

Hybrid Bill Petition

House of Lords

Session 2019-21

High Speed Rail (West Midlands to Crewe) Bill

Do not include any images or graphics in your petition. There will be an opportunity to present these later if you give evidence to the committee.

Your petition does not need to be signed.

Expand the size of the text boxes as you need.

1. Petitioner information

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

Theo Clarke MP
Unit 8, Pearl House,
Staffordshire Technology Park
Beaconside, Stafford.
ST18 0GB

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 am the member of Parliament for the Stafford constituency. The proposed HS2a route cuts through my constituency, severely affecting Moreton, Great Haywood, Ingestre, Staffordshire Showground, Hopton, Marston and Yarlet in the Stafford constituency. On its route it will affect miles of beautiful countryside and has already seriously impacted hundreds of lives.

2. Objections to the Bill

In the box below, write your objections to the Bill and why your property or other interests are [specially and directly 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 on new matters.

- A.** My predecessor (Jeremy Lefroy) has advised me that the announcement of the proposed route for HS2, Phase 2, on 28th January 2013, sent a shockwave across a considerable part of my constituency. Residents in my constituency learned that it was proposed to build an ultra-high-speed railway through long established and peaceful villages, farms, homes and businesses. The impact on the lives of several thousand of my constituents is extensive and will last for a considerable time. The impact will vary over time, from the current substantial reductions in house prices, leaving home owners unable to sell their properties without incurring a large financial loss, to the huge disruption during the construction phase, to the final operation of the route. The impact is and will continue to be considerable.

I support the Government's plans to build and improve our national infrastructure. I have advocated for both the development of new transport infrastructure and improving what already exists. My predecessor supported and I also back the proposal by the previous Government to build a 'Stafford bypass' on the West Coast Mainline through my constituency as well as the substantial rail development at Norton Bridge.

The Prime Minister has now confirmed that HS2 is going ahead. It is therefore vital, as a local Member of Parliament, that I do what I can to ensure that our community is properly served through mitigation of, and compensation for, the effects of HS2. It is in that spirit, therefore, that I am petitioning the select committee and will be making general points and specific points on behalf of constituents.

B. Issue. Your petitioner requires assurances that the Armitage-Handsacre link will be maintained after HS2a has been completed. The proposed stops using Classic Compatible trains at Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent stations are essential for Stafford, Stoke-on-Trent and the North Midlands as a whole. My Stafford constituency and much of Staffordshire is experiencing serious inconvenience as a result of HS2. A silver lining to the cloud has always been the fact that Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent **will always** have stops, thus bringing the benefits of HS2, as well as the difficulties.

In the initial documentation from HS2, Stafford was shown as having an HS2 Classic Compatible Service from London to Liverpool using the Armitage-Handsacre link. In subsequent documentation, this has been downgraded to a link via Stoke-on-Trent terminating at Macclesfield.

Request 1: That the Bill be amended to state that the HS2 Classic Compatible services will always service both Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent with a (minimum) hourly service.

Request 2: That the original proposal for an HS2 Classic Compatible service to one of the major cities of the North West of England (Liverpool or Manchester) be restored.

C. Issue: Your petitioner is very concerned that the viability of the existing West Coast Mainline will be put into question by the opening of HS2. Even when HS2 is in operation, the West Coast Mainline will remain the major provider of local, regional and many long-distance passenger services as well as freight. Hence, it is essential that it is properly maintained. To date, your petitioner has not seen a fully costed case which shows that the operation of HS2 will not be to the detriment of the continued operation of the West Coast Mainline.

Request: That HS2 provide the National Audit Office with a fully costed plan for the maintenance of the West Coast Mainline after it loses the lucrative high-speed passenger traffic.

D. Issue: 4.1 Your petitioner is very concerned at the lack of a detailed transport plan for the construction of the HS2a line. Within the Stafford constituency alone, the M6, A34, A518, A51 as well as B and C roads will all be impacted and closed during some periods of construction. Although plans for these individual roads exist, your petitioner is yet to see or hear of an integrated traffic plan. The M6 and A34 provide a vital north to south national, regional and local link. Any problem with both these roads at the same time will not just provide a problem for the residents of Stafford, nor just North Staffordshire, but will cause major disruption to the national and regional economy.

4.2 Stafford is also earmarked as a place of significant development. There are several developments planned and outline permissions granted for thousands of homes near

to the proposed HS2 routes with their construction planned for the same time period as the HS2 Phase 2a proposed construction. This development will involve traffic management and possibly road closures. There appear to be no joined up plans for traffic management with HS2 Ltd. despite the fact that these traffic restrictions will be on the roads that would reasonably be expected to be the diversions for any HS2 work.

4.3 The M6 is also scheduled to undergo significant disruption over the next few years as the Highways Agency completes works to turn the stretch between Junctions 13 and 15 into Smart Motorway. This will involve significant lane closures and over-night full road closures, using the A34 as the route to divert traffic. I am very concerned that there is no traffic management plan to deal with any clash between the HS2 and M6 projects.

4.4 Your petitioner is also aware of plans to construct a major rail freight interchange on greenbelt at Gailey on the Birmingham-Stafford line south of Penkridge (currently subject to a Planning Inquiry). Your petitioner is opposing this development. However, if it were to go ahead, it would have significant impacts on both the Midlands railway network and the M6, A449 and A5 roads. All of these are major regional and national links. The proposed development would coincide with the construction of HS2 Phase 2a.

4.5 Your petitioner is also aware of the proposals for a new link road between the M54 and M6. It is likely that these very substantial roadworks (if the project goes ahead) would also coincide with the construction of HS2 Phase 2a. This would add further strain on the already congested regional and national network.

Request 1: That a detailed transport plan be developed as a matter of urgency for the region affected by HS2 Phase 2a. This should take into account all existing, permitted or proposed developments.

Request 2: That no construction work on HS2 Phase 2a, which will have any impact on the M6, should commence until all proposed major developments affecting the M6 (Smart Motorway J13 – J15), M54/M6 N Link Road and (possibly) J12 rail freight interchange are complete.

Request 3: That a new link road between the A34 South of Stafford and the M6 J13 be developed to provide additional connectivity for both regular traffic flows and the additional construction traffic during HS2 Phase 2a. This link was originally proposed as part of the Stafford Eastern Distributor Road.

Request 4: That the viaduct (notwithstanding Request 2) carrying HS2 Phase 2a over the M6 be put in place during the work on the M6 J13-J15 Smart Motorway in order to minimise disruption. Precedent for this is the construction of the Lichfield Canal aqueduct over the M6 (Toll) during the motorway works in anticipation of the opening of a canal.

E. Issue: *Proposed Stone Railhead/IMB-r*

5.1 Although the proposed Railhead will be in the neighbouring constituency of Stone, it will have considerable implications for the Stafford constituency.

5.2 The impact of traffic for the A34 and neighbouring routes will be very serious. I am not aware of any plans for managing traffic during its construction. I have been informed that the impact assessments of traffic at the Junction of the A34 and Beaconside at Redhill show a large increase in congestion occurring at peak times.

The now proposed increase in HGVs travelling to the Yarlet construction site, plus the proposed Railhead, mean seriously increased traffic numbers at best and gridlock at worst, on the A34 a very strong possibility

5.3 The planned and consented housebuilding in the area to the North of Beaconside, and the proposed duelling of the road, will already cause additional congestion.

5.4 The Beaconside A34 route is a vital link between County Hospital in Stafford and the Royal Stoke University Hospital in Stoke as well as between the town of Stafford and the Royal Stoke University Hospital. Further congestion on this link is likely to increase the time taken by emergency ambulances to travel both between the two hospitals and between the Stafford area and its major acute hospital in Stoke.

5.5 The Stone Railhead is also likely to impact on rail services between Stafford, Stoke-on-Trent, Macclesfield and Manchester. This is the result of it connecting directly onto the mainline between Norton Bridge and Stone which serves this important route.

Request: That the Stone Railhead/IMB-r not be proceeded with and that an alternative location be sought with less impact on people and existing infrastructure

F. Ingestre Park Golf Club (the Club)

- a. If the Bill is passed it will authorise the compulsory acquisition of approximately 24.5 hectare of the Club's land, as the route of the proposed scheme will pass through the golf course resulting in the loss of 11 -14 holes and the view from the Clubhouse lounge & balcony ill be spoiled by the presence of the railway line. Additional Provision 2 (AP2) includes HS2's proposal for reconfiguration of the golf course and the use of additional land to replace that part of the existing golf course lost to construction of the railway. I have been advised that AP2 initially indicated that the Club had to be closed for 15 months, this was reduced to six months (at the Commons Select Committee Hearing) and now there is an implication that the Club will have to operate as a 9 hole course for at least six months.
- b. The Club has been recognised as a community asset throughout the House of Commons Select Committee's considerations and it is under threat.
- c. I contend that the Club is entitled to compensation under Rule 5, Equivalent Reinstatement, of the Compensation Code. This same right has been afforded to Whittington Heath Golf Club who are affected in Phase 1.
- d. **The Club's preferred option**
The Club's preferred option is an alternative site for a new golf course, clubhouse and associated facilities has been identified within the Parish of Ingestre and Tixall, thereby keeping the Club as an asset for the community. The Club believes that the costs for this option are similar to those for HS2's proposal and, more importantly, secure the Club's long-term future. The Club asks that it is given the chance to explore this option fully and produce comparable costings against HS2's proposal. If shown to be viable, the Club needs HS2's cooperation to ensure work at Ingestre did not commence until the new course was ready and the Club has left its original site.

