

Consultation Response to Volume 2 CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON

TABLE OF CONTENTS	VOLUME 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON.....		1
	1.1	General Comments	1
	1.2	Overview and description, Section 2.	1
	1.3	Stakeholder engagement and consultation	15
	1.4	Agriculture, forestry and soils	16
	1.5	Air Quality Section 5.	16
	1.6	Community – incorporating health related issues outside of the HIA Section 6.	17
	1.7	Ecology and biodiversity, Section 7.	20
	1.8	Health, Section 8.	21
	1.9	Historic environment, Section 9.	23
	1.10	Land quality, Section 10.	23
	1.11	Landscape and visual assessment, Section 11.	28
	1.12	Socio Economic, Section 12.	32
	1.13	Sound, Noise & Vibration, Section 13.	32
	1.14	Traffic and transport, incorporating PROW, highway design and Traffic Safety, Section 14.	33
	1.15	Water Resources & Flood Risk, Section 15.....	41

VOLUME 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON

1.1 General Comments

- 1.1.1 This report contains DCC comments for the Community Area 11 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 volumes which also form part of this consultation response.
- 1.1.4 The Council continues to be disappointed with HS2's failure to address key concerns in this area which have been raised on numerous occasions. These include the failure to accommodate the proposed Chesterfield and Staveley Regeneration Route and for the proposed Chesterfield Canal. DCC specifically welcomes proposals for the developments of the Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD) provided that they take account of local concerns.

1.2 Overview and description, Section 2.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
2.1.10	There is no mention of A6192 Erin Road, this needs to be addressed.
2.1.11	Chesterfield Canal is listed as part of the key transport infrastructure and as such should be accommodated in the scheme design.
2.1.21	Chesterfield Canal is listed as significant recreation, leisure and open space and as such, should be accommodated in the scheme design.
2.1.22	There is no mention of recently created woodland, wetland and grassland areas created as part of the Markham Vale regeneration project which are accessible to the public. The same is true for the Staveley Town Basin and the planned mixed-use development proposed as part of the Markham Vale project. This needs to be addressed.
2.1.23	There is no mention of the Clowne Greenway which is currently under construction. This needs to be addressed.
2.1.25	Appropriate reference is made to the Chesterfield Borough Local Plan Core Strategy 2013; Saved Policies of the Chesterfield Borough Local Plan 2006; Saved Policies of the Bolsover Local Plan 2000; Saved policies of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan 2005; Saved Policies of the Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan (2000/2002); and Saved Policies of the Derby and Derbyshire Waste Local Plan 2005. However, for consistency with the policy assessment set out for other sections of the proposed route through Derbyshire, reference should be made to the Derbyshire Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2026.

2.1.27	Reference should be made to the North East Derbyshire Local Plan Submission, which was submitted to the Secretary of State on 24 May 2018; and the Bolsover District Local Plan Submission, which was submitted to the Secretary of State on 31 August 2018. These two emerging plans will therefore need to form part of the assessment in the ES as both are submitted plans. Reference should also be made to the emerging Derby and Derbyshire Joint Minerals Local Plan and Derby and Derbyshire Joint Waste Local Plan, which are currently being prepared by DCC and Derby City Council. Although neither of these plans has yet to progress to the submission stage they will guide the location and degree of minerals and waste activity over the relevant period of HS2 development.
2.1.28 - 2.3.30	<p>Mention is made in these sections to committed developments, local plan allocations and land safeguarded for minerals in adopted Local Plans. DCC request that HS2 Ltd engages with the County Council on an ongoing basis to ensure that the baseline information, particularly relating to planning application commitments is up-to-date and robust as the WDES progresses towards its final version.</p> <p>Chesterfield Canal restoration at Staveley was underway prior to the HS2 route announcement and would reasonably have been expected to have been complete beyond Eckington Road were it not for the uncertainty caused by HS2. The Chesterfield Canal restoration should be included as a project likely to be constructed.</p>
2.1.28	<p>Chesterfield Canal restoration is safeguarded in the North East Derbyshire Local Plan and Chesterfield Borough Council Local Plan and should therefore be accommodated in the design.</p> <p>Severance of the Chesterfield Canal at Staveley – the construction of the HS2 IMD line will have significant, permanent and cumulative negative impacts and should therefore be addressed in the formal ES.</p>
2.1.32	A considerable number of areas of design are 'subject to further development'. As a result, it is difficult for the Council to provide a meaningful response to consultation at this stage.
2.2.12	<p>At up to 40m high, the height of the proposed M1 North Viaduct seems totally out of proportion to the road and watercourse it needs to cross. It will be visible from a very wide area and will create major adverse impact permanently. It is not clear whether the power companies have been consulted and whether they are happy with the embankment slope. If the power lines are to be diverted, it is not clear how the associated impacts been assessed?</p> <p>The associated map LV-03-397a does not show a photomontage location of this structure, (suggest 397-02-001 and Mastin Moor).</p> <p>It is requested the proposals in this location be further assessed through detailed discussion with the Council.</p>

2.2.22	<p>No provision is made in the present HS2 design at Wales Embankment for the proposed restoration of the Chesterfield Canal above the existing Norwood Lock flight in the way restoration was proposed by Arup in 2008. As stated in Volume 1, the role of the canal in supporting growth and visitor economy ambitions is important.</p> <p>The issue of protection of the canal route has been raised on a number of occasions over the past five and a half years with both HS2 and DCLG but remains unaddressed by the design formulated by HS2 to date. The impact of the present HS2 design fundamentally and detrimentally affects the multi million pound restoration work already completed and jeopardises the longer term intended restoration of the canal by the Chesterfield Canal Partnership in that it fails to safeguard the required route (DMRB Volume 11 - Section 3- Part 6 - Para 11.7).</p> <p>The Canal Trust has developed thinking around possible mitigation and alternative options at this location which need to be actively explored and considered by HS2.</p>
2.2.33	<p>There is no mention of the intended closure of the Clowne Branch Greenway indicated on Plan CT-06-635 (and currently under construction) which has, on a number of occasions, been raised and discussed with HS2 engagement teams and for which, the western end of the new greenway will be lost to rail development by HS2.</p> <p>There is also no mention of accommodating the proposed Oxcroft Branch Greenway which has also been discussed with the HS2 engagement team. This was intended to provide an alternative link in place of the length of the Clowne Branch to be lost to rail development and to provide future community Non Motorised User (NMU) linkage from Oxcroft & Stanfree toward Staveley, the Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) and Chesterfield Canal. The Oxcroft M1 underpass provides the only substantive 'bridge' crossing beneath both the M1 and future HS2 routes following the advised intended closure of the western end of the Clowne Branch Greenway by HS2.</p>

