 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 refered to specific locations mentioned by respondents. The same themes and codes were applied when analysing these new responses, and 20 new location codes were added. The themes and codes used in coding the additional responses included in 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.

dialogue*by*design

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. Levels of Agreement

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Agree with Q1	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	28
Agree with Q1 with caveats	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Agree with Q2	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	28
Agree with Q2 with caveat	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	5
Agree with question proposition	2	5	1	~	1	~	3	~
Agree with question proposition and HS2	9	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Agree with question proposition with caveats	20	8	~	3	1	~	3	~
Agree with question proposition, but not HS2	6	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Disagree with Q2	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	234
Disagree with question proposition	254	292	288	284	289	~	26	~
Disagree with question proposition and HS2	21	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
No comment on question	~	~	~	~	2	246	3	~
No comment on question - no personal impacts	~	~	~	~	~	~	2	~
No comment on question - not enough information	~	~	~	~	~	1	1	~
Unsure/undecided	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	~

2. Strategic Case and Economics

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Bus/need case - lack of vision/not ambitious enough	~	3	~	~	~	~	~	~
Bus/need case - need for further research	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	10
Bus/need case - question need for economic growth	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Bus/need case - question/disagree	13	16	9	3	4	1	3	194
Bus/need case - support	2	3	~	~	~	2	~	4
Bus/need case - uncertainty/long term projections	1	3	~	~	~	~	1	5
Bus/need case - white elephant/vanity project	4	1	~	3	~	~	1	7
Bus/need case - will not support economic growth	~	~	2	~	~	~	1	1
Bus/need case - will not support economic growth (enhanced capacity/performance and/or HS2)	13	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Bus/need case - will support economic growth	~	4	~	~	~	1	~	28
Bus/need case - will support economic growth (enhanced capacity/performance and/or HS2)	6	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Capacity - freight capacity will improve (on existing lines)	1	2	~	~	~	~	~	~

dialogue**by**design

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Capacity - freight capacity will not improve (oppose HS2)	1	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Capacity - freight other comments	~	11	~	~	~	~	~	3
Capacity - HS2 train capacity concerns	~	1	1	~	~	~	~	~
Capacity - needs to be addressed	19	10	~	~	~	~	~	24
Capacity - other comments/suggestions	4	4	2	~	~	~	~	8
Capacity - query/disagree with capacity requirements	8	4	~	1	~	~	1	6
Capacity - will not release capacity/relieve pressure on existing lines	2	3	~	~	~	~	~	2
Capacity - will release capacity/relieve pressure on existing lines	5	5	~	~	~	~	~	26
Capacity - will relieve pressure on East Coast main line	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Capacity - will relieve pressure on West Coast main line	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Competitiveness - Britain is behind other European countries	3	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
Competitiveness - other countries having HS rail does not mean UK has to	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Competitiveness - will increase competitiveness/productivity	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
Connectivity - connecting regional centres not required (oppose HS2)	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Connectivity - connecting regional centres positive (support HS2)	3	3	1	~	~	~	~	26
Connectivity - need for link with Europe/international accessibility	1	~	1	~	~	~	~	27
Cost - account for compensation	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	1
Cost - budget will overrun/delays/major project problems	2	2	~	1	~	~	1	8
Cost - effective/value for money	~	2	~	~	~	~	~	1
Cost - effective/value for money in long-term	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Cost - project funding suggestions	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Cost - question/disagree cost/benefit figures/analysis	4	15	2	3	~	1	2	20
Cost - relative to alternatives	9	4	~	2	~	~	~	5
Cost - return on investment	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Cost - subsidies concerns (general/rail fares)	~	2	2	~	~	~	1	4
Cost - too expensive in context of cuts/spending review	4	4	~	~	~	~	~	30
Cost - too expensive/not cost effective/not value for money	11	22	5	1	2	2	2	182
Cost - value the environment/non financial aspects	1	4	~	1	~	1	~	5
Demand - for rail is increasing generally	3	2	~	~	~	~	~	~

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Demand - IT makes business travel less necessary (oppose HS2)	10	1	~	~	~	~	~	6
Demand - other comments/suggestions	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Demand - question demand for intercity rail travel	1	~	~	~	~	1	~	1
Demand - question/disagree passenger projections/demand	13	12	1	3	~	2	1	13
Demand - will increase/be higher than projected	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Frequency - increased frequency positive	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Frequency - not sufficient/need more than 14 trains per hour	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Frequency - query/not needed	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	2
Job creation - HS2 will create jobs/access to jobs	~	2	~	~	~	1	~	1
Job creation - question/disagree figures/HS2 will not create jobs	3	~	1	~	~	1	1	4
Journey times - current times acceptable (oppose HS2)	4	~	~	~	~	~	1	7
Journey times - need to consider full journey/savings not relevant (oppose HS2)	7	1	~	1	~	~	~	7
Journey times - productive use of current train travel time (oppose HS2)	3	16	2	6	1	~	1	7
Journey times - question need for speed (oppose HS2)	5	3	2	4	2	~	~	7
Journey times - question/reject journey times/speeds	~	1	~	1	~	~	~	2
Journey times - reduced times positive (support HS2)	2	2	~	1	1	~	~	25
Journey times - savings not substantial enough (oppose HS2)	2	2	1	6	~	~	~	6
Rail fares - currently too expensive (oppose HS2)	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Rail fares - HS2 will only benefit wealthy passengers (oppose HS2)	2	4	~	~	1	1	1	3
Rail fares - need to be affordable (support HS2)	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Rail fares - other comments/suggestions	2	1	~	~	~	~	~	3
Rail fares - will be too expensive for HS2	2	3	~	~	~	1	~	2
Reliability - more reliable service positive (support HS2)	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	23
Reliability - of existing services	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Reliability - question reliability of HS2	1	2	~	~	~	~	~	~

