

Consultation Response to Volume 2 CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE

**TABLE OF
CONTENTS**

	VOLUME 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	1
1.1	General Comments	1
1.2	Overview and description, Section 2.....	1
1.3	Stakeholder engagement and consultation, Section 3.9	
1.4	Agriculture, forestry and soils, Section 4.....	9
1.5	Air Quality, Section 5.	9
1.6	Community – incorporating health related issues outside of the HIA.....	10
1.7	Ecology and biodiversity, Section 7.....	12
1.8	Health, Section 8.	13
1.9	Historic environment, Section 9.	14
1.10	Land quality, Section 10.....	15
1.11	Landscape and visual assessment, Section 11.	17
1.12	Socio Economic, Section 12.	18
1.13	Sound, Noise & Vibration, Section 13.	18
1.14	Traffic and transport, incorporating PROW, highway design and Traffic Safety, Section 14.....	20
1.15	Water Resources & Flood Risk, Section 15.	24

VOLUME 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE

1.1 General Comments

- 1.1.1 This report contains our comments for the Community Area 8 of WDES Volume 2.
- 1.1.2 Please also refer to the General response to WDES Volume 2 where comments apply to all areas within Derbyshire.
- 1.1.3 Detailed comments on other Community Area Reports are contained in separate local area volume which also form part of this consultation response.
- 1.1.4 The Council continue to be disappointed with HS2's failure to address key concerns in this area which have been raised by DCC on numerous occasions. These include the impact on the communities along the proposed spur line and on businesses such as the East Midlands Designer Outlet. DCC do however welcome the proposals for the introduction of high speed services from Chesterfield Station and the potential benefits for the wider area provided that they take account of access arrangements and rail connectivity.

1.2 Overview and description, Section 2.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
2.1.25	Appropriate reference is made to the Derby and Derbyshire Adopted Minerals Local Plan; Derby and Derbyshire Adopted Waste Local Plan; Derbyshire Local Transport Plan; and (emerging) Bolsover District Local Plan (2018). However, reference should also be made to the Saved Policies of the Adopted Bolsover District Local Plan 2000, which will still be relevant in the assessment process.
2.1.26	It should also be noted in this section that the Replacement Bolsover District Local was submitted to the Secretary of State on 31st August 2018 and so will be relevant in the assessment process. Reference should also be made to the fact that DCC and Derby City Council are currently preparing reviews of the Derby and Derbyshire Mineral Local Plan and Derby and Derbyshire Waste Local Plan but neither Plan has yet reached the submission stage to the Secretary of State.
2.1.27; 2.1.28; and 2.1.29	In terms of the identification of committed development, site allocations and safeguarded sites for minerals, DCC request that HS2 Ltd continues to liaise with the County Council's officers to ensure that the baseline information, particularly on committed developments, is robust and up-to-date as the WDES progresses to its final version.
2.1.31	There are a considerable number of areas in the design which are subject to further development. As a result it makes it difficult to provide a meaningful response to this consultation.

2.2.5 and 2.2.12	It is not clear why the Map Books for LA08 start at CT-06-447b but this community area report does not include/describe it. Why is there 3 sheets of overlap between LA08 and LA09?
2.2.13	<p>DCC ask that diverted PRoW will not have excessive gradients, (ie will follow industry best practice). Where diverted across existing and new bridges, these should be upgraded for the required use, (eg equestrian fences). DCC will be looking for improvement of provision on affected routes.</p> <p>Pinxton FP B8/1/1, is diverted some way along the top of a very large retaining wall. Please consider adding an alternative route with steps down the embankment to Farmwell Lane. Refer CT-06-448b.</p>
2.2.18	DCC ask that diverted PRoW will not have excessive gradients, (ie will follow industry best practice). Where diverted across existing and new bridges, these should be upgraded for the required use, (eg equestrian fences). DCC will be looking for improvement of provision on affected routes.
2.2.19	<p>There is no acknowledgement that a high voltage pylon will need relocation as part of the works, it is still shown in the middle of the HS2 line south of B6026 Blackwell Road (CT-05-449 J6 & 450).</p> <p>Associated works could have a major impact in the area which has not been assessed.</p>
2.2.26	Map is not clear that the southbound spur dives under the mainline, (the retaining walls make it look like it crosses over on plan CT-06-449.)
2.2.21 -2.2.36	The scale of the proposed elements e,g viaducts (up to 16m high), cuttings (up to 12m deep) and embankments (up to 12m high) in the area from the start of the spur through Hilcote, Netwton and Blackwell are totally out of proportion with the surrounding environment. More use should be made of cut and cover tunnels in this area to shield it from the worst of the impact. For example the residential area adjacent to Alfreton Road is badly affected. The mitigation study carried out on behalf of DCC and other east midlands councils by SNC Lavalin, which representatives from HS2 have been party to, made specific proposals to create a cut and cover tunnel in this area to shield it from the worst impact. A copy of the mitigation study can be found in Appendix B of the Council's response to this draft environmental statement.