2.2.33 (cont 1)	<p>If both routes are lost to public use, FP28 will need to be upgraded to bridleway standard and definitive status and suitable provision also made for its safe crossing of the B6419. This will enable an onward route from Cresswell, Clowne and Oxcroft toward Staveley, the TPT and the Chesterfield Canal. Possibly a similar standard and status upgrade is required in respect of FP27 to provide the NMU linkage that will be lost, though an alternative would be the provision of an additional NMU route alongside HS2 to link with the existing stone surfaced track at Markham Vale and shown on Plan CT-06-635 (B4).</p> <p>The areas of suggested new wetland and woodland advised at CT-06-634 (E6 to H5) already exist and will first be lost to HS2 before their re-creation. The wetland area contains surface water attenuation ponds serving the two existing industrial plots located to the south of the existing branch line corridor.</p> <p>The landscape mitigation area includes the towpath of the Chesterfield Canal. Inclusion in the mitigation area will sever access for the public and does not take into account the management and maintenance requirements of the canal infrastructure.</p> <p>To identify the area south of the Staveley spur as new public realm/community facility is inappropriate for two reasons. Firstly, this area is already in the public realm as it is a regeneration site developed by the DCC Markham Vale Employment Growth Zone project so will therefore not contribute to 'new' community facilities provided by HS2. Secondly, the Staveley Town Basin area has been developed as part of wider growth and leisure activities. Seizure of this land by HS2 will therefore reduce the overall public realm viability in this locality causing significant sunk cost losses to DCC, as well as on-going, additional liability costs.</p> <p>One of the areas adjacent to the Staveley Town Basin site has existing approval (and proposals being developed) for a mixed use commercial development as part of the Markham Vale project. HS2 has previously been advised and this needs to be accommodated in revised HS2 proposals.</p> <p>Staveley West Embankment and its toe drain are shown encroaching into the toe of the support embankment to the Staveley Loop Road (Ireland Close). The toe of this proposed embankment also extends over, and buries, the outfall drain located immediately alongside the road embankment on its north side and serving as outfall and drain facility for the restored Chesterfield Canal.</p>
-----------------	--

2.2.33 (cont 2)	<p>Closure of FP11 (only part as shown) will sever links northward for the remainder of FP11 and for FP12. Arguably an alternate extension needs to be provided outside the boundary of the IMD to link to Hall Lane OR FP11 and FP12 should be entirely closed to public use and the river bridges removed.</p> <p>The proposed lowering of Hall Lane by 6m at its crossing of the Staveley spur may sever an unmapped private surface water outfall drain serving the adjacent Hall Lane Landfill site to the north of the IMD which presently runs alongside the rail corridor on its south side and discharges to the River Rother. This drain is located close to where the tracks start to branch at the entrance to the IMD, crossing first the rail corridor then Hall Lane and the depth needs to be verified.</p> <p>There are both an LV Electricity substation and a YWS Sewerage Pumping Station located immediately to the west of the Seymour Link Road to the south of the proposed IMD corridor at CT-06-634 (G6) These may require relocation.</p> <p>Despite written assurance from HS2 to DCC regarding prevention against future encroachment to development plots, the current preliminary embankment design for Staveley East Embankment clearly appears to show encroachment onto previously prepared and/or recently sold and subsequently developed industrial plots at Markham Vale North (Seymour) CT-06-634 (E7 to H5). It is also located on an existing flood plain.</p> <p>The balancing pond suggested at CT-06-634 (D4 to D5) is sited at location of an existing subsidence flash entirely within the River Doe Lea floodplain and arguably can only be created through loss of river flood storage. Consequent to its location it may not be available for containment of railway drainage runoff requiring retention when the river is in flood. This proposed pond is also sited on the line of existing public footpath (Staveley 31) shown as closed. It is noted that HS2 advise in the WDES that the entire floodplain will be lost to development at Staveley and Poolsbrook Flash sites though it is unclear where alternate floodwater storage is to be provided upstream of the site.</p> <p>It is unclear why the access track to the proposed balancing pond CT-06-634 (D4 to D5) is located in the position shown when an existing access track runs parallel for most of its distance. This point applies to other proposed access tracks along this section of the HS2 route.</p>
-----------------	--

2.2.33 (cont 3)	<p>There are insufficient details on the temporary material stockpile proposed at CT-05-634 E3 to F2. This land forms part of the Markham Vale Estate and further discussion is required as the location has previously been landscaped.</p> <p>The area of grassland suggested at CT-06-634 (B1 to D5) already exists as subsidence flash, grasslands and washlands though it is again noted that HS2 advises in the WDES that the entire floodplain will be lost to development at Staveley and Poolsbrook Flash sites; it is unclear where alternate floodwater storage is to be provided upstream of the site and this needs to be resolved.</p> <p>There are insufficient details for the proposed River Doe Lea underbridge at Map CT-06-634, C4.</p> <p>There are insufficient details regarding the realignment of the River Doe Lea at Map CT-06-633, (H7 to I8) and its impacts on the existing flood plain.</p> <p>There is insufficient detail regarding the impacts on DCC land re the diversion of Staveley FP 29.</p> <p>There is insufficient detail regarding the construction of Oxcroft North culvert on DCC Markham Vale estate land nor on the new business developments - 375m north-east of the existing Seymour Link Road.</p> <p>It is unclear why there is a need for Oxcroft South culvert, adjacent to the existing Seymour Link Road as the diversion of Hawke Brook at this point appears not to be required.</p> <p>The proposals do not include for a new rail overbridge at Seymour Link Road. HS2 Ltd have previously been advised of this.</p> <p>Bolsover FP 64 accommodation overbridge only provides pedestrian access and not vehicular access. HS2 Ltd have previously been advised of this by DCC.</p> <p>Proposal for diversion of FP30 at 39m in length need provide for NMU access for all user types, pedestrian, cycle and equestrian users to DMRB standard.</p> <p>There are insufficient details on the proposed diversion of FP39 at Map CT-06-633, (H9).</p> <p>There are insufficient details on the proposed Staveley Footpath 30 overbridge at Map CT-06-633, (G8).</p>
-----------------	---

2.2.33 (cont 4)	A new balancing pond is shown located on high ground to the 'west of the Staveley spur' with outfall is by ditch crossing the restored Chesterfield Canal. There are insufficient details on how this will be constructed or managed. The proposals are located on land owned by DCC Markham Vale estate.
2.2.34	Despite commentary that 'This section of the route would not include any maintenance access points to the route of the proposed scheme', alignment of a proposed maintenance access for the River Doe Lea bridge appears to pass through DCC land at Markham Vale. Its alignment does not match with existing topographical features or follow the recently constructed highway and private roadway routes and greenway alignment constructed in 2015/16.
2.2.36	The proposed IMD site makes no provision for the route of the proposed Chesterfield and Staveley Regeneration Route, (CSRR). HS2 Ltd is fully aware of this significant infrastructure proposal following several years of detailed discussions and attendance at various CSRR meetings. These plans limit the various partners' economic ability to asses various corridor options for the CSRR and this issue needs to be addressed fully.
2.3.2	DCC owns considerable areas of land along the proposed route, particularly in the vicinity of Markham Vale. This land currently forms part of the Markham Vale Estate and there has been no discussion from HS2 regarding access to the land nor its purchase. See also comments in Volume 1.
2.3.12	Advance works should include the provision of new facility for crossing of the Chesterfield Canal beneath the proposed IMD line to avoid further and protracted delay to the ongoing restoration.
2.3.19	The proposals indicate that two satellite construction compounds are to be located adjacent to the B6419, (see Map CT-06-635 D2 to D6). These are located on a proposed extension to the Markham Vale North development for industrial use.
2.3.43	<p>Mastin Moor Cutting Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site plan as drawn. There is a level difference between site and carriageway that would require careful design to facilitate all geometric requirements for a 40 mph road. The site is located towards the end of a solid white line system therefore careful design of the access to achieve satisfactory visibility is needed although the wide verge could help.</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>