dialoguebydesign

3. Social and Economic

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Concern - cumulative development/other infrastructure (i.e. impact of motorways plus HS2)	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	3
Concern - disruption (general)	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Concern - future generations	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	7
Concern - impact on cultural heritage	~	~	~	~	1	2	~	10
Concern - Impact on development land/planning designations (planning blight)	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Concern - impact on local people/communities	~	1	~	2	5	1	~	14
Concern - impact on rural areas/communities	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Concern - impact on towns/villages	~	1	1	~	1	~	~	8
Concern - impact on urban areas	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Concern - impacted communities will not benefit	2	2	~	2	2	1	1	8
Concern - proximity to people/communities	1	~	~	~	3	1	1	7
Concern - proximity to respondents home/property	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	4
Concern - recreation/local amenities	~	2	~	1	1	1	~	7
Equality - Improving access to travel	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Equality - majority will benefit/national interest	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	23
Equality - majority will not benefit	5	7	1	2	~	2	1	6
Equality - other	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Health - stress/emotional impact	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Local business - negative impact	~	5	~	1	1	~	1	9
Local business - positive impact	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
North-south divide - will exacerbate/too London-centric	13	4	3	~	~	~	1	15
North-south divide - will promote more equitable development	4	1	~	~	~	~	~	4
Operation - capacity at city centres/stations/surrounding areas	~	2	4	~	1	~	~	4
Operation - disrupting roads/splitting communities	~	~	~	2	1	~	1	6
Operation - speed/frequency/timing of services	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Property - demolition of properties	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	4
Property - general blight	~	1	~	1	1	~	1	3
Property - other concerns/impacts	~	~	~	~	2	~	1	~
Property - values will decrease/property blight	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	3
Quality of life - will decrease	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Regional - link with London positive (for regional cities)	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Regional - regional job creation positive	3	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Regional - regional job creation question/disagree	2	1	1	~	~	~	~	6
Regional - regional jobs negative impact	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	2
Regional - supports devel - North of England	3	2	~	~	~	~	~	1
Regional - supports devel - West Midlands/Birmingham	1	1	1	~	~	~	~	3
Regional - supports regeneration/development (general)	2	2	~	~	~	~	~	4
Regional - will not support development where train does not stop	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Regional - will not support regeneration/development (general)	6	1	2	~	~	~	~	7
Regional equity - few places benefit	4	5	2	2	2	1	~	10
Tourism - negative impact	~	1	~	3	~	~	~	3
Tourism - will attract visitors/stimulate tourism	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	2

4. Safety, Security and Resilience

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Emergencies - access/impacts	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
General/other	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Health and safety - general comments	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Resilience - severe weather conditions	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Safety - concern about speed of trains	1	~	~	3	~	~	~	1
Security - terrorism concerns	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Security - vandalism concerns	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

5. Environment

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Assessment - EIA requirements/suggestions	~	~	~	~	4	3	2	10
Assessment - inadequate	2	2	1	1	3	3	1	15
Assessment - Need for EIA or SEA	1	~	~	6	5	16	~	4
Concern about future development	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Concern about pollution generally	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Designated area - Ancient Woodlands	1	~	~	4	2	2	~	8
Designated area - Archaeological sites	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Designated area - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	~	5	1	9	14	1	~	11

dialoguebydesign

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Designated area - Conservation Areas (SAC)	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Designated area - Green belt	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	5
Designated area - Listed buildings	~	~	~	3	1	~	~	6
Designated area - Local wildlife site	1	~	~	1	~	~	~	2
Designated area - Nature Reserves	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Designated area - Other	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	6
Designated area - Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM)	~	~	~	2	~	~	~	4
Designated area - Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	1	~	~	1	10	~	~	10
Environmental case - question/oppose	1	1	~	~	~	3	~	173
Generally negative to environment	1	2	1	4	5	2	~	11
Generally positive to environment	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	22
Geography - concern UK is a small country/no space	3	2	1	9	~	~	~	8
Geography - UK geography suited to HSR	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Natural - impact agricultural land/farming	~	1	~	2	2	1	1	12
Natural - impact air quality	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Natural - impact biodiversity/wildlife	~	2	~	2	11	2	1	25
Natural - impact countryside/landscape	2	5	1	9	15	5	~	39
Natural - impact flooding/flood risk	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	2
Natural - impact on aquifer/water supply	~	~	~	3	2	1	~	3
Natural - impact on footpaths/rights of way	~	~	~	2	2	1	~	9
Natural - impact rivers/canals/lakes	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	5
Visual - concern about light pollution	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	5
Visual - negative impact	~	~	~	~	1	2	~	11