2.3.32	<p>Maghole Brook Satellite Compound</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. In view of existing highway being severed by HS2 route and compound being located on a cul-de-sac. An 85th percentile speed survey is required to establish visibility splay requirements post stopping up</p> <p>The satisfactory use of compound relies upon severance of Brookhill Lane by a Stopping Up Order. Truncated ends of former route will require provision of turning heads. New junctions to diverted line of Brookhill Lane will require provision of adequate exit and forward visibility. Details of line and level of diverted route required in order to comment further.</p> <p>This site has been assessed based on the information / plans provided by HS2 and on an individual basis looking at access to the existing local highway network issues only. No assumption has been made as to whether the boundary of a site necessarily abuts the public highway, it will be for the promoter to ensure that rights to access a site exist.</p>
2.3.41	<p>Farmwell Lane Main Compound</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan because of the unknown status and indicated land ownership and control. HS2 Ltd therefore needs to establish status of Farmwell Lane and traffic impacts where this meets the publicly maintainable highway network.</p> <p>This site has been assessed based on the information / plans provided by HS2 and on an individual basis looking at access to the existing local highway network issues only. No assumption has been made as to whether the boundary of a site necessarily abuts the public highway, it will be for the promoter to ensure that rights to access a site exist.</p>

2.3.52	<p>Castlewood Transformer Station Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan, unless an existing classified highway is Stopped Up and Diverted. The severed ends of former Huthwaite Lane require provision of adequate turning facilities and junctions. These and the line and level of the diverted highway will all have to be designed to appropriate design standards.</p> <p>This site has been assessed based on the information / plans provided by HS2 and on an individual basis looking at access to the existing local highway network issues only. No assumption has been made as to whether the boundary of a site necessarily abuts the public highway, it will be for the promoter to ensure that rights to access a site exist.</p>
2.3.56	<p>B6026 Huthwaite Lane Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan as the existing margin reduces to nothing. Given the width of frontage available third party land is required to deliver exit visibility for access onto B6026.</p> <p>Topography may present an additional highway constraint due to the undulating nature of Huthwaite Lane. The exact point of access will need to demonstrate exit and forward visibility appropriate for speeds. Footways have minimal margins and are unlit. The nearest bus stop is over 1 km distant from site in Old Blackwell. The nearest shop is 1.3 km distant in Hilcote. There is no PRow near the site and the closest footpath at County Boundary to east of site is accessed via a B road with no footways and no lighting.</p> <p>Huthwaite Lane is shown as diverting at this location. The compound will ultimately be served via the bypassed route. The introduction of a 90 degree bend to the east of the site will reduce the achievable sightline but may be acceptable based on reduced speeds.</p> <p>This site has been assessed based on the information / plans provided by HS2 and on an individual basis looking at access to the existing local highway network issues only. No assumption has been made as to whether the boundary of a site necessarily abuts the public highway, it will be for the promoter to ensure that rights to access a site exist.</p>

2.3.63	<p>Newtonwood Lane Satellite Compound</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. Although Newtonwood Lane at this location is generally straight with wide margins, it raises as it forms a crest possibly obscured by the Motorway overbridge. The visibility to south will require safeguarding as part of future realignment of Newtonwood Lane.</p> <p>The site is lower than adjacent highway so any access is likely to require regrading within the site to achieve appropriate gradient onto highway and exit visibility from required eye height.</p> <p>There are no footways in the vicinity of the site with grassed margins only. A short length of footway leads to a weak bridge, but there is no margin at all over the bridge. A footway commences on the far side of the bridge and there is no lighting. The nearest shop is just under 1 km distant in Newton (unless pedestrian access to rear of motorway services is permitted). The nearest bus stop is on Main Street, Newton; over 1 km from the site. Public footpath no. 13 runs alongside the site and links to Huthwaite, Newton and onto the Silverhill Trail.</p> <p>The Bridge over Silverhill Trail to North West of site is weak and there is a maximum 13 Tonne (mgw) and it is also subject to signal controlled shuttle working. All construction traffic will approach from south east. Newtonwood Lane reduces in width beyond motorway service access and varies down to less than 5m. The horizontal alignment limits passing opportunities.</p> <p>This site has been assessed based on the information / plans provided by HS2 and on an individual basis looking at access to the existing local highway network issues only. No assumption has been made as to whether the boundary of a site necessarily abuts the public highway, it will be for the promoter to ensure that rights to access a site exist.</p>
2.3.70	<p>It is not clear how long the Sheffield spur main compound would remain in place. In section 2.3.73 it states it would remain in place for 2 year 12 months for construction of Cartwright Lane cutting, 2 years and 9months for the Cartwright Lane dive under, 2 years and 12 months for the Normaton Brook embankment, 3 years and 6 months for the Hilcote west embankment and 2 years and 9months for the Alfreton Road box structure. However in figure 5 the compound is shown as being open for 5 years and 3 months for civil engineering and in figure 6, 5 years and 3 months for rail systems work. More clarity is required on what the total time the various work compounds will be open for.</p>

2.3.79	<p>M1 South Satellite Compound</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. There appears to be insufficient frontage on New Road to achieve sightlines in line with the speed limit. Access via Huthwaite Lane is dependent upon 'HS2 Access' being constructed at this stage.</p> <p>Topography may present a highway problem, there is a crest on New Lane halfway along site frontage. The access location will need to ensure forward visibility is not prejudiced.</p> <p>There are no footways on New Lane. The footway on Huthwaite Lane starts opposite the site and leads to Old Blackwell, it has minimal margins and is unlit. The nearest bus stop is over 1 km distant from site in Old Blackwell. The nearest shop is in Hilcote and the PRoW at the southern corner of site provides a link to Hilcote.</p> <p>This site has been assessed based on the information / plans provided by HS2 and on an individual basis looking at access to the existing local highway network issues only. No assumption has been made as to whether the boundary of a site necessarily abuts the public highway, it will be for the promoter to ensure that rights to access a site exist.</p>
2.3.86	<p>Alfreton Road Satellite Compound</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. Formal on-street parking bays to the southern end of the site may require relocation.</p> <p>This site has been assessed based on the information / plans provided by HS2 and on an individual basis looking at access to the existing local highway network issues only. No assumption has been made as to whether the boundary of a site necessarily abuts the public highway, it will be for the promoter to ensure that rights to access a site exist.</p>
2.3.94	<p>DCC fully support the approach set out in this paragraph whereby excavated material across the whole scheme would be used as engineering fill material or in environmental mitigation works where suitable or reasonable practicable. See also comments on Section 2.3.95.</p>