2.3.53	<p>Barlborough Cutting Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. It is on the inside of a bend with restricted visibility (forward and exit) and onto a classified Dual Carriageway with a 70 MPH limit.</p> <p>A considerable extent of land would be required to achieve the appropriate visibility both forward and exit for a 70 mph limit, the only other Highway frontage is to Westfield Lane which is inadequate in width to accommodate site traffic. The introduction of slow moving vehicles turning across a Dual carriageway (70 mph) would be contrary to the best interest of highway safety.</p> <p>Topography potentially presents a highway problem due to carriageway alignment, the proposed site is higher than the carriageway.</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>
2.3.64	<p>Woodhall Common Cutting Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. The proposed site is on the inside of a bend with severely restricted visibility. Achievement of a satisfactory means of access is considered unlikely due to the extent of land which would be required to achieve the appropriate visibility both forward and exit for a 50 mph limit.</p> <p>The site is constrained due to a narrow frontage, the M1 Underpass and being on the inside of a bend. Topography could present a highway problem due to horizontal alignment.</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>

2.3.74	<p>Norwood Viaduct Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan as access would require the clearance of vegetation to the left on exit to facilitate visibility splays on accordance with 60 mph speed limit. Fronting vegetation beyond the land shown for the compound restricts exit visibility and could present a further constraint. Topography could present a highway problem due to the gradient on the derestricted road and may impact on stopping distances for heavy vehicles. Absence of exit visibility onto a derestricted road is of significant concern to DCC as the Highway Authority.</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>
2.3.100	<p>Staveley East Embankment Satellite Compound</p> <p>The proposals indicate that two satellite construction compounds are to be located adjacent to the B6419 (see Map CT-06-635 D2 to D6). These are located on a proposed extension are to the Markham Vale North development for industrial use.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. There are no pedestrian footways in the vicinity; bus stops exist at Bank House Farm and Woodthorpe Road; a cycle network exists within the Markham Vale development and is on the same alignment as the proposed HS2; PRoW's cross the site with some proposed diversions; the closest settlement with the most amenities is Staveley (approximately 2 miles).</p> <p>This is a split site with direct frontage to Bolsover Road (B6419) of sufficient length that, although the highway is of an undulating and sinuous nature, creation of compound accesses with appropriate exit visibility sightlines should be achievable, (particularly if all 'land potentially required during construction' is secured). However, should this not be the case, it's considered that introduction of temporary measures for the duration of the Works would be likely to prove acceptable. Notwithstanding, realignment of Bolsover Road is demonstrated and, in the event that this work precedes the creation of the depot, access to the site should be incorporated within the design of the diverted road.</p>

2.3.100 (cont)	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.
2.3.104	The two temporary material stockpile areas located adjacent to the B6419 (see Map CT-06-635 D2 to C4). These are located on a proposed extension are to the Markham Vale North development for industrial use.
2.3.108	It is unclear on the maps where the proposed Oxcroft South Culvert is located nor the reasoning behind it.
2.3.111	<p>A619 Lowgates Road Overbridge Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. The topography presents a highway problem since the existing rail line is located in a deep cutting which severs the proposed compound site. Pedestrian footways exist on each side of local highways; bus stops are located immediately adjacent to the site; access to cycle network/ Bridleway adjacent to Ireland Close is approximately 200m to the west of the site; and most amenities of Staveley are within approximately 750m of the site.</p> <p>This is a split site either side of the proposed HS2 line the western side having direct frontage to Fan Road where creation of a compound access with appropriate exit visibility sightlines should be achievable although this may require temporary relocation of an existing bus stop. Access to the eastern side would need to be taken via the same route crossing over the proposed HS2 line.</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>

2.3.117	<p>Staveley West Cutting Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. There are no pedestrian footways in vicinity; the only bus stops within a reasonable distance are located on Lowgates (A619) and accessible only by cycle network/ bridleway immediately adjacent to, with a short length passing through, the site. All amenities of Staveley Town Centre are located within 1 mile of the site by road.</p> <p>Whilst this site has direct frontage to Ireland Close (A6192) the public highway is at a lower level than the proposed compound that may result in access gradient issues. Subject to gradient being satisfactorily addressed, it should be possible to create an access with Ireland Close at a point where adequate forward and exit visibility sightlines are achievable. However, should this not be the case, it's considered that introduction of temporary measures for the duration of the Works would be likely to prove acceptable. The existing cycle/ Bridleway is affected by the site.</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>
2.3.125	<p>Staveley IMD South Chord Viaduct Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. There are no pedestrian footways in the vicinity, the closest is roughly 200m to the south on the opposite side of Hall Lane; bus stops are 600 – 700m to the south on Hall Lane; the Cycle network/ Bridleway is approximately 500m to the south accessed via Hall Lane; no PRoW are affected. All main amenities of Staveley are within 1 mile of the site.</p> <p>This site is separated from the closest public highway by an existing rail line and 'land potentially required during construction' therefore creation of an access would require either a structure to cross the line or a (temporary) closure. In the event that crossing the rail line can be overcome, creation of an acceptable access may require land beyond that demonstrated as being 'potentially required during construction'. That said, it may be possible to introduce temporary measures to form an access for the duration of the Works. Notwithstanding, realignment of Hall Lane is demonstrated and, in the event that this work precedes the creation of the depot, access to the site should be incorporated within the design of the diverted road.</p>

2.3.125 (cont)	<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>
2.3.131	<p>Staveley IMD Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. A pedestrian footway linking to the south only from proposed Depot Access; bus stops are 400 – 500m to the south on Hall Lane; the cycle network/ Bridleway is approximately 300m to the south accessed via Hall Lane; no PRoW affected. All main amenities of Staveley are within 1 mile of the site.</p> <p>This site is separated from the closest public highway by ‘land potentially required during construction’ and land demonstrated as being allocated as ‘Depot’. It’s assumed that access would be taken via that proposed to serve the proposed Depot which, it would appear, requires modifications to the existing public highway (Hall Lane). Detailed layout designs complying with current design guidance will need to be submitted for the Depot access/ Hall Lane modifications for Constructional Approval prior to access being taken.</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>
2.3.144	<p>Works Road Rail Systems Satellite Compound.</p> <p>A satisfactory access cannot be achieved to serve the site as drawn on the plan. There is a narrow pedestrian footway on one side of the existing highway, this being on the opposite side of the road to the eastern compound and same side of the road to the western compound. Bus stops are approximately 350m to the south of the eastern compound on Works Road; the cycle network is approximately 650m to the south of the eastern compound and accessed from Works Road; PRoW are likely to be affected by the eastern compound. The limited amenities of New Whittington are within 1½ miles with more extensive amenities of Staveley approximately 2 miles from the site.</p> <p>This is a split site with the east and west parts approximately 350m apart each on the southern side of Works Road/ Whittington Road. Both sites are separated from the closest public highway by ‘land potentially required during construction.</p>

2.3.144 (cont)	<p>The closest highway to the eastern site is Works Road where the highway is located within a cutting with substantial retaining walls to each side. There is no footway or margin on the proposed compound side of the carriageway. In addition, visibility sightlines would be compromised by the existing carriageway alignment. Given the short duration of time this compound is proposed to operate, it may be possible to introduce temporary traffic management measures to accommodate an access; however, significant engineering works would also be required.</p> <p>It is possible that a satisfactory access may be created to the western site using the land identified as being ‘potentially required during construction’ although, due to the change in speed limit across the frontage of this land, this would be likely to involve significant clearance of existing boundary hedges in order to achieve adequate visibility sightlines. Alternatively, again due to the perceived duration of use of this site, it may be possible to introduce temporary traffic management measures to accommodate an access.</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>
2.3.150	<p>In the other community area reports for Derbyshire it has been unclear which of the main and satellite compounds, if any, would remain in place for the rail systems works. The wording here would seem to suggest that the Staveley site will be fulfilling this role for the whole eastern leg of the scheme. This needs to be clarified as it would seem to disagree with information displayed in figure 9 page 63/72 which shows all of the main and satellite in this community area closing by Q3 2030. Yet rail systems work are not due to begin until Q3 2031 and end in Q4 2033.</p>
2.3.153	<p>DCC supports the approach set out in 2.3.153 that excavated material generated across the proposed scheme would be reused as engineering fill material or in environmental mitigation works of the proposed scheme where suitable and reasonably practicable.</p>

2.3.154	<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. More detailed discussion with the Council is welcomed on this matter as suitable options may be available locally.</p>
2.3.155	<p>DCC supports the approach set out in 2.5.155 that local excess or shortfall of excavated material within the study area would be managed through the integrated design approach with the aim of contributing to an overall balance of excavated material on a route wide basis. 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>

2.4.12 - 2.4.13	<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>
2.5.3	Bluebank Pools Local Wildlife Site should be included in this list.

