

## House of Commons

### High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill

#### 1. Petitioner information

In the box below, give the name and address of each individual, business or organisation submitting the petition.

Cheshire West & Chester Council.

In the box below, give a description of the petitioners. For example, “We are the owners/tenants of the addresses above”; “My company has offices at the address above”; “Our organisation represents the interests of...”; “We are the parish council of...”.

- i. Cheshire West & Cheshire Council (“CW&C”) was created in 2009 by an order, the Cheshire (Structural Changes) Order 2008, made under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007.
- ii. CW&C is the local authority for an administrative area comprising the same area as the former boroughs of Ellesmere Port and Neston, and Vale Royal and the City of Chester.
- iii. It is a unitary authority, having the powers of a non-metropolitan county and district council combined, and derives its powers from the Local Government Act 1972 and numerous enactments passed since then.
- iv. As the local planning authority, CW&C is responsible for general planning and the preparation of location plans. It is also the local highway, transport, and parking authority and has other powers and duties in relation to activities of public concern. These include housing, public health, recreation, civic welfare and amenity and the economic well-being of the area. As such, CW&C is responsible for the protection of its property, rights, security, and interests and those of the citizens, inhabitants and ratepayers of Cheshire West and Chester as a whole.
- v. The route of the HS2 Phase 2B scheme (“the Proposed Scheme”) goes through the eastern area of the borough and is described in community area report and map book MA02 – Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam. The route traverses north from Walley’s Green on embankment, passing Middlewich to the east, before crossing the Middlewich branch of the Shropshire Union Canal on viaduct. It continues on embankment, passing Winsford to the west and crossing the river Dane on viaduct. The route will continue north towards Lostock Gralam, alternating between embankment and viaduct to cross over Puddinglake Brook, the Trent and Mersey Canal, Gad Brook, Wade Brook, Peover Eye and Smoker Brook before continuing into the Pickmere to Agden and Hulse Heath area.

- vi. The Proposed Scheme also includes the Crewe North Rolling Stock Depot, which will be provided on land between the route of the Proposed Scheme and the West Coast Main Line, north-east of Walley's Green. This operational and maintenance hub will feature 27 sidings of 400 metre length to accommodate up to 54 high speed trains. When operational, the works undertaken at this Depot will be more extensive than elsewhere on the Western Leg, ranging from light cleaning to heavy duty maintenance. This Depot is where most train drivers would be based and would start and end their shifts.
- vii. Cheshire West and Chester has a population of approximately 331,000 and covers 350 square miles. The borough includes the historic city of Chester and the industrial and market towns of Ellesmere Port, Frodsham, Helsby, Malpas, Neston, Northwich and Winsford. About a third of the population live in rural areas. Winsford and Northwich are the two towns within the borough located closest to the HS2 route, having populations of approximately 34,000 and 49,000 respectively.

#### **Contents of petition**

- viii. This petition is concerned with the impacts of the Proposed Scheme on CW&C's administrative area, as described in the Environmental Statement and associated documents.
- ix. CW&C's concerns relate to (i) highways and active travel (ii) public transport and public rights of way (iii) Climate Change (iv) equality and diversity (v) landscape and visual (vi) ecology and biodiversity (vii) schools (viii) ground conditions (ix), Crewe North Rolling Stock Depot (x) the need for engagement officers (xi) waste and (minerals).

#### **Context**

- x. The construction and operation of Proposed Scheme will have significant, disproportionate, and long-lasting detrimental impacts on residents, communities and businesses. As the infrastructure will permanently sever, and a change of character of, communities, mitigation must be focused on being driven from the context of the communities affected. Cumulative assessment of impacts and the provision of appropriate solutions is essential. The consideration of impacts in isolation would be unacceptable to CW&C.
- xi. Areas throughout the borough affected by the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme present the Promoter with challenging conditions including unstable ground, complex geology, salt and brine caverns, and underground gas storage infrastructure. It is essential that any issue arising from these conditions is addressed fully and at the Promoter's cost.
- xii. Rather than complete section 3 of the petition, the Council has listed its request, or solution, in this section under each issue.

## 2. Objections to the Bill

In the box below, write your objections to the Bill and why your property or other interests are **directly and specially affected**. Please number each paragraph.

Only objections outlined in this petition can be presented when giving evidence to the Committee. You will not be entitled to be heard by the Committee on new matters not included in your written petition.

### **Highways & Active Travel**

1. As a Highways Authority, CW&C has a statutory duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on its highway network. This duty will, of course, apply during the construction of the Proposed Scheme and, in some locations, mitigation will be required to allow for future transport growth and to reduce detrimental effects on the highway network. During this time, CW&C will have to continue delivering a safe and accessible borough for residents and businesses in line with its corporate vision, including our Bus Service Improvement Plan.
2. CW&C is concerned that the Promoter has not provided detailed traffic modelling information that allows it to fully assess the Proposed Scheme's construction and operational impacts on certain junctions. This prevents CW&C from being able to consider properly whether any proposed mitigation measures are suitable, and whether any additional land take is required.
3. To make up for the absence of detailed information, CW&C is procuring specialist external resources to work with officers to collate robust evidence bases, and to support the issues raised in the Highways section of this petition. To date, a high-level review of the Promoter's documents has been undertaken to establish potential options for increasing the capacity and/or improving the operation of the junctions which will be affected detrimentally by the Proposed Scheme. These are discussed below.

### **A556 Shurlach Road construction works – impact on surrounding junctions and communities**

#### Issue

4. CW&C is concerned that the Promoter has not confirmed how it intends to undertake the A556 Shurlach Road works including traffic management (lane and road closures etc), diversions routes and duration of construction. This information will have a significant impact on the traffic assessments for each of the junctions listed below and will assist in determining whether further mitigation or land take is required –
  - A556 Shurlach Road / A530 King Street – during the peak periods this junction is already near or at full capacity, without the predicted additional construction traffic;
  - A556 Shurlach Road / A559 Manchester Road;
  - A556 Shurlach Road / Birches Lane – CW&C is concerned by implications on safety of traffic travelling at speed joining A556 Shurlach Road;

- A559 Manchester Road / A559 Hall Lane – during the peak periods this junction is already near or at full capacity without the predicted additional construction traffic;
  - A559 Manchester Road / A530 Griffiths Road; and
  - A530 King Street / B5082 Middlewich Road.
5. Moreover, CW&C is concerned that the low bridge on the A530 Griffiths Road has not been considered as part of the Transport Assessment, despite the Promoter's submitted plans showing the A530 Griffiths Road as a construction route. (The A530 Griffiths Road is the proposed diversion route being used when the re-alignment works on the A556 Shurlach Road are being undertaken).
  6. CW&C is further concerned that the Promoter has not accounted for the 24/7 access that local businesses will require and the impact the construction works on A556 Shurlach Road will have on the successful delivery of their operations. This is particularly true for businesses located on the Gadbrook Park a 100-hectare business park on the outskirts of Northwich. In addition, Roberts Bakery and Morrisons Distribution Centre are located close to this area. The operations of these businesses, together with Jack Richards Haulage, TATA and LSEP incinerator, all located on Griffiths Road will have a big impact on traffic movements at each junction detailed above.
  7. The Winsford Industrial Estate has almost 150 businesses, employing more than 4,000 people, and operating in a range of sectors – from logistics and warehousing to pharmaceuticals and catering which will also be impacted by the construction works. Again, the businesses will be detrimentally affected by the Proposed Development's impact of junctions.
  8. Local communities such as Rudheath, Lostock, Byley, Lach Dennis, Lostock Green and Davenham are concerned about the impacts on their parishes with increased traffic volumes using these areas as 'rat runs' or alternative routes which will increase road safety issues, journey time delay to residents and public transport.
  9. Moreover, the Promoter has not acknowledged in the Transport Assessment the significant increase in HGV traffic that the new TATA incinerator on the A530 Griffiths Road will generate, something which will put additional pressures on A556 Shurlach Road / A530 King Street roundabout as the route to the site.
  10. CW&C are concerned that the proposed closure of A556 Shurlach Road / B5082 Penny's Lane has not been fully considered as part of the Transport Assessment as this is a well-used route and will have an impact on the movements at the A556 Shurlach Road / A530 King Street junction. This junction was identified as a medium-term priority for intervention in the Northwich Transport Strategy
  11. CW&C are concerned that based on the predicted increased traffic flow at the above locations improvements to pedestrian and cycling facilities are required in line with national and CW&C's policy to promote active and sustainable travel.

#### Solutions

12. CW&C considers that additional mitigation measures including land take may be required at the junctions stated above. However, CW&C has been unable to fully assess the impact, as detailed junction modelling has not been provided. This has been requested several times.