6. Noise and Vibration

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Assessment - inadequate/further assesment/more information	~	~	~	~	4	10	1	3
Assessment - noise/decibel levels/measurement (figures)	~	~	~	~	1	1	~	1
Assessment - should be based on pass by/maximum noise not an average	~	~	~	~	~	2	~	1
Assessment - suggestion	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Impact - aerodynamics	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Impact - frequency/timing of services	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Impact - general concern noise	~	1	1	1	3	3	~	17
Impact - noise impact on health	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Impact - noise impact on wildlife	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Impact - speed	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Impact - vibration (general)	~	~	1	~	~	1	~	4
Impact - vibration/noise - tunnels	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Predictions - HS2 sound simulation (events)	~	~	~	~	2	1	~	1
Predictions - question noise predictions	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	~

7. Sustainability Appraisal and Climate Change

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Appraisal – question/inadequate/flawed/more information	1	1	~	~	~	34	~	11
Appraisal - comment/suggestion	1	~	~	1	~	7	~	7
Appraisal - methodology	~	~	~	~	~	2	~	2
Appraisal - support with caveats	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Appraisal - support/adequate	~	~	~	~	2	3	~	~
CO2 - consider total journey	1	~	~	~	~	1	~	1
CO2 - construction emissions (concern)	1	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
CO2 - HS2 will NOT/may not reduce emissions/will increase emissions	11	2	1	3	~	9	1	9
CO2 - HS2 will reduce emissions	~	2	~	~	~	~	~	1
CO2 - include other CO2 mitigation measures	8	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
CO2 - other comments	2	2	~	~	~	3	~	7
CO2 - question measurement/figures	~	~	~	~	~	3	~	4
CO2 - total project impact (footprint)	~	1	~	~	~	1	~	~
Energy - General (rising costs etc)	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Energy - HS2 energy consumption	3	9	1	3	~	2	1	9
Energy - HS2 fuel source/type	~	~	~	~	~	3	~	4
Modal shift - aviation will not reduce	~	3	2	~	~	8	1	5
Modal shift - aviation will reduce	1	~	4	~	1	~	~	1
Modal shift - HS2 increases travel	~	3	2	2	~	~	1	2
Modal shift - LHR link will reduce aviation	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Modal shift - LHR link wont reduce aviation usage	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Modal shift - other comment	2	11	~	1	1	1	~	4
Modal shift - road usage will not reduce	1	2	~	~	2	1	~	~
Modal shift - road usage will reduce	3	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Modal shift - suggestion	1	~	~	~	~	3	~	2
Modal shift - will encourage modal shift	1	~	1	~	~	~	~	4
Modal shift - will not/may not happen	9	2	1	~	~	3	~	2

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Sustainability - general/other	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
Sustainability - HS2 inappropriate for agenda/targets	8	~	~	~	~	1	~	1
Sustainability - HS2 must achieve agenda/targets	8	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Sustainability - is sustainable/benefits outweigh costs	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	1
Sustainability - most sustainable option/route	~	~	8	~	~	~	~	2
Sustainability - not most sustainable option	~	1	~	~	~	6	~	2
Sustainability - not sustainable/costs outweigh benefits	~	1	~	1	~	~	~	1
Sustainability - of rail travel (support)	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
Sustainability - rail/high speed rail (question/oppose)	2	8	~	1	~	~	~	2
Sustainability - support 4 principles	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Sustainability - support generally	1	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Sustainability - won't create sustainable communities	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

8. Principles and Specification

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
(1) Speed - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	4	~	~	~	1
(1) Speed - concerns/object	1	~	~	21	1	~	~	3
(1) Speed - increases noise	~	~	~	1	~	2	~	~
(1) Speed - performance not speed	1	1	~	2	~	~	~	~
(1) Speed - support	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	1
(2) Capacity - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	5	~	~	~	~
(2) Capacity - support	~	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
(3) Environment - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
(3) Environment - question/not meeting principle/concerns about impacts	~	~	~	24	~	~	~	1
(3) Environment - support	~	~	~	3	~	~	~	~
(4) Controlling cost – concerns/object	~	~	~	6	~	~	~	~
(4) Controlling cost - support	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	1
Agree route selection process	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Agree route selection process with caveat	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Agree with principles/specification	~	~	~	2	~	~	~	1
Agree with principles/specification with caveats	~	~	~	3	~	~	~	~
Disagree - application of PS to RSP	~	~	~	1	1	~	~	~
Disagree route proposed	~	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Disagree route selection process	~	~	~	8	~	~	~	~

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Disagree with principles/specification	~	~	~	14	2	~	~	1
General - concerns about feasibility of service	1	4	7	8	~	~	1	3
General - missing principle - other	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
General - not enough information	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
General - suggestions/comments	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
General - too few options considered/remit too limited	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
General - trade off/too much focus on	~	~	~	7	~	~	~	1
Principles - exploiting max benefit from high speed capacity	~	1	~	1	~	~	~	~
Principles - high speed trains only	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Principles - Integration with classic network	~	~	3	5	~	~	~	5
Principles - Integration with other transport networks	~	~	1	4	~	~	~	~
Principles - Long distance, city to city - query/object	1	~	~	5	~	~	~	~
Principles - Long distance, city to city - support	~	~	~	4	~	~	~	~
Principles - segregation from classic network over time	~	~	~	5	~	~	~	~
Selection process - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Selection process - too few route options/need more information/assessment of routes	~	~	~	8	~	~	~	~
Selection process - too much focus on speed/cost	~	1	~	25	2	~	~	2
Specification - EU Directive Interoperability/broad gauge	1	~	~	3	~	~	~	~
Specification - principles of sustainability	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~

