



Department
for Transport

2021 HS2 land and property review proposals consultation

Government response

February 2022

Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR



This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/ or contact, The National Archives at www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/contact-us.

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

This publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport

Contents

Ministerial foreword	4
Executive summary	5
Introduction	5
What we consulted on	5
Approach to consultation	5
1. Key changes in response to the consultation	6
Streamlined Residential Blight (SRB) Scheme	6
A variation to the need to sell (NTS) scheme	6
Safeguarding policy changes	7
2. Streamlined Residential Blight Scheme: questions and summary of responses	8
Summary of consultation proposals	8
The consultation questions	8
Summary of responses	9
3. A variation to the need to sell scheme: questions and summary of responses	11
Summary of consultation proposals	11
Summary of responses	12
4. Safeguarding policy changes: questions and summary of responses	15
Summary of consultation proposals	15
The consultation questions	16
Our response	16
Consultation principles	17
Annex A: Organisations responding to the consultation	18
Annex B: Glossary	19

Ministerial foreword



HS2 is an exceptional project. Those property owners that are impacted by it deserve an exceptional response. That is why we have always sought to put people along the route at the heart of our property compensation schemes. In that spirit, we are committed to keeping the package of HS2 property compensation schemes under review.

In November 2020, the Government published [HS2 Land and Property Review: findings and proposals](#). This set out 36 proposals intended to improve how the Government and HS2 Ltd communicate with people whose property is affected by the HS2 project; to improve how long it takes to settle compensation schemes; and to improve the support offered to businesses to relocate.

The proposals varied from the quick to implement through to more complex reforms that will take longer to work through. We have implemented over half of the proposals and aim to conclude work on the rest before the second anniversary of the report's publication.

Many of the proposals in the Review originated from discussions held with property market professionals having direct experience of advising clients affected by HS2. But in some instances, the Government considered that it needed to consult on specific proposals. Another issue, not raised in the 2020 Review, also arose in relation to safeguarding and was included in the consultation to which this document is the Government's response.

The consultation did not gather a large number of responses; but the Government was pleased that, in addition to some of those directly affected, we received replies from a number of key stakeholders, including line of route local and transport authorities. A list of the organisations that responded is included at Annex A.

This document sets out what we will now do as a result of the consultation responses. In some cases, we know that there is more work to be done in terms of analysis and testing. In others, we now consider that we are in a position to move forward to implementation.

I am grateful to everyone who responded to the consultation and shared their views.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Andrew Stephenson'.

Andrew Stephenson MP

Minister of State

Executive summary

Introduction

This document sets out the Government response to the [2021 HS2 land and property review proposals public consultation](#).

The consultation ran from 19 May to 30 June 2021. The Government received 11 responses, 7 of them from organisations and 4 from individuals. This document provides a summary of those responses and sets out the Government's conclusions and next steps.

What we consulted on

The consultation covered 3 broad policy proposals relating to how land and property is affected by High Speed Two (HS2). Two of the 3 derived from the [HS2 Land and Property Review 2020](#): a detailed review of the HS2 property buying programme seeking views; and ideas on how to improve the experience of property owners and other residents affected by HS2 or who may apply to the HS2 property schemes. The third, relating to safeguarding, arose subsequent to the 2020 Review but for convenience was included in the consultation.

The consultation therefore covered:

- Proposals for a streamlined residential blight (SRB) scheme;
- Proposals for variation to the need to sell (NTS) scheme; and
- Proposals for a variation to safeguarding.

Approach to consultation

The consultation was run by the Department for Transport (DfT). The consultation document and response form were available online and hard copies were available on request.

As the number of responses was relatively small, analysis was undertaken by officials in the DfT.

1. Key changes in response to the consultation

Streamlined Residential Blight (SRB) Scheme

The responses to the consultation have helped the Government to expand its understanding of the public's and key stakeholder bodies' views of the proposed SRB scheme. Based on the responses received, the Government has decided that it is going to press ahead with the implementation of the proposed SRB scheme, as it considers that this will give those most impacted by the construction of HS2 greater choice in how they want their property acquisitions dealt with.