13. CW&C seeks reassurances from the Promoter that the Transport Assessment has fully assessed the impact on these junctions and to provide traffic modelling and junction analysis to demonstrate there will be no detrimental effects on the network.
14. If junction modelling shows that the construction works will have a major impact on traffic movements, the Promoter will need to provide additional mitigation measures, including land take if required.
15. Finally on this point, CW&C is aware that Parish Councils and Ward Members have serious concerns regarding the Proposed Scheme's impacts on road safety, particularly during the construction phase. The Council seeks a commitment that the Promoter will work closely with Parish Councils and Ward Members to seek to address their concerns.

#### Issue

16. CW&C considers that revisions detailed in the Additional Provision 1 ("AP1") will not address CW&C's concerns regarding traffic effects on the junctions mentioned above.
17. For instance, the proposed permanent changes to the A559 Manchester Road / A530 Griffiths Road reinforces CW&C's existing concerns about available design space for this junction alteration within the highway boundary. Also, the suitability of A530 Griffiths Road as a diversion route with the low bridge has not been addressed in any of AP1's supporting documents.
18. It is stated that there will be a temporary layout at this junction for 12 months which will have a big impact on CW&C's principal network, and it unclear how this will be managed, as detailed modelling has not been provided.

#### Solution

19. CW&C seeks confirmation that the proposed junction alteration at A559 Manchester Road / A530 Griffiths Road can be undertaken within the highway boundary without compromising design standards and that it does not require additional land take.

### **Community severance at Lostock**

#### Issue

20. The Proposed Scheme will result in community severance because of its impacts on the A556 Lostock Green. The Promoter proposes to provide a diversion route to mitigate the effects of severance; however, the length of the route is disproportionately long and will not encourage use of active modes.

#### Solution

21. In respect of the community severance point, CW&C requests a new footbridge from Lostock Green to Lostock. The length of the proposed diversion route is disproportionately long and it would be preferable if a footbridge were provided instead.

### **Hydrogen Pipeline**

#### Issue

22. CW&C is concerned that the Promoter has not fully considered the routing of a new hydrogen pipeline which will cross the proposed route of HS2 on the A556

Shurlach Road or A530 King Street to connect to the gas storage facility off King Street.

Solution

23. CW&C requests confirmation from the Promoter that it has fully assessed the impact of the hydrogen pipeline on the HS2 route and that residents' safety will not be compromised.

**The A54 Middlewich Road / Clive Lane / Road One junction**

Issue

24. This junction is a four-arm signal-controlled crossroads with no controlled pedestrian crossing facilities. The Transport Assessment shows the junction operates over capacity on the A54 Middlewich Road (west) approach in the morning peak hour and, in the afternoon peak hour, the Clive Lane approach also operates over capacity [Transport Assessment, paragraph 7.4.55].
25. The junction is affected by the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme. For instance, the Environmental Statement states that diversion of traffic associated with certain highway changes, including the realignment of the A54 Middlewich Road, will lead to flow changes on the highway network resulting in changes in congestion and delays at junctions. In 2038 and 2046, the A54 Middlewich Road / Road One / Clive Lane junction will experience significant delays [Community Area report: MA02: Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam, paragraph 14.5.9 and 14.5.10].
26. The Promoter's Transport Assessment acknowledges that this junction will be operating at over-capacity in all future scenarios, but no mitigation is proposed.

Solution

27. CW&C requests that mitigation is provided for the following reasons –
- All of the Promoter's construction traffic is being routed to this junction, and this includes significant HGV movements. This traffic will be in addition to the existing commuter traffic, for instance, the traffic using this junction to access Winsford Industrial Estate. There are also concerns that there is insufficient land take within the Bill for an appropriate mitigation scheme at this location, and this will require the promotion of an Additional Provision to deliver additional land.
  - The Winsford Transport Strategy identified this junction as requiring improvements to the right turn manoeuvres in and out of Road One in addition to a need to re-route A54 (Stanthorne to Road One) to ease flows in Clive Lane/ Clive Green Lane and address the existing Road One / A54 Middlewich Road congestion. Given the current over saturation of this junction; adding HS2 traffic to the existing situation without any mitigation, risks making the situation intolerable.
  - Clive Green Lane is the HGV route to A530 Nantwich Road avoiding the low bridge in Middlewich. The Promoter needs to assess, and then mitigate, the impact of their planned works on the significant amount of traffic seeking to access the M6 at Junction 18.
28. Alternatively, CW&C requests that the Promoter provides a fourth arm from the proposed roundabout connecting A54 Middlewich Road and A533 Bostock Road to Road 5 on the Winsford Industrial Estate. This would require sufficient land

take to be included within the Bill for an appropriate mitigation scheme at this location. This scheme would also require: -

- the signalisation of the Road One / Road Five junction including right turn lane provision. Right turn manoeuvres from Clive Green Lane can be directed via Road Five.
- the provision of cycle infrastructure, designed to the appropriate standard, including the Department for Transport's document *Cycle infrastructure design* LTN 1/20. This would require any land take needed to be included within the Bill for an appropriate mitigation scheme at this location.
- Clive Green Lane has been identified as a key route along its whole length for HS2 construction traffic. CW&C requests that the Promoter funds an upgrade for its full length, working in collaboration with CW&C. This request is supported by Cheshire East Council.

29. The Council is also supportive of the view that if a Haul Road were to be installed to the south of Middlewich between the A530 and the southern end of the proposed Middlewich Eastern Bypass this could mitigate significant levels of harm from construction traffic on the A54 through Middlewich and the B5309 King Street. This would have the potential to remove the need for other mitigation such as at Croxton Lane, Leadsmithy Street (Middlewich) and area wide traffic calming of residential streets in the town.

30. Such a proposal could also have legacy benefits for any future solution which would bypass Middlewich to link up with the committed Clive Green Lane improvements and provide a suitable route to the M6 from the Winsford Industrial Estate; consistent with the Winsford Transport Strategy.

#### **A530 Nantwich Road / Chapel Lane**

##### Issue

31. This junction is a three-arm priority controlled (give way) T-junction with no controlled pedestrian crossing facilities which will be affected by the construction of the Proposed Scheme.

32. The construction of the Rolling Stock Depot will have a major environmental impact of the junction in Wimboldsley and surrounding roads as they are being used for construction traffic and the movement of materials from borrow pits.

33. The Promoter states in its Transport Assessment that in 2030 the scenario, the junction will operate at capacity; however, the Transport Assessment does not take account of, for instance, the additional traffic from the proposed borrow pit that will be directed via Chapel Lane and will affect this junction.

34. The Environmental Statement says that changes in traffic flow as a result of certain of the Proposed Scheme's construction works will lead to significant delays and congestion at this junction. These are described as having a "major adverse effect" during "scenario 1", between early 2025 and late 2028 when utility and advance works will take place, together with the setting up of compounds and early main construction works, yet no mitigation is proposed. [Community Area report: MA02: Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam, paragraph 14.4.26].

35. The impacts on this junction will include –

- as part of the construction of the Rolling Stock Depot, the surrounding roads will be used for construction traffic and the movement of materials from borrow pits;
- an increase in the number of HGV movements along A530 to around 600 movements per day at peak construction times with workforce traffic in addition to this; and
- no construction traffic will travel north via Clive Green Lane for an initial period; all construction traffic will pass Chapel Lane. This will make it more difficult to exit the junction, increasing the risk of accidents.

36. CW&C further notes that the A530 Middlewich Road (which changes name to Nantwich Road at its junction with Brookhouse Lane) is an emergency service route to Leighton Hospital and requests that the Promoter confirms whether School Lane or Chapel Lane will become the diversion route during closures for the construction of a new overbridge to the south of Chapel Lane.

37. CW&C is also aware of local concerns and potential safety issues around Wimboldsley Primary School. There are road safety concerns for children at the school particularly on School Lane. Despite the effect of additional traffic movements and safety concerns, the Promoter does not propose any mitigation at this location.

#### Solution

38. CW&C considers that an improvement scheme will be required at the A530 Nantwich Road / Chapel Lane junction. This should include the signalisation of the junction and, as a minimum, a right-turn lane needs to be provided from A530 Nantwich Road into Chapel Lane.

39. The Council considers this scheme will require additional land take at the junction of A530 Nantwich Road / Chapel Lane and so the promotion of an Additional Provision.

### **Public transport**

#### Issue

40. Road based public transport including fixed route scheduled bus services and non-fixed route flexible bus services provide important opportunities for sustainable travel for the construction and operation of HS2. Passengers as well as staff would benefit during the operational phase. As construction will have substantial adverse impacts on traffic congestion, CW&C requests that the Promoter commits to working with CW&C and operators to provide targeted services that will make meaningful reductions in car journeys. Funding by the Promoter will be essential to deliver this work. Clearly, this will have a positive impact on managing the Proposed Scheme's carbon footprint during construction and operation of the railway.

#### Solution

41. CW&C seeks a commitment from the Promoter to provide timely and sufficiently detailed information to allow CW&C and operators to implement changes to road-based passenger transport services which will allow them to maintain services, punctuality, reliability and (not excluding bus priority at key junctions) during construction.