9. Mitigation Measures

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Construction mitigation - inadequate	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Environmental mitigation - inadequate	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Environmental mitigation - suggestion	~	~	~	1	7	~	~	2
Environmental mitigation - support	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Mit measures - (Q5) inadequate/disagree	~	~	~	~	13	~	~	2
Mit measures - (Q5) support/agree	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	1
Mit measures - assessment of HS2 inadequate	~	~	~	~	3	~	~	2
Mit measures - concern about cost	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

dialoguebydesign

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Mit measures - implementation/concern will not happen	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Mit measures - inadequate	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Mit measures - no amount adequate	~	~	~	~	3	1	~	3
Mit measures - not detailed enough/more information	~	~	~	~	8	~	1	4
Mit measures - suggestions/comments	~	~	~	~	3	~	~	6
Mit measures - visual impact of mit measures (concern)	~	~	~	~	2	1	~	~
Noise mitigation - inadequate	~	~	~	~	2	1	~	1
Noise mitigation - not detailed enough/more information	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	2
Noise mitigation - suggestion	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
Noise mitigation - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Noise mitigation - visual impact of mit measures (concern)	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Social mitigation - suggestion	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Visual mitigation - inadequate	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Visual mitigation - suggestion	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	5

10. Blight Proposals

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
How much - full property value	~	~	~	~	~	~	255	2
How much - valuation mechanism/level	~	~	~	~	~	~	5	1
Impact - community	~	~	~	~	~	~	12	~
Impact - construction	~	1	~	~	1	~	9	1
Impact - countryside/amenity/visual impact	~	~	~	~	1	~	7	1
Impact - disruption/annoyance	~	~	~	~	~	~	3	~
Impact - generalised blight	~	~	~	~	~	~	3	~
Impact - impacts understated/estimated	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Impact - livelihood/business	~	~	~	~	~	~	8	4
Impact - lives/quality of life	~	~	~	~	~	~	4	2
Impact - loss of home/garden	~	~	~	~	~	~	2	1
Impact - mortgages	~	~	~	~	~	~	10	1
Impact - noise/vibration	~	~	~	~	~	~	5	~
Impact - not just property value	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Impact - other	~	~	~	~	~	~	5	4
Impact - property values	~	~	~	~	1	~	7	2
Impact - retirement/equity in home	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Impact - uncertainty/anxiety	~	~	~	~	~	1	5	2
Principle - ability to move house	~	~	~	~	~	~	4	~
Principle - assisting those whose properties lose significant value	~	~	~	~	~	~	3	~
Principle - fairness / transparency	~	~	~	~	~	~	246	~

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Principle - functioning of property market	~	~	~	~	~	~	14	1
Principle - Gov owning large numbers of properties	~	~	~	~	~	~	14	1
Principle - mitigate first	~	~	~	~	~	~	9	~
Principle - no amount would be adequate	~	~	~	~	~	~	5	~
Principle - of compensation - agree	~	~	~	~	~	~	26	2
Principle - polluter/govt pays	~	~	~	~	~	~	6	1
Principle - reassuring now fair compensation will be paid	~	~	~	~	~	~	12	1
Principle - stay in homes and communities	~	~	~	~	~	~	13	1
Scheme - comments/ideas/suggestions	~	~	~	~	~	~	19	2
Scheme - examples of compensation schemes	~	~	~	~	~	~	5	~
Scheme - implementation concerns	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Scheme - Legal issues	~	~	~	~	~	~	3	~
Scheme - not acceptable	~	~	~	1	1	~	5	1
Scheme - not detailed/clear enough	~	~	~	~	~	~	6	1
Scheme - not fair	~	~	~	~	~	~	9	~
Scheme - too restrictive/inflexible	~	~	~	~	~	~	2	~
What - Bond Based Scheme - question/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	4	~
What - Bond Based Scheme - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	13	2
What - Bond Based Scheme - support with caveats	~	~	~	~	~	~	9	1
What - Compensation Bond Scheme - question/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	6	~
What - Compensation Bond Scheme - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
What - Current EHS Scheme - question/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	4	2
What - Hardship-based property purchase scheme - question/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	7	1
What - not just statutory	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
What - statutory blight	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
What - statutory blight/compulsory purchase	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	2
What - statutory compensation	~	~	~	~	~	~	4	~
What - statutory provisions - acceptable	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
When - announce scheme now/soon	~	~	~	~	~	~	2	~
When - blight happening now/pre construction	~	~	~	~	1	~	15	2
When - compensation too slow	~	~	~	~	~	~	9	~
When - proposals too slow	~	~	~	~	~	~	2	~
Where - does not extend far enough (from route)/suggest proximity	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Where - property above tunnel	~	~	~	~	~	~	6	1

dialoguebydesign

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Where - proximity to line	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Who - everyone/not just worst affected should be fully compensated	~	~	~	~	~	~	14	~
Who - non home owners/ tenants/shared ownership	~	~	~	~	~	~	3	~
Who - other	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	1
Who - phase 2/differences	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