Based on the findings of the consultation the Government will launch a trial of the new SRB based on the criteria set out in the consultation document and does not plan to make any changes at present to the proposed scheme following the consultation. The new SRB scheme will require applicants to commit to both the Red Book valuation and the £7,000 fixed sum disturbance payment should they opt to sell their property via the scheme. When the Government and HS2 Ltd launch applications for the new SRB scheme, it will be launched on a trial basis and any findings of the trial will inform any changes to the scheme in the future. The Government will set out details of the trial period in the spring.

In response to feedback from respondents, the Government has asked that HS2 Ltd explore options for implementing - when requested by an applicant - that they can opt only into the 'Red Book' valuation. The Government will also consider including business and agricultural property within this. This however will not be part of the SRB scheme. Scheme-specific guidance where this applies would be updated in due course if implemented. HS2 Ltd will also seek views on this as part of the wider trial of the SRB Scheme.

A variation to the need to sell (NTS) scheme

The consultation responses, although useful, did not provide a clear way forward on the proposed variation to the need to sell scheme. However, taking account of the responses received and other feedback, including from HS2 Ltd, the Government has reached the following conclusions.

There is merit in further consideration of the variation to the need-to-sell scheme, even though some questions remain. We will therefore pursue further analytical work, building on that already done, to consider a number of possible additional variables.

If the additional analytical work supports the further consideration of the NTS variation, the next step would be to undertake research and / or to operate the variation on a trial basis.

The exact form of any such trial remains to be determined but it would be likely to test such variables as the incentive payment (which the Government is minded to include) and whether it is right to limit the applicability of the NTS variation to applicants who receive an offer of at least 75% of the unblighted value.

Leaving aside the question of a trial, the Government has concluded the following, based on the consultation responses.

There is no need to set an outer geographic boundary to the variation. The Government was interested in seeing if there was any support for such a proposal, but it has not so far been necessary to define a boundary for the existing NTS scheme and a variation to the original scheme should for clarity comply as far as possible with the rules established for the original. The consultation responses did not provide evidence for the introduction of an outer boundary for the NTS variation.

However, the Government agrees with the majority of responders, that an inner boundary to the NTS variation would be appropriate on those parts of the HS2 route where the Rural Support Zone (RSZ) operates. The NTS variation will therefore not be available within the RSZ, although the existing NTS scheme will continue to apply there and elsewhere.

The Government agrees with the responder who stated that the incentive payment requires more thought. Research and a possible trial scheme could test what the appropriate amount might be. They could also test what risks the NTS variation might introduce into the scheme.

Safeguarding policy changes

Currently there are two types of safeguarding: surface and subsurface. Owner-occupiers in safeguarding may be eligible to serve a blight notice on the Secretary of State requiring their property to be purchased. Where a property is in subsurface safeguarding only, the Secretary of State would not normally expect to buy it, although there will be a small payment as part of the acquisition of sub soil rights.

The Government consulted on introducing a third type of safeguarding for airspace where a crane will only temporarily oversail a property. Our intention would be to clarify that, where a property is in airspace safeguarding only, we would not normally expect to buy it. This should provide clarity to owner-occupiers and reduce their concerns about substantial impacts on their property but also reduce the risk of nugatory spend of taxpayer's money.

The introduction of airspace safeguarding would avoid negatively impacting property values as the market would be more likely to function normally where there would be no surface safeguarding to suggest the land would be bought for construction purposes (for example requiring demolition for the building of the railway).

The Government's intention, therefore, is to introduce this new type of safeguarding.

2. Streamlined Residential Blight Scheme: questions and summary of responses

Summary of consultation proposals

The 2020 Land and Property review proposed a series of measures to streamline and speed up the process for agreeing on compensation. This includes exploring the option for [statutory blight](#) cases to:

- use the property valuation method already used for non-statutory schemes;
- implement arrangements for a fixed-sum payment to cover the costs associated with moving to a new house (such as removals and mail redirection), removing the need for lengthy discussions.

The proposed Streamlined Residential Blight (SRB) scheme was developed in response to these proposals about statutory blight cases.