- e. An extract from the decision of the Select Committee following the Club's second appearance in May 2019 states:

"We expect Ingestre Golf Club to work with HS2 to ensure that the proposals set out in AP2 are delivered for the local community and that the golf club maintain current levels of employment for all their staff."

I understand that HS2 has given the Club no assurances about its future. Even more worryingly, my predecessor has informed me that on 19th June 2019, HS2 Ltd. advised the Club that if the reconfigured golf course could not be built within a budget of £4.89 million then extinguishment of the Club would happen. I have been advised that this is because HS2 Ltd. is not prepared to budget for a cost of anything other than marginally above this figure, for the implementation of the AP2 proposals.

Since the first announcement of the HS2 proposals in 2013, both Ingestre Golf Club and my predecessor have made it clear that agreements need to be made swiftly in order for a suitable new course to be constructed. I agree with my predecessor that it is vital that the Club can move to a fully functioning course, before HS2 require occupation of the Club's land.

Sadly, the Club is now in a situation where it requires timelines and assurances from HS2 immediately, otherwise the club will be left in an untenable situation.

- f. I am very concerned by the ongoing delays by HS2 on agreeing the budget and proposals. The Club now believes that there is a plan by HS2 to make the delivery of the project more difficult and that the intention is to seek extinguishment of the Club thereby providing HS2 with the cheapest option. These actions/inactions are clearly against the recommendations and instructions of the Select Committee.
- g. If the Club is to remain viable, it must be able to offer 18 holes continuous golf, not only for their members but for visitors and societies, and to be able to continue to host county events. They are currently being asked to accept (without any details provided yet as to where, when and how) a 9 hole golf course for at least six months. If HS2 continue with their current strategy, I am concerned that we will see the demise of an excellent community facility and the loss of decades of dedication from local volunteers.

Request 1: That HS2 remove the threat of extinguishment of the Club.

Request 2: The Club believes that it should be granted compensation on the basis of Equivalent Reinstatement, preferably by way of complete relocation, to secure the Club's future. The lack of information required for HS2's proposal is hindering progress and therefore it is only fair that the Club are given the opportunity to explore fully their preferred new site.

Request 3: The Club should have 18 holes continuous golf to ensure the Club's business and community sustainability.

Request 4: The golf course that is provided should be of a similar standard and quality to that which is currently enjoyed in order to ensure that the Club and its members are not disadvantaged as a result of the impact of HS2.

G. Hopton Parish

- a. The deep cutting scheduled for Mount Edge means that the railway will bisect the village. Although the proposed over bridge will provide some limited access on foot or by bike, Mount Edge will still, effectively, be cut off from the rest of its natural community in the village of Hopton because the over bridge will be a bridleway, not a road bridge. There is already a diminishing community spirit because of this barrier and there will be a feeling of isolation because there will be a physical barrier between them and the rest of the village.
- b. My predecessor requested previously for HS2 to see what they could do to help with the Village Hall in Hopton as a token of goodwill. With the decrease of long-term residents and community spirit, the income for community facilities has also decreased. At the same time, the Village Hall in Hopton, one of the main centres of the community, is in great need of repair.
- c. The ongoing impact of HS2 has also had a serious detrimental impact on the health of local residents. Many residents have reported stress and stress related illnesses. My staff regularly deal with distressed individuals and I am very sorry to report that the treatment of some residents by some HS2 staff has made matters worse.
- d. There will be two major construction routes passing either side of the village (the Sandon Road and the Weston Road) and there are fears that a linking road (Within Lane) will be used in periods of heavy congestion. I note that it is not the intention that HGV's will use this link road. It is almost certain that some HGV's will, on occasion, ignore that stipulation, as will HS2 sub-contractors:

- H. This link road is narrow with soft verges and no pedestrian pavement.
- I. There are already many potholes.
- J. Lorries have to go up onto the verges to accommodate oncoming traffic (map provided).
- K. This road is not safe for pedestrians at the moment and the fear is that the situation will get worse with non-car driving residents on the caravan sites being effectively "trapped " on their caravan park with no possibility of walking to the village to visit the church, the village hall or the playground, which is located within the grounds of the village hall.
- L. The Third Special Report of Session 2017 – 19 says: *"There is no doubt that Heavy Goods Vehicles and site traffic will increase on roads close to the enabling works for the Scheme. Traffic will peak at certain points"*. This further convinces HPC that the traffic on Within Lane will increase.

Request: A 5.6 km long bore tunnel would mean that the deep cutting scheduled for Mount Edge would not be necessary and so, one part of the village would not be cut off from the other. Much of this devastation on people and the beautiful countryside could be avoided if part of the line was encompassed in a tunnel.

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. You do not have to complete this box if you do not want to.

The committee cannot reject the Bill outright or propose amendments which conflict with the principle of the Bill. But it can require changes to the Government's plans in response to petitioners' concerns, which can take the form of amendments to the Bill or commitments by HS2 Ltd.

You can include this information in your response to section '2. Objections to the Bill' if you prefer. Please number each paragraph.

Requests have been included in section two.

If you have already petitioned against the High Speed Rail (West Midlands to Crewe) Bill, please give your petition number.

Next steps

Once you have completed your petition template please save it and [continue on our website](#).

If clicking 'continue on our website' doesn't work, copy this link and paste it into your browser: <https://beta.parliament.uk/petition-a-hybrid-bill/4?step=writing-your-petition-online#complete-petition>

March 2020

**HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS -
CREWE) BILL**

**HOUSE OF LORDS
SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Petition No. HS2-HOL-037:
Theo Clarke MP**

Promoter's Response Document

INTRODUCTION

This Promoter's Response Document (PRD) forms the Promoter's response to Petition No. HS2-HOL-037, from Theo Clarke MP.

In this PRD, 'the Promoter' means the Secretary of State and HS2 Ltd acting on his behalf.

The purpose of the PRD is to advise you and the Select Committee of the Promoter's position in relation to the petitioning points raised. It is intended that the PRD will alleviate many of the concerns raised in the petition.

The Table of Contents overleaf lists the page number, petitioning points in the order they appear in the petition, and a summary statement of the issue(s) contained in the petition for quick reference. Other supporting material (e.g. reports, drawings and photographs) referred to in the response are attached where applicable.

Copies of the HS2 Phase 2A Information Papers referred to in the response can be found at <http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/high-speed-rail-west-midlands-to-crewe-bill>.

Department for Transport
High Speed Two (HS2) Limited

BACKGROUND

Theo Clarke MP ('the Petitioner') is the Member of Parliament for the Stafford constituency. The Proposed Scheme passes through the constituency of Stafford, which includes the villages of Moreton, Great Haywood, Ingestre, Hopton, Marston and Yarlet, as well as the Staffordshire County Showground.

Key features in the area include the Great Haywood Marina, Staffordshire County Showground, Yarlet School, Ingestre Salt Marsh and Ingestre Park Golf Club.

In April 2018 and April 2019 the Petitioner's predecessor, Jeremy Lefroy MP was sent a PRD for his petition against the Bill and Additional Provision 2 (AP2) to the Bill in the House of Commons (Petition Nos. HS2-P2A-188 and HS2-AP2-081). Mr Lefroy appeared before the House of Commons Select Committee on 15 May 2018 and 8 May 2019.

PETITION NO. HS2-HOL-037

THEO CLARKE MP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.	Petition Paragraph No.	Issue
4	2a - 2b, Request 1 - 2	Armitage-Handsacre link
7	2c, Request	Viability of West Coast Mainline
9	2d 4.1 – 4.5, Request 1 - 4	Detailed Transport Plan
15	2e 5.1 – 5.5, Request	Proposed Stone Railhead/IMB-R
19	2f a - g, Request 1 - 4	Ingestre Park Golf Club
26	2h a - d, i – n, Request 1- 2	Hopton Parish Council

ATTACHMENTS

Title
Annex A: Hopton Tunnel Alternatives Summary Report April 2018

HOUSE OF LORDS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Theo Clarke MP

PETITION NO: HS2-HOL-037

PARAGRAPH NO: 2a - 2b, Request 1 - 2

ISSUE RAISED: Armitage-Handsacre link

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 2a. My predecessor (Jeremy Lefroy) has advised me that the announcement of the proposed route for HS2, Phase 2, on 28th January 2013, sent a shockwave across a considerable part of my constituency. Residents in my constituency learned that it was proposed to build an ultra-high speed railway through long- established and peaceful villages, farms, homes and businesses. The impact on the lives of several thousand of my constituents is extensive and will last for a considerable time. The impact will vary over time, from the current substantial reductions in house prices, leaving home owners unable to sell their properties without incurring a large financial loss, to the huge disruption of the construction phase, to the final operation of the route. The impact is and will continue to be considerable.

I support the Government's plans to build and improve our national infrastructure. I have advocated both the development of new transport infrastructure and improving what already exists. My predecessor supported and I also backed the proposal by the previous Government to build a 'Stafford bypass' on the West Coast Mainline through my constituency as well the substantial rail development at Norton Bridge.

The Prime Minister has now confirmed that HS2 is going ahead. It is therefore vital, as a local Member of Parliament, that I do what I can to ensure that our community is properly served through mitigation of, and compensation for, the effects of HS2. It is in that spirit, therefore, that I am petitioning the select committee and will be making general points and specific points on behalf of constituents.