1.3 Stakeholder engagement and consultation

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
3.1.4	DCC welcomes the indication that HS2 Ltd would engage with stakeholders on an ongoing basis on the design and assessment process of the scheme. The County Council considers it to be particularly important that ongoing consultation is carried out to ensure that the baseline information for the ES is up-to-date and robust.
3.3.2	Chesterfield Canal is one of the main themes to emerge from stakeholder engagement however, severance of the canal restoration by the construction of the IMD line is not addressed.
3.4.1	There have been many meetings 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.

3.4.1 - 3.4.4	DCC welcomes the indication that HS2 Ltd would engage with stakeholders on an ongoing basis on the design and assessment process of the scheme. The County Council considers it to be particularly important that ongoing consultation is carried out to ensure that the baseline information for the ES is up-to-date and robust.
3.4.9	Whilst HS2 acknowledges its consultation with DCC regarding the Markham Vale development, it has not acknowledged consultation with the Council's private sector partner Henry Boot Developments Ltd who also has an interest in the land affected.
3.4.14	Correction of error: the Chesterfield Canal Trust does not own any canal assets. The canal and infrastructure in the Staveley area is wholly owned and maintained by DCC.

1.4 Agriculture, forestry and soils

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

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
4.3.32	<p>The proposals fail to identify or acknowledge the several recently constructed surface water drainage features on Markham Vale business park. These have been provided as part of a sustainable drainage system for the newly created business park and either need to be protected or replaced if impacted by the proposals.</p> <p>The proposals also fails to identify or acknowledge the several recently planted woodland areas created as part of the Markham Vale development.</p>

1.5 Air Quality Section 5.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
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.

5.3.6	<p>It is noted that the Chesterfield Borough A619 Brimington AQMAs fall within scope, and it is noted in 5.4.9 that construction traffic may impact upon this location. The formal ES will need to address this impact in full.</p> <p>It is noted that the Barlborough 1 & 2 AQMAs fall 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.</p>
5.4.1	It is noted that the control and management measures as specified are "generally sufficient to avoid any significant effects". The Council wishes to see confirmation in the formal ES that this holds true for specific impacts in the LA11 area.
5.4.6	It is noted that the risk of dust effects 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 requests that further work is undertaken as part of the formal ES.
5.4.9	<p>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.</p> <p>There is no mention of either Erin Road or Seymour Link Road, does this mean that no construction traffic will use these two roads?</p>
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.
5.4.13	It is noted that any significant residual effects from construction traffic emissions will be reported in the formal ES.
5.5.1	It is noted that "no specific mitigation measures for air quality are proposed during the operation of the scheme". 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 LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
6	DCC welcomes the choice of Staveley for the maintenance depot, bringing job opportunities back to the area, and utilising the former industrial site. The Council requests that a skills plan is developed as part of a wider economic impact assessment (see Volume 1) to ensure local people can benefit from the construction and future employment opportunities at the Depot.

6 (cont)	<p>The Council recognises that the Depot will have a detrimental impact on a number of residents and communities during and after construction, with the loss of dwellings to demolition, and the loss or use of recreational sites. There will also be on-going noise, light and pollution disturbance through train movements, often late at night. These need to be further mitigated.</p> <p>DCC does not agree with the claims made in this and other sections of the consultation that taking a part of a household's driveway or garden will not impact upon the amenity of owners/ people living in the dwellings concerned. This is an inaccurate and unrealistic assessment of the likely experience of these families. The very presence of such a large development so near will have an immediate impact on the quality of lives and privacy of the families concerned, with the possibility of additional noise and disruption to access and enjoyment.</p> <p>At this stage, the operational impacts of the IMD are not fully understood. Inevitably, though, maintenance activities will be concentrated within off-peak periods for passenger services, mostly at night. It is anticipated that lighting at the IMD, movement of maintenance trains and vehicular traffic associated with its workforce shift changes could all be a significant impact on the adjacent communities. Measures need to be made to mitigate the impact of this on surrounding residential communities.</p>
6.2.3	<p>It should be recognised that not all promoted routes for vulnerable users are dedicated as public rights of way. This should not lessen the value placed on them but rather ensure that safeguards are in place to accommodate them to avoid issues of severance in the network. See also EIA comments</p>
6.2.4	<p>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. See also EIA comments.</p>
6.3.3	<p>There are also 4 proposed multi user trails in this community area, at Park Hall, Mastin Moor to Barlborough Common, Clowne Branch Line and Oxcroft Branch Line. Work to develop the Clowne Branch Line is underway and will be affected by the IMD line.</p>
6.3.4	<p>There is no mention of the Staveley Town Basin nor the Chesterfield Canal as a community facility.</p>
6.3.5	<p>There is no mention of recently improved landscape and habitat areas and PRowS for leisure use recently created as part of the Markham Vale project.</p>
6.3.7	<p>There is no mention of recently improved landscape and habitat areas for leisure use recently created as part of the Markham Vale project.</p>

6.4.2-7	The loss of amenity to the residents and its impact on their physical and especially mental wellbeing should be considered. See also EIA comments.
6.4.11	Chesterfield Canal should be included here and severance of the canal restoration addressed.
6.4.34	<p>The replacement TPT/Cuckoo Way routes must be constructed to a multi-user route standard, including the design of the Staveley Bridleway 47 overbridge and subsequent link onto Staveley BW48 and onward northbound section of the TPT. Because of the land levels in this area (a steep slope down and then up), the overbridge will need to extend the full length of the realignment path, to the connection with Staveley FP71. East to west connections of the TPT can only be resolved when the matter of the canal crossing is addressed.</p> <p>The construction phase drawing CT-05-631-R1 shows that the potential area used by HS2 for construction includes considerable lengths of the land used by Brimington FP1 / Staveley Staveley FP1 (which double as the Trans Pennine Trail and the Cuckoo Way), between Troughbrook Road at Hollingwood and Hall Lane at Staveley. The construction area also takes in an important access point onto the TPT at Mill Green, Staveley. This route is a crucial public access corridor for walkers and cyclists, both for leisure and commuting use. It must remain accessible throughout the construction period, or alternative suitable provision made for regular users.</p>
6.5.1	It would be helpful to appraise the vulnerable user path connectivity in the area as a mitigation quick win. There are short sections of missing paths that would significantly improve permeability across this community area, particularly to connect built trail at Seymour to connect across the IMD line to Poolesbrook Country Park, and a replacement route for the section of the Clowne Branch Line (under construction) to be lost for the IMD line with connections from the Oxcroft Line.
6.5.6	See previous comments on Chesterfield Canal.