11. Proposed Route and Locations

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Birmingham Airport interchange - concerns	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	4
Birmingham Airport interchange - suggest/comment	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	3
Birmingham CC Station - concerns	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	2
Birmingham CC Station - suggest/comment	~	~	1	~	1	~	~	3
Birmingham CC station - too remote/not central enough	~	~	1	3	3	~	~	~
Birmingham interchanges - concerns	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Birmingham interchanges - suggest/comment	~	~	~	~	5	~	~	2
Interchanges - difficulties of access	~	~	~	3	~	~	~	~
Interchanges/spurs - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	1	2	~	~	1
London station - Euston - concerns	1	3	4	1	4	~	~	5
London station - Euston - suggest/comment	~	~	1	~	3	~	~	2
London station - Euston - support	~	~	~	1	1	~	~	~
London station - suggest Paddington	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Old Oak Common interchange - concerns	~	~	1	3	3	~	~	1
Old Oak Common Interchange - suggest/comment	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	2
Old Oak Common interchange - support	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Proposed route - agree with caveat	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Proposed route - disagree (Q5)	~	~	~	~	18	~	~	5
Proposed route - disagree/query	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	5
Proposed route - no comment (Q5)	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Rolling stock depot - comments	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Route - amendments to route - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Route - amendments to route - question/object	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Route - amendments to route - support	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	1
Route - follow existing rail corridors	~	1	~	~	6	~	~	2

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Route - follow existing transport corridors	~	1	1	1	6	~	~	3
Route - follow existing/does not	~	~	~	11	~	~	~	2
Route - follow Great Central Railway (GCR) route	1	1	~	~	2	~	~	~
Route - follow motorways	~	~	1	~	12	~	~	4
Route - most direct/straight - oppose	~	~	~	8	~	~	~	4
Route - most direct/straight - support	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	2
Route - prefer alternative HS2 route proposals (1.5, 2.5, 4)	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Route - prefer alternative route/network configuration	~	~	~	2	3	~	~	4
Route - will become bottleneck	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Selection process - agree/support	~	~	~	~	3	~	~	~
Selection process - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	~	3	~	~	3
Selection process - disagree/question	~	3	~	~	10	~	~	3
Selection process - too few route options/need more information/assessment	~	1	~	~	3	~	~	2
Selection process - too much focus on speed/cost	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	1
Specific section - comment/suggestion	~	~	~	1	5	~	~	9
Specific section - question/object	~	~	~	1	3	1	~	5

12. Proposed Link - Heathrow

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Agree with LHR link/spur	1	~	3	~	2	~	~	24
Agree with LHR link/spur (oppose HS2)	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Agree with LHR link/spur with caveats	~	~	4	~	~	~	~	~
Disagree with LHR link/spur	~	2	10	~	2	~	~	2
Disagree with LHR link/spur (support HS2)	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	1
Disagree with LHR spur/prefer through route (support HS2)	~	1	5	~	~	~	~	~
LHR capacity/location/third runway concerns	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
LHR spur - causing delays/longer journey times	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
LHR spur - combine ticket aviation/HS2	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	1
LHR spur - need more info/assessment inadequate	~	1	8	2	1	~	~	~
LHR spur - suggest/comment	1	1	6	~	~	1	~	3
Link between LHR and HS1 - question/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

dialoguebydesign

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Link between LHR and HS1 - support	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Oppose - airports in the North/regions/LHR link not needed	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Oppose - existing LHR connections adequate	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Oppose - improve (existing) LHR connections	~	~	3	~	~	~	~	~
Oppose - LHR spur too expensive/concern about cost/question/oppose economic case	~	~	6	1	~	~	~	~
Oppose - other reasons for opposing LHR link/spur	~	~	3	~	~	~	~	~
Oppose - question/oppose passenger projections/inadequate demand	~	~	6	~	~	~	~	~
Prefer LHR interchange at Old Oak Common	~	~	1	~	1	~	~	1
Prefer LHR link in Phase 1/soon	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Prefer LHR link in Phase 2/support for phasing	~	~	3	~	~	~	~	~
Prefer LHR through route/direct not spur	1	1	1	1	~	1	~	2
Support - improves access to LHR/improves access from North	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Support - other reasons for supporting LHR link/spur	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	~

13. Proposed Link - HS1

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Agree with HS1 link	1	~	17	~	~	~	~	25
Agree with HS1 link (oppose HS2)	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Agree with HS1 link with caveats	~	~	3	~	~	~	~	~
Cite HS1 as disappointment	3	6	2	~	1	1	2	5
Cite HS1 as success	~	1	1	3	2	~	~	2
Disagree with HS1 link	~	~	4	~	1	~	~	~
Disagree with HS1 link (support HS2)	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	1
Link - border control issues/customs facilities	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Link - double track preferable to single track	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	1
Link - improve HS1/HS2 link plans	~	~	2	~	1	~	~	2
Link - need more info/assessment inadequate	~	~	5	~	~	~	~	~
Link - prefer link in Phase 1/soon	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Link - prefer St Pancras/direct connection	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	1
Link - suggestions/comments	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	2
Oppose - feasibiliy of proposed link	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	1