2b. Your petitioner requires assurances that the Armitage-Handsacre link will be maintained after HS2a has been completed. The proposed stops using Classic Compatible trains at Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent stations are essential for Stafford, Stoke-on-Trent and the North Midlands as a whole. My Stafford constituency and much of Staffordshire is experiencing serious inconvenience as a result of HS2. A silver lining to the cloud has always been the fact that Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent will always have stops, thus bringing the benefits of HS2, as well as the difficulties.

In the initial documentation from HS2, Stafford was shown as having an HS2 Classic Compatible Service from London to Liverpool using the Armitage-Handsacre link. In subsequent documentation, this has been downgraded to a link via Stoke-on-Trent terminating at Macclesfield.

Request 1:

That the Bill be amended to state that the HS2 Classic Compatible services will always service both Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent with a (minimum) hourly service.

Request 2:

That the original proposal for an HS2 Classic Compatible service to one of the major cities of the North West of England (Liverpool or Manchester) be restored.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

Armitage-Handsacre link

1. The Phase 1 Act authorises powers to construct the junction of the HS2 railway with the West Coast Main Line (WCML) at Handsacre ('the Handsacre Junction').
2. The Phase 2a Bill, under Additional Provision 2 (AP2) to the Bill in the House of Commons amends the design of the Handsacre Junction to create a connection from the HS2 route to the WCML slow lines, via the Handsacre Spur, enabling a connection via Stafford for up to seven trains per hour (one-way train flow), reducing to one train per hour following construction of Phase 2a.
3. As set out in Supplementary Environmental Statement 2 (SES2) and AP2 ES Volume 2, the amendment proposing alterations to the Handsacre Junction connection has

been identified to reduce disruption to the WCML during construction, optimise the design in terms of construction and maintenance, and reduce the costs of HS2 the scheme.¹

4. As set out by the Promoter in evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee, specifying and legislating a particular service for Stoke or indeed any other location through the Bill or by means of a binding undertaking would displace the existing statutory process for the determination of services and access to the rail network by the operators. These steps are appropriately considered by the industry regulator, the Office of Rail and Road (ORR), at the point at which a franchised operator is approaching regulatory approval for access to the rail network.

5. Access to the network and the services that are run are regulated by the Railways Act 1993 and the Railways (Access, Management and Licensing of Railway Undertakings) Regulations 2016.

6. Both the Secretary of State for Transport and the ORR have prescribed duties in relation to the operation of the railways under section 4 of the Railways Act 1993. These include promoting improvements in railway service performance, protecting the interests of railway users and promoting use of the rail network for the carriage of passengers and goods. It also includes developing the network and a number of other concerns about promoting efficiency and economy on the part of those providing rail services. These represent a need to balance interests taking a variety of users into account and it would be premature and preferential to fix a particular operation at this point before reaching the point of settling services for all who would be served.

7. Fixing a service now would cut across the existing duties on the Secretary of State under the Railways Act 1993 in designating passenger services for franchising and engaging with tenderers for the service to be provided. It would also cut across the duty of the ORR in ruling on track access and approving use of the network under franchise or other access arrangements. Fixing it in perpetuity would also tie their hands against any change in services or operators and consideration of new track access contracts to meet future growth and changing passenger demand.

¹ See section 5

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/775951/J10_HS2_Phase_2a_AP2_ES_Volume_2_CA1_report.pdf

HOUSE OF LORDS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Theo Clarke MP

PETITION NO: HS2-HOL-037

PARAGRAPH NO: 2c, Request

ISSUE RAISED: Viability of West Coast Mainline

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 2c. Your petitioner is very concerned that the viability of the existing West Coast Mainline will be put into question by the opening of HS2. Even when HS2 is in operation, the West Coast Mainline will remain the major provider of local, regional and many long-distance passenger services as well as freight.

Hence, it is essential that it is properly maintained. To date, your petitioner has not seen a fully costed case which shows that the operation of HS2 will not be to the detriment of the continued operation of the West Coast Mainline.

Request:

That HS2 provide the National Audit Office with a fully costed plan for the maintenance of the West Coast Mainline after it loses the lucrative high-speed passenger traffic.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

West Coast Mainline (WCML) services

1. The Proposed Scheme has been designed to release capacity on the WCML and to improve the reliability and performance of the existing rail network.
2. As noted by the Petitioner, the WCML will remain a major provider of local, regional and long-distance services. By providing direct intercity services on dedicated HS2 lines, there will be extra space for more trains on the existing heavily congested WCML and East Coast Main Line (ECML).
3. The Promoter notes the Petitioner's continued concern about WCML services, which was also raised by the Petitioner's predecessor. The Promoter notes:
 - Network Rail (NR) is licenced under the Railways Acts for the operation,

maintenance and funding of the West Coast Mainline. Network Rail is under a number of licence obligations and is answerable to the Office of Rail and Road (ORR) as the regulator for railway infrastructure and ultimately the Secretary of State for Transport;

- Network Rail has raised no objections to the Proposed Scheme and has not petitioned against the Bill; and
- The ORR will determine the costs for the maintenance of the railway when they set the relevant Control Period funding settlement with Network Rail. The current Control Period will run until March 2024, and the ORR will determine the costs for operating the railway based on forecast traffic levels at an appropriate time.

4. The Secretary of State for Transport awarded the West Coast Partnership to First Trenitalia in August 2019. Under this contract, First Trenitalia, as well as operating conventional services on the WCML, have been appointed to act as Shadow Operator for HS2, and will be responsible for the development and delivery of single integrated passenger offer covering both high speed and conventional services on the West Coast corridor.

5. HS2 would deliver greater rail capacity in the longer-term, but the Promoter acknowledges that in the meantime there is a need to continue to provide a safe and reliable railway for passengers. This is why the Government is investing at record levels in existing rail services.

6. On 12 October 2017 the Secretary of State for Transport announced the Government's intention to commit around £47 billion on directly improving the existing reliability of the rail network between 2019 and 2024 – delivering a significant increase in track renewals and maintenance compared to previous years. That is on top of the current record levels of investment, which will see £50 billion spent on reliability and major infrastructure enhancements up to 2019.

7. Network Rail, not HS2 Ltd, is responsible for the maintenance of the WCML, therefore it would not be for HS2 Ltd to prepare plans for the maintenance of the WCML. The Business Case for HS2 does however assess the impact of HS2 on the whole GB rail network and shows that there is financial benefit to the taxpayer, as the operating surplus on HS2 more than outweighs any additional subsidy requirement on the conventional network¹. A key benefit of HS2 is that it will provide substantial new rail capacity for the UK. Once HS2 services begin, substantial capacity will be released on the WCML, which will be used to provide new regional services which will benefit passengers along its route.

¹ See Phase 2 Financial Case paragraph 7.6

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/634196/high-speed-two-phase-two-economic-case.pdf

HOUSE OF LORDS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Theo Clarke MP

PETITION NO: HS2-HOL-037

PARAGRAPH NO: 2d 4.1 - 4.5, Request 1 - 4

ISSUE RAISED: Detailed Transport Plan

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 2d 4.1 Your petitioner is very concerned at the lack of a detailed transport plan for the construction of the HS2a line. Within the Stafford constituency alone, the M6, A34, A518, A51 as well as B and C roads will all be impacted and closed during some periods of construction. Although plans for these individual roads exist, your petitioner is yet to see or hear of an integrated traffic plan. The M6 and A34 provide a vital north to south national, regional and local link. Any problem with both these roads at the same time will not just provide a problem for the residents of Stafford, or north Staffordshire, but will cause major disruption to the national and regional economy

2d 4.2 Stafford is also earmarked as a place of significant development. There are several developments planned and outline permissions granted for thousands of homes near to the proposed HS2 routes with their construction planned for the same period as the HS2a proposed construction. This development will involve traffic management and possibly road closures. There appear to be no joined up plans for traffic management with HS2 Ltd. despite the fact that these traffic restrictions will be on the roads that would reasonably be expected to be the diversions for any HS2 work

2d 4.3 The M6 is also scheduled to undergo significant disruption over the next few years as the Highways Agency completes works to turn the stretch between Junctions 13 and 15 into Smart Motorway. This will involve significant lane closures and over-night full road closures, using the A34 as the route to divert traffic. I am very concerned that there is no traffic management plan to deal with any clash between the HS2 and M6 projects.

2d 4.4 Your petitioner is also aware of plans to construct a major rail freight interchange on greenbelt at Gailey on the Birmingham-Stafford line south of Penkridge (currently subject to a Planning Inquiry). Your petitioner is opposing this development. However, if it were to go ahead, it would have significant impacts on both the Midlands railway network and the M6, A449 and A5 roads. All of these are major regional and national links. The proposed development would coincide with the construction of HS2 Phase 2a

2d 4.5 Your petitioner is also aware of the proposals for a new link road between the M54 and M6. It is likely that these very substantial roadworks (if the project goes ahead) would also coincide with the construction of HS2 Phase 2a. This would add further strain on the already congested regional and national network.

Request 1:

That a detailed transport plan be developed as a matter of urgency for the region affected by HS2 Phase 2a. This should take into account all existing, permitted or proposed developments.

Request 2:

That no construction work on HS2 Phase 2a, which will have any impact on the M6, should commence until all proposed major developments affecting the M6 (Smart Motorway J13 – J15), M54/M6 N Link Road and (possibly) J12 rail freight interchange are complete.

Request 3:

That a new link road between the A34 South of Stafford and the M6 J13 be developed to provide additional connectivity for both regular traffic flows and the additional construction traffic during HS2 Phase 2a. This link was originally proposed as part of the Stafford Eastern Distributor Road.