42. The information should also be sufficient to allow CW&C and operators to respond to changing circumstances and to provide practical alternatives to car travel in areas of the borough affected by the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme.
43. This commitment should be accompanied by index-linked capital and revenue funding, for an incremental programme to be overseen by a service design review panel including officers from the Promoter, CW&C and user representatives. The Promoter is asked to note the adopted Bus Service Improvement Plan for the borough.

#### **Appropriateness of Construction Routes and Structure Capacity**

##### Issue

44. CW&C has concerns about the suitability of several local roads across the borough as construction routes, including the number of HGVs that are proposed to use them and the fact that there may be structures that have not been assessed to meet capacity loadings. The Promoter has not considered the narrow, rural nature of these routes, with many of them carrying a high volume of large agricultural traffic, with few places for two large vehicles.

##### Solution

45. CW&C requests that the Promoter considers the use of alternative construction routes, with greater use of the strategic road network instead of using local roads as construction routes
46. CW&C requests that the Promoter makes provision for construction routes to be made suitable for the proposed level of HGV movements in advance of construction. This should include road enhancements, road widening and increased passing places, including the provision of additional land to facilitate localised road widening.
47. A review of any structures on HGV routes should also be conducted to ensure they can safely accommodate the proposed levels of construction traffic

#### **Construction Route - Maintenance Liabilities**

##### Issue

48. CW&C are concerned about the additional maintenance responsibilities for construction routes, new highway structures and diversions, for example, our winter maintenance operations. These will cause a resource and financial burden to the Council.
49. The Bill contains limited provision for these expenses to be reimbursed where the Council can prove an additional financial burden. Maintenance of such routes is, in general, a programmed and planned regime. Reactive, unplanned and ad hoc maintenance is inevitably more expensive and less reliable than that which is programmed in advance. This mechanism for reimbursement in the Bill does not allow the Council to easily programme maintenance of HS2 construction routes which ordinarily fall outside the scope of, say, winter maintenance. Therefore, such maintenance on these routes would likely be reactive.

##### Solution

50. CW&C requests that the Promoter provides it with an appropriately sized, index-linked fund to ensure there is no additional financial burden on the Council.

51. CW&C further requests that construction routes are updated to a standard agreed with the Council ahead of the commencement of construction works.

**Public Rights of Way (PROW) / Trent and Mersey Canal**

**Issue**

52. The PROW network is a critical part of CW&C's active travel network and published Local Cycling Walking and Implementation Plan. It is a valuable asset for improving health and wellbeing and is also beneficial to the local tourism industry. The extent of interference with the PROW network is unclear from the deposited documents.
53. CW&C seeks clarification and further detailed information from the Promoter, including the information sought in the following paragraphs.

**Solutions**

**The proposed stopping up of A530 Nantwich Road – old section**

54. CW&C seeks confirmation whether this section will be permanently closed or whether it could be made available for an active travel route to avoid having to use the main road and crossing over the bridge. Pedestrian/cyclist use of the A530 Nantwich Road would provide an improved link to Wimboldsley FP5 and FP9 (Verdin Arms), as the two PROW also link to the Trent and Mersey Canal towpath.
55. The plan CT-06308B shows the A530 Nantwich Road closure. As this is not retained as an alternative route, better design is required for the A530 Nantwich Road overbridge to ensure an active travel route is provided.

**Clive Green Lane – old section**

56. CW&C seeks confirmation whether the old Clive Green Lane section will be a retained highway once the new bridge is built. CW&C seek assurances from the Promoter that the land should be retained for a safe pedestrian/cycling access to help promote active travel and long-term community benefits
57. CW&C notes that, in AP1, the Promoter proposes to retain the Clive Green Lane Bridge and Canal towpath. CW&C supports the proposed multi-user path parallel to Clive Green Lane and the proposed ramp between the lane and towpath; however, the design specification needs to take account of Equality Act 2010. [Paragraph 5.4.1 of *Supplementary Environmental Statement 1 and Additional Provision 1 Environmental Statement; MA02: Wimboldsley to Lostock Gralam*].

**A530 Nantwich Road realignment**

58. CW&C considers this new section requires the provision of active travel infrastructure (including segregated facilities and suitable height parapets) and requests it is included in the design.

**Clive Green Lane realignment - including new canal crossing**

59. CW&C considers this new section requires the provision of active travel infrastructure (including segregated facilities and suitable height parapets) and requests it is provided in the design.

**A556 Shurlach Road**

60. The re-alignment of A556 Shurlach Road needs to provide for a multi-user safer route that is designed to the appropriate standard, including the Department for Transport's document *Cycle infrastructure design* LTN 1/20 and Manual for

Streets. This route is an essential part of promoting safer routes to schools from Rudheath and Davenham to Leftwich and is currently a well-used community recreational route.

61. CW&C notes that, in AP1, the Promoter proposes to provide a cycle and pedestrian route along the A556 Shurlach Road. CW&C supports this. However, there is a current provision alongside both sides of the carriageway, and it is strongly recommended that this is maintained to promote active travel and provide community connections between Lostock Green and Lostock / Rudheath. CW&C therefore requests that the Promoter commits to doing so.

#### **Proposed deletion of FP1 Wimboldsley**

62. The proposed deletion of FP1 Wimboldsley will curtail segregated facilities to destinations such as Wimboldsley Primary School and, since the A530 Nantwich Road has no footway or cycle facilities. CW&C considers there needs to be active travel infrastructure mitigation provided along the A530 Nantwich Road instead. CW&C therefore requests that the Promoter commits to provide this.
63. CW&C notes, and fully supports, the proposal in AP1 to retain FP1 Wimboldsley. The retention of this route provides a vital active travel link connecting rural communities and Wimboldsley School. CW&C requests that the Promoter ensures that FP1 Wimboldsley is accessible for all users and not just used as a local construction access.

#### **Lostock Gramam FP14 route**

64. CW&C considers the status of this route is unclear on the deposited plans. CW&C seeks confirmation from the Promoter that the Lostock Gramam FP14 route and configuration is being retained. This is a heavily used footpath which links Lostock to Rudheath and its amenities which is vital for local communities.

#### **Standards and specifications for PROW furniture**

65. The Promoter's documents do not include standards and specifications for PROW furniture (e.g., gates). CW&C would expect to be provided with such information as widths, surfacing, underpass headroom, underpass lighting, overbridge specification, gradients and signage.
66. CW&C seeks an assurance that any new PROW furniture will conform to the Council's Path Furniture Policy standards, British Standard design BS 5709:2006, British Horse Society advice and the "least restrictive access" principle.
67. CW&C supports the proposed new PROW detailed in AP1 connecting Birches Lane to RB1 and requests that it is incorporated into the Bill scheme.
68. CW&C requests that the Promoter considers an improvement to the Bridleway 6 connection with Sutton Lane, which would provide an active travel route with community benefits linking Middlewich to Wimboldsley including the school. It would also provide a sustainable connection for construction workers travelling to the Rolling Stock Depot from Middlewich.

#### **Trent and Mersey Canal Towpath and FP 10**

69. CW&C seeks an assurance from the Promoter that it will commit to the provision and design of improvements to the Canal Towpath. Mitigation measures for the section under the shadow of the Proposed Scheme's viaduct. CW&C requests that the Promoter ensures, within its design, that this amenity route is safe for all users by providing adequate lighting, surfacing and underpass headroom.

(CW&C also seeks an assurance that the Promoter will engage in proactive dialogue with CW&C and the Canals and River Trust where the PROW network interfaces with the Trent and Mersey Canal to ensure that each party is satisfied with the Promoter's proposals.

### **Trent and Mersey Canal - Resident Narrowboat Moorings**

#### Issue

70. No alternative provision has been made by the Promoter for the permanent 'live aboard' boating community at Park Farm, Stanthorne. These permanent moorings will be lost during construction of the canal rail bridges.

#### Solution

71. Alternative moorings need to be identified by Promoter so that the 'live aboard' permanent boating community can continue to reside in the local area for family connectivity and work. The promoter needs to liaise with the Canal & River Trust and local landowners along the canal to supply like for like facilities and moorings within a reasonable radius of those existing at Park Farm, Clive Green Lane.

### **Climate Change**

#### Issue

72. Climate change, in particular flooding impacts, is a common theme in the documents accompanying the Bill and the Proposed Scheme sets a standard of 1/100-year flood risk for several flood risk types. Issues are treated in isolation and not combined effects. With the increased risk from climate change, the Promoter's modelling should consider multiple-source flooding risks and propose solutions to any new risks identified.

#### Solution

73. CW&C requests that the Promoter undertakes the modelling exercise described above and provides appropriate mitigation in the light of that exercise. CW&C considers it might be necessary for the Promoter to provide improved drainage and storage systems.

