



Working Draft Environmental Statement [WDES]
consultation for HS2 Phase 2b

Summary of responses

Section LA11- Staveley to Aston
Consultation published October 2018
Close - 21st December 2018

Response 1 Support from the Secretary of State

The Trust believes that the restoration has been blighted for 6 years by HS2 plans, and that it is now time for Government rather than HS2 to supply written assurances and solutions to enable restoration work to continue.

The situation remains that the Trust is still to see the assurances given verbally, most recently by the Secretary of State [HoC Transport Questions 11/10/18 - SoS to Lee Rowley MP] reflected in any design documentation emanating from HS2 Ltd.

“The Secretary of State for Transport (Chris Grayling)

It might be helpful if I inform the House that High Speed 2 is today publishing its environmental statement for phase 2b, which is the northern leg from Crewe to Manchester and through the east midlands to Leeds. It will be available in the Library. The route will clearly have an impact on many people, and I have instructed HS2 to treat people with as much decency as possible at what is a difficult time for them. If there are examples of where that is not happening, I want to hear about it, as does the Under-Secretary of State for Transport, my hon. Friend the Member for Wealden (Ms Ghani). I would encourage Members to come and see us about that.

Lee Rowley (North East Derbyshire) (Con)

T5. Chesterfield canal is part of the way through a restoration of its historical route, which is to be completed in time for its 250th anniversary a few years from now. However, the restoration of the last few miles has been stopped in recent years because confirmation cannot be obtained from HS2 that barges will still be able to get underneath it if the trains go ahead. Can my right hon. Friend assure me that that will be possible? [906942]

Chris Grayling

I should like to give my Hon. Friend that assurance. It is a tragedy, in an era when canals are being reopened for leisure purposes, that when the M6 was built, so many parts of the Kendal canal were cut off and are no longer available. I do not wish, and I do not expect, to see HS2 do the same and culvert canals when the railway is being built.”

Response 2 Active engagement from Government and the DfT

The Trust has come to the view that there are some issues that HS2 Ltd itself can not decide on with third parties, and that there is a need for the Department of Transport and Government to become involved in aligning and reconciling the existing policies and strategies determined for local regeneration with those for the development of HS2. This is necessary to ensure that HS2 does not needlessly damage local regeneration.

Response 3 Consultation and the consultation documentation

- The WDES Non-technical Summary airbrushes out the canal and consequences of the railway plans for its restoration. Despite frequent references to the canal in the main body of the WDES [approx 140 in all] this is not reflected in the Summary which is likely to be the document most read by policy makers and decision takers.
- The Trust firmly believes that the significance of effects of the railway plans on the restoration of the Chesterfield Canal have been under estimated and are under-reported in the WDES.
- At Vol1 - 8.8.12 it is asserted that “Appropriate mitigation measures have been identified and taken into account” - this is clearly not the case in respect of the canal restoration at the present time.
- The Trust believes that the information contained within the WDES is inconsistent in its nomenclature; the data used and in its categorisation and analysis. The quality of the data analysis needs to improve greatly before being presented to decision takers.

Response 4 Further restoration prevented

The Trust believes that the WDES clearly identifies multiple instances where the construction and operation of the railway will have major adverse effects with significant sensitivity, and as such these instances should be identified and mitigated for preferably before the draft Bill is presented to Parliament.

As the current situation as portrayed in the WDES stands, the railway effectively prevents all further restoration taking place.

The WDES is inaccurate, ambiguous and needs urgent and detailed correction before the design of the railway progresses to draft Bill stage.

Response 5 Health assessments

Some communities impacted by HS2 Phase 2b are among the most deprived in the UK

Given the former uses of the Staveley IMD site and other areas of land to be used on the route of Phase 2b, it is vital that current health status of residents is better understood, and their health monitored through the process of construction and into operation.

Whilst the ability to assess significant health effects is extremely important, especially given the proposed reuse of formerly contaminated brownfield land, an assessment of the impacts on residents’ and visitors’ wellbeing should also be a feature of the ES.

Response 6 Noise assessments

Any plans for residential moorings at Tipton and STB need to be reviewed in light of the projected noise levels for the IMD and Staveley Spur.

Currently, there are no noise assessments for any part of the Staveley spur from the HS2 main line and none will be prepared until the formal ES is prepared - despite the fact that the residents of Barrow Hill and Staveley will experience the 24/7 working of the IMD

No assessments are available for Waterside or Tipton where train noise from the use of the MML could impact on the feasibility of residential mooring.

Response 7 Noise baffles

The Trust firmly believes that unmitigated noise from the railway will be severely detrimental to the development of the Canal corridor as a tourism feature and needs to be baffled and reduced before the operation of passenger trains begins.

Response 8 MML consultation

The Trust believes that it is vital for members of the public and impacted stakeholders to be able to examine the proposals for the HS2 route from Birmingham to Leeds and the proposals for the MML concurrently, and well before the draft Bill and formal ES are lodged with Parliament., and requests that Government ensure that this is done.