2.3.95	<p>It is noted from this section that forecasts of the amount of construction, demolition and excavated waste that would be produced during construction of the proposed scheme is to be reported in Volume 3 of the ES. However, DCC considers it to be important that full details of the likely amounts of construction, demolition and excavation waste should be set out for this specific section of the route in the ES so that DCC can make a more detailed assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the generation of waste material, particularly if it is proposed that any excess waste material will need to be exported from the study area.</p> <p>Without knowing the balance between cut and fill the extent to which borrow pits will be required is unknown and therefore an assessment of the accuracy of the proposal in forecasting the requirement for land take to accommodate borrow pits and stocking areas is uncertain.</p> <p>The transport implications of this uncertainty in cut and fill balance, and in the need to export/import materials is also uncertain. Movement of excavated and imported materials will have the potential for a significant impact on the local road network, this should be addressed.</p>
2.3.96	<p>DCC fully supports the proposed approach whereby local excess or shortfalls in excavated material in the area would be managed through the mitigation earthworks design approach with the aim of contributing to an overall balance of excavated material on a route-wide basis.</p>
2.4.2	<p>Previously it was proposed that there would be 2 trains an hour on the spur route to Sheffield one of which would serve Chesterfield and then Sheffield and the other running nonstop to Sheffield. However it is now proposed that there will be 4 trains an hour. Does this mean that frequency has now doubled or does this depend on proposed link north of Sheffield back onto the main line being built? If the service is doubled will this mean more trains will now serve Chesterfield or will the extra 2 an hour also be nonstop? Comment made in the MML01 and 02 Community Area Report suggest that only 1 train per hour will actually stop at Chesterfield. A study on the potential for additional services to stop at Chesterfield has previously been produced by a consultant working on behalf of DCC and Chesterfield Borough Council. This study can be found in Appendix D. DCC expect HS2 to take full account of this study.</p>

2.4.7	<p>With regard to operational waste and material resources, DCC considers it important that full details of the likely amounts of operational waste that would be generated by this specific study area of the scheme should be set out in the ES. DCC can then make a more detailed assessment of the likely environmental impacts of the scheme, particularly where there is likely to be a need for significant amounts of excess waste material to be exported from the study area.</p> <p>Without knowing the balance between cut and fill, the extent to which borrow pits will be required is unknown and therefore an assessment of the accuracy of the proposal in forecasting the requirement for land take to accommodate borrow pits and stocking areas is uncertain.</p> <p>The transport implications of this uncertainty in cut and fill balance, and in the need to export/import materials is also uncertain. Movement of excavated and imported materials will have the potential for a significant impact on the local road network, this should be addressed.</p>
2.5.6	<p>DCC have asked on a number of occasion that HS2 look at the option of putting the Sheffield services onto the existing Erewash Valley rail line at the East Midlands Hub station in Toton doing away with the need to construct any type of spur line at all. DCC have never received a formal response to this suggestion and would therefore ask that this option should be considered as well.</p>
2.5.7 and 2.5.8	<p>In respect of the Sheffield spur alignment falling within LA08, LA09 and LA10, prior to the announcement of the preferred route in July 2017 HS2 indicated that the Sheffield spur line could provide a link from the HS2 main line to the existing conventional rail network either via the Erewash Valley Line or the Midland Main Line. Four options were taken to a more detailed appraisal where engineering, construction feasibility, costs and environmental implications were considered as part of the determination of the preferred route.</p> <p>It is noted with regret that Option O is the selected option taken forward into the proposed scheme states that this option will have less community impact compared to the other options however it will directly affect Old Blackwell, Blackwell, Newton and Stonebroom. Given the significant impact on residential properties within Blackwell and Newton, particularly the demolition of 18 houses along Alfreton Road, HS2 is urged to reconsider Option O and look more favorably on different options set out within the alternatives report, in particular those options which would lessen the impact and reduce the number of demolitions.</p> <p>Therefore DCC urge HS2 reconsider the alternative options for this section of the route giving more weight to factors other than cost.</p>

CT-05-447b CT-06-447b	These drawings are wholly within LA07 and repeated as CT-06-447a, it is not clear why included as the overlap is due to construction management and are not referenced in the document.
--------------------------	---

1.3 Stakeholder engagement and consultation, Section 3.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
3.3.2	DCC have asked on a number of occasion that HS2 look at the option of putting the Sheffield services onto the existing Erewash Valley rail line at the East Midlands Hub station in Toton doing away with the need to construct any type of spur line at all. We have never received a formal response to this suggestion and we would therefore ask that this option should be considered as well.
3.4.6	There have been many meeting between DCC and various HS2 staff and consultants with the local authority providing considerable amounts of information and views on the different elements of the proposed scheme. However it has often been felt that this is one way process with little or no feedback from HS2 on what they think of the views expressed by DCC. The lack of any notes from many of the meetings also is a cause of concern as it is hard to tell if the issues raised by DCC have been recorded, understood or taken on board.
3.4.6 /3.4.9	DCC request that HS2 Ltd ensures that it engages with the County Council on an ongoing basis to ensure that the baseline information in the ES is robust and up-to-date as the WDES progresses to its final version.