Request 4:

That the viaduct (notwithstanding Request 2) carrying HS2 Phase 2a over the M6 be put in place during the work on the M6 J13-J15 Smart Motorway in order to minimise disruption. Precedent for this is the construction of the Lichfield Canal aqueduct over the M6 (Toll) during the motorway works in anticipation of the opening of a canal.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

Management of traffic during construction

1. The Petitioner's predecessor, Jeremy Lefroy MP requested a traffic management plan in their petition against the Bill in the House of Commons and received the following response in April 2018:

- The Promoter has been working with Staffordshire County Council (SCC) as the local highway authority to address concerns about HS2 construction traffic routes. However, the Promoter considers that the controls under the planning regime established under Schedule 17 to the Bill provide the local highway authority with sufficient control over the proposed construction routes. Under the planning regime established under Schedule 17 to the Bill the nominated undertaker will be required to seek approval from the relevant qualifying authority (that is the relevant planning authority for the area, which in this case will be SCC) for the use by large goods vehicles of any routes to and from a working or storage site, a site where material will be re-used, or a waste disposal site (this does not apply to routes where the number of movements per day is 24 or less, nor to motorways and trunk roads or any part of the route beyond a motorway or trunk road). This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2a Information Paper B2: The Main Provisions of the Planning Regime.
- Local Traffic Management Plans (LTMPs) would be prepared in consultation with the local highway authority and other relevant parties prior to the start of construction that would seek to address local issues and provide for the local highway authority to be involved with decisions relating to the use of certain roads as construction routes. This is explained in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E3: Management of Traffic During Construction. At that time there would be greater clarity regarding other pressures on the highway network, including developments by others. Until there is that clarity it is not considered appropriate or practicable to develop detailed traffic management plans.

2. The Transport Assessment (TA) in Supplementary Environmental Statement 2 (SES2) and Additional Provision 2 (AP2) ES Appendix TR-001-000³ identifies the road network likely to be affected by the Proposed Scheme, including both baseline traffic and any planned developments. Where relevant, traffic associated with more recent committed development has been included in the future year baseline traffic conditions, the details of which are provided in the community area sections of the report.

³ See SES2 and AP2 ES Appendix TR-001-000

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/776242/J49_1_HS2_Phase_2a_AP2_ES_Volume_5_Transport_assessment_Part_1.pdf

3. An update to the committed development and proposed development data which informs the TA found in SES2 and AP2 ES can be found within the HS2 Phase 2a SES2 and AP2 ES: Planning Data document⁴. This includes planned developments including the application for 66 dwellings served via an existing access to Beaconside, found north of Beaconside and East of A34 Stone Road. It also includes an application for 194 dwellings in Fairway by St Modwen Developments, and an application for 81 dwellings at the Walton Hill Residential Development.

4. The Promoter continues to proactively engage with all highways authorities, including SCC, when considering the potential impacts of traffic during construction of the Proposed Scheme.

5. The TA in SES2 took into account a number of junction improvements agreed with SCC to improve traffic flow and these were included in AP2. The SES2 also included an additional construction traffic route along the A51 through Sandon and Weston. This construction traffic route was requested by SCC to reduce the forecast construction traffic impacts in the Stafford urban area.

6. SCC as the designated transport authority have not petitioned against the Bill in the House of Lords, however the Promoter would continue to engage with SCC through the Highways Sub-group. The first meeting of the Highways Sub-group of the Planning Forum took place on 17 July 2018, comprising the Promoter, Highways England, Cheshire East Council, Staffordshire County Council and Shropshire County Council.⁵

7. The Highways Sub Group has been established to:

- facilitate engagement between members on route-wide common interest matters related to local highway authority roads and public rights of way;
- seek agreement on a common approach to route-wide principles, standards, practices and processes associated with highway consents and approvals;
- present recommendations on highway-related planning consents and approvals to the Planning Forum as appropriate;
- identify and discuss areas of common interest and concern to local highways authorities along the whole line of route; and
- progress matters as raised and directed by the relevant Select Committee during the passage of the HS2 Phase 2a Bill through Parliament.

⁴ See HS2 Phase 2a SES2 and AP2 ES: Planning Data

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/776235/J47_HS2_Phase_2a_AP2_ES_Volume_5_Planning_Data.pdf

⁵ HS2 Phase 2a Planning Forum: Highways Sub-group

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/806525/Highways_Sub-group_Phase_2a_-_TORs_final_agreed_120319.pdf

Traffic improvements under AP2

8. As part of AP2 a number of amendments were made to mitigate the impacts of traffic resulting from the construction of the Proposed Scheme. These include better use of site haul roads which travel along the route of the Proposed Scheme, introducing local placement sites within the boundaries of the Proposed Scheme to reduce offsite disposal of excavated materials, and a range of highway and junction improvements which will leave a legacy benefit.

M6

9. Works relating to the Proposed Scheme that have the potential to affect the Strategic Road Network would require the consent the relevant highway authority, in this case, Highways England. The Promoter is working with Highways England and the local highway authority to ensure that, as far as reasonably practicable, the works relating to the Proposed Scheme do not interfere with other highway schemes and that HS2 works are closely co-ordinated with those of the highways authorities.

Link road between the A34 South of Stafford and junction 13 of the M6

10. The TA for the Proposed Scheme identifies a number of proposed HS2 construction routes and the impacts of such construction traffic on the roads identified. The Promoter does not propose to use roads around the south of Stafford or roads directly accessing junction 13 of the M6 for HS2 construction traffic. Given this, the Promoter does not believe that the proposal in Request 3 would assist in mitigating the impacts of HS2 construction traffic.

11. The construction of a new link as proposed would be a substantial undertaking and would be likely to have a range of impacts on the local environment and wider traffic impacts that would need full assessment, and the Promoter believes this could only be justified in the context of long-term transport and other objectives. Consideration of such issues and promotion of any scheme such as this are outside of the scope of this Bill and are the responsibility of the relevant highway authorities. The impacts of HS2 construction traffic are, in this context, relatively short-term effects.

12. Any changes of this scale would require amendments to the Bill that would necessitate an Additional Provision. The guidance on petitioning published by the Private Bill Office in the House of Lords in July 2019 in advance of the petitioning period explained:

“An additional provision is a change to the bill that goes beyond the scope of the existing powers of the bill and which may potentially have an adverse direct and special effect on particular individuals, groups or bodies, over and above any effect on the general public.

Two additional provisions were submitted and considered by the House of Commons Select Committee. However, under the rules governing private bill

procedures, it is expressly forbidden to introduce an additional provision in respect of a bill in the second House – in this case, the House of Lords. The Lords Select Committee on the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill heard extensive procedural argument on the issue concerning its application to a hybrid bill and concluded that it would be contrary to well-established practice for an additional provision to be included. It can therefore with some confidence be expected that the same would apply to the High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill.”

M6 Meaford viaduct

13. The AP2 revised scheme design included changes to the design of the M6 Meaford Viaduct to avoid the need to realign southbound lanes on the M6 motorway with the associated disruption this would have caused. This was achieved by widening the span of the Meaford viaduct and using a different means of structural support, to remove the need for a central pier between the two carriageways of the M6.⁶

14. The M6 junction 13 to junction 15 smart motorway is a Major Scheme being undertaken by Highways England to improve the M6 by making it a smart motorway. The project is scheduled to be complete by 2021/22⁷. The works include permanent conversion of the hard shoulder to create a fourth lane, and alterations of affected junctions to accommodate this change.

15. The Promoter has made amendments in AP2 that would affect the M6 Meaford viaduct, the realignment of Yarnfield Lane and the earlier implementation of M6 motorway slip roads for HS2 construction access.⁸

16. The Promoter continues to engage with Highways England to ensure that the M6 smart motorways scheme is future proofed for the HS2 works that would affect the emergency slip roads at the junction of the M6 with Yarnfield Lane.

17. The Promoter would continue to collaborate with Highways England and all relevant highway authorities to seek the necessary consents and approvals for works affecting the public highway.

⁶ See CT-06-223 in Volume 2 Map book, CA3 Stone and Swynnerton
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/692601/G16_Volume_2_CA3_map_book.pdf

⁷ <https://highwaysengland.co.uk/projects/m6-junction-13-to-junction-15-smart-motorway/>

⁸ See Volume 2 Report, CA3 Stone and Swynnerton
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/775953/J12_HS2_Phase_2a_AP2_ES_Volume_2_CA3_Stone_and_Swynnerton.pdf

HOUSE OF LORDS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Theo Clarke MP

PETITION NO: HS2-HOL-020

PARAGRAPH NO: 2e 5.1 - 5.5, Request

ISSUE RAISED: Proposed Stone Railhead/IMB-R

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 2e. 5.1 Although the proposed Railhead will be in the neighbouring constituency of Stone, it will have considerable implications for the Stafford constituency.

2e. 5.2 The impact of traffic for the A34 and neighbouring routes will be very serious. I am not aware of any plans for managing traffic during its construction. I have been informed that the impact assessments of traffic at the Junction of the A34 and Beaconside at Redhill show a large increase in congestion occurring at peak times. The now proposed increase in HGVs travelling to the Yarlet construction site, plus the proposed Railhead, mean seriously increased traffic numbers at best and gridlock at worst, on the A34 a very strong possibility

2e. 5.3 The planned and consented housebuilding in the area to the North of Beaconside, and the proposed duelling of the road, will already cause additional congestion.