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Oppose - HS1 link too expensive/cost concern/question economic case	~	~	4	~	~	~	~	~
Oppose - impact of proposed link on existing services	~	~	3	~	1	~	~	~
Oppose - improve (existing) HS1 connections	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Oppose - other reasons for opposing HS1 link	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Oppose - question passenger projections/inadequate demand	~	~	3	~	~	~	~	~
Support - through trains from North to Europe	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	2
Support - through trains to Europe	~	~	10	~	1	~	~	1

14. Y Network and Extensions

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Extent - links/plans - question/inadequate	~	~	10	~	1	~	~	~
Extent - network needs to extend further - does not go far enough	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	1
Extent - support links/connections	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Extent - support stage 1/London to Birmingham	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Extent - support Y network/stage 2	~	2	1	~	~	~	~	27
Integrate with airports NOT a priority/no need for rail to airport links	~	~	8	~	~	~	~	~
Integrate with existing rail services	1	1	2	1	1	~	~	2
Integrate with Manchester airport	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Integrate with other airports	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	5
Integrate with transport hubs/networks	1	~	10	4	1	~	~	6
Link with Crossrail support	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	2
Link with/stop at [location named]	1	~	1	~	~	~	~	1
Link with/stop at Coventry	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Edinburgh	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Link with/stop at Glasgow	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	3
Link with/stop at Leeds	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Link with/stop at Manchester	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Link with/stop at Newcastle	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Link with/stop at Sheffield	1	~	1	~	~	~	~	1
Need for parkway station(s) on route	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Need for parkway stations - concerns/oppose	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Need more stops along HS2 route/too few stops	2	~	~	3	~	~	~	1
Need to connect cities in the North	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Need to connect with city centres/doesn't currently	~	~	9	~	~	~	~	1

dialogue by design

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Need to reach East Midlands	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Need to reach North	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	2
Need to reach North-East	~	2	1	~	~	~	~	3
Need to reach North-West	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Need to reach Scotland	~	2	1	~	~	~	~	4
Phase 2 - specific comments/suggestions	~	1	2	5	3	~	1	2

15. Y Network Phasing

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Agree with phased roll-out	~	~	3	~	~	~	~	~
Agree with phased roll-out with caveats	~	~	10	~	~	~	~	~
Disagree with phased roll-out	~	~	9	~	~	~	~	~
Management - ownership/management/planning of scheme	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Phasing - build full network immediately	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Phasing - concern about completion	~	~	5	~	~	~	~	~
Phasing - concern about disruption	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Phasing - concern about existing capacity issues	~	1	3	~	~	~	~	~
Phasing - concerns/comments Hybrid Bill	~	2	5	~	~	~	~	~
Phasing - need plan/powers for Phase 2 now	1	~	6	~	~	~	~	2
Phasing - suggestions	~	~	5	~	~	~	~	2
Phasing - support as learn from Phase 1	~	~	~	1	3	~	~	~
Phasing - support but as quickly as possible	~	~	3	~	~	~	~	24
Phasing - support for financial reasons	~	~	4	~	~	~	~	~
Start phased roll-out in North	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Timing - build network quicker	1	~	3	~	~	~	1	1
Timing - overall timescale very long	4	2	~	~	1	~	~	5
Timing - should have been started years ago	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

16. Engineering and Construction

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Associated infrastructure (power, telecoms)	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
Bridges - concern about impacts	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	5
Bridges - support use	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Const impacts - disruption to roads/traffic/accessibility	1	2	1	~	1	1	~	7

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Const impacts - dust and dirt	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Const impacts - environmental damage	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Const impacts - general/other	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	1
Const impacts - local business/communities	~	~	~	~	1	1	~	2
Const impacts - noise	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Const impacts - spoil/movement of earth/waste	~	1	~	1	2	1	~	4
Const impacts - to existing rail services	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Construction - engineering/geology - concern	~	~	~	2	~	~	~	1
Construction - facilities/accommodation for/impact of builders	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
Construction - work hours	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Construction - worksites	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Contracts - use of foreign labour/contractors/suppliers	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	5
Contracts - use of local/UK labour/contractors/suppliers	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	4
Contracts - who benefits/transparency	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Cuttings - comments/suggestions	~	~	~	~	1	1	~	~
Cuttings - concern about impact	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Cuttings - support use	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Design - support good/appropriate design	~	~	~	1	1	~	~	2
Design - utility corridor alongside HS2 (e.g. water, electricity)	2	2	~	1	2	2	2	2
General - disruption	~	2	~	~	1	~	~	3
Green tunnels/cut cover - concern about impact	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	~
Green tunnels/cut cover - support use	~	~	~	1	1	~	~	~
Green tunnels/cut cover - use in specific area/stretch of route	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	2
Height of line - concern	~	~	~	~	2	1	~	3
HS2 - future proofing (capacity, speed, technology)	~	~	1	1	1	~	~	2
HS2 - width of rail roadway/track requirements	1	1	~	~	2	~	~	1
HS2 train - length/size of the train	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
HS2 train - on board design/facilities	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	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	~	~	~	2	~	~	~	2
Maintenance/resiliance - comments/concerns (other than cost)	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	1