1.4 Agriculture, forestry and soils, Section 4

- 1.4.1 At this time the council has no specific comments to make on this community area. Please see Volume 2 General Responses for more details.

1.5 Air Quality, Section 5.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
5.2.3	The Council notes, and raises its concern, that there is no reference to the formal ES presenting further assessment of dust effects.

5.2.4	The selection of the year 2023 as "worst case" is noted, but the Council is provided with no information on construction traffic levels over the period 2023-2032 so is not able to comment on whether this is correct.
5.3.5	It is noted that the South Normanton AQMA falls within scope, and also (in 5.4.9) that this may be impacted by construction traffic. The formal ES will need to address this in full.
5.4.1	It is noted that the control and management measures as specified are "generally sufficient to avoid any significant effects". The Council will wish to see confirmation in the formal ES that this holds true for specific impacts in the LA08 area.
5.4.6	It is noted that the risk of dust effects from trackout could be "high" and human health effects arising could be "medium" in this area.
5.4.7	Given 5.4.6 above the Council is concerned that no further assessment in the formal ES is mentioned. DCC request that further work is undertaken as part of the formal ES.
5.4.9	It is noted that the WDES identifies "likely" routes and impacts, which will need to be confirmed, and impacts quantified, before the Council can respond.
5.4.10	It is noted that the effects of changes in air quality on local receptors will be considered in more detail within the formal ES.
5.5.1	It is noted that "no specific mitigation measures for air quality are proposed". The Council wishes to record that such measures may be required subject to the findings of the further assessment and monitoring set out in the WDES.

1.6 Community – incorporating health related issues outside of the HIA.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
6	The route will run very close to a number of villages and dwellings within this area. We are concerned that HS2 hugely underestimates the impact this change will have on the lives of those affected. Pinxton is already affected by the M1 and A38, and HS2 will add to this impact. Parts of South Normanton are also going to be adversely affected with the route only around 35m to the west of some dwellings. Similarly at Hilcote the line will come within 45m of dwellings. DCC believe that this is far too close. The residents of these dwellings will require additional support or assistance, where they believe it is unfeasible to go on occupying their homes. Significant work may be required to shield them from noise, visual disruption and other aspects both during construction and afterwards.

6 (cont)	<p>This area also contains a number of locations where residential properties will need to be demolished, affecting the residents, their families and any landlords. At Pinxton 2 dwellings will be demolished, at South Normanton, a similar number, Hilcote 1 dwelling. However in the village of Newton more than 20 dwellings will need to be demolished, impacting significantly on this former mining community/ small village, which has already lost services in recent years.</p> <p>In the case of Newton the village will become sandwiched between lines and this will have a very significant isolating effect on the village and its residents. This will in the future limit the ability of the village to attract new development. A number of the dwellings have already suffered from blight. Residents have complained that properties are not being maintained by HS2 and protected from vandalism pending future demolition. House prices in the rest of the village have crashed as residents make choices about the likely impact on their lives and homes.</p> <p>Additionally, a number of community facilities and recreational facilities will also be impacted upon, either during construction, or permanently. This includes the Normanton Brook and the Blackwell Trail, used by local people for exercise, leisure and activities such as dog walking and cycling. The Silverhill Trail at Tibshelf is also affected by the proposals.</p> <p>During construction local access is likely to be significantly restricted due to temporary or permanent re-routing/ diversions and this could have a further isolating effect on the village and its remaining services, as well as causing frustration to residents seeking to travel to Alfreton or Tibshelf, the two nearest larger settlements.</p> <p>It is not clear how the places listed above will benefit from the development as communities. DCC ask HS2 to take steps to ensure that employment and related business opportunities are targeted at local people, by way of bringing economic benefits to people who are unlikely to utilise the line for business related trips to the capital or elsewhere. This could include apprenticeships, offering local businesses the opportunity to provide supplies, using local sub-contractors, and providing additional community facilities during and post construction.</p> <p>DCC are also concerned that during the construction period and once the line is built and operating that whole communities will experience the additional impacts of noise and pollution. This could cause additional health problems over time. DCC believe that HS2 should consider making a contribution to services that will support people both during construction and afterwards; such as health, social and mental health related facilities.</p>
----------	---

6.2.4	When reinstating or sourcing alternative public footpaths in this locality HS2 should pay particular attention to the impact of disrupted access upon those with physical disabilities, such as wheelchair users, to ensure any particular needs are altered as part of the planning for temporary diversions or permanent route/footpath changes.
6.4.1	Add additional mitigation point of avoiding using important local roads for construction traffic, which will worsen existing congestion and therefore exacerbate commuter stress.
6.4.9 to 6.4.14	DCC request that HS2 add additional mitigation here to ensure that residents affected by demolition are given adequate counselling and support.