2e. 5.4 The Beaconside A34 route is a vital link between County Hospital in Stafford and the Royal Stoke University Hospital in Stoke as well as in the town of Stafford and the Royal Stoke University Hospital. Further congestion on this link is likely to increase the time taken by emergency ambulances to travel both between the two hospitals and between the Stafford area and its major acute hospital in Stoke.

2e. 5.5 The Stone Railhead is also likely to impact on rail services between Stafford, Stoke-on-Trent, Macclesfield and Manchester. This is the result of it connecting directly onto the mainline between Norton Bridge and Stone which serves this important route.

Request:

That the Stone Railhead/IMB-r not be proceeded with and that an alternative location be sought with less impact on people and existing infrastructure

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

Proposed Stone Railhead/Infrastructure Maintenance Base-Rail (IMB-R)

1. The Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 2: Community area 3, Stone and Swynnerton explains that:

"The Stone IMB-R will be located on the site of the Stone railhead within the Stone and Swynnerton area. The railhead will be used to manage railway systems construction of the Proposed Scheme and will then be converted for use as the Stone IMB-R on completion of construction. This will be situated on land between the route of the Proposed Scheme and the M6, between the areas of Stone and Yarnfield. Permanent access to the IMB-R will be provided via a new works access slip road from the M6 (southbound)."

2. Phase 2a Information Paper F3: Infrastructure Maintenance and Rail Systems Construction Facilities sets out:

- an overview of the strategy associated with the temporary construction facility for rail systems (the 'railhead');
- the reasons behind the proposed railhead location near Stone;
- an overview of the strategy associated with the IMB-R;
- the reasons behind the proposed IMB-R location near Stone and the site layout; and
- the steps that have been taken to mitigate impacts on the local community

3. As set out in the 'HS2 railhead and maintenance update'⁹ the reason the Promoter chose the site between Yarnfield and Stone for the railhead was that:

- the site adjoins the M6, which would allow heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) to access it directly on new dedicated slip roads. This will reduce the impact of construction traffic on local roads.
- the site also has access to an existing operational railway – the Norton Bridge to Stone line. This will allow us to move large amounts of construction equipment and material by rail, reducing further the impact on local roads.

⁹ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/673766/stone_railhead_update_december_2017.pdf

- the site is approximately halfway along the Phase 2a route. Building the railhead here, rather than at one end of the railway, would enable us to build in north and south directions at the same time. This will reduce the overall construction time.
4. As described above, The Transport Assessment (TA) in SES2 and AP2 ES Appendix TR-001-000¹⁰ identifies the road network likely to be affected by the Proposed Scheme, including both baseline traffic and any planned developments, including in the Beaconside area.¹¹ Where relevant, traffic associated with more recent committed development has been included in the future year baseline traffic conditions, the details of which are provided in the community area sections of the report.
 5. Construction traffic on the A34 Stafford Road in the vicinity of the Stone IMB-R is illustrated within exhibit reference P1164 (12) within the AP2 traffic and transport standard pack¹², provided as evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee. The letters 'O' and 'P' show that there is a 4% increase predicted in all vehicle traffic both Northbound and Southbound on the A34 Stafford Road (between Stone bypass and Eccleshall Road).
 6. It is not anticipated that the rail traffic serving the IMB-R at Stone will introduce any constraints on the passenger service provided along the Norton Bridge to Stone line. There will be train movements during the night-time and the design minimises the impact on local residents.
 7. The in principle case for siting the Railhead and IMB-R at Aldersey's Rough instead of Stone was heard by the Select Committee in April 2018. The House of Commons Select Committee decided in their First Special Report in May 2018⁶ that the proposal to site the Railhead and IMB-R at Stone should not be changed.
 8. Relocation of the IMB-R would require amendments to the Bill that would necessitate an Additional Provision. The guidance on petitioning published by the Private Bill Office in the House of Lords in July 2019 in advance of the petitioning period explained:

“An additional provision is a change to the bill that goes beyond the scope of the existing powers of the bill and which may potentially have an adverse direct and special effect on particular individuals, groups, organisations and businesses, over and above any effect on the general public.

¹⁰ SES2 and AP2 ES Appendix TR-001-000

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/776242/J49_1_HS2_Phase_2a_AP2_ES_Volume_5_Transport_assessment_Part_1.pdf

¹¹ See HS2 Phase 2a SES2 and AP2 ES: Planning Data

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/776235/J47_HS2_Phase_2a_AP2_ES_Volume_5_Planning_Data.pdf

¹² See exhibit reference P1164 (12)

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/796124/section_p_part_3.pdf

Two additional provisions were submitted and considered by the House of Commons Select Committee. However, under the rules governing private bill procedures, it is expressly forbidden to introduce an additional provision in respect of a bill in the second House – in this case, the House of Lords. The Lords Select Committee on the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill heard extensive procedural argument on the issue concerning its application to a hybrid bill and concluded that it would be contrary to well-established practice for an additional provision to be included. It can therefore with some confidence be expected that the same would apply to the High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill.”

HOUSE OF LORDS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Theo Clarke MP

PETITION NO: HS2-HOL-037

PARAGRAPH NO: 2f a - g, Request 1 - 4

ISSUE RAISED: Ingestre Park Golf Club

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 2f. a If the Bill is passed it will authorise the compulsory acquisition of approximately 24.5ha of the Club's land, as the route of the proposed scheme will pass through the golf course resulting in the loss of 11 -14 holes and the view from the Clubhouse lounge & balcony will be spoiled by the presence of the railway line. Additional Provision 2 (AP2) includes HS2's proposal for reconfiguration of the golf course and the use of additional land to replace that part of the existing golf course lost to construction of the railway. AP2 initially indicated that the Club had to be closed for 15 months, this was reduced to six months (at the Commons Select Committee Hearing) and now there is an implication that the Club will have to operate as a 9 hole course for at least six months.

2f. b. The Club has been recognised as a community asset throughout the House of Commons Select Committee's considerations and is under threat.

2f. c. I contend that the Club is entitled to compensation under Rule 5, Equivalent Reinstatement, of the Compensation Code. This same right has been afforded to Whittington Heath Golf Club who are affected in Phase 1.

2f. d. The Club's preferred option
The Club's preferred option is an alternative site for a new golf course, clubhouse and associated facilities has been identified within the Parish of Ingestre and Tixall, thereby keeping the Club as an asset for the community. The Club believes that the costs for this option are similar to those for HS2's proposal and, more importantly, secure the Club's long-term future. The Club asks that it is given the chance to explore this option fully and produce

comparable costings against HS2's proposal. If shown to be viable, the Club needs HS2's cooperation to ensure work at Ingestre did not commence until the new course was ready and it has left its original site.

2f. e. An extract from the decision of the Select Committee following the Club's second appearance in May 2019 states:

"We expect Ingestre Golf Club to work with HS2 to ensure that the proposals set out in AP2 are delivered for the local community and that the golf club maintain current levels of employment for all their staff".

I understand that HS2 has given the Club no assurances about its future. Even more worryingly, my predecessor has informed me that on 19th June 2019, HS2 Ltd. advised the Club that if the reconfigured golf course could not be built within a budget of £4.89 million then extinguishment of the Club would happen because HS2 Ltd. is not prepared to budget for a cost anything other than marginally above this figure, for the implementation of the AP2 proposals.

Since the first announcement of the HS2 proposals in 2013, both Ingestre Golf Club and my predecessor have made it clear that agreements need to be made swiftly in order for a suitable new course to be constructed. I agree with my predecessor that it is vital that the Club can move to a fully functioning course, before HS2 require occupation of the Club's land.

Sadly, the Club is now in a situation where it requires timelines and assurances from HS2 immediately, otherwise the club will be left in an untenable situation.

2f. f. I am very concerned by the ongoing delays by HS2 on agreeing the budget and proposals. The Club now believe that there is a plan by HS2 to make the delivery of the project more difficult and that the intention is to seek extinguishment of the Club thereby providing HS2 with the cheapest option. These actions/inactions are clearly against the recommendations and instructions of the Select Committee.

2f. g. If the Club is to remain viable, it must be able to offer 18 holes continuous golf, not only for their members, but for visitors and societies, and to be able to continue to host county events. They are currently being asked to accept (without any details provided yet as to where, when and how) a 9 hole golf course for at least six months. If HS2 continue with their current strategy, I am concerned that we will see the demise of an excellent community facility and the loss of decades of

dedication from local volunteers.

Request 1:

That HS2 remove the threat of extinguishment of the Club.

Request 2:

The Club believes they should be granted compensation on the basis of Equivalent Reinstatement, preferably by way of complete relocation to ensure the Club's future. The lack of information required for HS2's proposal is hindering progress and therefore it is only fair that the Club are given the opportunity to explore fully their preferred new site.

Request 3:

The Club should have 18-holes continuous golf to ensure the Club's business and community sustainability.

Request 4:

The golf course that is provided should be of a similar standard and quality to that which is currently enjoyed to ensure that the Club and its members are not disadvantaged as a result of the impact of HS2

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. In recognition of the impacts of the Proposed Scheme upon Ingestre Park Golf Club, the Promoter included powers to acquire additional land, adjacent to the existing golf course, upon which the holes lost to HS2 could be re-provided to create a reconfigured golf course (referred to as the 'sideways move') in Additional Provision 2 (AP2) to the Bill in the House of Commons. The AP also provides the opportunity for the Club to use an accelerated town planning process to obtain the necessary planning consent through the Bill provisions when enacted.