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Tunnels - concern about impacts	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	3
Tunnels - concerns about cost	~	~	1	1	2	~	~	1
Tunnels - impact on properties	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Tunnels - support greater use/not used enough	~	~	~	~	4	1	~	1
Tunnels - use in AONB/environmental sensitive areas	~	~	~	1	1	~	~	~
Tunnels - use in specific area/stretch of route	~	~	~	~	10	1	~	1
Vent shafts - concerns	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Viaducts - concerns	~	~	~	~	3	1	~	5

17. Strategic Alternatives – Rail

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Existing network is effective	14	2	5	2	1	~	~	5
Existing network is not effective (oppose HS2)	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Existing network is not effective (support HS2)	4	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Existing network should not be upgraded/minimise disruption (support HS2)	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Impact of HS2 on existing rail services	7	5	2	2	~	2	1	14
Impact of HS2 on funding other rail/transport projects (concern)	6	3	~	~	~	~	1	5
Improve existing - in phases	~	2	1	~	~	~	~	2
Improve existing - less first class carriages	~	2	~	~	~	~	~	8
Improve existing - longer platforms/trains	5	4	1	~	~	~	~	9
Improve existing - signalling	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Improve existing - specific improvements - suggestions	1	7	2	~	1	~	1	13
Improve existing - ticket pricing/fares	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	4
Improve existing - upgrades in progress/past improvements	4	2	1	1	~	~	~	3
Improve existing lines - electrification	1	4	1	~	~	~	~	3
Improve existing lines as well (support HS2)	5	5	4	~	1	~	~	7
Improve/invest in local/commuter/intra-city rail lines	13	4	~	~	~	~	~	7
Improve/utilise existing network instead (oppose HS2)	16	16	10	16	3	1	3	32
Other comments on existing rail services	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Prefer new conventional speed rail lines	~	9	~	~	1	~	~	1
Prefer Rail Package 2 (oppose HS2)	~	8	1	~	3	1	1	3

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Reopen old lines instead	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	3

18. Strategic Alternatives- Non Rail

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Air - air travel is preferable	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Air - improve aviation	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Air - suggestions	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Alternative - invest in North/regions (oppose HS2)	2	~	1	~	~	~	~	3
Alternative - other spending priorities	7	1	~	~	~	1	~	16
Alternative - strategy/approach	8	3	1	1	~	~	~	8
Alternative - support living/working locally	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Alternative - support reduction in travel	13	1	~	~	~	1	1	3
Alternative - utilise/develop IT instead (oppose HS2)	11	2	~	~	~	~	1	6
Alternatives - not properly considered/more information needed/better options (rail/nonrail)	9	19	5	14	1	13	2	13
Bus - improve the bus network	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
General - improve local transport services	5	1	~	1	~	~	~	5
General - improve the transport network generally	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	2
General - need for integrated transport strategy	10	2	8	3	1	9	~	13
Roads - concerns about roads	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	~
Roads - driving is preferable	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Roads - improve the road network	2	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Roads - suggestions	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

19. References

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Comments on transport policy	3	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
FOI request	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Government publications/white papers	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	8
HS2 reports/technical studies	1	2	1	1	~	~	~	4
Other information (e.g. non HS2 reports/studies/articles)	2	4	4	1	1	~	~	14
Other studies - Atkins study	1	1	~	~	~	~	~	1
Other studies - Eddington Transport study	6	2	2	1	~	~	1	5
Other studies - Imperial College report	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	1
Other studies - Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA)	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	~

dialogue**by**design

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Other studies - Mawhinney Review	~	~	2	~	~	~	~	~
Other studies - McNulty review	1	2	~	~	~	~	~	2
Other studies - Oxera report	2	3	2	~	~	1	~	~
Refer to 51M response	1	2	~	~	~	~	1	3
Refer to Arup plans/studies	~	~	~	2	~	~	~	1
Refer to Charter for High Speed Rail (Right Lines)	~	~	1	1	~	1	~	3
Refer to Command Paper	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Refer to DfT	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Refer to Evergreen III / Airtrack	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	2
Refer to House of Commons Transport Committee	1	~	1	~	~	~	~	2
Refer to level of public/local opinion (oppose HS2)	1	~	1	~	2	~	1	7
Refer to NIMBY debate	2	~	~	~	~	1	~	10
Refer to other country examples	5	~	4	6	1	1	1	17
Refer to other organisations submission	~	~	1	~	~	1	3	10
Refer to other question	~	2	2	2	6	3	~	3
Refer to other transport projects	1	1	~	~	~	1	~	3
Refer to own submission(s) - process/documents/organisation	2	~	~	~	1	1	3	71
Refer to proposals from URS Scott Wilson and Foster + Partners	~	1	~	1	~	~	~	1
Refer to revised DfT figures	~	~	~	1	~	~	~	~
Refer to stakeholder/organisation/local action group	2	4	2	~	4	5	9	14
Refer to TfL comments	~	~	1	~	1	~	~	~
Refer to UK heritage/railways/engineering	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Reference to planning contradictions	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Reference to planning guidance	~	~	~	1	~	~	3	6
Reference to policy	2	2	~	~	1	1	1	4