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 LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
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 able 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, DCC suggests that the following broad and/or overarching issues will need thorough consideration prior to the next step of the ES development.</p> <p>The Staveley Spur and the Staveley IMD appear to have the potential to cause significant impacts to and even the complete loss of a number of designated sites and notable habitats outside of designated sites. It is unclear at this stage whether potential Local Wildlife Sites (pLWSs) have been appropriately identified and considered for protection.</p> <p>Whilst the impact on those sites, both designated and undesignated, will need to be considered in the ES, additional thought will need to be given to the cumulative impact of habitat losses in the Poolsbrook, Netherthorpe Flash, Doe Lea flash area, and the impacts this will have for protected and notable species. Additional consideration will need to be given to the potential of and need to compensate for impacts on Open Mosaic Habitats and open grasslands on previously developed land, associated with the Staveley IMD site.</p>
General (cont)	<p>The main line through the remainder of Derbyshire (from the M1 realignment northwards to Woodall Common) appears to also result in direct habitat loss. There are potential impacts on ancient woodlands (High Wood, a small woodland near Romeley House, south-east of Barlborough) and woodland and other habitats around Robinson's Lumb are a concern. Could Robinson's Lumb and High Wood be traversed by a viaduct rather than embankment in order to minimise ecological impacts and maintain meaningful connectivity post construction? More broadly, opportunities should be sought to maintain and enhance east-west connectivity throughout this section.</p>

7.3.12	The proposals do not identify the recently created woodlands as part of the Markham Vale project.
7.3.15	The proposals do not identify the recently created and improved grassland areas as part of the Markham Vale project.
7.3.16	The proposals do not identify the recently created and improved hedgerows as part of the Markham Vale project.
	The proposals do not identify the recently created and improved waterbodies as part of the Markham Vale project.
7.3.18	Chesterfield Canal has been omitted.
	The proposals do not identify the recently created and improved waterbodies as part of the Markham Vale project.
7.4.12	Chesterfield Canal has been omitted.

1.8 Health, Section 8.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
General	There is concern that the impacts around the IMD have not been fully assessed. The noise level assessment is based on electric trains but the traffic is likely include a significant number of diesel trains. There is also no assessment of light pollution. With the depot running 24 hrs this could have a significant impact on the environment, ecology and the wellbeing of the local population. It is also likely to restrict the development opportunities.
8.2.2	The report demonstrates an understanding that the wider determinants of health will be affected as a result of this development.
8.2.3	The report identifies that there will be adverse and beneficial health impacts.
8.2.4	DCC agrees with the health determinants listed. However, HS2 has neglected to include: potential effects on mental health and wellbeing, community connectivity, employment, housing, local transport, food and farming and economy.
8.2.6	DCC agrees that the strength of evidence does not 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.

8.2.8	DCC encourages HS2 Ltd to use and refer to DCCs "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.
8.3.3	No mention of the Staveley Town Basin nor Chesterfield Canal as a community facility.
8.3.5	No mention of recently improved landscape and habitat areas for leisure use recently created as part of the Markham Vale project. The same is true for the several PRoWS that have not been recorded by HS2.
8.4.1	DCC agrees with the mitigation listed also consider adding: 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 requests that HS2 include reference to community connectedness in this section.
8.4.22	There would be direct impacts on access to green space, recreation and physical activity where publicly accessible open space is either temporarily or permanently lost or where the usability of land is compromised.
8.4.23	Due to the 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 catered for as part of the planning for temporary diversions or permanent route/footpath changes.
8.4.26	DCC requests that HS2 add an additional mitigation of avoiding using important local roads for construction traffic. Increased traffic congestion will make it more difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to utilise active travel options and increased journey times will lead to increased stress levels for commuters.
8.4.28	DCC requests 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'.
8.4.32	The scheme will result in 13 properties being demolished in Staveley, Mastin Moor and Barlborough. 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.

1.9 Historic environment, Section 9.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
9.2.8	The assessment of the impact of HS2 construction on the Chesterfield Canal at Staveley and Norwood as 'unlikely to be significant' is incorrect.
9.3.13	The statement is factually incorrect, evidence of an enclosed settlement dating from early bronze age, the imprint of a Prehistoric round house and Post Medieval fence line were identified and recorded through intrusive investigation undertaken by Trent and Peak Archaeology in 2014. A site which has only been partly investigated. The site is located approximately 750m to the south west of Woodthorpe, Derbyshire and is just 450m from the footprint corridor of the Staveley spur. Archaeological Record of the find is lodged at Sheffield Museum as accession number SHEFM:2015.297.
9.4.1	The proposed scheme has made no provision for the Chesterfield Canal at Staveley or Norwood.
9.4.5 and 9.4.14	An assessment of the temporary impacts and effects on the Chesterfield Canal and its supporting infrastructure (including Staveley Town Basin) has been omitted and should be included here.
CT-06-637	Map number CT-06-637 shows proposed 'landscape mitigation planting' just outside the boundary of the Grade II Registered Park/Gardens of Barlborough Park and around 300m from the Grade I Listed Barlborough Hall. This does not appear to be discussed or mentioned in the accompanying text. If there are potential impacts to Barlborough Hall/Park requiring mitigation then these should be identified and the proposed mitigation subject to consultation.

1.10 Land quality, Section 10.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
10.1.2	DCC welcomes the indication that HS2 Ltd will continue to engage with stakeholders on the design of the scheme and assembling the baseline information for the assessment in the ES. It is considered to be particularly important that the baseline information is up-to-date and robust to inform the preparation of the final version of the ES.
10.2.7	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.

10.2.27	<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. The North Derbyshire coalfields are known to be susceptible to instance of spontaneous combustion where poor quality (Low CV) coal seams are exposed to air through the opening up of excavations. Spontaneous combustion of seams which migrate underground can be notoriously hard to extinguish and care need be taken by HS2 and their consultants to take geological seam mapping of seams and outcrops into account during design. It is suggested that guidance is obtained from the Coal Authority in this respect.</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>
10.3.32	<p>The Chesterfield Canal is under construction and the route lies fully within the proposed construction area at Norwood and Staveley. Further the reference to the canal at Norwood as 'disused' should be removed and replaced with other appropriate wording.</p> <p>There is no mention of Hawke Brook.</p>

10.3.34	<p>The effects of the proposed scheme on the future licensed open cast mining areas would be permanent where overlain by the footprint of permanent works with a strip of the mineral resource becoming sterilized. HS2 note that appropriate mitigation measures would be discussed in advance with the relevant Minerals Planning Authority.</p> <p>Such engagement with the County Council is welcomed and supported. However, it should be noted that the whole of the surface coal resource in the area is safeguarded under Policy MP17 of the adopted Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan. This indicates that the Minerals Planning Authority will resist proposals for any development which would sterilise or prejudice the future working of important economically workable mineral deposits except where there is an overriding need for development; and where prior extraction of the mineral cannot be reasonably undertaken or is unlikely to be practicable or environmentally acceptable.</p> <p>DCC, as the Minerals Planning Authority, expects to see an assessment that examines whether prior extraction of the mineral resource in advance of the development is practicable and environmentally feasible. DCC also expects 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>
10.3.42 - 10.3.43	<p>Re Table 24 the record is inaccurate. Both colliery shafts at the former Seymour Colliery were re-capped (and again left open beneath) during site development works and under supervision of the Coal Authority in March 2016. Provision has been made for monitoring of minewater /groundwater recovery.</p> <p>Re Table 25, Whilst not historic, there is no mention of current commercial uses on Markham Vale North.</p>
10.3.53	<p>Significant species diversity is being recorded at the site of the stormwater attenuation ponds at Markham Vale North (Seymour), Plan CT-05-634 (E6-F6). This site is presently not recorded as a Local Wildlife site. It is anticipated that the rich variety of fauna present will be recognised and recorded during ongoing ecological surveys by HS2 and their specialist consultants and that the site itself perhaps be protected during construction.</p>