### **Equality and diversity**

#### Issue 1: employment

74. The commitments set out in paragraphs 5.2.20 – 5.2.24 of the Equality Impact Assessment Report ("EqIA Report") in terms of the employment of under-represented groups are wide-ranging and include the following –
- All major contracts will contain contractual requirements to provide skills, employment and education (SEE) outputs, including apprenticeships, workless job starts and schools' engagement;
  - HS2 has launched a Job Brokerage which aims to creating pathways into employment for people from disadvantaged and under-represented groups, including members of protected characteristic groups;
  - For each relevant contract, HS2 Ltd will set EDI requirements; and
  - HS2 Ltd has committed to providing a minimum of 2,000 apprenticeships over the lifetime of the entire project, (i.e. Phases 1, 2a and 2b).

75. CW&C welcomes these commitments; however, they are general in nature, in that they apply across the route of the whole HS2 scheme, and it is possible that under-represented groups within CW&C's administrative area will not benefit from them.

Solution

76. CW&C requests that the Promoter provides an assurance that under-represented groups from CW&C's administrative area benefit from these commitments, working in partnership with the Councils' Skills and Employment team and other local training providers and schools. The Promoter should also ensure that it provides training to support local residents to develop the necessary skills required for emerging roles. This joint working should apply to the full range of employment opportunities within HS2 Ltd. (e.g. roles within ecological management) and should not be limited to (say) roles in construction.
77. CW&C would request that local schools have an opportunity to benefit from the Promoter's education programme. To date, such opportunities have been limited.

Issue 2: Footways

78. Paragraph 5.2.26 of the EqIA Report refers to maintaining "where reasonably practicable" footways of adequate width to facilitate pedestrian flows during construction.

Solution

79. CW&C requests that footpaths should be accessible for those who use wheelchairs, as well as pedestrians as per the manual for streets (e.g. minimum width of 2m should therefore be maintained etc.).

Issue 3: Lostock Green

80. The permanent loss of Lostock Green Picnic Area, as described in paragraphs 7.4.2 and 7.4.3 of the EqIA Report and its accessible toilet represents a detriment to children, older and disabled people, and pregnant and nursing mothers.

Solution

81. CW&C requests that the Promoter provides a replacement picnic area and accessible toilets (ideally with a Changing Places Toilet ("CPT") in line with Government schemes). Have a height adjustable adult-sized changing bench; have a ceiling hoist (preferably with a H-frame); be at least 12m<sup>2</sup> in size; have a peninsular toilet with vertical and horizontal rails; a privacy screen (fixed or mobile) and a shower.

Issue 4: Greenhayes Farm

82. Greenhayes Farm (described in paragraph 7.3 of the EqIA) is a working dairy farm that offers a free educational facility for local children and will be permanently lost due to the construction of the Proposed Scheme. The owner has indicated he has no plans to try to replicate the facility elsewhere and this represents a significant loss and disadvantage to young people. The nearest similar establishment is Riverside Organic Farm approximately 4 kilometres away, but this charges a fee.

Solution

83. HS2 should mitigate the loss of Greenhayes by paying the additional costs involved for local children to attend Riverside for a minimum period of five years.

Issue 5: Lostock Gram area-based effects

84. The 'Lostock Gralam area-based effects' section (described in paragraph 7.7 of the EqIA) outlines some of the impacts on access to amenities. For instance, the EqIA refers to an “increase in traffic-related severance, which is likely to make it more difficult for pedestrians and other non-motorised users to cross the road”. It does not, however, propose any mitigation, nor does it recognise difficulties in access to local shops or access to the nearest hospitals (in Crewe and Northwich) both of which are likely to be an issue for older and disabled residents, and surrounding communities.

#### Solution

85. CW&C requests that the Promoter mitigates these difficulties, through, for instance, increasing local public transport to amenities and making accessible transport routes between the hospitals and Lostock Gralam and surrounding communities.
86. The Promoter needs to ensure that under-represented groups and those with additional needs properly understand scheme impacts and understand their ability to influence matters and any new information. Consequently, the Promoter will need to provide information in alternative formats (including Braille, Audio, Easy Read) and other languages including British Sign Language as required.

### **Landscape & Visual**

#### Introduction

87. Details of mitigation proposals for the landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Scheme are currently unclear. For instance, there is no indication of any benefits to the local community, to the receiving landscape, or to the access and transport networks. Furthermore, there is no reference to how any legacy scheme can be achieved.
88. Although it is understood that the development will result in impacts that will have significant adverse harm which cannot be fully mitigated, it is also considered that the Proposed Scheme could provide positive benefits. This could, for instance, include the creation of a strategic and interconnected route of corridors for landscape character, climate change and biodiversity net gain. However, at this stage further detail and supporting information is required to demonstrate any wider benefits.
89. In the following paragraphs CW&C describes 10 landscape and visual issues and proposes a solution for each.

#### Issue 1 – Strategic approach-landscape and ecological network connectivity

90. The Landscape and visual Impact Assessment (“LVIA”) includes the Cheshire West and Chester Landscape Character Areas (taken from the Cheshire West and Chester Council Landscape Strategy 2016) which have been sub-divided into local character areas.
91. The LVIA provides several viewpoints, including photomontages for which certain impacts are illustrated, including the impacts on the elevated sections such as the embankments and the viaducts. Although the photomontages and supporting documentation is welcomed, many questions and uncertainties remain. There is an understanding that the proposed railway line will achieve a ‘green corridor’, however a more strategic approach to landscape and ecological connectivity is

required beyond the potential benefits and opportunities provided by the single corridor effectively created by the proposed railway line.

#### Solution

92. CW&C requests that the Promoter provides, as soon as possible, information which explains the Promoter's strategic approach to 'green corridor' connectivity. If this cannot be provided now, CW&C and the Promoter should agree a reasonable timeframe for its provision. CW&C requests that the strategy explains-
- how the development will help people and communities along this section of the railway to connect with the natural world, including by footpaths and active travel;
  - the scheme's conservation and education proposals;
  - projects to create or restore woodland in CW&C's administrative area.

#### Issue 2 – Need for elevation drawings and sections

93. The proposed railway line will form a linear route following a north / south axis with much of it being elevated. As a result, in several sections the development will contrast significantly with the receiving landscape character. With respect to mitigation, the proposed linear corridor of woodland planting could be considered to adversely contrast with the existing landscape character. With no elevations drawings and sections, it is difficult to fully understand the impacts of the proposed railway line in terms of existing landscape character.

#### Solution

94. CW&C requests that the Promoter provides, as soon as possible, elevation drawings and sections to allow CW&C to understand the Proposed Development's impacts. If this cannot be provided now, CW&C and the Promoter should agree a reasonable timeframe for its provision.

#### Issue 3 – need for detail on proposed mitigation

95. As acknowledged within the LVIA, the development will result in several significant adverse impacts to both the visual appearance and the landscape character between Wimboldsley and Lostock Gralam. Mitigation is largely proposed in the form of planting works, embankments and bunding; however, the detailing at this stage is still unclear. Several viaducts will reach heights of up to 29m and embankments will reach heights of 14m. It is also unclear as to what the impacts will be on the many nearby properties and views from footpaths.

#### Solution

96. CW&C requests that the Promoter provides, as soon as possible, information which explains the Promoter's proposed mitigation in the form of planting works, embankments and bunding. If this cannot be provided now, CW&C and the Promoter should agree a reasonable timeframe for its provision.

#### Item 4 – Landscape Strategy

97. CW&C would expect the LVIA to contain, or be accompanied by in a separate document, a supporting Landscape Strategy. CW&C would expect the Strategy to, amongst other things, clearly explain the design approach and demonstrate an iterative design process whereby the impacts and mitigation measures have helped to shape the LVIA.

98. This information should then inform the proposed landscape mitigation i.e., to explain its function, the constraints and opportunities associated with the Proposed Scheme, and any positive impacts which can be offered to the receiving landscape character in response to the significant adverse harm resulting from the development. The supporting information should inform how the proposals will offer a mosaic of habitats and provide a connection to wider existing features to achieve a more strategically considered outcome.

Solution

99. CW&C requests that the Promoter prepares an appropriate Landscape Strategy, which includes the points raised in the preceding paragraphs.

Issue 5 – Clarification on wider planting proposals

100. In the layout plans, hedgerows are identified; however, most of them appear to be existing hedgerows.

101. CW&C notes that many hedgerows are currently lacking hedgerow trees.

Solution

102. CW&C seeks confirmation of (i) whether the hedgerows in the layout plans exist already and, if this is the case and, confirmation of what the improvement gains will be and (ii) whether any new hedgerow trees will be incorporated into the mitigation works. If so, CW&C seeks confirmation as to how the Promoter will arrange for them to be managed and maintained.

Issue 6 – Heights of embankments and viaducts

103. Although the heights of embankments and viaducts is provided within the Environmental Statement, it would be helpful if more specific information could be included in the layout plans, sections drawings and LVIA.