Response 9 Noise and Vibration

The Trust believes that it is extremely important that noise and vibration assessments are carried out and published well in advance of the draft Bill going to Parliament so that proper mitigation needs and measures can be identified ahead of petitioning.

The Trust also notes that initial assessment of operating noise for the section of track past Norwood is assessed as having the potential to exceed the upper EU thresholds for day time noise.

13.5.25 states:

The initial assessment indicates that the forecast noise from long-term railway operation may exceed the daytime threshold set by the Noise Insulation Regulations, the night-time Interim Target identified in the WHO Night Noise Guidelines for Europe 2009 or the maximum noise levels criteria set out in the SMR, at individual residential properties closest to the Proposed Scheme in:

- Bank House Farm in the vicinity of the B6419 Bolsover Road (identified on Map SV-01-380b).
- Barlborough in the vicinity of the A619 Chesterfield Road (identified on Map SV-01-381).
- Barlborough in the vicinity of Westfield Lane (identified on Map SV-01-381).
- Barlborough in the vicinity of the A6135 Sheffield Road (identified on Map SV- 01-381).
- Wales in the vicinity of Cherry Tree Road and B6059 School Road (identified on Map SV-01-384).

Response 10

Canal as an integral feature

The Trust submits that HS2 and the ES need to be consistent in the treatment of the canal as an integral feature of the la11 area.

- 2.1.11 Chesterfield Canal is listed as part of the key transport infrastructure and as such should be accommodated in the scheme design.
- 2.1.28 Chesterfield Canal restoration is safeguarded in the North East Derbyshire Local Plan and Chesterfield Borough Council Local Plan and should therefore be accommodated in the design.
- 2.1.29 Canal restoration at Staveley was underway prior to the HS2 route announcement and would reasonably be expected to have been completed already were it not for the uncertainty caused by HS2 itself. It should therefore be included as a project likely to be constructed.
- 2.1.30 Severance of the Chesterfield Canal at Staveley by construction of the HS2 IMD line will have significant, permanent negative cumulative impacts and should therefore be included in the formal ES.
- 2.2.8 The construction of the railway and its programme generates construction noise and potential disruption for 4½ years in Staveley and just over 4 years at Wales South/Norwood.

Response 11

Significant Health Effects

For the 50,000 walkers and 25,000 cyclist who use the Chesterfield Canal towpath [Cuckoo Way] annually in NE Derbyshire, the denial of access to that facility is likely to have significant negative health and well-being consequences. Furthermore, many of the walkers and cyclists using this facility are not elite high performing athletes, but rather members of the public engaged in self managing their own health improvement by increasing exercise.

Canal towpaths are level and offer a unique resource for easily accessible, low impact exercise in the open air.

Response 12

Need for further socio-economic assessment work

The Trust believes that greater consideration needs to be given to mitigating the impacts of building and operating HS2 Phase 2b on communities experiencing high multiple deprivation and poor health. At Vol. 1-8 - 13.14, it is stated that “significant adverse effects on health and the quality of life on a larger community group may also be identified as an effect likely to be considered significant on a community basis”.

It is therefore important that ‘communities’ relate to real life entities and not those constructed for the purpose of building the railway.

Response 13

Limits of deviation needed

In the WDES there are NO clear dimensions and limits of deviation given.

The Trust requests that the Limits of Deviation for Phase 2b are made public well in advance of the date when the Bill is lodged with Parliament.

Response 14

Use of DMRB appraisal standards

The Trust believes that the use of the DMRB approach should be applied to canal restoration projects impacted by the railway proposals, and in particular to the restoration of the Chesterfield Canal.

Response 15

Detrimental effect of HS2 planning process on the restoration of the Chesterfield Canal

The Trust submits that it has been placed at a severe disadvantage by the protracted railway development programme and would, in all other circumstances, have obtained full planning permission for the full nine mile restoration. It therefore asks that the restoration be regarded as committed development for the purposes of the railway design.

The restoration of the canal has featured in successive local authority plans and those authorities signify their support for restoration through their membership of the Chesterfield Canal Partnership.

The announcement of the Initial Preferred HS2 route in 2013 has:

- Blighted the Trust for restoration funds because the continued existence of the canal in the face of HS2 could not be guaranteed.
- Caused the Canal Partnership to lose its Development Manager who foresaw a long period of indecision during which further restoration and development work could not continue.
- Made submission of a planning application for the remaining nine miles of restoration otiose until there was clarity about the HS2 route and assurance of mitigation.

Response 16

Mitigation

The planning of HS2 has already blighted the restoration of the Chesterfield Canal for almost SIX years. Steps were taken to offer mitigation to the Shimmer Estate, Mexborough after only SIX MONTHS. We request ADVANCED mitigation to enable restoration to continue.

Furthermore we request that the canal is regarded as a resource for developing aquatic mitigation for the loss of the 26 ponds along the section of LA 11.