It is expected this scheme would allow compensation to be agreed on more quickly while compensating affected parties fairly and delivering value for money for the taxpayer. The scheme would not replace the existing statutory blight process. It would sit alongside it as an optional scheme. Once a blight notice has been accepted, eligible applicants would be able to choose to sell their property either using the SRB scheme or the existing statutory blight process.

The consultation questions

The consultation asked the following questions:

- Do you agree that it is of benefit to applicants to have the option of selling their property via a streamlined residential blight scheme?
- Do you agree with the eligibility criteria for the proposed scheme?
- Do you have any suggested changes for the proposed scheme?
- Do you see merit in trialling the SRB scheme for a set period of time or for a particular section of the HS2 route?
- Are there any other aspects of the proposed scheme that you would like to comment on?

Summary of responses

The Government was pleased to see from the consultation responses that there is a broad base of support from the individuals and organisations who provided comments on this section for the introduction of the SRB scheme.

We asked – Do you agree that it is of benefit to applicants to have the option of selling their property via a streamlined residential blight scheme?

There was no opposition among those who responded to the consultation to the implementation of the SRB scheme in principle, with many commenting that they welcomed any change that would give more choice to applicants about how their case would be settled. Respondents also commented that anything that had the potential to speed up the statutory blight claim process should be encouraged. However, respondents did suggest changes to the SRB scheme which will be addressed further in this section.

We asked – Do you agree with the eligibility criteria for the proposed scheme?

The eligibility criteria includes only accepting residential properties that are on Phases 2a and 2b of the HS2 route who meet the 3 qualifying criteria that statutory blight applications are judged against. Applicants would also not be able to claim for any hope¹ or developmental value. It also specifically excludes business and agricultural applicants from being able to apply as the Government does not consider these to be suitable. In most cases they would have significantly higher levels of disturbance claims than a residential property, so would still need to be negotiated on an individual basis.

In addition, a respondent raised the idea of allowing residential properties as well as business and agricultural units to be able to opt into just the Red Book valuation aspect of the scheme. The Government will respond to this in the final question in the SRB scheme section.

We asked – Do you have any suggested changes for the proposed scheme?

Several respondents suggested a change to the disturbance amount awarded to affected parties. They suggested that the figure should not be fixed at a single amount (currently proposed to be £7,000) but instead to be calculated based on factors related to the property being acquired.

For example, respondents suggested the Government should look at paying a percentage of the property value or an amount per square metre as the disturbance amount instead. Before the publication of the consultation, the Government had already considered the possibility of setting different fixed amounts and whether there were different ways of calculating a bespoke disturbance figure. The Government decided on a fixed disturbance amount as it intends that the SRB scheme should allow for speed and certainty when opted into by the affected party. The Government considers that moving away from the fixed disturbance amount removes the certainty to the property owner when they opt into the SRB scheme and opens the potential for dispute over the amount, particularly if the

¹ If land is perceived to have a higher value than its Market Value, based not on fact but on judgement, then this additional value may be referred to as 'Hope Value'.

Government were to use a property size calculation, removing a key goal of the SRB scheme to speed up the process. For the trial period the Government has decided to proceed with a fixed disturbance amount of £7,000. After the trial, the Government will determine the final fixed disturbance amount and whether there should be any scope to vary it.

We asked – Do you see merit in trialling the SRB scheme for a set period of time or for a particular section of the HS2 route?

Respondents agreed that there should be a trial period to test how the SRB scheme would work in practice. No respondent disagreed with there being a trial period. The Government has decided that the SRB scheme should be trialled with further details to be set out in due course. However, this will be a time limited trial; it is likely that there will be a yet-to-be-specified cap on the maximum number of applications before the functioning of the SRB scheme is reviewed. The trial period is not likely to be on a specific part of the route; instead applications will be welcomed from those that qualify under the eligibility criteria.

We asked – Are there any other aspects of the proposed scheme that you would like to comment on?