10.3.55	Reference should be made to the fact that DCC and Derby City Council are jointly responsible for overall minerals and waste plans in Derbyshire and that a new Minerals Local Plan for Derbyshire is currently being prepared by the two councils, which will guide minerals related development in Derbyshire until 2030 by setting out where it is expected that quarrying and mineral mining will take place and outlining principles to inform planning applications during this time.
10.3.58	<p>It is welcomed that appropriate reference is made of the fact that dolomite and dolomitic limestone are present in the area around Barlborough. However, it should be clarified that the limestone resource is safeguarded under Policy MP17 of the adopted Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan.</p> <p>This indicates that the Minerals Planning Authority will resist proposals for any development which would: sterilise or prejudice the future working of important economically workable mineral deposits except where there is an overriding need for development; and where prior extraction of the mineral cannot be reasonably undertaken or is unlikely to be practicable or environmentally acceptable.</p> <p>DCC, as Minerals Planning Authority, expects to see an assessment that examines whether prior extraction of the mineral resource in advance of the development is practicable and environmentally feasible. 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 27, there appears to be no plan to clarify or advise the location of these sites. Plans therefore need to be provided.
10.4.16	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 28, there appears to be no plan to clarify or advise the location of these sites. Plans therefore need to be provided.
10.4.23	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 Table 29, there appears to be no plan to clarify or advise the location of these sites. Plans therefore need to be provided.

10.4.34	<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> <p>The effects of the proposed scheme on the future licensed open cast mining areas would be permanent where overlain by the footprint of permanent works. A slip of the mineral resource would become sterilised and appropriate mitigation measures would be discussed in advance with the relevant Minerals Planning Authority. Such engagement with the County Council is welcomed and supported. However, it should be noted that the whole of the surface coal resource in the area is safeguarded under Policy MP17 of the adopted Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan which indicates that the Minerals Planning Authority will resist proposals for any development which would sterilise or prejudice the future working of important economically workable mineral deposits except: where there is an overriding need for development; and where prior extraction of the mineral cannot be reasonably undertaken or is unlikely to be practicable or environmentally acceptable.</p> <p>DCC, as Minerals Planning Authority, expects to see an assessment that examines whether prior extraction of the mineral resource in advance of the development is practicable and environmentally feasible. 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>
10.4.35	<p>Except for brief reference in Para 10.3.62 deep coal reserve is poorly considered. Impact on deep coal reserve is unmentioned (as in LA11 report para 10.4.30) despite this section of the proposed route clearly passing through the North Derbyshire Coalfields. As well as the consideration of shallow 'opencast' coal sterilisation, the WDES needs to consider impact on the deep coal reserve. They also need to determine what restriction the surface routing of the proposed HS2 rail line could introduce in respect of coal reserve which underlays the rail corridor. If recovered by deep mining process it could cause severe detrimental impact to rail embankment integrity and thus high speed travel in the event of future mining subsidence.</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 LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
11.1.4	<p>The changes to the landscape resulting from the major regeneration scheme at Markham Vale has not necessarily been updated on to latest OS Maps and HS2 have previously been made aware of this by DCC.</p> <p>Plans LV-02-396 a and b are based on aerial photography from as far back as 2011(?) and does not include recent developments at either Markham Vale or Coalite.</p> <p>Plans LV-02-397 a and b are based on aerial photography from as far back as 2011(?) and do not include recent developments at either Markham Vale North nor at the former Oxcroft Colliery.</p> <p>Plans LV-02-450 a and b are based on aerial photography from as far back as 2011(?) and do not include recent developments at either Staveley Town Basin nor at the former Hartington Colliery.</p>
11.3.2	The Chesterfield Canal has been omitted from the existing landscape baseline and should be included here.
11.3.5	The changes to the landscape resulting from the major regeneration scheme at Markham Vale has not necessarily been updated on to latest OS Maps and HS2 have previously been made aware of this this by DCC.

11.3.10	<p>Re Mastin Moor and Poolsbrook areas - The changes to the landscape resulting from the major regeneration scheme at Markham Vale has not necessarily been updated on to latest OS Maps and HS2 have previously been made aware of this.</p> <p>Table 31: The presence and on-going restoration of the Chesterfield Canal is acknowledged here but is not otherwise appraised in the chapter. Table 32: Impacts to the Chesterfield Canal has been omitted.</p> <p>This sections sets out the nine LCAs that would be significantly affected within the Staveley to Aston area. As DCC expressed in earlier correspondence to HS2 and their consultants, there is some concern with the way these areas have been defined and then evaluated. Staveley Post-Industrial River Valley LCA is by its very nature and character sensitive and susceptible to new development regardless of its current condition but this is not reflected in the value assigned to the landscape. Floodplains are inherently sensitive to development because of their linear nature and their susceptibility to flood.</p> <p>As DCC has expressed previously, there are concerns that the LVIA has conflated character and condition and as a result, the sensitivity of the landscape has been under-valued. The Poolsbrook Valley Restored Coalfield has been almost entirely defined based on condition incorporating as it does parts of the DCC defined Riverside Meadows Landscape Character Type (LCT) and Estate Farmlands LCT. By simply pulling out areas of poor condition it is inevitable within the context of the methodology that these areas will then score low with regard to their overall sensitivity and susceptibility to change. This leads to an under-estimation of effects and significance, and as a consequence does not inform high standards of design and mitigation, in other words poor quality areas lead to poor quality development.</p>
11.3.16	<p>Not all PRowS have been identified by HS2 and some are incorrectly mapped.</p>
11.3.17	<p>The Seymour Link Road has not been fully recognised by HS2.</p>
11.3.18	<p>The major employment area of Markham Vale has not been fully recognised by HS2.</p>
11.4.8	<p>Table 32: Impacts to the Chesterfield Canal have been overlooked.</p> <p>No mention of the new bridge required to cross the Seymour Link Road.</p>

11.4.12	<p>No mention of the new bridge required to cross the Seymour Link Road.</p> <p>Table 33: Impacts on the users of the Cuckoo Way have been assessed without reference to this being the route of the Chesterfield Canal restoration which is currently underway.</p> <p>Table 33: An 'overall high magnitude of change and major adverse effect' to users around the canal basin is included without acknowledging the canal itself.</p> <p>Table 33 identifies the significantly affected viewpoints during the construction phase whilst Table 35 (11.5.7) sets out those significantly affected viewpoints during the operational phase at Year 1 and Year 15. It is noted that there are a number of viewpoints within Derbyshire where there would be significant adverse visual effects up to year 15 of the operational phase. There is no assessment of how many receptors (people) these effects would relate to or how this assessment work has then informed the design process as part of an iterative exercise. For example VP 397-03-005 (PRoW west of Romely Farm) is assessed as having Major adverse (significant) effect at Year 15 of operation as a result of "the M1 motorway North viaduct, the viaduct itself would remain a visually prominent component of the view". In response to this identified impact shouldn't the design be taking account of this significant effect and designing a viaduct that might provide greater visual amenity?</p>
11.5.2	<p>The new areas of public realm / replacement community facilities to be created already presently exist and are available to the public. Two sites as grassland and the recently restored canal. The area adjacent to Staveley town basin has also been earmarked for a mixed-use commercial development. Sites are owned by DCC and part of the Chesterfield Canal restoration. The land forms part of the sustainability plan for the canal and its removal by HS2 will have direct economic consequences to the scheme and DCC's liabilities.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to claim an area already in the public realm as mitigation for the HS2 scheme. The proposed mitigation scheme comes without a comprehensive access and management plan and is likely to constitute an additional liability to DCC in addition to the loss acquired from failure to develop the current model. The proposed public realm mitigation comes a long way short of mitigating the impact of severing the canal restoration at Staveley and Norwood and loss of public realm as a result.</p>

