

Consultation Response to Volume 2 CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	VOLUME 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS.....	1
1.1	General Comments	1
1.2	Overview and description, Section 2.....	1
1.3	Stakeholder engagement and consultation, Section 3.6	
1.4	Agriculture, forestry and soils, Section 4.....	7
1.5	Air Quality, Section 5.	7
1.6	Community – incorporating health related issues outside of the HIA, Section 6.	8
1.7	Ecology and biodiversity, Section 7.....	9
1.8	Health, Section 8.	9
1.9	Historic environment, Section 9.	11
1.10	Land quality, Section 10.....	11
1.11	Landscape and visual assessment, Section 11.	13
1.12	Socio Economic, Section 12.	14
1.13	Sound, Noise & Vibration, Section 13.	14
1.14	Traffic and transport, incorporating PROW, highway design and Traffic Safety, Section 14.....	16
1.15	Water Resources & Flood Risk, Section 15.	19

VOLUME 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS

1.1 General Comments

- 1.1.1 This report contains our comments for the Community Area 9 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. 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 LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
2.1.23	Appropriate reference is made in this section to relevant local plans covering the study area including the Saved Policies of the Adopted Bolsover Local Plan 2000; Saved Policies of the Adopted North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2005; Adopted Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan (2000 and 2002); Derby and Derbyshire Adopted Waste Local Plan 2005. However, for consistency with other study area sections of the WDES, reference should also be made to the Derbyshire Local Transport Plan.

2.1.23 (cont)	It is not clear why reference is made to the Saved Policies of the Adopted Amber Valley Local Plan as no part of the study area is located within Amber Valley Borough. This section of the ES is not consistent with other Sections of the ES for the individual study areas in Derbyshire (LA05, LA06, LA07 and LA08), which also include an assessment of emerging Local Plans in the respective study areas that have reached submission stage and the indication that those plans would be considered in the assessment. In this respect, reference should be made to the Bolsover District Local Plan 2018, which was submitted to the Secretary of state on 31 August 2018 and the North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2018 that was submitted on 24th May 2018. Reference might also be usefully made to the emerging Derby and Derbyshire Minerals and Waste Local Plans currently being prepared by DCC and Derby City Council, although neither of these plans have yet reached the submission stage to the Secretary of State.
2.1.25 - 2.1.27	With regard to information on committed developments, local plan allocations and safeguarded land for mineral extraction, DCC requests HS2 Ltd to ensure that it continues to engage with the County Council on an ongoing basis to ensure that the baseline information for the ES is robust and up-to-date, particularly for committed developments for minerals and waste schemes, as the WDES is progressed to its final version.
2.1.29	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.
2.2.6	DCC are concerned about the impact on the existing rail network during the electrification and engineering works on the Erewash Valley Line and Midland Main Line. Every effort must be made to minimise the impact of the work on existing rail services. The opportunity should also be taken to increase capacity on these lines so they can accommodate the HS2 and regional services.
2.2.14	DCC request 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. The scale of the proposed embankment at Blackwell North (up to 24m high), seems totally out of proportion with the surrounding area and road and watercourse it needs to cross. Could a viaduct be used instead at a lower height to lessen the impact?

2.2.19	<p>DCC request that diverted PRoW will not have excessive gradients, (ie follow industry best practice). Where diverted across existing and new bridges, these should be upgraded the required use, (eg equestrian fences). DCC will be looking for improvement of provision on affected routes.</p> <p>The permanent diversion of the River Rother is likely to require significant earthworks as it is diverted uphill! There is no indication of any associated works on plans CT-06-605 or 606, the concern is that the impact has not been properly evaluated.</p>
2.3.25	<p>As the spur will link with the existing Erewash Valley rail line could this not this be used to move materials to site and to remove waste to lessen the impact on the road network as part of the construction and rail installation phase.</p>
2.3.30	<p>Alfreton Road Transformer Station Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. There is limited frontage available and there are only minimal highway margin widths; therefore achieving appropriate sightlines for the speed of road will require third party land.</p> <p>There are no footways and the road is unlit. The site lies some 1.4 km from Tibshelf or Blackwell and would be accessed mainly via an unlit B road with no footway and a 60 mph speed limit. The Silverhill Trail runs behind the site and may provide walking/cycling opportunity to Tibshelf or Blackwell via Gloves Lane. The nearest bus stops are in Tibshelf or Westhouses.</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>