1.7 Ecology and biodiversity, Section 7.

1.7.1 Please also refer to General Responses to WDES Volume 2 CAR's for general comments on this section.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
General	<p>The lack of a detailed analysis of ecological impacts and details of proposals for compensation and mitigation mean that a detailed site-by-site and feature-by-feature analysis of and response to ecological issues, impacts and opportunities is not possible at this stage. It is understood that various studies are ongoing and it is of course anticipated that a thorough analysis of this kind will be included within the final version of the ES.</p> <p>Whilst not wishing to consider potential impacts on individual sites, features and species at this time, with regards only to the section of the route (and potential receptors) within the county of Derbyshire, we would suggest that the following broad and/or overarching issues will need thorough consideration prior to the next step of the ES development.</p> <p>East-west connectivity along the Normanton Brook corridor should be maintained and ideally be enhanced. The use of the Normanton Brook Viaducts together with wetland habitats beneath should go some way towards achieving this, but it should be demonstrated that this is sufficient to allow the passage of amphibians, reptiles, and mammals.</p>

General (cont)	The inclusion of 31 mitigation and compensation ponds north of the A38 is an interesting prospect. Whilst the accompanying text suggests that these will “be within a wider area of grassland habitat creation to provide replacement habitat and ecological connectivity” this connectivity isn’t immediately obvious given that these ponds are more or less surrounded by industrial land to the east, HS2 to the west, the A38 to the south and a functional balancing pond to the north. It should again be demonstrated that the retained connectivity is sufficient and appropriate.
----------------	---

1.8 Health, Section 8.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
8.2.2	Demonstrates an understanding that the wider determinants of health will be affected as a result of this development.
8.2.3	Identifies that there will be adverse and beneficial health impacts.
8.2.4	DCC agree with health determinants listed. However, HS2 has neglected to include: potential affects on mental health and wellbeing, community connectivity, employment, housing, local transport, food and farming and economy.
8.2.6	DCC agree that the strength of evidence does that necessarily determine the importance of the outcome. HS2 also need to consider what our community tells us. The Derbyshire HS2 HIA outlines extensive community insight for example the development might improve pride in the area/better self-worth or anxiety over the threat of a compulsory purchase order. There are 29 residential properties and 4 businesses are scheduled for demolition in this section so this impact could be significant.
8.2.8	DCC encourage HS2 Ltd to use and refer to Derbyshire County Councils "Rapid Health Assessment of HS2" (2013) and "Update on the 2013 Rapid Health Impact Assessment of HS2" (2017) when constructing the formal ES document. See Appendix A.
8.3.14	Pinxton and South Normanton both lie in Bolsover District. Bolsover is a deprived area with associated poorer health status than other areas in Derbyshire. Overall residents in this district are poor in health and life expectancy is worse than the Derbyshire average.
8.4.1	DCC agree with mitigation listed but HS2 also need to consider adding: commission access to expert counselling services for dealing with loss related to demolition.
8.4.5	DCC agree that community engagement framework and personnel are vitally important.

8.4.8	DCC ask that HS2 also include reference to community connectedness in this section.
8.4.18	DCC ask that HS2 include reference to mitigation such as using aesthetic design solutions.
8.4.24	Due to impact on PRoW in this locality HS2 should pay particular attention to the impact of disrupted access upon those with physical disabilities, such as wheelchair users, to ensure any particular needs are altered for as part of the planning for temporary diversions or permanent rout/footpath changes.
8.4.32	DCC request that HS2 include additional mitigation to work with Derbyshire constabulary and community safety partnerships during the construction phase to monitor any adverse impact on community cohesion and community safety during the construction phase. HS2 should ensure that construction sites and all companies contracted to service them are registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme which will include monitoring against 'respecting the community'.
8.4.35 and 8.4.36	DCC request that HS2 ensure that residents affected by demolition are given adequate counselling and support.
8.4.40	A total of 29 residential properties would be demolished. The erosion of social networks resulting from these demolitions would have the potential to reduce social capital, reducing the beneficial health effects that are gained through social contact and support. Relocation, whether forced or voluntary, may cause stress impacting more on low income families and those with disabilities or poor social support.

1.9 Historic environment, Section 9.

1.9.1 Please also refer to General Responses to WDES Volume 2 CAR's for general comments on this section.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
9.2.4	DCC suggest that the 2km study area for gathering data, "either side of the land required in rural areas and urban areas", should be appropriately broadened in areas where there is the potential for more far reaching impacts on the setting of heritage assets. This is because the extent of the setting of a heritage asset is not fixed, or in other words it has no definable limit. Therefore the potential impacts and so the study area should be considered more organically in response to this.

9.4.5, also 9.4.9 and 9.4.20	Brookhill Hall and stable block are separately Grade II Listed. The proposed setting impact to this designated asset is under-assessed in the WDES. Given the proximity of the scheme to the assets and the proposed major re-engineering of the immediate parkland setting (which the WDES acknowledges is an important feature of significance). This includes diversion of Brookhill Lane with major earthworks and the nearby Maghole Brook satellite compound. To suggest the degree of change is only of 'medium' magnitude is not credible. This is a colossal change to setting and assessment of a high magnitude of impact would be more appropriate here, resulting in a major adverse effect.
------------------------------	---

1.10 Land quality, Section 10.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
10.1.2	DCC welcomes the indication that HS2 Ltd will continue to engage with the County Council to discuss the potential impacts of the proposed scheme to inform the formal ES. This is particularly important to ensure that the baseline information in the ES is robust and up-to-date.
10.2.7	<p>Basing minerals assessment on mining records but ignoring inference of minerals provided by geological maps/reports may result in omissions of future issues from early consideration in the next design phase.</p> <p>The proposed line passes through the potential 'Winterbank' opencast coal site, identified in the 1990's by the then British Coal and which is located mostly within Derbyshire to the south of the A38 intersect.</p> <p>Failure to deal with likely intersect of coal seams within cutting excavations could result in significant delay to construction should licence for incidental coal recovery be required through application to the Coal Authority followed by undertaking of the subsequent mineral recovery process.</p>
10.3.40	Although not recognised by Mineral Safeguarding Areas or Mineral Local Plan historic identification of the 'Winterbank' opencast site to the south of the A38 suggests likely presence of shallow coal seams. HS2 advise intent to excavate up to 20m in depth at their crossing of the A38 in cutting. Investigation for the presence of shallow coal seams should be made to better inform baseline environmental assumptions.