2. The programme of the works for the sideways move involves the construction of new holes and some reconfiguration of existing holes prior to critical utility works commencing. During the House of Commons Select Committee's consideration of AP2, the Promoter agreed to use reasonable endeavours to keep 18 holes in use as long as possible, however the programme at that time suggested only 9 holes could be guaranteed in the final 6 months of the sideways move works due to the commencement of pipe diversion works.

3. The pause in the Parliamentary process due to the election and the Government's Oakervee review into the HS2 project has led to the need to reconsider the programme. The golf course works and works for the Proposed Scheme are necessarily seasonal in nature and hence 6 months delay to Royal Assent could have a larger impact upon the programme of works. The Club have recently requested that HS2 pipe diversion works are delayed until September 2022 which is currently being

investigated by HS2 to ensure this does not lead to similar delays and resulting additional costs to the HS2 main works. This is a crucial issue for the HS2 project.

4. The Promoter has therefore undertaken extensive consultation with the Club on the scope and cost of works which are continuing. More recently, the Promoter has drawn up detailed heads of terms for an agreement to fund the works agreed with the Club for the sideways move. These heads of terms are subject to agreement on the critical areas of cost and programme, so that the Promoter is aware of the financial commitment for these works in advance and is assured that the works can be undertaken so as not to delay the main works programme for construction of the Proposed Scheme which could lead to significant additional construction costs and risks (potentially many times the cost of the sideways move).

Community asset

5. The Promoter is continuing to engage with the Club with a view to identifying a practical and cost effective solution that allows the golf club to continue as a community asset, and is now progressing with a request from the Club for funding for them to be able to commission specialist advisors.

Compensation

6. The general purpose of the statutory framework is to provide fair compensation to a landowner whose land has been compulsorily purchased for public works. Payment of compensation for land compulsorily acquired would be in accordance with the general statutory framework incorporated within the Bill (and the general Compensation Code as interpreted by the Courts and the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber)).

7. As HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper C8: Compensation Code for Compulsory Purchase sets out, 'the Compensation Code is not a single document, but a collective term used for the principles set out in Acts of Parliament, principally the Land Compensation Act 1961, the Compensation Act 1965, the Land Compensation Act 1973, the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 1991 and the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This is supplemented by case law, relating to compensation for compulsory acquisition'. Again, the principal purpose of the Compensation Code is to provide for the payment of fair compensation to an owner whose land is compulsorily purchased for public works. The Promoter would be required to act in a way consistent with this framework, under the law The Compensation Code is explained further in the HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper C8: Compensation Code for Compulsory Purchase. Other sources recommended for reference include the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's Guides to Compulsory Purchase, a copy of which can be found at www.gov.uk/government/collections/compulsory-purchase-system-guidance.

8. Depending on the particular circumstances in each case, compensation can be claimed under the following categories:

- the open market value of land taken, assuming 'no scheme';
- severance and injurious affection - this means the depreciation in the value of land retained where part only of the claimant's land holding is acquired;
- disturbance – (this represents costs and losses as a result of being disturbed from the occupation of a property);
- loss payments – (these are an additional set payment depending on the nature of the interest being acquired); and
- fees – the reasonable surveyor's fees incurred in preparing and negotiating a compensation settlement together with solicitor's fees for any conveyancing are normally paid by the acquiring authority. Further details on fees are contained in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper C9: Recovery of Costs by Property Owners.

9. In its letter to the Club of 28 June 2018 the Promoter offered the Club an opportunity to resolve the basis of compensation, but the Club has chosen not to engage with the Promoter on this.

Phase 1 comparisons case

10. The works being carried out to reconfigure Whittington Heath Golf Club are more extensive than those proposed at Ingestre as the impact of the Phase 1 route is greater, involving the loss of the existing clubhouse and course facilities as well as a significant part of the course. However, the reconfiguration at Whittington Heath retains as much of the original course as possible, while also incorporating a large element of environmental mitigation land which was originally proposed to be located elsewhere. Whittington Heath Golf Club is a demonstration that with collaborative working a sideways reconfiguration is achievable and that it is not necessary to go to the additional expense of a wholesale relocation.

11. The proposals for the reconfiguration at Ingestre include necessary reconfiguration of the holes on the retained part of the course. The Promoter does not consider it necessary to rebuild the greens on those holes thereby reducing unnecessary cost and disruption, unless those holes become unplayable (which is not expected). The Promoter accepts that modifications to and reconfiguration of the irrigation system would be required and the costs would be included in the comparison between the two options under consideration.

12. At Whittington Heath Golf Club, the HS2 scheme required acquisition and demolition of the Clubhouse. At Ingestre Park Golf Club, the existing clubhouse is not directly affected by the construction works. However, the Promoter's proposals would lead to the loss of 12 holes which would be replaced on adjoining land.

Viability

13. The Promoter accepts that a golf course with fewer than nine holes (on a temporary basis) would not be viable and that compensation for temporary disturbance or interruption to golf would be payable in accordance with the Compensation Code. The

Promoter is continuing to work with the Club to assess the options and to seek to achieve continuation of a golf course at Ingestre in the most cost-effective manner.

14. The Promoter considers there is a high risk of delivering the Petitioner's alternative proposal in terms of time, cost and risk. The Club's alternative proposal would carry greater risk in acquiring land, obtaining planning and all other consents and to construct an 18-hole golf course, club house, car park and related infrastructure within a timescale ahead of the Promoter's construction programme.

15. The Club members are understood to be overwhelmingly in favour of proceeding with the sideways move provided HS2 delay their advanced pipe diversions works and 18 holes are maintained throughout the construction period.

Select Committee Direction

16. Following the publication of the House of Commons Select Committee's Second Special Report in July 2018 the Promoter established a steering group with the Club to review both the Promoter's proposal for a sideways move to provide sufficient replacement land to enable the Club to continue at Ingestre, and the Club's proposal for establishment of an entirely new replacement course elsewhere to which the Club could relocate.

17. Through the steering group process the Promoter and the Club have examined the costs involved in both proposed solutions in order to better inform the Select Committee, by commissioning golf course designers to carry out the cost review, this work is ongoing. The Club have requested recent increases to the scope of works and therefore the costs which are being investigated. The Promoter is conscious of the significant costs attached to both options in relation to the underlying value of the existing golf course, and the desire to maintain the Club as a community asset.

18. The Promoter is fully aware of the Club's original preference to relocate the golf course, the clubhouse and the car park to an alternative site in Tixall, but this option is not supported by the Parish Council and cannot be delivered within the necessary timescale before HS2 pipeline works commence without closure of the Club.

19. Based on the Promoter's initial cost estimates, the Club's proposal to move wholesale is significantly more expensive than the Promoter's sideways proposal and does not constitute value for money. Furthermore, the Club's proposal does not allow the continuation of the golf club in Ingestre as a community asset, whereas the Promoters proposal does.

Extinguishment

20. The Promoter estimated the costs for the House of Commons Select Committee based on the information it had available at the time. In the same way that the Promoter and the Club have revised their estimates for the sideways move, based on fuller and

better information, the Promoter would like to do the same for the extinguishment cost. It is important that the House of Lords Select Committee has an accurate comparison of the two costs when arriving at their judgement on whether it is appropriate to remove extinguishment as a measure of the Club's compensation.

21. The Club has been asked to provide the Promoter with a fully particularised and evidenced estimate of the Club's extinguishment compensation including copies of the last four years trading accounts and a list of staff members and their length of service for use in estimating redundancy costs. Without this information the Promoter will not be able to revise or increase the Promoter's estimate of the extinguishment value and the previous estimate of £2m to £3m as the comparator with the sideways move.

22. The cost of moving the Club sideways including the latest additions to the scope of works requested by the club is estimated to be in the region of £7m excluding the cost of land. Whereas the Promoter is prepared to fund the sideways move maintaining the community asset and local employment, this cannot be at any cost. Hence the heads of terms require a reasonable fixed cost to be agreed for golf reconfiguration works and other associated works before entering into a funding agreement.

Tixall

23. By giving its support for the Promoter's preferred sideways move the House of Commons Select Committee was not persuaded to support a wholesale relocation of the Club.

24. Advisors to the Club confirmed on 3 August 2019 that they are not taking any steps to develop the Tixall site. It was agreed during the steering group meetings that the Promoter and the Club would not continue to explore the Tixall move. To do otherwise would go against the direction of the House of Commons Select Committee in their Third Special Report of Session 2017 –2019 (see paragraph 84 on page 24) which states that it expects the Club to work with the Promoter to ensure that the proposals set out in AP2 are delivered for the community and that the Club maintain current levels of employment for all their staff.

HOUSE OF LORDS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Theo Clarke MP

PETITION NO: HS2-HOL-037

PARAGRAPH NO: 2g a - d, i - n, Request 1 - 2

ISSUE RAISED: Hopton Parish Council

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 2g. a. The deep cutting scheduled for Mount Edge means that the railway will bisect the village. Although the proposed over bridge will provide some limited access on foot or by bike, Mount Edge will still, effectively, be cut off from the rest of its natural community in the village of Hopton because the over bridge will be a bridleway, not a road bridge. There is already a diminishing community spirit because of this barrier and there will be a feeling of isolation because there will be a physical barrier between them and the rest of the village.

2g. b. My predecessor requested previously for HS2 to see what they could do to help with the Village Hall in Hopton as a token of good will. With the decrease of long-term residents and community spirit, the income for community facilities has also decreased. At the same time, the Village Hall in Hopton, one of the main centres of the community, is in great need of repair.