Solution

104. CW&C requests that the layout plans, sections drawings and LVIA are amended accordingly.

Issue 7 – bunding Information

105. CW&C is unclear as to what the design rationale for the bunding is. Similar to the previous issue, CW&C considers it would be helpful if the height of the proposed bunding could be added to drawings. Moreover, at present, the bunding appears to be linear in form, running parallel to the proposed HS2 railway line. It is unclear how this will provide a positive benefit to the wider landscape character.

Solution

106. CW&C requests that the Promoter explain its rationale for the bunding, that it provides details of the height of the proposed bunding on drawings, and that it explains how the proposed bunding will provide a benefit to the character of the affected landscape.

Issue 8 – additional information

107. The Proposed Development generally follows a North / South axis; however, additional landscape and wildlife information following an East / West axis is required.

Solution

108. CW&C requests that information is provided on how the Proposed Scheme will provide visual and physical connectivity from East to West, in terms of both wildlife and landscape character. CW&C also requests that the Promoter considers wider connectivity to existing river corridors and woodlands.

Issue 9 – impacts on the A556 Corridor

109. The Proposed Development will result in a significant remodelling of the A556 highway corridor; however, from the information currently available, CW&C considers the impact of this remodelling is difficult to understand from a landscape and visual perspective.

Solution

110. CW&C requests that the Promoter provides, as soon as possible, photomontages of the A556 Corridor, including the viaduct over Smoker Brook. If this cannot be provided now, CW&C and the Promoter should agree a reasonable timeframe for its provision.
111. In addition, CW&C requests that further information on the proposed viaduct through Winnington Wood and Smoker Brook is provided, including photomontages. If this cannot be provided now, CW&C and the Promoter should agree a reasonable timeframe for its provision.

Issue 10 – Crewe North Rolling Stock Depot

112. CW&C considers there is an absence of information in respect of the Crewe North Rolling Stock Depot, including such information as building heights, external lighting, impacts on Nantwich Road and proposed mitigation.

Solution

113. CW&C requests that this information is provided. If this cannot be provided now, CW&C and the Promoter should agree a reasonable timeframe for its provision.

**Ecology & Biodiversity**

**Issue 1 – Local Wildlife Sites (“LWS”)**

Issue

114. Twenty-seven LWS have been considered within the Promoter’s assessment. There are 15 LWS within 250 metres of the HS2 centreline, five of which are designated for their ancient woodland. Eleven LWS will be dissected or lost as a result of the proposed railway line. CW&C notes there is no proposal to compensate for the LWS loss in terms of designation; for instance, aspirations to target conditions of habitat quality to LWS status and assessment against LWS criteria.

Solution

115. The Council requests that the Promoter provides an assurance that it will work with the Council to compensate robustly the loss of the LWS and ensure any replacement habitats achieve LWS standards.

**Issue 2: Protected species: Great Crested Newts, Otters, Bats, Badgers, Barn owls**

116. Species-specific impacts will affect great crested newts, otters, bats, badgers, and barn owls and each is dealt with in turn –

Great Crested Newt:

117. Five moderate populations and 11 meta-populations of GCN are to be impacted, where habitat loss resulting from the construction of the Proposed Scheme will result in significant adverse effects at county level in each case. There are also three small populations of great crested newt where habitat loss resulting from the construction of the Proposed Scheme will result in significant adverse effects at the district/borough level.

Otter:

118. Loss of two active and five potential Otter holts will occur. This will result in a permanent adverse effect on the conservation status of each of these otter populations which will be significant at the district/borough level in each case.

Bats:

119. The Promoter's statement states that the impact of disturbance on bat populations will generally be localised and limited to the period of construction. However, the evidence to support this is not provided, nor how long construction in these areas will be. It is stated that the construction of the proposed scheme will affect two distinct bat assemblages, due to loss of 7 non-breeding soprano pipistrelle and Brown long-eared bat roosts and one maternity soprano pipistrelle roost and fragmentation of habitats that provide links between woodlands.

120. Replacement artificial roosts are proposed near to locations in which they are lost and habitat creation of varying types is proposed to improve connectivity in these locations. Lighting measures are proposed to reduce lighting impact, specifically in the Crewe North RSD. Following implementation of these measures, it is stated that the effects on the bat assemblage between Stanthorne and Rudheath will be reduced to a level that is not significant. However, Bats can travel great distances for foraging and commuting and between seasonal roosts.

Badger:

121. Three main Badger setts are present within land required for the construction of the Proposed Scheme. A further four main setts are present between 70-80m from land required for the Proposed Scheme. It is stated that there will be no significant effects on badger populations in this area; however, there is no evidence to reach this conclusion. As a species, Badgers are heavily dependent on habitat connectivity, so impact could be significant.

Barn owl:

122. Three pairs of breeding Barn owl will be impacted due to the permanent loss of Barn owl foraging habitat, which will be significant at county/metropolitan level. It is stated that once the habitats have become established, the adverse effect on barn owl populations resulting from the loss of foraging habitat and potential nesting sites will be reduced to a level that is not significant. However, there is no timescale provided that details how long these habitats will take to reach a standard that provides such habitats and this should be addressed further. It is stated that provision of additional nest boxes would be likely to increase numbers of barn owls within the wider landscape and thus offset the adverse effect. However, Barn owls rely on suitable habitats for foraging and so an increase in boxes cannot secure the mitigation required.

Summary

123. Species impacts have only been considered locally and not at the meta-population level. The meta-population concept is critical, due to species interactions and the

long-term substantiality of these populations. A project such as HS2 is likely to have significant severance effects. Therefore, population connectivity is essential to understand, so impacts can be confidently predicted, and mitigation appropriately designed. Habitat creation is stated by the Promoter to reduce impacts on species to insignificant levels, however, this cannot be confidently predicted without considering project impacts at the meta-population scale. Confirmed residual impacts include impacts on Bats and Barn owls and this could include more species when the requested studies are undertaken.

124. In addition, timetables for impacts during construction and habitat creation have not been given and increased time between impact and mitigation could result in permanent loss, rather than temporary loss and replacement.

#### Solution

125. CW&C requests that an exercise to assess species impacts and mitigation at the meta-population level is undertaken and the results, are shared with CW&C as soon as possible.
126. CW&C also requests that timetables for species impacts, habitat loss and habitat creation are assessed, so impacts can be accurately assessed as temporary or permanent.

#### **Issue 3: Protected habitats**

##### Ancient woodland:

127. Construction of the proposed scheme will result in the loss of 1.3ha of ancient woodland from four Ancient Woodland Inventory sites: Stanthorne Hall Farm; Bull's Wood; Winnington Wood; and Leonard's and Smoker Wood. The loss of ancient woodland is proposed to be partly compensated through a range of measures, including planting of 11.8ha of native broadleaved woodland, the translocation of ancient woodland soil with its associated seed bank where appropriate and planting native trees and shrubs. However, Ancient woodland is irreplaceable, and its loss will result in a significant permanent adverse residual effect. Details provided are not specific enough to ensure the mitigation proposed will be effective.

##### Woodland:

128. 8.4ha of woodland is predicted to be lost. The loss of this woodland will have a permanent adverse effect significant at the county level. Planting of 11.8 ha and 36.1ha of native broadleaved woodland will occur along the route. There is no assessment of the loss of woodland impact and replacement at a landscape scale. Woodland habitats take over 30 years to reach levels of good condition and timetables for replacement are not provided. Therefore, impact could be more severe than predicted, the further away compensation occurs in relation to the impact.

##### Orchards:

129. Construction on the Proposed Scheme will result in the loss of orchard habitat from Bostock Road Orchards Local Wildlife Site and Pear Tree Farm. 0.28ha of orchard will be lost This will result in a permanent adverse effect that will be significant at the county level. There is no mitigation/compensation proposed specifically for orchard habitats.

##### Hedgerow:

130. On a precautionary basis, it is assumed that there will be a net loss of 56.9km (35.4 miles) of hedgerow, after a total of 32km of new hedgerows will be planted. This will result in a permanent adverse residual effect. The combined loss and severance of hedgerows within the land required for the construction of the proposed scheme will have a permanent adverse effect that is significant at county level.

Watercourses:

131. The main watercourses are avoided in the majority and are not significantly affected directly, however severance and realignment of smaller watercourse means that the habitat loss and reduction in connectivity cumulatively will result in a permanent adverse effect that is significant at up to district/borough level. Mitigation includes re-naturalising new channels, but there is no assessment of the location, quantity or quality of the mitigation.

Open Mosaic habitats:

132. The Promoter's assessment states that 1.5ha of open mosaic habitat will be lost. The loss of this habitat will result in an adverse effect that will be significant at up to county level. It is stated that following restoration of existing habitats after completion of utilities diversions, the adverse effect on open mosaic habitat will be reduced to a level that is not significant, however there is no detail of this in terms of quantity.