Response 17

Adverse effects need to be addressed

The Trust believes that, given the significant and lasting potential and demonstrable adverse effects identified in the WDES, further studies and research is undertaken and published in advance of the formal ES, to enable members of the public and local organisations to assess the likely impacts of the IMD and railway on the communities in NE Derbyshire and S Yorkshire.

Response 18

Chesterfield and Staveley Regeneration Route

The Chesterfield and Staveley Regeneration Route from Hall Lane to the centre of Chesterfield has been mooted for more than 50 years. Its passage through the Staveley Works Corridor has been airbrushed out of the WDES and the map book, presenting a less than accurate or honest picture of projected land use.

This needs to be addressed as a matter of great urgency and before the ES goes to Parliament.

Response 19

Blight in the former Staveley Works area

The Trust believes that the evidence presented in the WDES is grossly out of date, partial and has the potential to significantly damage economic regeneration initiatives in the former Staveley Works area by blighting developments already well advanced in the planning process.

Response 20

Threat to canalscape

HS2 jeopardises already restored sections of Chesterfield Canal.

The Trust is concerned that an already restored section of the canal between just NE of Hollingwood Hub through to Mill Green may be rendered unusable in the following respects:

- Fenced along its length on the NE side.
- The subject of dust, noise and fumes from both excavated contamination and from construction plant.
- Visual intrusion into the canalscape with Staveley IMD protruding 7m into the air.
- Degrading of the outdoor experience for walkers and cyclists because of construction activities.

The Trust currently runs public trip boats along this section of the canal, and construction work on the scale envisaged is likely to lead to a downturn in passenger numbers.

Response 21

Basic engineering information needed urgently

In order to progress the canal's restoration further, there needs to be an agreement about the level at which the new supply line to the IMD will cross the canal; whether there is sufficient headroom to get boats, pedestrians and cyclists under the railway. There needs to be agreement about how equestrians and the Trans Pennine Trail can be accommodated and where PRow will be rerouted.

Response 22

Mitigating the landscape and visual impact of the IMD and Staveley Spur on 'residential receptors' and users of the PRow

Rather than plucking mitigation from thin air, the Trust firmly believes that Government, the Department for Transport and HS2 Ltd. should ensure that the formal ES reflects and reports fully on the severe and long-term detriment caused by the development of the railway on the lives of residents and the canal restoration project.

Staveley Town Basin has long been planned as a mixed residential, recreation and business development, and the arbitrary decision by HS2 Ltd. to take the land is not acceptable; a block to economic regeneration and an irrational and ill-conceived act.

The Trust believes that the scale and extent of the damage inflicted since 2013 deserve in-depth study and serious consideration for substantial mitigation, far in excess of meagre tiered seating and the return of extant public realm land to its original developers.

Response 23

Norwood

The Norwood section of LA 11 is one of the most historic and ecologically sensitive on Phase 2b and requires far greater understanding of the impacts of creating the railway through this area.

The historic elements of national importance need examination before any design is finalised. Aquatic mitigation measures for the destruction of the two dozen ponds and value added for the massive decimation of the landscape and tranquil rural area needs to be substantial; capable of adding value, and enabling and supportive of further canal restoration.

Response 24

Mitigation at Norwood

The Trust believes that a solution needs to be found to enable the restoration of the canal to get under the M1 and the main HS2 line and urges HS2 Ltd. to urgently enter into discussions with Canal and River Trust with a view to agreeing a means of achieving further restoration.

The Trust would reiterate the sentiments contained in the Consultation Summary Report; 6.3.28 makes the following point on mitigation:

"Mitigation measures vary on a case by case basis and are influenced by finding a reasonable balance between environmental and engineering constraints, cost and construction programme impacts, hence 'where appropriate and practical' Mitigation measures are not solely decided on cost. The extent and scale of mitigation will be designed to control and reduce significant adverse environmental effects. Priority has to be given to avoiding or preventing effects; and then [if this is not possible], to reducing or abating them; and then, if necessary, to offsetting them through restoration or compensation."

The Trust is now convinced that the combined noise levels from the Motorway and Railway mean that the only acceptable means of achieving this is by the use of a new, short section of tunnel below the M1 and HS2 line.

Response 25

Proportionate mitigation

The Norwood Complex represents groundbreaking Georgian engineering of a type never seen in the UK at the time of its completion. The Trust would ask that, in designing the railway, proper consideration is given to the uniqueness of the Chesterfield Canal and that the railway contributes to its restoration and the maintenance of the landscape characteristics in every way possible rather than the decimation of the setting and character of one of its finest elements - the Norwood flight.

Response 26

Railway drainage attenuation

The proposals for new attenuation ponds and leats ignores the ready availability of Woodhall and Killamarsh ponds as part of a railway drainage management system.

The use of these assets would also recreate a source of water for the Norwood flight of locks and avoid the need to back pump.