As previously stated in this response it has been raised by some that the Government should allow residential properties as well as business and agricultural units to opt into just the Red Book valuation aspect of the scheme. The Government has recognised this and agrees that this could bring benefits to those going through the process. Therefore, the Government has asked that HS2 Ltd explore options for implementing - when requested by an applicant - that they can opt only into the 'Red Book' valuation aspect. HS2 Ltd will as part of the wider SRB scheme trial will test whether applicants would have preferred the option of being able to select a Red Book valuation method for residential, business, and agricultural properties. This however will not be part of the SRB scheme and if the Government decided to implement this at a future date would remain separate to the SRB Scheme. Scheme specific guidance on where this applies will be updated in due course after the trial period if the Government decides to implement it.

3. A variation to the need to sell scheme: questions and summary of responses

Summary of consultation proposals

The need to sell (NTS) scheme supports property owners who have a compelling reason to sell their property but, due to HS2, are unable to do so other than at a significant loss. Or, if they are unable to sell their property, they would face an unreasonable burden in the next 3 years.

If an application under the NTS scheme is successful, the government agrees to buy a property for its full, unblighted, open-market value.

A property owner who applies to the NTS scheme is required to market the property for at least 3 months as part of the established qualifying criteria. If, by that means, they are able to obtain a realistic unblighted price or get within 15% of a realistic unblighted price, they should sell at that price (unless they can demonstrate that an offer greater than 85% of the unblighted price in fact represents a blighted price). If they are not able to obtain an offer within 15% of an unblighted value, then their application to NTS proceeds.

The consultation proposed a variation to NTS, to run alongside the current scheme. Under the variation there would be 2 main differences:

- The Government would invite the successful NTS applicant to sell their property on the open market instead of to the Government (unless an immediate and compelling need to sell was identified, in which case, the applicant may find it quicker to sell to the Secretary of State). If an offer at between 75% and 85% of the unblighted value or above was forthcoming, the sale would be concluded on that basis. And if no offers were forthcoming, even at a blighted price, the existing NTS scheme remains the route to a sale to the Secretary of State.
- If a blighted offer (subject to valuation) were deemed to be the best offer available, the Government would pay the vendor the difference between the blighted and unblighted price. A blighted offer here means one that is between 75% and 85% of the unblighted price. An offer that is within 15% of the unblighted price should simply be accepted. An offer at less than 75% of the unblighted price should proceed as a sale under NTS to the Secretary of State.

Under the variation to NTS, a one-off payment would be paid to the vendor to incentivise them to sell their property on the open market rather than to the Secretary of State.

Summary of responses

We asked - What is your view on the general principle of introducing a variation to the NTS scheme?

Eight responders agreed with the general principle of the variation to the NTS scheme and only one disagreed. Two offered no opinion. The CAAV did not support the principle but did concede that “the proposed scheme is helpful in that it offers a fairer system for those who could sell their property at 75-85% of the unblighted price”. However, the CAAV’s objection to the proposal was based on a more general perception that the NTS scheme itself is inherently unfair, in that it usually expects a property owner to accept an offer within 15% of the unblighted value. RICS made this point also, whilst agreeing with the proposal overall. The Government is not minded to remove the obligation on property owners to accept an offer within 15% of the realistic unblighted asking price, unless they can show evidence that an offer above that level represents a blighted offer.

Those who supported the general principle of the NTS variation cited such reasons as that it could offer a faster route to the sale of a property and one noted that NTS is a voluntary scheme. Some of those who supported the overall principle nevertheless complained of a lack of detail in the consultation proposals.

We asked – If implemented, should the variation be applied to an individual phase of the HS2 route to test how it would operate in practice before any wider implementation decision was taken?

Opinions were fairly evenly divided with regard to the advisability of running a trial of the NTS proposal before fuller implementation. Four responders supported the idea of a trial, 3 opposed it and 4 expressed no opinion. There was little evidence offered on either side as to why a trial should or should not be attempted, although one responder advocated implementing the NTS proposal across the full route but withdrawing it later if it was found not to work. The Government is not minded to take that approach, however. More work would be needed to design a trial and the Government will undertake further analysis before determining whether and where to undertake a trial scheme.

We asked – The Government is minded to set a limit of 75% of the unblighted value of a property for the variation to the NTS scheme, after which it could be more appropriate for the government to acquire the property under the existing scheme. Do you agree?