2g. c. The ongoing impact of HS2 has also had a serious detrimental impact on the health of local residents. Many residents have reported stress and stress related illnesses. My staff regularly deal with distressed individuals and I am very sorry to report that the treatment of some residents by some HS2 staff has made matters worse.

2g. d. There will be two major construction routes passing either side of the village (the Sandon Road and the Weston Road) and there are fears that a linking road (Within Lane) will be used in periods of heavy congestion. I note that it is not the intention that HGV's will use this link road. It is almost certain that some HGV's will, on occasion, ignore that stipulation as will HS2 sub-contractors:

2g. i. This link road is narrow with soft verges and no pedestrian pavement

2g. j. There are already many potholes

2g. k. Lorries have to go up onto the verges to accommodate oncoming traffic (map provided)

2g. l. This road is not safe for pedestrians at the moment and the fear is that the situation will get worse with non-car driving residents on the caravan sites being effectively “trapped “ on their caravan park with no possibility of walking to the village to visit the church, the village hall or the playground which is located within the grounds of the village hall.

2g. m. The Third Special Report of Session 2017 – 19 says: “There is no doubt that Heavy Goods Vehicles and site traffic will increase on roads close to the enabling works for the Scheme. Traffic will peak at certain points”. This further convinces HPC that the traffic on Within Lane will increase.

2h n. Hopton Parish Council have put a number of requests in their petition, all of which I endorse, but I would emphasise the following:

Request 1:

A 5.6 km long bore tunnel would mean that the deep cutting scheduled for Mount Edge would not be necessary and so, one part of the village would not be cut off from the other. Much of this devastation on people and the beautiful countryside could be avoided if part of the line was encompassed in a tunnel.

PROMOTER’S RESPONSE:

Tunnelling

1. A number of tunnel options, including the request referred to by the Petitioner, were considered in the Hopton (CA2) Tunnel Alternatives Summary Report (24 April 2018), attached at Annex A².

2. The case for a tunnel through Hopton and the conclusions of this report were considered by the House of Commons Select Committee on 15 May 2018. On the basis of this evidence, the House of Commons Select Committee did not direct HS2

² HS2 Hopton (CA2) Tunnel Alternatives Summary Report
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/706216

Ltd to bring forward an alternative design at this location.

3. The request for a 5.6km long bored tunnel would require amendments to the Bill that would necessitate an Additional Provision. The guidance on petitioning published by the Private Bill Office in the House of Lords in July 2019 in advance of the petitioning period explains:

“An additional provision is a change to the bill that goes beyond the scope of the existing powers of the bill and which may potentially have an adverse direct and special effect on particular individuals, groups or bodies, over and above any effect on the general public.

Two additional provisions were submitted and considered by the House of Commons Select Committee. However, under the rules governing private bill procedures, it is expressly forbidden to introduce an additional provision in respect of a bill in the second House – in this case, the House of Lords. The Lords Select Committee on the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill heard extensive procedural argument on the issue concerning its application to a hybrid bill and concluded that it would be contrary to well-established practice for an additional provision to be included. It can therefore with some confidence be expected that the same would apply to the High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill.”

Petitioner's support for requests by Hopton and Coton Parish Council

4. As referred to in paragraph 2h.n, Hopton and Coton Parish Council raised a number of requests in their petition against the Bill in the House of Lords. A package of assurances has been accepted by the Parish Council and on 22 October 2019 they withdrew their petition against the Bill. For information these assurances are outlined below.

Funds for a new village hall

5. As referred to in paragraph 2g.b, the Petitioner's predecessor Jeremy Lefroy supported the request for HS2 to provide support for the village hall. Hopton Parish Council were offered a £350,000 fund to contribute towards the improvement of community facilities or the local environment in the parish of Hopton and Coton. The assurance is set out below:

"Hopton and Coton Parish Fund

1.1. The Promoter will provide a contribution of up to £350,000 (three hundred and fifty thousand pounds) ("the contribution") towards the improvement of community facilities or the local environment in the Parish of Hopton and Coton. These funds will be released to the Parish Council following the nominated undertaker's review of the Parish Council's proposals and will be subject to:

1.1.1. the commencement of construction of the Proposed Scheme;

1.1.2. all required consents and approvals in relation to any community facility or environmental improvement works being obtained by Hopton and Coton Parish Council.”

Within Lane

6. In paragraph 2g.d the Petitioner refers to the concerns raised by Hopton and Coton Parish Council that Within Lane would be used by construction traffic for the Proposed Scheme, as it intersects two roads which are shown as routes for construction traffic (Sandon Road and Weston Road). Following discussion with the Parish Council the following assurance was offered:

“HS2 HGV Construction Traffic

The Promoter will require the nominated undertaker to restrict HS2 Large Goods Vehicles from using Within Lane between its existing junction with the A518 Weston Road and the B5066 Sandon Road during the Construction Period, except:

- in circumstances where works can only be accessed via Within Lane; or
- in circumstances where it is required to do so by the relevant planning authority under the powers conferred on it by paragraph 6 of Schedule 17 to the Bill; or
- in the case of emergency or if directed to do so by the police or emergency services; or
- where, it would prejudice the safe, timely and economic delivery of the Proposed Scheme.

Signage

Subject to having the necessary rights and consents to erect such signage at the locations in question, the Promoter will require the nominated undertaker to use reasonable endeavours to provide appropriate signage stating “No HS2 HGV construction traffic” at the junction of Within Lane and the A518 Weston Road and the junction of Within Lane and the B5066 Sandon Road during the Construction Period.”

Hopton Pools

7. Hopton Parish Council requested an assurance that the Promoter undertake a survey of Hopton Pools:

“The Promoter will procure that an ecological survey of Hopton Pools is carried out by a suitably qualified ecological specialist subject to the landowner of Hopton Pools granting the necessary rights to access Hopton Pools and to carry out that ecological survey. The Promoter will inform the Petitioner of the results of the ecological survey carried out pursuant to this paragraph.”

8. As a result of these assurances, including that on the contribution, the Parish Council decided to withdraw their petition against the Bill in the House of Lords on 22 October 2019.

Health assessment

9. The Petitioner raises concerns about health and wellbeing at paragraph 2g.c. A Health Assessment of the Proposed Scheme was undertaken as part of the design and planning process, prior to deposit of the Bill. The inclusion of the Health Assessment in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was implemented to accord with the 2017 EIA Regulations. The definition of health used in the assessment follows that of the World Health Organization, which describes health as “a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity”.

10. The Health Assessment identifies reasonably practicable measures to prevent or to reduce adverse health effects, or to provide mitigation or compensation to those affected. Health effects have been assessed locally within each Community Area or route-wide, depending on the nature of the health determinant. The assessment of local effects is reported in Volume 2 and assessment of route-wide effects is reported in Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement (ES).

11. The integrated approach to health and environmental assessment includes an emphasis on integrated stakeholder engagement. Information obtained through stakeholder engagement has helped to inform this health assessment. Engagement on health issues formed part of the wider EIA consultation process and health considerations were a key element of community engagement activities.

Mental health and wellbeing

12. The Promoter is committed to being a good neighbour by treating affected communities with respect and consideration, and by focusing on minimising and mitigating impacts, whilst maximising the benefits both locally and nationally across the UK.

13. HS2 Ltd's Residents' Charter²⁶ sets out 10 community commitments, including that HS2 Ltd would respect the wellbeing of affected communities, minimise disruption to their lives with local mitigation plans and activities, and ensure that the standards set out in the draft Code of Construction Practice are met.

14. More generally, the Promoter takes their equality duty seriously, in terms of addressing the needs of those stakeholders with protected characteristics, including age, and an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) was one of the documents published alongside the Bill in July 2017. Updates to the original EqIA were published in February 2019 as a result of the changes and amendments included within the Supplementary Environmental Statement and Additional Provision Environmental Statement as well as the Supplementary Environmental Statement 2 and Additional Provision 2 Environmental Statement.

Further work on health and wellbeing during House of Commons Select Committee

15. In addition to the assessment and measures outlined above, in its Second Special Report (July 2018)²⁷, the House of Commons Select Committee directed the Promoter to commission an epidemiological report to address community health and wellbeing.

16. As a result, the Promoter commissioned consultant health experts to undertake the initial scoping for an epidemiological study to address community health and wellbeing. The Select Committee acknowledged the increased efforts by the Promoter to help those affected by the Proposed Scheme and the cross-departmental work that has taken place on this issue, and instructed the Government to incorporate and build on this work.

17. The Promoter's response to the House of Commons Select Committee's Third Special Report of Session 2017 – 2019 explains:

“38. HS2 Ltd is launching a support service that is able to provide expert advice to those members of the workforce who are engaging with communities, as well as helping manage, support and signpost those individuals who are deemed to be vulnerable.

39. This independent support service will be made available along the whole line of the new railway route. Key areas of focus will include:

- providing face to face or telephone consultations with those individuals deemed vulnerable, ensuring support is tailored to their specific needs.
- assisting people in understanding and responding to HS2 Ltd documentation.
- signposting individuals or HS2 Ltd workforce to the relevant organisation for additional support

²⁶ HS2 Ltd Residents' Charter

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/704895/CS959_Community_Engagement_Residents_Charter_26_4.pdf

²⁷ House of Commons High Speed Rail (West Midlands - Crewe) Bill Select Committee Second Special Report of Session 2017–19 Report

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmhs2/1452/1452.pdf>

- assisting HS2 Ltd with case management of those individuals who may become vulnerable as a consequence of HS2 activity.