Ponds:

133. It is assumed that 63 (of 70) ponds will be permanently lost. The loss of ponds within the land required for the construction of the Proposed Scheme will lead to a permanent adverse effect on the conservation status of water bodies that will be significant, in each case, at up to district/borough level. At least one pond will be created for every pond lost within the land required for the construction; however, this is well below accepted pond replacement ratios and there is no assessment of locations of ponds within the local pond network on a landscape scale, providing the valuable "stepping stone" function across the landscape for protected species.

Summary:

134. Confirmed residual impacts include ancient woodland, hedgerow and orchard loss.

Solution

135. CW&C requests that a full table of losses and mitigation by habitat type, quantity, condition and timescale, should be provided to enable full assessment of loss and impact. This should include pond replacement ratios at 4 to 1.
136. The impact of habitat loss in terms of connectivity and severance impact, as well as mitigation, should be addressed at a landscape scale, using existing habitat data and the CW&C Ecological Network. This could focus on enhancing east-west links across the HS2 line, to improve connectivity across the route of impact.

**Issue 4: Cumulative effects with other approved development**

137. The operation of the Middlewich Eastern Bypass is anticipated to result in an adverse impact on barn owl as a result of collision risk during operation. Operation of the proposed scheme, expected from 2038, is also anticipated to result in a negative impact on barn owl in these locations due to the risk of train collision. The consecutive nature of these impacts is likely to result in an increase in mortality of

barn owl over time, leading to an overall reduction in breeding success for these pairs until mitigation for both schemes is established. The cumulative effect of the Proposed Scheme and committed development will therefore result in a significant adverse effect on barn owl at Wimboldsley and north-west of Middlewich.

#### Solution

138. Detailed mitigation proposals are required, to address this, as well as habitat replacement at a landscape scale.

#### **Schools: Byley Primary School and Nursery and Wimboldsley Community Primary School**

#### Background

139. CW&C commissioned surveyors to assess, and report on, the impacts of the Proposed Scheme on Byley Primary School and Nursery and Wimboldsley Community Primary School. The reports were sent to the Promoter on 24 May 2022 and inform the issues and solutions set out in the following paragraphs.

#### **Byley Primary School and Nursery**

#### Issue 1 – HS2 Construction Traffic

140. HS2 state that there will be significant disruption on the highway network due to increased traffic associated with construction works, including HGV construction traffic, on the B5081 Byley Road.
141. CW&C consider the impact on Byley School from construction traffic will include increased travel times for parents, pupils, staff and visitors. The school note that a high proportion of pupils on roll reside in or around Middlewich.
142. Pupils at the school attend a range of off-site educational activities and visits during school hours, which range from weekly swimming lessons to residential trips. It is anticipated that road closures will have an impact on travel times to and from these locations.

#### Solutions

143. CW&C's Highways Service consider there will be unavoidable disruption across areas within the proximity of HS2 works and advise that discussions are ongoing with the Promoter to secure focused highway mitigation to ease congestion at junctions.
144. CW&C requests that the Promoter provides as assurance that it will fund an extension to the school's existing 'before and after' school club to ensure flexibility on travel times for parents during peak traffic times. This would also reduce the burden on staff co-ordinating issues resulting from parents/guardian arriving later for drop-off and pick-up due to traffic issues.
145. CW&C further requests that the Promoter continues to engage with CW&C's Transport and Highways Service to establish predicted levels of construction traffic and the impacts of this and agree appropriate mitigation measures in the vicinity of Byley School. (This could support travel training and road safety training for example).

#### Issue 2 – Road safety

146. CW&C considers the significant increase in HGVs using the B5081 Byley Road during construction works (up to 572 each way HGV trips every day i.e. a vehicle

movement every 30 seconds) could result in road safety issues at the 4-way junction of the B5081 Byley Road/Drakelow Lane/Moss Lane as there is poor visibility at this junction from both Moss Lane and Drakelow Lane and most parents use this junction to access the School.

147. The school encourages parents to park at Byley Village Hall and walk along Moss Lane to drop-off and pick-up children. Increased traffic along Moss Lane is likely to adversely impact the safety of this walk to school route.

#### Solutions

148. CW&C considers that further technical investigations are required to establish potential road safety impacts and available mitigation. In the light of this, CW&C requests that the Promoter funds a Road Safety Audit which focuses on the school, and to subsequently implement any recommendations arising from the Road Safety Audit. Alternatively, CW&C requests that the Promoter funds CW&C's cost of commissioning a Road Safety Audit and implementing any recommendations.
149. CW&C requests that the Promoter continues to engage with CW&C's Highways Service to establish potential road safety impacts and available mitigations in the vicinity of the school and at the 4-Way junction of the B5081 Byley Road/ Drakelow Lane/ Moss Lane.
150. Finally, CW&C seeks an assurance that HGVs will not travel when pupils are dropped off at, or picked up from, the school.

#### Issue 3 – Impact of air quality from construction works and borrow pits

151. Construction works will result in dust soiling at Byley School unless the Promoter's contractors implement mitigation measures.
152. The Promoter states that air quality will remain within UK standards and CW&C's Regulatory Services team broadly agrees; however, the Promoter suggests that the management of dust soiling impacts at a number of receptors in the Byley area will be reliant on construction mitigation (e.g., spraying down materials in storage areas) and it is understood that the Promoter's contractors have previously failed to implement mitigation for dust soiling, causing issues for schools and residents living near to HS2 Phase 1.
153. Any adverse impact on air quality may reduce the frequency and/or duration of the use of the school's outdoor areas. The school use the outdoor area for a range of curriculum activities in addition to informal play which is a fundamental part of any child's development. A reduction in the access to the school's outdoor area would negatively impact the wellbeing, development and learning of the school's pupils.

#### Solutions

154. CW&C requests that the Promoter –
- provides CW&C with a technical explanation to demonstrate that the mitigation included in the Promoter's Draft Code of Construction Practice will reduce the impact of dust soiling to an acceptable level;
  - provides funding for officers to closely monitor compliance with Draft Code of Construction Practice;
  - updates the Environmental Statement to include the school as a receptor for dust soiling;

- provides funding for enhanced cleaning of dust soiled areas at Byley School;
- funds internal and external building fabric/structural and/or site mitigation to the school to reduce the impact on air-quality to an acceptable level or funds an enhanced cleaning regime to remove dust etc entering the building provides continuous air-quality monitoring equipment at the school and at the Borrow Pit and funds a monitoring and mitigation regime to ensure that any air-quality breaches can be immediately identified and mitigated; and
- explores the relocation of the Borrow Pit with CW&C
- provides an assurance that a mains water supply will be installed onsite for the nearby borrow pits to ensure adequate dust suppression measures can be installed and operational from day 1.

#### Issue 4 – Noise and vibration

155. The Promoter has identified Byley School in the Environmental Statement as a receptor for noise.
156. The Promoter states that noise from construction traffic is predicted to result in increased noise at Byley School but this will be within acceptable limits. CW&C notes that the Promoter's methodology for predicting construction noise impacts does not assess the potential for high levels of short-term noise (e.g., excavation work vehicle reversing noise, sudden drilling) which could affect the pupils, staff and visitors of the school, potentially being audible over the existing baseline noise.
157. CW&C considers that excessive noise pollution could adversely affect teaching and learning and general mental health and wellbeing of pupils, staff and visitors at the school. Pupils with Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities and those with additional needs may be further adversely impacted by increased noise.
158. Tranquillity is a distinct characteristic of the school and CW&C is concerned by the prospect of the impact of the cumulative noise levels of lorries and machinery at the Borrow Pit, particularly in the light of the existing tranquil environment.

#### Solutions

159. CW&C considers that further technical investigations are required to establish the impact of construction noise and vibration on the school, and to identify appropriate mitigation. CW&C considers the impact of mitigation can only be known once the potential for high intensity, short term noise has been assessed and so that assessment must be carried out.
- CW&C also requests that the Promoter –
  - undertakes its construction noise assessment based on the *Department for Education's Acoustic Design of schools: Performance Standards Building Bulletin 93* (Published February 2015) (for new and refurbished schools) which advises that noise impacts should be assessed on a 30-minute mean which would predict levels of short term/high intensity construction noise;
  - provides noise mitigation once the potential short-term impacts (30-minute mean) from high intensity construction works have been identified;
  - funds building fabric/structural mitigations to the school to reduce the impact of noise and vibration to an acceptable level;

- implements relevant mitigation measures to reduce the impact of vibration on the school building fabric;
- monitors the condition of buildings, before, during and after the construction works are completed and undertakes necessary repairs to damage/deterioration caused by construction traffic, including to the external walls, chimney, and window apertures; and
- limits Moss Lane to LGVs and local traffic only to prevent excessive vehicular vibration from damaging the building fabric.

#### Issue 5 – Impact of the Proposed Scheme on pupil numbers

160. CW&C consider there is a risk that prospective parents may be dissuaded from sending their children to Byley School because of the impacts, or perceived impacts, of the Proposed Scheme on the school. Funding for schools is predominantly based on pupil numbers and a reduction in those numbers could affect the financial viability of the school.
161. CW&C considers the greatest area of concern for parents is likely to be the significant works associated with Borrow Pit D due to its proximity to the school.