Most responders offered no answer to the question regarding a 75% limit to the blighted value that a property might be sold at before the NTS variation would apply, and below which the Government is minded simply to acquire the property and thereby have an asset that can eventually be sold once blight has receded. Two responders agreed with the proposal and three opposed it. RICS warned of the possibility that property owners might ‘game’ a system that set defined boundaries, noting “where there is any scheme with hard boundaries in terms of percentages of values set there is the potential for property owners to ensure that they can fit themselves in the most appropriate category to suit themselves and their personal circumstances”. The HS2 Residents’ Commissioner argued that any putative ‘floor’ to the NTS proposal mattered far less than the determination of an unblighted value itself, and who undertakes that.

We asked – Do you foresee any risks to the proposal and, if so, how might they be mitigated?

Three responders saw the possibility of risks introduced with the NTS proposal and 2 saw none; the remaining 6 offered no opinion. The CAAV commented that the NTS process could be too time consuming and suggested wider reform of NTS, including setting the level at which a property owner should be expected to sell rather than pursue an NTS claim at 95% of the unblighted price (rather than 85%, as at present). The Residents' Commissioner was concerned that property owners will "encourage an offer at 85% [of the unblighted price] or below" in the knowledge that the Government would top that up and add the incentive payment under the NTS variation. That risk should be offset, in the Commissioner's view, against the savings to be made through the Government acquiring fewer properties that it does not need and the benefits of encouraging the normal working of the property market.

We asked – Do you think it reasonable for the Government to limit the variation to NTS to beyond 120 metres and therefore outside of the RSZ?

We asked – Should the variation to NTS have an outer boundary to prevent applications from properties that are clearly too far from HS2 to experience any form of blight resulting from it?

The suggestion that the NTS variation should start outside the Rural Support Zone was viewed favourably, with 6 responders supporting it and the rest offering no opinion. Three responders considered that a geographic boundary to the NTS variation could be appropriate and two did not; the rest had no opinion. Of the two who opposed the idea of a boundary, one suggested that a boundary increases perceptions of blight.

We asked – Do you agree the variation to the NTS scheme should include an incentive payment? How much, in your opinion, should it be?

One of the key elements of the NTS variation proposal is the incentive payment. However only 3 responders supported the payment of an incentive, with 2 of those suggesting an amount between £5k and £10k. Three responders were against the idea of an incentive and the remaining 5 had no opinion. The NFU suggested that the incentive payment idea required more thought.

We asked – Are there any other aspects of the proposed scheme that you would like to comment on?

The Residents' Commissioner suggested that the government "could tie the incentive payment to a percentage of the market value of the property to make it fair to all and to close the gap for those who are selling within the 15% differential". RICS returned to the theme of the perceived unfairness of the NTS scheme, and in particular that property owners might have to sell at below the unblighted value. Both Trafford and Manchester City councils acknowledged that the Government might not wish to acquire property for which it has no need, but urged the Government to consider the wider societal benefits of publicly-owned property, which they suggested could help with issues other than HS2.

One responder questioned the incentive payment and considered that if a vendor has sold on the open market and has been 'topped up' to the unblighted price, they should be

content with that. This responder also noted that the buyer in those circumstances has obtained “a potentially cheaper house” so they too should be satisfied. The responder suggested that this approach might replace the existing NTS scheme and thereby save taxpayers’ money. However, the Government does not intend the variation to NTS that it has consulted on as a replacement for the existing scheme.

4. Safeguarding policy changes: questions and summary of responses

Summary of consultation proposals

Safeguarding is a planning tool used to protect land which may be needed for future infrastructure from potentially conflicting development. Safeguarding directions for HS2 require local planning authorities to consult HS2 Ltd on planning applications to avoid development that potentially conflicts with the project.

Issuing safeguarding directions also triggers statutory blight. This means property owner-occupiers within the safeguarded area may be eligible to serve a blight notice asking the Secretary of State to buy their property before it's needed for construction.

Currently, there are 2 types of safeguarding:

- surface; and
- subsurface.