2.3.33	<p>Stonebroom Embankment Satellite Compound</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan although the site does abut the public highway at a point where the carriageway alignment is straight and level.</p> <p>A footway is provided to one side of carriageway but it is an unlit country lane. There is a 4m height restriction at the rail bridge nearby, which may result in access limitations for large vehicles.</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>
2.3.37	<p>As the Stonebroom embankment and satellite compound will be adjacent to the existing Erewash Valley rail line could this not be used to move bulk materials rather than the public highway lessening the impact of the project on the road network?</p>
2.3.43	<p>Morton Cutting Pond Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. It appears that access is intended to be via the existing unmade vehicular access to the water treatment plant, which ends at the end of Lime Tree Grove. This would require vehicles driving a considerable distance through a traffic-calmed residential area. This route has high numbers of pedestrians at the start and end of the school day due to the proximity of Sharley Park Primary School and also significant numbers of vehicles parked on-street due to limited off-street parking facilities in the general area.</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>

2.3.47	<p>New Station Road Satellite Compound</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. An unmade, vehicular gated access exists at the location shown as access on the plan provided. The construction route is shown accessing the site from the east (St Lawrence Road) only, however the exit visibility is likely to be inadequate from the West (over the rail bridge) and the forward visibility may also be an issue from this direction.</p> <p>Further investigation will be required to determine whether an adequate level of exit and forward visibility is achievable.</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. Horizontal and vertical alignment of the carriageway may constrain adequate exit and forward visibility. 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>
2.3.50	<p>DCC support the proposed approach set out in this section that excavated material across the project scheme would be re-used as engineering fill material or environmental mitigation earthworks where suitable or reasonably practicable.</p>
2.3.51 and 2.3.52	<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. DCC can then 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>

2.3.53	It is not clear which of the satellite compounds in this area, if any, would remain in place for the rail systems works. Figure 8 on page 32/33 shows the Alfreton Road satellite compound open from Q2 2029 to Q2 2030 the Stonebroom embankment satellite compound open from Q4 2024 until the end of Q3 in 2028, the Morton cutting pond satellite open from Q2 2026 to Q3 2027 and the New Station Road systems compound in Q1+2 of 2028. Yet rail systems work are not due to begin until Q3 2031 and end in Q4 2033.
2.4.7 / 2.4.8	<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 if 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>
2.5.5	DCC have asked on a number of occasions 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.

1.3 Stakeholder engagement and consultation, Section 3.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
3.3.3	DCC have asked on a number of occasion that HS2 look at the option of putting the Sheffield services onto the existng Erewash Valley rail line at the East Midlands Hub station in Toton, thus 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 continues to engage with the County Council on the scheme, particularly on the baseline information to be used in the ES to ensure that it is robust and up-to-date as the WDES progresses towards the final version.

1.4 Agriculture, forestry and soils, Section 4.

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

1.5 Air Quality, Section 5.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
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.
5.4.1	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 LA09 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, Section 6.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
6	<p>The Council is concerned over the likely impact of the line upon Stonebroom and upon Clay Cross to a lesser extent. In the case of Stonebroom the line will come within 30 m of parts of the village.</p> <p>We also note that 4 dwellings will be demolished in order to construct the line and that a number of recreational facilities will be affected either temporarily or permanently, including Doe Hill community park.</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 catered for as part of the planning for temporary diversions or permanent route/footpath changes.
6.3	At this time the council has no comment to make.
6.4.9	The construction of the Stonebroom cutting and Stonebroom embankment would temporarily require approximately 35% of the land within the Doe Hill Community Park for a duration of approximately two years and three months. 25% of the park will be lost permanently and the remainder will be cut in two. This would result in a major adverse effect, which would be significant.
6.4.12	Stonebroom embankment and associated works would require the demolition of two residential properties on Doe Hill Lane, Tibshelf and two residential properties on Stonebroom Lane, Stonebroom.
6.5	There is no detail available DCC are therefore unable to comment.

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 LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
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, DCC suggest that the following broad and/or overarching issues will need thorough consideration prior to the next step of the ES development.</p> <p>The principle issues along this stretch of the route are associated with habitat losses directly associated with the route construction. Affected habitats include ancient woodland, species rich grassland and other habitat types (particularly associated with Padley Wood) whilst habitat severance and impacts on recreational opportunities (e.g. around Doe Hill Community Park) can also be envisaged. It is assumed that thorough consideration of these impacts will fall within the scope of the ES.</p>

1.8 Health, Section 8.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
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.
8.4.1	<p>DCC agree with mitigation listed but ask that HS2 also consider adding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> commission access to expert counselling services for dealing with loss related to demolition.
8.4.5	Community engagement framework and personnel is vitally important.