#### Solution

162. CW&C seeks an assurance that the Promoter will provide compensatory revenue funding to Byley School should pupil numbers fall during the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme.
163. The Promoter should also explore the relocation of the Borrow Pit D with CW&C.

### **Wimboldsley Community Primary School**

#### Issue 1 – Road closures

164. The Promoter states there will be significant disruption on the highway network from road closures and it is expected that road closures will affect the school since they are likely to result in lengthy diversion routes and increased travel times for pupils, staff and visitors.
165. Pupils at the school attend a range of off-site educational activities and visits during school hours, which range from weekly swimming lessons to residential trips. It is anticipated that road closures will have an impact on travel times to and from these locations.

#### Solutions

166. While CW&C notes that the Promoter states that all roads will remain open during construction works with closures limited to overnight and weekend closures, CW&C consider that reasonable alternative routes should be available for any overnight/weekend closures which overrun.
167. CW&C also requests that the Promoter should continue to engage with CW&C's Highways Service to determine the sequencing of any temporary night/weekend closures and clarify that roads will remain open during realignment works.
168. Finally, CW&C seeks an assurance from the Promoter that roads will remain open during the construction phase and that any temporary closure will be sequenced to ensure any unexpected delays/ issues will not affect journey times to/from the school.

Issue 2 – the Promoter’s construction traffic

169. The Promoter states there will be significant disruption to the highway network due to increased traffic associated with HS2 construction works.
170. There will be significant volumes of construction traffic within the vicinity of the school and travelling past the school during the day.
171. CW&C considers that the likely impact on the school from construction traffic will be increased travel times for parents, pupils, staff, and visitors.

Solutions

172. CW&C’s Highways Service advise that there will be unavoidable disruption across areas within the proximity to HS2 works and that discussions are ongoing with the Promoter to secure focused highway mitigation to ease congestion at junctions.
173. CW&C requests that the Promoter provides as assurance that it will fund a ‘before and after’ school club to ensure flexibility on travel times for parents during peak traffic times. This would also reduce the burden on staff co-ordinating issues resulting from parents/guardian arriving later for drop-off and pick-up due to traffic issues.
174. CW&C further requests that the Promoter continues to engage with CW&C’s Transport and Highways Service to establish predicted levels of construction traffic and the impacts of this and agree appropriate mitigation measures in the vicinity of Wimboldsley School.

Issue 3 – Road safety

175. CW&C considers there is a likely risk that HS2 construction traffic and HS2 staff travelling to/from construction sites will use School Lane and this could result in adverse road safety implications.
176. Due to the location of the school and the rural nature of School Lane, there are limited areas for cars to stop and park. The school currently have a strict system for dropping off and collecting pupils which must be carefully managed and supervised by school staff. There is concern that further traffic in the vicinity of the school could lead to road safety issues, particularly when parents drop off / collect their children.

Solutions

177. CW&C considers that further technical investigations are required to establish potential road safety impacts and available mitigations at School Lane. In the light of this, CW&C requests that the Promoter funds a Road Safety Audit which focuses on the school, and to subsequently implement any recommendations arising from the Road Safety Audit. Alternatively, CW&C requests that the Promoter funds CW&C’s cost of commissioning a Road Safety Audit and implementing any recommendations.
178. CW&C requests that the Promoter continues to engage with CW&C’s Highways Service to establish potential road safety impacts and available mitigations at School Lane.
179. CW&C seeks an assurance that HS2 construction traffic will not travel along School Lane when pupils are dropped off at, or picked up from, the school.

180. Finally, CW&C seeks an assurance that that the Promoter provides a dedicated drop-off/pick-up area for the school.

Issue 4 – Impact of air quality from construction works and borrow pits

181. Construction works will result in dust soiling at Wimboldsley School unless the Promoter's contractors implement mitigation measures.

182. The Promoter states that air quality will remain within UK standards and CW&C's Regulatory Services team broadly agrees; however, the Promoter suggests that the management of dust soiling impacts at the school will be reliant on construction mitigation (e.g., spraying down materials in storage areas) and it is understood that the Promoter's contractors have previously failed to implement mitigation for dust soiling, causing issues for schools and residents living near to HS2 Phase 1.

183. It should be noted that the Promoter has not included the school as a receptor for dust soiling but it has identified other receptors which CW&C considers to be acceptable proxies.

184. Any adverse impact on air quality may reduce the frequency and/or duration of the use of the school's outdoor areas. The school use the outdoor area for a range of curriculum activities in addition to informal play which is a fundamental part of any child's development. A reduction in the access to the school's outdoor area would negatively impact the wellbeing, development and learning of the school's pupils.

Solutions

185. CW&C requests that the Promoter –

- provides CW&C with a technical explanation to demonstrate that the mitigation included in the Promoter's Draft Code of Construction Practice will reduce the impact of dust soiling on the school and whole community to an acceptable level;
- provides funding for officers to closely monitor compliance with Draft Code of Construction Practice;
- updates the Environmental Statement to include the school as a receptor for dust soiling;
- provides funding for enhanced cleaning of dust soiled areas at the school;
- funds internal and external building fabric/structural and/or site mitigation to the school to reduce the impact on air-quality to an acceptable level or funds an enhanced cleaning regime to remove dust etc, entering the building;
- provides continuous air-quality monitoring equipment at the school and at the Borrow Pit and funds a monitoring and mitigation regime to ensure that any air-quality breaches can be immediately identified and mitigated; and
- explores the relocation of the Borrow Pits A and B with CW&C.
- provides an assurance that a mains water supply would be installed onsite for the nearby borrow pits to ensure adequate dust suppression measures can be installed and operational from day 1.

Issue 5 – Noise and vibration

186. CW&C notes that the Promoter has identified the School in its assessment as a receptor for noise.

187. CW&C further notes that the Promoter's methodology for predicting construction noise impacts does not assess the potential for high levels of short-term noise (e.g., excavations, foundation piling etc.) which could impact the School, potentially being audible over the existing baseline noise.
188. CW&C considers that excessive noise pollution would adversely impact on teaching and learning and general mental health and wellbeing of pupils, staff and visitors at the school. Pupils with Special Educational Needs and/or Disabilities and those with additional needs may be further adversely impacted by increased noise.

#### Solutions

189. CW&C also requests that the Promoter –
- undertakes its construction noise assessment based on the *Department for Education's Acoustic Design of schools: Performance Standards Building Bulletin 93* (Published February 2015) (for new and refurbished schools) which advises that noise impacts should be assessed on a 30-minute mean which would predict levels of short term/high intensity construction noise;
  - provides noise mitigation once the potential short-term impacts (30-minute mean) from high intensity construction works have been identified;
  - funds building fabric/structural mitigations to the school to reduce the impact of noise and vibration to an acceptable level;
  - implements that relevant mitigation measures to reduce the impact of vibration on the school building fabric;
  - monitors the condition of buildings, before, during and after the construction works are completed and undertakes necessary repairs to damage/deterioration caused by construction traffic;
  - limits the weight and/or speed of its construction vehicles on Nantwich Road (A530) at the junction of School Lane to prevent excessive vehicular vibration from damaging the building's fabric; and
  - provides and assurance that construction traffic will not travel along School Lane when pupils are dropped off at /picked up from the school.

#### Issue 6 – Impact of the Proposed Scheme on pupil numbers

190. The Promoter acknowledges that Wimboldsley residents will experience impacts on two or more health determinants (neighbourhood quality and social capital) during the construction works.
191. CW&C consider there is a risk that prospective parents may be dissuaded from sending their children to the school because of the impacts, or perceived impacts, of the Proposed Scheme on the school. Funding for schools is predominantly based on pupil numbers and a reduction in those numbers could affect the financial viability of the school and the William Stockton Community Primary School, which is part of the school's federation.
192. CW&C believe that the greatest area of concern for parents is likely to be the significant works associated with Borrow Pit A (300m to the southwest of the School) and Borrow Pit B (85m to the north-west of the School) due to their close proximity to the School.

Solutions

193. CW&C seeks an assurance that the Promoter will provide compensatory revenue funding to the school should pupil numbers fall during the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme.
194. The Promoter should also explore the relocation of the Borrow Pits A and B with CW&C.

**Ground conditions**Issue

195. CW&C is concerned about how the Promoter will satisfactorily ensure that all aspects relating to the significant extent of unstable ground conditions, complex geology, geohazard and underground infrastructure are identified, assessed and fully mitigated.
196. These issues will have safety implications during the construction and operational phases, particularly for those in surrounding areas.
197. CW&C cannot overstate how important this issue is to the Council and its residents. It is essential that the Promoter can address any implications arising from the features which are unique to the borough. It is likely that climate change implications will exacerbate these issues.