Recently, cases have been identified where HS2 Ltd only needs access to the airspace above a property to operate cranes. This is called 'oversailing'. The properties impacted are not actually required for the construction of HS2 and therefore acquiring the properties would not provide good value for money to the taxpayer.

Currently, oversailing cases fall into surface safeguarding. But being in surface safeguarding makes it more difficult for an owner-occupier to sell their property due to the effects of statutory blight. Owner-occupiers of oversailed properties may therefore be in a position where they cannot sell their properties on the open market or to the Secretary of State. They would still be able to submit a blight notice as they would be in safeguarding, however these would unlikely be accepted in the situation where only the airspace above a property is required. The introduction of a third type of safeguarding is intended to provide clarity of expectations around the need for a property – i.e. if the land is needed or not.

We asked for views on whether introducing a third type of 'airspace' safeguarding would offer more clarity and protection to owner-occupiers where crane oversailing forms the extent of construction requirements for HS2.

The consultation questions

- Is there anything we should factor into our considerations when introducing a third type of safeguarding? Is there anything we can do to help reduce an owner-occupier's concerns at being placed into oversailing safeguarding?
- If the owner-occupier had a compelling reason to sell the property but could not do so (other than at a substantially reduced price) due to the impact of HS2, they would be able to request consideration of any special circumstances, or of the atypical nature of their property.
- Or, they could apply to the need-to-sell scheme (but would need to meet the qualifying criteria). Does this help to strike a fair balance between adequately supporting the affected owner-occupier and maintaining value for money for the taxpayer?
- Currently, being placed into safeguarding can affect the ability of an owner-occupier to sell a property on the unblighted open private market. In your view, would introducing a category of safeguarding for crane oversailing: a) give you the confidence to buy a property, on the basis that the only construction effects would be the oversailing of cranes? b) help you to put your property on the market if you were in that situation, and to feel you were being fairly treated?
- Are there any other aspects of this proposal that you would like to comment on?

Our response

The Government wants to support the needs of those people who live within properties that are oversailed by cranes, effectively remove them from statutory blight and reduce the volume of property purchases that are not directly needed for construction.

The Government's intention, therefore, is to introduce a new type of airspace safeguarding. We would clarify that, where a property is in airspace safeguarding, we would not normally expect to buy it. This more targeted approach should provide greater clarity to landowners affected by safeguarding and reduce the negative impacts of safeguarding in a local area. HS2's discretionary property schemes, such as the need to sell scheme, would continue to operate and may be available to applicants that meet the eligibility criteria.

The responses to the consultation have been helpful in establishing what further comfort mortgage lenders need to grant mortgages to properties in airspace safeguarding.

Consultation principles

This consultation was conducted in line with the Government's key consultation principles which are available at www.gov.uk/government/publications/consultations-principles-guidance

If you have any comments about the consultation process, please contact:

Consultation Co-ordinator

Department for Transport

Zone 1/29 Great Minster House

London SW1P 2DR

Email: consultation@dft.gov.uk

Annex A: Organisations responding to the consultation

The following submitted responses to the consultation. We have not listed individuals who responded, even where they chose to give their names. However, we have considered the HS2 Residents' Commissioner to have responded as an organisation for the purposes of this list.

- The Central Association of Agricultural Valuers (CAAV)
- The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS)
- The National Farmers' Union (NFU)
- Manchester City Council
- Trafford Council
- Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)
- The HS2 Residents' Commissioner