10.3.42	Appropriate reference is made to the Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan and that the existing plan is to be replaced by a new Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan which is being prepared by Derbyshire County Council and Derby City Council, for which a rolling consultation process is ongoing with the production of a range of consultation papers.
10.3.43	Appropriate reference is made to the fact that the Adopted Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan does not identify any mineral site allocations within the study area.
10.3.46 and 10.3.49	<p>This section correctly notes that the Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan shows that the whole of the study area lies over a surface coal resource and that all surface coal that has not already been worked shall be safeguarded.</p> <p>In this respect, to prevent the sterilisation of the coal resource in accordance with Policy M17 of the Derby and Derbyshire Mineral Local Plan, DCC, as Minerals Planning Authority, expect to see an assessment that examines whether prior extraction of the mineral resource in advance of the development is practicable and environmentally feasible.</p> <p>DCC expect borehole evidence to be used to provide an indication of the quality and depth of the deposit, particularly when such areas are considered as borrow pits. Every effort should therefore be made to extract the mineral resource in advance of the proposed development in order to prevent the sterilisation of the mineral resource. This approach would accord with the policies of the Adopted Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan.</p>
10.4.10	Whilst screening assessment is advised as having been undertaken with each potential contaminated site given a unique reference, as listed in Table 23, there appears to be no plan to clarify or advise the location of these sites. Plans therefore need to be provided.
10.4.15	Whilst consideration of construction effects is advised as having been undertaken with each potential significant site indicated by its unique reference, as listed in Tables 24, there appears to be no plan to clarify or advise the location of these sites. Plans therefore need to be provided.
10.4.16	With regard to mine water and mine gas mitigation measures that would be identified, DCC requests that HS2 LTD consult with the County Council's officers on any such scheme as an 'authoritative consultee'.
10.4.22	Whilst consideration of post construction effects is advised as having been undertaken with each potential significant site indicated by its unique reference, as listed in Tables 25, there appears to be no plan to clarify or advise the location of these sites. Plans therefore need to be provided.

10.4.27	<p>As correctly noted, construction of the proposed scheme has the potential to affect existing mineral resources and proposed areas of mineral exploitation and that this could occur by sterilisation of the mineral resource.</p> <p>DCC, as Minerals Planning Authority, expect to see an assessment that examines whether prior extraction of the mineral resource in advanced of the development is practicable and environmentally feasible.</p> <p>DCC expect borehole evidence to be used to provide an indication of the quality and depth of the deposit, particularly when such areas are considered as borrow pits. Every effort should therefore be made to extract the mineral resource in advance of the proposed development in order to prevent the sterilisation of the mineral resource. This approach would accord with the policies of the Adopted Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan.</p>
10.4.31	<p>However low the percentage of natural resource that it is considered would be sterilised by the permanent construction of the proposed new HS2 rail route, every effort should be made to ensure full extraction of mineral resource in advance of, or during early phases of construction, to ensure the resource is not lost for posterity. This approach would accord with adopted development plan policies.</p>

1.11 Landscape and visual assessment, Section 11.

1.11.1 Please also refer to General Responses to WDES Volume 2 CAR's for general comments on this section.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
11	There are no substantive landscape and visual issues relating to this section of the route other than to state that some of the likely visual impacts of the proposed route identified in Tables 28 (11.4.7) and 31 (11.5.7), particularly during the operational phase (Years 1 and 15) have been under-estimated and would in DCC's opinion be greater than assessed as a result of the proximity of receptors to the route and the scale of the change. Examples of views where the effects have been under-estimated include VPs 389-02-014, 389-03-015, 389-02-016 and 440-02-004.
11.4.6	This paragraph potentially understates the impact of overhead power lines - a pylon will need relocating, potentially massive disruption.

1.12 Socio Economic, Section 12.

1.12.1 Please also refer to General Responses to WDES Volume 2 CAR's for general comments on this section.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
12.4.9	<p>There is no mention of the impact on the East Midlands Designer Outlet during construction. The outlet will be directly opposite a main construction compound with another on the other side of the A38. A cutting will also be constructed opposite the outlet and a box tunnel on the A38 which is the main access point to the site. All of these will create significant impacts on the site and will effect its attractiveness to customers and retailers.</p> <p>The line also crosses a site previously identified for expansion of the outlet which could impact on its long term viability. This issue has been highlighted in the SNC Lavelin report, see Appendix B, along with the potential for expansion of the outlet elsewhere.</p>

1.13 Sound, Noise & Vibration, Section 13.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
13.1.4	The maps showing the noise impacts of the scheme need also to show the before situation to allow residents and other stakeholders to make comparison of what noise the scheme will generate.
13.2.4-13.2.5	It is noted that the WDES relies upon qualitative assessment, initial estimates and professional judgement. The Council will wish to see the full quantitative assessment in the formal ES before providing its own definitive response.
13.4.1	The Council notes the assumptions and limitations and the need for assessment in the formal ES.
13.4.5	The Council notes the assumptions made in the assessment and wishes to record the need for consideration in the formal ES of any requirements specific to the LA08 area.
13.4.6	The intention to conduct work towards estimating the requirement of noise insulation or temporary rehousing of residents and report in the formal ES is noted.
13.4.9	It is noted that the likely significant effects on St Webergh's Church, Old Blackwell will be confirmed in the formal ES.
13.4.10	It is noted that residual temporary noise or vibration likely significant effects associated with construction practices will be reported in the formal ES.