Solution

198. CW&C requests that the Promoter (i) funds and appoints a relevant independent technical specialist to ensure these matters are managed and addressed appropriately and (ii) works with the technical specialist to share information and any proposed solutions with and CW&C, and representatives from communities and businesses affected.
199. CW&C also requests that all relevant health and safety concerns attached to prevailing geological conditions and ground stability concerns should be addressed and costed for the lifetime of the railway (as far as these can be reasonably established) and not simply for the purposes of the initial construction phase. These solutions are linked with the solutions below under the heading "Minerals".

**Crewe North Rolling Stock Depot (RSD)****Issue**

200. The sheer size and scale of construction and subsequent operation of the RSD at Wimboldsley is a major scheme in itself, aside from the magnitude of construction and operation of the HS2 line and infrastructure.
201. Located in a rural area with far reaching views, the RSD will have widespread landscape impacts and take existing productive farmland and fundamentally change the distinct character of this area, which includes a primary school referred to elsewhere within this petition.
202. Residents, communities, businesses, and others with an interest and technical knowledge of the natural and built environment as well as CW&C need to ensure that the Promoter has inclusively and satisfactorily addressed all impacts of the RSD including ensuring appropriate design and capacity of utilities and consequential flood prevention.

**Solution**

203. CW&C seeks a commitment from the Promoter to convene a working group including the above parties, with an independent Chair, to specifically identify the impacts on this geographical area of construction and subsequent operation of the RSD.
204. The scope of the group's work should include matters such as option appraisal of solutions to issues identified, whether reasonable solutions and mitigation measures are achievable to support this location for the RSD from a context beyond the immediate requirements of the Proposed Scheme.

**Engagement Team Resource****Issue**

205. The Proposed Scheme will be the most significant to have taken place in Cheshire since the construction of the railways in the nineteenth century. It is essential that the Cheshire local authorities and the Promoter establish and maintain an excellent working relationship throughout the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme.
206. Within the borough, there will be up to 4 borrow pits, a rolling stock depot, 9 civil engineering satellite construction compounds, 7 large temporary stockpiles and a further 13 smaller temporary stockpiles. In addition to works affecting many rural areas, the communities of Northwich, Winsford and Middlewich (in Cheshire East) are areas with the greatest concentration of residential properties and people affected by the Proposed Scheme. The impact of roadworks in the borough will be felt in Cheshire East and vice versa and the two local authorities share several similar concerns.

**Solution**

207. The Council seeks an assurance that the Promoter will provide funding for a full-time Engagement Team who will be the direct point of contact between the Promoter and CW&C and Cheshire East Council representing community and business interests. Since the two local authorities already share certain services it would seem sensible for the Team to operate across both local authority boundaries.

**Waste****Issue 1**

208. CW&C is concerned by the predicted 67% reduction of inert waste landfill capacity in the North West Region [Volume 3 Route Wide Effects – section 15 Waste and Material Resources Reference, table 57 and para 15.6.46]. This is likely to adversely affect the ability of the Council and all waste planning authorities in the North West to manage their waste arisings over the Plan period.
209. CW&C's Waste Needs Assessment identifies that there is currently sufficient capacity for inert waste management including landfill. This does not account for HS2, which could potentially have a huge impact on inert waste levels requiring disposal in CW&C.
210. The loss of 67% of the capacity in the North West will clearly affect CW&C and the other North West authorities and will compromise their ability to plan for and provide sufficient facilities for management of inert waste.

Solution 1

211. CW&C requests that the Promoter revisits its plans and identifies additional opportunities for reductions in waste generation and increased re-use rather than disposal to landfill.
212. CW&C's also requests that the Promoter considers alternative methods of treatment or disposal in more detail.

Issue 2

213. The loss of 4.56 million tonnes of inert waste landfill capacity (which comprises the 67% overall reduction in the North West) is described in the Environmental Statement (ES) as being of "low importance". Through the significance criteria, the impact is assessed as minor adverse, which is not considered to constitute a significant effect.
214. This 67% reduction in inert waste landfill capacity in the North West will have major implications for all North West authorities. It will compromise their ability to plan for and provide sufficient facilities for management of inert waste. If existing and planned facilities are filled with waste from HS2, additional facilities will need to be provided in the future.

Solution 2

215. Owing to the strategic implications of this loss on CW&C and all North West authorities, the CW&C considers the impact of this loss should be reassessed.
216. The Environmental Statement should be amended to identify a 'high adverse' impact, which would take account of the impact on lost capacity and the difficulty replacing this capacity.

Issue 3

217. The Environmental Statement identifies there are other options open to waste planning authorities for managing inert waste arisings such as for use as fill in site restoration. CW&C does not consider this a realistic option for managing any significant quantity of waste arisings in its area as there are not enough sites, nor is CW&C aware of any sites likely to come forward that would provide any significant capacity for inert waste deposit. The Environmental Statement does not provide any examples of alternatives to inert waste landfill and the potential for treatment and re-use on site does not seem to have been fully considered. The Environmental Statement states there is sufficient inert waste landfill capacity in West Midlands and Yorkshire and Humber regions which would mitigate any loss of North West capacity. There is no evidence that the waste planning authorities in these regions have been approached to ascertain whether this is a feasible option. In any event, the CW&C would be concerned with the sustainability and climate change impacts of utilising these facilities.

Solution 3

218. CW&C requests and the Promoter revisits its plans and identifies additional opportunities for reductions in waste generation and increased re-use rather than disposal to landfill.
219. CW&C also requests that the Promoter considers alternative methods of treatment or disposal in more detail.

220. Details of any opportunities for managing inert waste arisings for use as fill or in site restoration should be provided. Details regarding landfill capacity in the West Midlands and Yorkshire and Humber regions should also be provided, along with confirmation from those areas as to whether this is a feasible option.

### Minerals

#### Issue 1

221. Insufficient research and background information has been provided to show that the scheme will minimise impacts on mineral supply and safeguarding and will maximise re-use of minerals.
222. The potential for prior extraction of minerals in safeguarded areas and the potential for the use of marine aggregate have not been considered fully. The potential for use of material from commercial quarries does not consider the existing quarries within CW&C.
223. Decisions on the need for borrow pits and the likely material to be extracted from the borrow pits have been made on limited information and assumptions (for example assumptions of mineral thickness). Relatively little information has been provided to justify the choice of borrow pit sites, particularly for locations in proximity to residential dwellings such as on Penny's Lane, Lach Dennis.
224. Additional information could result in significant changes to mineral demand and potential provision. Overestimates of the demand for minerals resulting from HS2 could result in unnecessary development of borrow pits, with associated impacts on local communities.

#### Solution 1

225. Additional information should be provided to justify and explain the decisions and to ensure that mineral requirements are reduced as much as possible. Ground investigations should be undertaken to provide further information and to show likely levels of minerals to be provided from the proposed borrow pits. Information should also be provided on associated transport and carbon impacts resulting from alternative methods of minerals provision.

#### Issue 2

226. Within the ES the sensitivity value of the sand and gravel Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) is identified as 'medium' and the impact on the MSA is considered to be 'minor'. The impact does not take account of severance or isolation of MSAs, severance of mineral transport routes or the impact of buffer zones. Sand and gravel resources are becoming increasingly scarce in the North West of England and many authorities have well below the required 7 year supply. As such, there is likely to be increased demand for land-won sand and gravel in the Cheshire area in the future, making protection of MSAs even more important.

#### Solution 2

227. CW&C requests that the Promoter amends the Environmental Statement to identify the sensitivity value of the sand and gravel MSA as 'high'. The magnitude of impact on the MSA should be changed to 'high' and the effect on the sand and gravel MSA should be changed to 'major adverse effect'. The impact of severance or isolation of MSAs, severance of mineral transport routes and the impact of buffer zones should be fully considered. It would then be considered a significant

effect and would also require further assessment of impacts, residual effects, alternatives and further mitigation.

Issue 3

228. The impact of HS2 on salt and brine safeguarding areas, existing mineral extraction operations (such as salt and brine extraction) and other major proposed schemes (such as HyNet pipelines and gas storage) have not been fully considered.

Solution 3

229. The potential impacts on salt and brine safeguarding areas, existing mineral extraction operations and other major proposed schemes should be considered in more detail.

230. Further information needs to be made known and an independent assessment (funded by the Promoter) to justify the need for the borrow pits to be located within Cheshire West and Chester and of the nature and volume of material to be extracted and back filled. Consequential impacts on matters such as flood risk, adverse environmental effects, residential dwellings in proximity and geohazards of the known poor ground conditions must be included within this assessment.

### **3. What do you want to be done in response?**

In the box below, tell us what you think should be done in response to your objections to the Bill. You do not have to complete this box if you do not want to.

You can include this information in your response to the section 'Objections to the Bill' if you prefer. Please number each paragraph.

Please see the "Objections to the Bill" section above and the solutions included in it.