Annex B: Glossary

- **Blight claim:** A term used to describe the claim form that is submitted to the Secretary of State (via HS2 Ltd) for compensation for selling a property to the Secretary of State. A Blight Claim can only be served once the Secretary of State has confirmed acceptance of the blight notice.
- **Blight notice:** This is the statutory notice that can be served on the Secretary of State (via HS2 Ltd), for eligible properties, in order to seek acceptance that the Secretary of State is willing to purchase a property.
- **Compensation code:** This is the collective term used to describe the principles for the assessment of compensation. It is a mixture of Acts of Parliament, court cases ('case law') and government guidance relating to compensation for compulsory acquisition. It can also be referred to as the 'Compulsory Purchase Code'.
- **Department for Transport (DfT):** DfT works with its agencies and partners to support the transport network that helps the UK's businesses and gets people and goods travelling around the country. The DfT plans and invests in transport infrastructure to keep the UK on the move. DfT is a ministerial department, supported by agencies and public bodies, including High Speed Two Limited (HS2 Ltd).
- **Development value:** This is the value of a property for an alternative use with existing full planning permission.
- **Disturbance compensation:** Usually only available to the occupiers of the properties, it means compensation for reasonable additional costs and losses incurred as a result of being required to move (for example, removal expenses).
- **Extended homeowner protection zone (EHPZ):** An area that is no longer safeguarded by the Secretary of State but within which people can still apply for Express Purchase for five years from the date safeguarding was removed.
- **High Speed Two Limited (HS2 Ltd):** The company responsible for developing and promoting the UK's new high speed rail network. It is funded by grant-in-aid from the government. HS2 Ltd is an executive non-departmental public body, sponsored by the Department for Transport.
- **Hope value:** If land is perceived to have a higher value than its market value, based not on fact but on judgment, then this additional value may be referred to as 'hope value'.
- **Need to sell (NTS) scheme:** A discretionary scheme for property owners who believe they have a compelling reason to sell their property.
- **Non-statutory schemes:** These schemes are non-statutory schemes available outside of statutory blight claims, and as a result have their own set of requirements dependant on the scheme. They include schemes such as need to sell and are available along the line of route ahead of construction beginning.
- **Owner-occupier:** An owner-occupier is anyone who owns a property (either outright or with a mortgage) as a freehold or on a certain term of years lease (with at least three years unexpired) and has it as their principal residence or place of business. The full

definition of ‘owner-occupier’ can be found through reference to Chapter 2, Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- **Phase Two:** The HS2 route from the West Midlands to Manchester and the East Midlands. Other commonly used terminology in relation to Phase Two includes Phase 2a (the route from the West Midlands to Crewe); Phase 2b Western Leg (the route from Crewe to Manchester) and Phase 2b Eastern Leg (the route from the West Midlands to the East Midlands/Leeds).
- **Red Book valuation:** a valuation undertaken according to the principles set out in The Red Book, which is issued by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS). The publication details mandatory practices for RICS members undertaking valuation services.
- **Rural support zone (RSZ):** The area outside the safeguarded area and up to 120m from the centre line of the HS2 railway in rural areas. Two discretionary schemes are available in the RSZ – Voluntary Purchase and the Cash Offer.
- **Safeguarding directions:** These are the directions issued by the Secretary of State that establish the land that is safeguarded.
- **Safeguarding:** Safeguarding is an established part of the planning system, designed to protect land which has been earmarked for major infrastructure projects from conflicting developments that might otherwise occur. From the date Safeguarding Directions are issued, local planning authorities must consult with the authority which issued the Directions on planning applications they receive that fall within the safeguarded area. Safeguarding also triggers ‘statutory blight’. This means that property owners within the safeguarded area may be eligible to serve a blight notice asking the acquiring authority to buy their property in advance of any compulsory purchase.
- **Statutory blight:** This is the term used to describe a situation where a property is blighted in a legal sense, such as where it is in a development plan or within land safeguarded for a specific purpose such as HS2 or included within a compulsory purchase order.
- **Streamlined Residential Blight (SRB):** a scheme that would allow compensation to be agreed on more quickly while compensating affected parties fairly and delivering value for money for the taxpayer.
- **Subsurface safeguarding:** In locations where subsurface safeguarding applies, local authorities do not usually have to consult on applications for planning permission, unless the proposed development would extend below ground level. For HS2, subsurface safeguarding is usually put in place when the proposed line of route is in a bored tunnel.
- **Surface safeguarding:** In locations subject to surface safeguarding, local planning authorities must consult on all planning applications they receive that fall within this area. For HS2, the land that is identified for surface safeguarding typically involves surface works and structures associated with the railway.
- **Unblighted open market value:** This is the value that a property would have on the open market if the cause of blight were removed – in the context of this consultation if there were no plans for HS2.