13.4.12	It is noted that further work is being undertaken to confirm significant construction noise and vibration effects, including any temporary indirect effects from construction traffic.
13.5.2	The Council notes the lack of reference to the impacts of track maintenance and requests that these be included in the formal ES.
13.5.11	It is noted that baseline information will be confirmed in the formal ES.
13.5.13	It is noted that noise effects arising from permanent changes to existing roads will be reported in the formal ES. This will need to take into account any effects on how traffic uses the network (ie reassignment to different routes, re-timing of journeys or the release of suppressed demand).
13.5.14	It is noted that further work is being undertaken to confirm the extent, location and type of the noise mitigation to be included within the design of the Proposed Scheme, which will be reported in the formal ES.
13.5.19	The Council notes that further assessment of operational noise and vibration will be reported in the full ES, and requests that these take into account the impacts of track maintenance activities.

1.14 Traffic and transport, incorporating PROW, highway design and Traffic Safety, Section 14.

1.14.1 Please also refer to General Responses to WDES Volume 2 CAR's for general comments on this section.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
14.1.2	<p>DCC as the Local Highway Authority for Derbyshire welcomes that the engagement process will continue as part of the development of the Proposed Scheme. It is noted however that much of the work carried out as part of the ES to date is mostly qualitative and that quantification of much of the impact of the Proposed Scheme will be presented in the formal ES. However DCC appreciate early sight of any preliminary outputs of the environmental appraisal prior to the ES's publication as part of the Hybrid Bill.</p> <p>DCC as the Highways Authority are extremely disappointed by the lack of engagement and the limited information provided prior to the WDES going into publication. The requests and approaches to meetings from HS2 Project Leads has been very fragmented and often under extreme time pressures. Prior to meetings being set up HS2 representatives, very often clear agendas have not been provided to DCC and this has at times led to the wrong officers being in attendance and meetings have therefore become somewhat abortive. Only a limited number of meetings have been requested and were not formally recorded by the HS2 representatives. No official record of the discussion points have been provided back to DCC to date. Also although it is appreciated that this project is far reaching and complex it is DCC's view that the whole route was not presented as a complete package. Therefore DCC have had an inadequate opportunity to inform the initial engagement process in a meaningful joined up way.</p>
14.2.6	It is noted that potential effects on traffic and transportation will be reported in the formal ES. This will need to take into account any effects on how traffic uses the network (ie reassignment to different routes, re-timing of journeys or the release of suppressed demand).
14.3.9	The scheme has the potential to impact on parking associated with the East Midlands Designer Outlet. The site for the line had previously been identified as a potential location to expand the current car park for the site.
14.4.6	How will HS2 enforce and or incentivise the use of construction workers using more sustainable travel options?
14.4.14- 14.4.15	It is noted that potential effects on traffic and transportation will be reported in the formal ES. This will need to take into account any effects on how traffic uses the network (ie reassignment to different routes, re-timing of journeys or the release of suppressed demand).

14.4.17	<p>It is noted that potential effects on public transport will be reported in the formal ES. This will need to take into account any effects on how traffic uses the network (ie reassignment to different routes, re-timing of journeys or the release of suppressed demand).</p> <p>The vast majority of these bus services are provided on a commercial basis by operators with no direct support from local or central government. Prolonged diversions and increased journey times will reduce the attractiveness of these services. Mitigation in terms of funding to support these services during the construction period to lessen the impact and ensure their commercial sustainability will be required.</p>
14.4.21	<p>It is noted that potential effects on PRow will be reported in the formal ES. This will need to take into account any effects on how traffic uses the network (ie reassignment to different routes, re-timing of journeys or the release of suppressed demand).</p>
14.4.24 and 14.4.29	<p>It is noted that potential effects on traffic and transportation will be reported in the formal ES. This will need to take into account any effects on how traffic uses the network (ie reassignment to different routes, re-timing of journeys or the release of suppressed demand).</p>
14.5.8	<p>Increased travel distance for bus service can impact on their commercial viability. To reduce the impact specific measures should be put in place to improve bus reliability in the area at the same time as the line opens.</p>
14.5.9	<p>This comment refers specifically to the Proposed Blackwell Trail South. This is a proposed non-motorised route identified as part of the Derbyshire Greenway Strategy and Derbyshire Local Cycle Network. It follows a former railway line to the south of the Blackwell Trail between the B6406 and the Fulwood Industrial Estate on the south side of Normanton Brook. Map CT-06-449 shows the route covered and lost by the West and East Normanton Brook Embankments. A mitigation proposal is for the creation of a connecting path leading south from the Blackwell Trail, across Normanton Brook and joining the HS2 Access Road east of Normanton Brook East Embankment, with multi user access rights to the main highway issuing into Fulwood Industrial Estate, as a non-motorised route to work.</p> <p>This comment refers specifically to the Blackwell Trail. It is noted that both the HS2 Mainline and the Sheffield Spur are carried on viaducts across the trail. It must be ensured that there is sufficient height clearance to accommodate the trail users. A minimum height for mounted horse riders is 3.7m (BHS standard specifications).</p>