8.4.8	DCC request that HS2 also include reference to community connectedness in this section.
8.4.19	There is potential for communities to experience increased difficulty in accessing shops and community services (such as post offices, banks, libraries) as a result of increased journey times during construction.
8.4.22-23	There would be direct impacts on access to green space, recreation and physical activity at Doe Hill Community Park, where construction of the Stonebroom cutting and Stonebroom embankment would temporarily require approximately 35% of the land within the Doe Hill Community Park for a period of approximately three years and six months. Changes to landscape character can create stress, especially in deprived communities already less satisfied with their environment. Following this, approximately 10ha (approximately 25%) of open space within the park would be permanently lost. The overbridge provided to reconnect the paths, and to connect the two remaining sections of the park should be accessible to all. Notwithstanding the implementation of this mitigation, impacts on access to green space, recreation and physical activity would persist.
8.4.24	The route will intersect a number of PRow in the Stonebroom to Clay Cross area. There will be impacts on amenity and recreational value of these footpath networks, and therefore levels of physical activity and associated health and wellbeing effects. Health effects are felt disproportionately by deprived communities, which would describe much of this area. 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 catered for as part of the planning for temporary diversions or permanent route/footpath changes.
8.4.25	Some construction traffic including HGV, will use local roads. This could obstruct or deter pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians from using these routes.
8.4.29	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'.
8.5	There is no detail available DCC are unable to comment.

1.9 Historic environment, Section 9.

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

1.10 Land quality, Section 10.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
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>Failure to deal with likely intersect of coal seams within cutting excavations could result in significant delay to construction should license for incidental coal recovery be required through application to the Coal Authority followed by undertaking of the subsequent mineral recovery process.</p>
10.3.44	<p>Appropriate reference is made to the Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan and its policies for controlling minerals related development within the study area.</p>
10.3.45 / 10.3.47	<p>Appropriate reference is made in these sections to DCC's consultation response of 2014. This indicated that in relation to the Stonebroom to Clay Cross area, surface mining of coal was reported in the east of the County where potential for future applications for surface coal extraction was considered likely.</p> <p>In this regard and the fact that the study area lies in an area of surface coal, 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>

10.3.46	Reference is made in this section to the fact that the Derby and Derbyshire Local Aggregates Assessment '2016' does not identify any aggregates sites in the Stonebroom to Clay Cross study area. It should be noted that the latest published version of the LAA is for 2017, which also does not identify any aggregate sites in the study area.
10.3.49	<p>Appropriate reference is made to Derbyshire Consultation response of 2014. This indicated that although there were no Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSA) in the study area, a MSA for coal is proposed by DCC, which has the potential to be exploited by opencast methods.</p> <p>Appropriate reference is also made to the County Council's 2014 response which indicated that minerals of economic importance, including surface coal resources, should be taken into account in the assessment of applications for non-minerals development to avoid the sterilisation of the resource. It is welcomed, therefore, that the text indicates that surface coal reserves have been considered in the ES assessment for this section of the proposed route.</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 16, there appears to be no plan to clarify or advise the location of these sites. Plans therefore need to be provided.
10.4.14	Whilst consideration of construction effects is advised as having been undertaken with each potential significant site indicated by its unique reference, as listed in Table 17, there appears to be no plan to clarify or advise the location of these sites. Plans therefore need to be provided.
10.4.17	With regard to any proposed mitigation measures required for minerals mine water or mine gas, DCC request that it is consulted on any such measures as an 'authoritative consultee'.
10.4.28	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.

10.4.24/10.4.25/10.4.29	<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>The whole of the study area lies over a surface coal resource. 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>
-------------------------	---

1.11 Landscape and visual assessment, Section 11.

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

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
11.4.7	<p>Table 20 identifies the two LCAs directly affected by the proposed scheme; Tibshelf and Doe Hill and Morton Colliery. The latter is an example of the concerns DCC raised in earlier consultation response to HS2 that the negative connotation attached to the naming of the LCA has then influenced the overall judgement that has been made in the assessment.</p> <p>The Doe Hill and Morton Colliery LCA has seen significant change historically as a result of past mining but more recently these areas have been restored to deliver significant environmental enhancement as evidenced by the work that has been undertaken at the Doe Hill Community Park. DCC judge the sensitivity and susceptibility of this landscape to be at least medium (which is greater than the judgement in the LVIA), which would give rise to a greater adverse effect during construction and on completion of the route as a result of the high magnitude of change that this LCA would experience.</p>

11.4.11	<p>Table 21 identifies the 'Significantly Affected Viewpoints' along this section of the route although it is noted that the table refers to viewpoints that then aren't shown on the associated plans for this section, such as VP 440-02-005 in Tibshelf, which is only shown on the maps for the LA10: Tibshelf to Shuttlewood section. In general viewpoint selection isn't sufficiently robust in some areas where a single viewpoint such as VP 440-02-004 aims to reflect the view for a number of residential properties along and users of Alfreton Road, Newton.</p> <p>The level of effects at this VP is assessed as Moderate adverse during the construction phase but not significant during the operational phase. This seems to be hardly credible when the residents of individual properties that currently enjoy open views over surrounding countryside will get these views curtailed by extensive new tree planting proposed as mitigation. The visual impact assessment should be a judgement on the changes in the view and not simply a reflection of whether you can see the proposed railway line and trains using it. Again there is no reflection in the description as to the likely number of visual receptors (people) who would experience any particular effect.</p>
---------	--

1.12 Socio Economic, Section 12.

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

1.13 Sound, Noise & Vibration, Section 13.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
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.
13.4.4	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 LA09 area.