11.5.2 (cont)	<p>See Map LV-04-397a C9 - the proposal include mitigation planting of new woodland within the existing building of Ferdinand Bilstein on Plot 14 Markham Vale North. This is despite HS2 being advised of the new developments at Markham Vale on several occasions over a number of years by DCC.</p> <p>HS2 propose to create an area of grassland habitat creation and wetland habitat creation (Map CT-06-634, E6 to H5) on an area of recently created wetland and grassland habitat. This was undertaken as part of the Markham Vale landscape and environmental mitigation measures and HS2 Ltd have previously been advised of this by DCC.</p> <p>See Map LV-04-397a C10 - the proposal include mitigation planting of new woodland within the existing boundary of Great Bear on Plot 13 Markham Vale North. This is despite HS2 being advised of the new developments at Markham Vale on several occasions over a number of years by DCC.</p>
11.5.4	<p>Table 34: Staveley Town Basin is described as 'partially restored' - the basin was completed in 2016 and the canal now extends towards Eckington Lane, which is the current construction site.</p> <p>Tree planting along the Chesterfield Canal and Staveley Town Basin falls short of adequate mitigation and should be addressed.</p>
11.5.7	<p>The changes to the landscape resulting from the major regeneration scheme at Markham Vale has not necessarily been updated on to latest OS Maps and HS2 have previously been made aware of this.</p> <p>RE VP 450-03-010 and VP 450-03-011: This is the first ever mention of the need for the installation of overhead line equipment on the IMD. Previously it has been suggested the line would be used by diesel trains due to the need for power to be off during maintenance works on the main line, though more latterly the intended train types has been less clear.</p>
LV-04-396b	<p>Areas of tree planting are shown on plan LV-04-396b at A1 to C2 both in the river floodplain and in the area of the surface water management ponds between the railway and Hawke Brook. These deal with attenuation of storm runoff from MV Plots 15 and 16. This planting is surely unacceptable in the river floodplain unless alternate provision is made for stormwater balancing/attenuation ponds.</p>

1.12 Socio Economic, Section 12.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
12.1.1	Socio economic changes resulting from the major regeneration scheme at Markham Vale cannot have been incorporated in to this report as HS2 have consistently failed to acknowledge its physical presence despite several years of discussions with HS2 Ltd.
12.4.10	The proposals clearly show the land required for the construction of HS2 incorporating land within the boundary fence of Ferdinand Bilstein on Markham Vale North, see Map CT05-634 H4. Similarly other development land within this area is similarly affected despite HS2 Ltd having provided written confirmation to the contrary in late 2016.

1.13 Sound, Noise & Vibration, Section 13.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
13.1.1	<p>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.</p> <p>There is concern that the noise impacts around the Depot have not been fully assessed. The assessment is based on electric trains but the traffic is likely to be diesel trains.</p>
13.2.4 and 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.
13.4.3	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 LA11 area.
13.4.4	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.
13.4.6	As the overbridge at Seymour Link Road has not been included within the proposals then surely the noise level impacts at Woodthorpe cannot be accurate nor assured without including the additional construction works within the noise assessment.

13.4.7	It need be noted that plans SV-01-420b and SV-01-421 do not show predicted noise levels at this time as HS2 has not yet completed assessment of impacts. There is insufficient information on which to comment.
13.4.8	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.
13.4.13	It is noted that further consideration will be given to the noise and vibration impacts on non-residential receptors in the formal ES.
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.
13.5.15	It is noted that noise and vibration from the depots and associated access lines has not been assessed at this stage but will be fully assessed in the formal ES
13.5.18	It is noted that likely significant airborne noise effects arising from permanent changes to existing roads, will be reported in the formal ES. This will needs 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).
13.5.19	It is noted that noise and vibration effects arising from the operation of the Staveley IMD will be reported in the formal ES.
13.5.20	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.
13.5.25	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.

1.14.2 DCC have concerns regarding management and maintenance liabilities of new routes, for example at Staveley. There is also concern regarding the impact on the canal, the Public Rights of Way, Trans Pennine Way and Staveley Town Basin development site.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
14.1.2	DCC as the local highway authority, 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. DCC strongly requests that given the level of 'missing' information at present, that early sight of any preliminary outputs of the environmental appraisal be shared prior to the ES's publication as part of the Hybrid Bill.
14.2.3	A6192 Erin Road is not listed.
14.2.5	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).
14.3.3	It is noted that surveys were carried out on existing rights of way to determine current usage. This data should be used with caution as it will not represent wholly where people need to travel to or desire to travel to. It can only represent what can be accessed given the current state, connectivity and condition of the routes.
14.3.13	<p>It is noted that all existing routes will have been identified in the assessment. However, there are as yet undeveloped routes in the area or paths requiring upgrading that have been identified to provide multi user trails for non-motorised users of the Local Cycle Network (LCN) and Key Cycle Network (KCN). These are at Park Hall, Mastin Moor to Barlborough Common for the LCN, and Clowne Branch Line (as identified and as a current scheme under construction) and the Oxcroft Branch Line for the KCN.</p> <p>The report fails to acknowledge the presence of a number of PRoW in the Markham Vale North area and of those that are identified several are incorrectly shown.</p>
14.3.16	The Chesterfield Canal is acknowledged as a navigable canal and under construction. However the project design severs the canal at Staveley and Norwood.
14.4.1	The proposals indicate that the M1 overbridge (CT-05-364 G8) will be used during the construction period and that a haul road (CT-05-364 G8 to G7) will provide the access to the HS2 Staveley Spur. The proposed route fails to acknowledge that a new track has been built (as evidenced in the background OS details at this point) connecting the M1 overbridge with Seymour Link Road. The HS2 proposed construction route also negatively impacts the development Plot 15 at Markham Vale North.

	<p>It should be noted that there is no vehicular access between Woodthorpe village and the Seymour Link Road. Seymour Link Road terminates at a cul-de-sac off Erin Road. Beyond the limit of Seymour Link Road, the surfaced track is a private gated track providing access to agricultural land. It is very important that HS2 recognise that all traffic access to Markham Vale North along Seymour Link Road is via access off Erin Road.</p>
14.4.12	<p>In light of the above comments, do HS2 Ltd propose to use J29A M1?</p>
14.4.16 - 14.4.17	<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>
14.4.18	<p>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).</p>
14.4.19	<p>It is noted that potential effects on parking and loading 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	<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 majority of these bus services are provided on a commercial basis by operators with no direct support from local or central government. Prolonged diversions to other roads in the area will increase 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 the rail network will be reported in the formal ES. This will need to take into account any effects on both passenger and freight operations over the wider rail network.</p>
14.4.23	<p>It is noted that not all PRoWs within the Markham Vale scheme have been identified nor mitigated.</p>
14.4.25	<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>