14.5.9 (cont)	<p>This comment refers specifically to Blackwell Footpath 6. Where the path alignments connect to the Blackwell Trail all Access for All design standards should be adhered to. This path will have a significant impact on the journey time between the communities of Hillcote and Huthwaite.</p> <p>This comment refers specifically to Blackwell Footpath 8. Map CT-06-449-L1 shows this path as permanently stopped up with no alternative. A mitigation suggestion would be to make provision for a 3m wide shared pedestrian/cycleway alongside the diverted New Lane between Pasture Lane and Huthwaite Lane.</p> <p>This comment refers specifically to Silverhill Trail. The proposed overbridge should ensure access for all and that standards are maintained with approach ramps no greater than a 1:20 gradient, and surface width no less than 5m, with parapets 1.8m high.</p> <p>This comment refers specifically to Blackwell Footpath 12/1. The new section of path shown on map CT-06-450 to divert B3/12/2 should be designed to meet access for all standards 3 with any approach ramp no greater than a 1:20 gradient.</p> <p>This comment refers specifically to Blackwell Footpath 12/1 & 12/2. This path extends south across the Derbyshire/Nottinghamshire county boundary by Longside Farm as a Public Bridleway to Huthwaite Lane. It is recommended that the footpath on the Derbyshire side linking directly onto the Silverhill Trail be upgraded to Public Bridleway status on completion to make this route of similar status. Construction of the section in Derbyshire should therefore reflect the required widths and specifications for bridleway design.</p>
14.5.12 and 14.5.15	<p>It is noted that potential effects on traffic and transportation will be reported in the formal ES. This will need to take into account any effects on how traffic uses the network (ie reassignment to different routes, re-timing of journeys or the release of suppressed demand).</p>
CT-05-449	<p>This plan shows significant realignment and stopping up of the existing highway network on B6026 Blackwell Lane/Huthwaite Lane and Fordbridge Lane. DCC as the Highway Authority have grave concerns about the lack of engagement and discussion surrounding these proposals. No information has been provided around vertical and horizontal alignment and proposed limits of adoption. Also the HS2 Project team have not sort Highway Authority comments about the need to stop up sections of the existing highway and how these parcels of land will need to be reverted to the subsoil owner/adjacent land owner. The HS2 project team are required to provide the Highway Authority with detailed information surrounding these proposals and in depth discussions are required.</p>

CT-05-449-L1	This plan shows significant realignment and stopping up of existing highway network on the B6026 Huthwaite Lane and Fordbridge Lane. The Highway Authority have grave concerns about the lack of engagement and discussion surrounding these proposals. No information has been provided around vertical and horizontal alignment and proposed limits of adoption. Also the HS2 Project team have not sort Highway Authority comments about the need to stop up sections of the existing highway and how these parcels of land will need to be reverted to the subsoil owner/adjacent land owner. The HS2 project team are required to provide the Highway Authority with detailed information surrounding these proposals and in depth discussion are required.
CT-05-450	This plan shows significant realignment and stopping up of existing highway network on Newtonwood Lane. The plan also makes reference to an Overbridge on Newtonwood Lane. DCC as the Highway Authority have grave concerns about the lack of engagement and discussion surrounding these proposals. No information has been provided around vertical and horizontal alignment and proposed limits of adoption. The HS2 Project team have not sort Highway Authority comments about the need to stop up sections of the existing highway and how these parcels of land will need to be reverted to the subsoil owner/adjacent land owner. The HS2 project team are required to provide the Highway Authority with detailed information surrounding these proposals and in depth discussion are required.
CT-05-601	This plan shows significant realignment and stopping up of existing highway network on Cragg Lane. The plan also makes reference to an Overbridge on Cragg Lane. DCC as the Highway Authority have grave concerns about the lack of engagement and discussion surrounding these proposals. No information has been provided around vertical and horizontal alignment and proposed limits of adoption. The HS2 Project team have not sort Highway Authority comments about the need to stop up sections of the existing highway and how these parcels of land will need to be reverted to the subsoil owner/adjacent land owner. The HS2 project team are required to provide the Highway Authority with detailed information surrounding these proposals and in depth discussions are required.

1.15 Water Resources & Flood Risk, Section 15.

1.15.1 Please also refer to General Responses to WDES Volume 2 CAR's for general comments on this section.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA08: PINXTON TO NEWTON AND HUTHWAITE	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
15.4.16	<p>The WDES states that balancing ponds for Highway and Railway drainage will be sized on a precautionary basis. The DCC Flood risk team were informed via consultations with the HS2 design teams that the ponds would be sized to a 1/100yr + 40%CC event.</p> <p>DCC seek clarification with regards to surface water run-off and attenuation, in particular the run-off from the viaducts. Following conversations with the Environment Agency, they have intimated that there has been some miss-understanding with regards to surface water run-off and attenuation with different Risk Management Authority (RMA) giving different advice. DCC have been advised that guidance was planned to be issued to all partners, LA's etc to try and provide an acceptable approach across the board.</p> <p>Although this is not directly connected to this section, DCC have a general concern as to whom will be adopting and maintaining the Highway Balancing Ponds post construction. DCC have been supplied with a document "HS2 - Maintenance of Landscaped Areas Version 1 June 2018" and Section 6.7.2 in this document states "The location of these features would determine who is responsible for maintaining them". This suggests that all highway balancing ponds would be adopted by the highway authority, but with no additional funding to maintain them which is not acceptable.</p>