13.4.5	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 residual temporary noise or vibration likely significant effects associated with construction practices will be reported in the formal ES.
13.4.13	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.
13.5.10	It is noted that baseline information will be confirmed in the formal ES.
13.5.12	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).
13.5.13	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.
13.5.18	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 LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
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 would in the meantime 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>
14.2.5	<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>
14.3.10	<p>DCC has a long term aspiration to see a rail station opened in the Clay Cross area to serve the growing community. The design of this part of the route and where it joins the existing Erewash Valley line needs to consider how this could be accommodated.</p> <p>Extra capacity on the line is required to accommodate the proposed HS2 route and the existing and potential future local and regional train services.</p>
14.4.6	<p>How will HS2 enforce and or incentivise the use of construction workers using more sustainable travel options?</p>

14.4.8	The traffic and transport impacts during the construction period within the Stonebroom to Clay Cross area will include construction vehicle movements to and from the various construction compounds including a compound proposed on New Station Road, Tupton. An assessment of the quantative impacts will need to be considered in the formal ES.
14.4.16- 14.4.17	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).
14.4.18	It is noted that potential effects upon accidents 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).
14.4.19	<p>The 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> <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>
14.4.20	It is noted that potential effects on rail services 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).
14.4.24	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).
14.4.27, 14.4.33 and 14.5.2	It is noted that potential effects on rail services 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).

14.5.9	<p>The proposed 4 HS2 trains an hour on this section of the Erewash Valley line have the potential to adversely affect the existing local and regional rail services on this route if they take paths currently used by them to accommodate the new service. The line capacity between the point where HS2 joins the Erewash Valley line and the connection with the Midland Mainline needs to be increased to ensure there are sufficient paths for all existing and proposed services.</p> <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>
14.5.11	<p>This comment refers specifically to Tibshelf Bridleway 5. The diversion of BW5 is acceptable however it should be noted that the route diverts onto The Silverhill Greenway, an existing multi user trail, a strategic part of the Derbyshire Key Cycle Network and an integral part of a visitor attraction known as the Phoenix Greenways. It is imperative that the accommodation overbridge identified on map numbered CT-05-602b remains level to the trail or if ramps to the overbridge are required, these should be designed to a maximum gradient of 1:20 to meet the required standards for retaining easy access status of the route. The diverted routes for Bridleway 5 should also be constructed to maximum gradients of 1:20 to allow for easy access connectivity.</p> <p>This comment refers specifically to the non-statutory non-motorised routes at Doe Hill Community Park. Map CT-06-603 shows the proposed development in cutting through the Doe Hill Country Park and is described in 14.5.11 of the corresponding report as footpath. This route carries a non-statutory bridleway between Love Lane and Doe Hill Lane is shown crossing the cutting on Doe Hill Park Overbridge. This bridge should be designed to carry all vulnerable users and maintenance vehicles and be fitted with parapets 1.8m high in line with British Horse Society standard specifications for horse riders on overbridges. The approach ramps should be no greater than 1:20 gradient to allow for access for all. On completion this route would benefit from dedicating it as a public bridleway between Love Lane and Doe Hill Lane.</p>

14.5.11 (cont)	<p>With regard to Morton Bridleway 8 Overbridge, this bridge should be designed to carry maintenance vehicles and be fitted with parapets 1.8m high in line with British Horse Society standard specifications for horse riders on overbridges. The approach ramps should be no greater than 1:20 gradient to allow for access for all.</p> <p>This comment refers specifically to Pilsley FP 7 Overbridge. This bridge should be designed to carry maintenance vehicles with approach ramps no greater than 1:20 to be compliant with access for all standards.</p>
14.5.18	It should be noted that the Doe Hill Community Park route carries horse riders and cyclists and although currently a non-statutory route, for accuracy should be treated as a bridleway rather than a footpath.
14.5.19	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).
CT-05-603	Within this plan there is a structural asset identified within the Highway Authorities Structural Register No C46029 (Highway Authority). This structure appears to be impacted by the proposed construction works. HS2 project team will need to undertake in depth discussions with DCC as the Highway Authority to provide detailed information about the proposals and impact upon this structure.

1.15 Water Resources & Flood Risk, Section 15.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA09: STONEBROOM TO CLAY CROSS	
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>

15.4.16 (cont)	<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>
----------------	---