40. In addition, HS2 Ltd is also delivering specific training for frontline staff to ensure they are able to identify and communicate with those individuals who may be vulnerable.”

18. Procurement for a framework of services to provide staff with expert advice and assistance in supporting vulnerable people has been completed and the contract has been awarded to the successful provider (POhWER).

Vulnerable groups

19. As stated in the EqIA report there are further steps to fulfil the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED):

“1.8.1 The PSED is an ongoing duty requiring consideration of equality issues by public bodies. This report contributes to fulfilling that obligation, by reporting findings of potential effects on equality as a result of the Proposed Scheme, based on the available information about people with protected characteristics in affected communities. As the Proposed Scheme progresses, further equality issues may be identified and will require consideration in decision-making by HS2 Ltd and may have implications for other relevant public bodies, including the Department for Transport.

1.8.2 HS2 Ltd will ensure that potential effects identified in this EQIA Report are kept under review, and where appropriate, the baseline evidence will be updated and further stakeholder engagement undertaken. That further information and appraisal of potential effects will be used to inform future decisions.

1.8.3 HS2 Ltd has appointed an equality lead responsible for overseeing monitoring and reporting of equality effects during the construction of the Proposed Scheme. The equality lead will continue to bring equality issues to the attention of the project team and is responsible for reporting on the effectiveness of measures taken to mitigate potential or actual negative effects as well as positive actions to promote equality.”

²⁸ House of Commons Select Committee on High Speed Rail (West Midlands - Crewe) Bill promoter's response to the select committee's third special report of session 2017 - 2019
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-2a-promoters-response-to-select-committees-third-special-report>

Controls within the draft Code of Construction Practice

20. Contractors will be required to comply with the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) which will be the means of controlling the impacts of construction works to ensure that the effects of the works upon people and the natural environment are reduced or avoided so far as reasonably practicable.

21. The draft CoCP²⁹ explains:

“Sufficient suitably qualified and experienced personnel will be appointed by the lead contractors to supervise the main construction works. This would include professionally qualified environmental management staff, with relevant experience in the environmental disciplines included within the ES. They would be present on site during the main construction works to advise the nominated undertaker and the contract management team, and supervise and report on the implementation of appropriate environmental mitigation measures and safeguards.”

22. The nominated undertaker and its contractors will maintain a construction operations website (which will include an email function or the latest communication technique) and telephone helpline staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to handle enquiries from the general public and local businesses regarding construction activities.

23. It will also act as a first point of contact for information in the case of any emergency or incident. The helpline will be widely promoted and displayed on site signboards and hoardings. It will also be possible to contact the HS2 helpline service via the HS2 website email function.

24. Furthermore, a comprehensive community emergency plan will be put in place, where relevant, for each section of the work. This will ensure that in the case of a major emergency, when working in partnership with the relevant emergency service, the community can be kept fully informed and that adequate arrangements are in place for the evacuation of an affected area if necessary.

Impact on Hopton residents and community

25. The Promoter recognises the impact of the Proposed Scheme at this location. The ES, Volume 2: Community area 2 report, Colwich to Yarlet³⁰ sets out the following in sections 9.4.2, 9.4.5 and 9.4.33 respectively:

“9.4.2 The mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the Proposed Scheme in the Colwich to Yarlet area include:

²⁹ See paragraph 4.5.1

HS2 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/draft-code-of-construction-practice-for-hs2-phase-2a>

- reducing the proximity of the Proposed Scheme to property and community assets, insofar as reasonably practicable. For example, the route has been moved further away from residential properties at Moreton, Hopton, Marston and Yarlet;
- maintaining access across the route of the Proposed Scheme, for example, between Mount Edge and the rest of Hopton village (via the Hopton and Coton new footpath overbridge), to properties on Tolldish Lane (via the Tolldish Lane temporary highway diversion), and properties and businesses on the A34 Stone Road (via the A34 Stone Road temporary diversion).

9.4.5 The draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) will require the nominated undertaker and its contractors to produce and implement a community engagement framework and provide appropriately experienced community relations personnel to implement the framework, to provide appropriate information and to be the first point of contact to resolve community issues. The nominated undertaker will take reasonable steps to engage with the community, particularly focusing on those who may be affected by construction impacts, including local residents, businesses, landowners and community resources, and the specific needs of protected groups (as defined in the Equality Act 2010).

9.4.33 The draft CoCP includes a commitment to produce and implement a community engagement framework and provide appropriately experienced community relations personnel. HS2 Ltd will engage with local authorities and community representatives to identify measures aimed at fostering and maintaining good relationships between the workforce and local communities. Any measures identified will be included within the community engagement framework, as appropriate."

Community engagement in Hopton Parish

26. HS2 Ltd has a strategic aim to be a good neighbour, and has made ten commitments to communities as set out in the published Community Engagement Strategy³¹. HS2 Ltd publishes reports on its community engagement delivery every six months. It also publishes tailored Local Area Engagement Plans that describe what the strategy means locally.

27. HS2 Ltd continues to provide a Community Engagement team dedicated to managing community relationships along the route of the Proposed Scheme. It includes a Community Engagement Manager dedicated to the area between Great Haywood and Swynnerton (which includes Hopton). The aim of the team is to:

³⁰ See

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/627562/E14_Volume_2_Community_Area_report_CA2.pdf

- Produce a local engagement plan that explains how the community engagement strategy will be delivered at a local level;
- Provide a flexible approach to community engagement using a range of tailored engagement activities including one-to-one meetings, site visits, and public events such as drop-ins and surgeries; and
- Deliver public communications through a range of methods, including direct mail, and an online community website.

28. HS2 Ltd will also:

- ensure that each of its contractors employs a suitably experienced Community Relations Representative;
- provide advanced notification of construction and related works;
- undertake stakeholder and community engagement in relation to common and key design elements;
- handle enquiries and complaints using a Freephone Helpdesk available all day every day;
- Expect its contractors to identify opportunities to have a positive impact within local communities by investing their time, people, skills and equipment in the local community;
- Seek views on community engagement from impacted communities for the whole of the route, through a range of methods. Insight and results will be shared with construction partners, so that lessons learned can be implemented to drive continuous improvement; and
- Liaise with an independent Construction Commissioner has been appointed by an independent selection panel on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport, and an independent HS2 Residents' Commissioner oversees the Residents' Charter and monitors the way in which HS2 Ltd communicates with residents who are affected by its proposal.

Pre-Bill consultation with local communities and individuals

29. The Promoter has carried out extensive stakeholder and public consultation in advance of the submission of the Bill. This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper G1: Consultation and Engagement³².

30. Consultation and engagement has been carried out in compliance with relevant guidance and legislation, including:

³¹ HS2 Community Engagement Strategy, November 2018
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/773683/HS2_Community_Engagement_Strategy_FULL_HiRes_WEB.pdf

- prior to July 2012, the Cabinet Office's Code of Practice on Consultation issued in July 2008; and
- the Gunning Principles, which are a set of criteria for assessing the fairness of a public consultation.

31. Consultation has been a major influence on the development of the Proposed Scheme, particularly in helping to identify and mitigate local impacts. Initial consultation on high speed rail was undertaken between February – July 2011, and the subsequent announcement of the decision to pursue the Y network in two phases was announced in January 2012.

32. In January 2013 the initial preferred route for Phase Two was announced which allowed early opportunity to engage with key stakeholders on potential key issues and concerns about the route and its impacts ahead of consultation. This included the publication of background material used to inform the initial preferred route, including an Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS) options report setting out the environmental performance of alternative route options. Consultation on the Phase Two route between July 2013 and January 2016 sought comments on the proposed route and the approach to the environmental appraisal carried out by the Promoter.

33. In November 2015 the decision to accelerate construction and the preferred route for Phase 2A was announced. This included a consultation response for Phase 2A, including feedback on the AoS of the proposed Phase Two route via Question 7 of the consultation (December 2015) and the publication of a summary change document reflecting changes made since the consultation and publication of a Sustainability Report for the Phase 2A route, highlighting the difference in environmental impacts.

34. The ES and EqlA was submitted with the Bill on 17 July 2017 and these were consulted on until 30 September 2017. During the consultation, 6 events were held to provide direct engagement with stakeholders along the route, and engagement was undertaken with local authorities and Parish Councils.

35. The Promoter's records show that HS2 Ltd wrote to the Parish Council in late November/early December 2015 in regards to the property consultation (and related events scheduled in January 2016 – one of the events being at the Gatehouse Theatre in Stafford). HS2 Ltd also wrote to the Parish Council in September 2016 in regards to three consultations:

- The Working Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report;

³² See

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/829000/G1_Consultation_Engagement_v1.2.pdf

- The Working Draft Equality Impact Assessment Report; and
- Design Refinement.

36. Letters were also sent to Members of Parliament, local authorities, statutory organisations and other stakeholders, to inform them of the launch of the consultation. Regional press releases and local advertisements in newspapers were issued to raise awareness of the consultation and public events.

37. The following events have been held in or close to the Parish of Hopton and Coton since 2013:

- Phase Two route and stations consultation, Staffordshire County Showground, 10 December 2013
- Information event on the Tunnel, Hopton Village Hall, 11 December 2015
- Property consultation event at the Gatehouse Theatre, 20 January 2016
- Working draft EIA consultation event, Gatehouse Theatre, 10 October 2016
- Bill deposit information event, Gatehouse Theatre, 12 August 2017
- Phase 2a Information event, Gatehouse Theatre, 29 October 2018
- HS2 land and property surgery, Hopton Village Hall, 17 January 2019