20. Consultation

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Comment - documentation	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	7
Comment - events	~	1	~	~	~	~	~	3
Comment - media coverage	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Comment - process	~	~	~	~	1	~	4	4
Comment - question	1	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Comment - timescale	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Comment - website	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Communicate case for HS2 more effectively	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Consultation on route/selection process	~	~	~	3	~	~	~	~
Follow up requested	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	7
Further consultation needed	~	~	2	8	~	~	4	10

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
General question of/objection to consultation	1	3	4	~	~	1	1	7
General support of consultation	~	~	~	~	~	~	2	~
More information needed	1	3	1	1	1	4	1	3
More information on impacted communities	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	6
Need for public enquiry/review/referendum	1	~	~	1	~	~	~	11
Phase 2 - need more consultation	~	1	4	~	~	~	~	1
Phase 2 - need more information/assessment	~	6	5	2	~	~	~	1
Query/oppose - documentation	1	2	2	1	1	2	3	11
Query/oppose - events	~	1	~	~	1	1	~	3
Query/oppose - process	2	1	~	2	4	6	2	9
Query/oppose - question	11	5	2	~	~	~	1	5
Query/oppose - question influence of consultation	1	~	~	~	~	1	~	8
Query/oppose - question/biased	~	~	~	2	~	~	~	~
Query/oppose - timescale	~	~	1	~	~	~	2	1
Query/oppose - website	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Support - process	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~

21. Other Comments

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
General criticism of DfT	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	2
General criticism of Government	1	~	3	~	~	1	1	5
General criticism of HS2 Limited	~	~	1	~	1	~	~	2
General opposition to HS2	6	1	5	2	11	5	6	294
General support for Government	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
General support for HS2	3	2	~	~	~	~	~	35
Other issues	1	~	1	~	~	~	1	8

22. Locations

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
(Chainage)	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
(Grid Reference)	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
A413	~	~	1	~	1	~	~	2
A421 Milton Keynes - Bicester	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
A4421	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Amersham	~	~	1	~	1	~	1	1
Aylesbury	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Aylesbury Vale	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Balsall Common	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Barton Hartshorne Road	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Bascote Heath	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Berkswell	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	~
Berkswell Hall Woods	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

dialoguebydesign

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Birmingham	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	2
Broadwells Wood	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Buckinghamshire	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	2
Burton Green	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Calvert	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Camden	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Castle Bromwich	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Chelmley Wood	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Cherwell	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Chetwode	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Chiltern Ridge	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Chilterns	~	4	1	7	11	1	1	13
Colne Valley	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	2
Coombe Hill	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Cottisford	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Coventry	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Coventry to Kenilworth	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Crackley	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Crackley Wood	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Cubbington	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Cubbington Woods	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Doddershall	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Ealing	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Edgcote House	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Eythrop Estate	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Featherbed Lane	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Finemere Wood	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Finmere	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Fosse Way	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Fringford	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Fulwell	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Godington	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	3
Grand Union Canal	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Great Missenden	~	1	~	~	2	~	~	3
Great Ouse River	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Greatworth	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Grendon	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Grim's Ditch	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Hampton in Arden	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Hartwell	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Hartwell House	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Hillingdon	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Hodnell Manor	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Hunningham Road	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Hyde Farmhouse Barn	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Itchington Wood	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Kenilworth	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Kenilworth Golf Club	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Kensal Green	~	~	~	~	~	~	1	~
Kensal Green Cemetery	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Kensal Green to Queens Park	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	~
Kensal Rise	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	~
Kings Ash Lane	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Ladbroke	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Lavender Hall Farm	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Ledburn Junction	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Little Missenden	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Little Packington	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
London	~	~	~	~	~	1	~	1
Long Itchington Road	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Lower Farm, Stoneythorpe	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Maida Vale	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Meriden Gap	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Middleton	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Middleton Hall	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Misbourne Chalk River	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Misbourne Valley	~	~	~	~	2	2	~	1
Missenden	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Mixbury	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Mossycorner Lane	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Newton Purcell	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	4
North Warwickshire	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Northamptonshire	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Offchurch	~	~	~	~	1	1	1	4
Offchurch Greenway	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Old Oak Common to Northolt	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Oxford Canal	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Potter Row	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Preston	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Priors Hardwick	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Quarrendon	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Queens Park	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Ridgeway National Trail	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
River Leam	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Ruislip	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	2
Ruislip Golf Course	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Shardeloes	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Sheephouse Wood	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
South Cubbington Wood	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
South Heath	~	~	~	~	3	~	~	~
South Northamptonshire	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Southam	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Spilsmere Wood	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Stareton	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Stoke on Trent	1	~	~	~	~	~	~	~
Stoneleigh	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	3
Stoneleigh Abbey	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Stoneleigh Park	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Stoneleigh Show Ground	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Stoneton	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1

Code	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Other format
Stoneythorpe Hall	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
The Oaks Farm/ Warren Farm	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Twyford	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Ufton Wood SSSI	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Uxbridge	~	~	1	~	~	~	~	~
Village Street, Offchurch	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Waddesdon	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Warwickshire	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	3
Washwood Heath	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	1
Water Orton	~	~	~	~	2	~	~	1
Welsh Road Farm	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	2
Wendover	~	~	~	~	8	1	1	3
West London	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
West Ruislip	~	~	~	~	1	~	~	~
Wormleighton	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1
Yorkshire	~	~	~	~	~	~	~	1