14.4.26	<p>Under DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 6 - Para 11.7 provision should be made for ongoing restoration of the canal and this appears to have been entirely omitted.</p> <p>The document suggests that the Proposed Scheme would have 'no significant effect'. The scheme has made no accommodation for the canal at Staveley or Norwood and will in fact sever the route and cause the already restored section to be redundant.</p> <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>
14.4.30	No mention of A6192 Erin Road nor of Seymour Link Road.
14.5.6	<p>There is no reference to the Chesterfield and Staveley Regeneration Route. HS2 was made aware of development proposals back in January 2013 consultation and as a result, adjusted the footprint of the IMD in subsequent publications 2017. The County Council and their development partners are extremely disappointed that the current footprint of the depot compromises the route, and therefore steralises development opportunities around the Staveley Works Area. This needs to be addressed at the earliest opportunity to ensure planned growth can be facilitated.</p> <p>Alongside the Chesterfield Station Masterplan, the Northern Growth Zone is designed to accommodate and complement the Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD) at Staveley and connectivity improvements between here and Chesterfield Station delivered through the Chesterfield-Staveley Regeneration Route (CSRR). This is a major intervention, facilitating significant housing and employment development, and is receiving significant current investment towards design and business case preparation. The major landowners along this corridor are fully engaged in this work. The IMD, though, places significant constraints on both the quantum of development achievable and on the alignment of the CSRR. These are issues are acknowledged by HS2 Ltd, which is welcome, but much remains to be done through further engagement to ensure that the needs of all parties can be met in full.</p> <p>At this stage, the operational impacts of the IMD are not fully understood. Inevitably, though, maintenance activities will be concentrated within off-peak periods for passenger services, mostly at night. It is anticipated that lighting at the IMD, movement of maintenance trains and vehicular traffic associated with its workforce shift changes could all be significant impacts on adjacent communities.</p>

14.5.7	No mention of the Seymour Link Road overbridge.
14.5.12	The proposed 4 HS2 trains an hour on the existing Midland Mainline and 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 then further north where it joins the Midland Mainline to Sheffield needs to be increased to ensure there are sufficient paths for all existing and proposed services.
14.5.13	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.
14.5.14	<p>Information regarding new footpath and greenway routes which are not yet included in the adopted RoW network at Markham Vale was provided to HS2 in January 2018. It is disappointing to see that this information was not included in the plans published in October. New routes at Markham Vale should be considered for continuity and severance impacts in the same way as definitive RoW routes.</p> <p>This comment relates specifically to Public Footpath Killamarsh 47 and Barlbough 25. A proposed bridleway extension from Woodall is planned to use the M1 underpass and upgrade these 2 footpaths to form a multi user trail across the Yorkshire-Derbyshire Local County boundary. The proposed diversion of the route alongside Rotherham Road would need to provide a 3m wide shared use path separated from the carriageway by a 1m wide verge for the full section to connect with the bridleway at Pebley Oaks east of the M1 underpass.</p> <p>This comment relates specifically to Public Footpath Barlbough 6. The use of the M1 underpass as a safe means of accessing the countryside from the community of Barlborough shall be lost. The re-alignment along Sheffield Road should provide a 3m wide shared use path to allow for safe and pleasant access the physical barriers.</p>

14.5.14 (cont)1	<p>With regard to Public Bridleway 12 Woodhouse Lane, a proposed multi user trail has been identified to connect Woodhouse Lane with Slayley Lane to connect to the Clowne Branch Greenway at Barlborough Common. Where the route is proposed to be diverted a suitable crossing and receiving 3m wide path should be considered along the length of A619 Worksop Road/Chesterfield Road.</p> <p>This comment relates specifically to Public Footpath Staveley 30. A major strategic route is under construction to connect Clowne to Chesterfield (and wider NCN6 to Trans Pennine Trail). It is important that the realignment and over bridge of footpath 30 is constructed to accommodate this onward trail and provide a connection to Poolesbrook Country Park. A minimum width should allow for a 3m wide path with suitable parapets on the bridge to accommodate a bridleway. This should also be constructed to connect to the existing trail (not shown on map CT-06-633 in the LA map book) constructed east of FP30 to Seymour Link Road as part of the Markham Vale Growth Zone development. The resulting route between Erin Road and Seymour Link Road should (once constructed) be dedicated a public bridleway. However, the resulting location of the proposed realigned FP30 and overbridge is not shown on the map number CT-06-633 in the LA11 map book. It is assumed that this is an oversight and the overbridge will accommodate higher access rights to accommodate the trail at this location.</p> <p>This comment relates specifically to Public Footpaths Staveley 29 and 28. The realignment of these paths to fit with the realignment of B6419 Bolsover Road warrants further discussion with regard to the additional trail development that is occurring in this area to develop Derbyshire's Key Cycle Network. The Clowne Branch Line is under development as a multiuser Greenway and there are plans to connect this to and develop the disused Oxcroft Branch Railway. At delivery of HS2 2b the western section of the Clowne Branch Line shall be used by the proposed HS2 development and an alternative alignment will need to be provided to Seymour Link Road/Poolesbrook Country Park. Further discussion is required to agree a preferred route for the planned multi user trail.</p> <p>The suggestion to reinstate FP1 via footbridge for users of the TPT & Cuckoo Way (the former including cyclists and equestrian users!) is unfeasible.</p>
-----------------	--

14.5.14(cont)2	<p>Realignment of FP47 as shown would introduce an unacceptable gradient on approach to the rail bridge. A ramped infill would sever the restoration route of the Chesterfield canal unless FP47 bridge is extended or replicated to link with the existing route on the north side of the canal cutting'.</p> <p>The diverted line of FP50 will require an additional bridge crossing of the recently restored length of the Chesterfield Canal immediately to the east of Eckington Road bridge.</p> <p>The existing line of FP64 is incorrectly shown on plan CT-06-634. The diversion of FP64 shown is substantive and severs public access alongside the east fringe of the River Doe Lea flood corridor. An underpass should be considered where the path is shown as closed so that users can pass from north to south or vice versa along the east fringe of the floodplain as presently.</p> <p>No mention is made for accommodation of the proposed Oxcroft Branch Greenway. This will provide future community NMU linkage from Oxcroft & Stanfree toward Staveley, the TPT and Chesterfield Canal and will provide the only substantive 'bridge' crossing beneath both the M1 and future HS2 routes, (following the proposed closure of the western end of the Clowne Branch Greenway by HS2).</p>
14.5.16	<p>If both routes above are lost to public use, FP28 will need to be upgraded to Bridleway standard and status. Suitable provision is required for its crossing of the B6419 to enable an onward route toward Staveley, the TPT and the Chesterfield Canal. This could be provided through a similar standard and status upgrade to FP27 or by inclusion of an additional NMU route to link with the existing stone surfaced track at Markham Vale and shown on Plan CT-06-635 (B4).</p>
14.5.22 and 14.5.38	<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-05-632	<p>Within this plan there is a structural asset identified within the Highway Authorities Structural Register No C47853 (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.</p> <p>This plan shows significant realignment of the existing highway network on Hall Lane and the construction of an overbridge on B6053 Eckington Road. 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 are required to provide the Highway Authority with detailed information surrounding these proposals and in depth discussions are required.</p>
CT-05-634	<p>Within this plan there is an omission as the HS2 line is shown to sever Seymour Link Road, but no infrastructure provision is shown as to how this impact will be mitigated.</p>
CT-05-635	<p>Within this plan there is a structural asset identified within the Highway Authorities Structural Register No C47068 (Highway Authority). This structure appears to be impacted by the proposed construction works. HS2 project team will need to undertake in depth discussions with the Highway Authority to provide detailed information about the proposals and impact upon this structure.</p> <p>This plan shows significant realignment and stopping up of the existing highway network on B6419 Bolsover Road. The HS2 Project team have not sought 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 Highway Authority has 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 are required to provide the Highway Authority with detailed information surrounding these proposals and in depth discussions are required.</p>

CT-05-637	<p>This plan shows significant realignment and stopping up of the existing highway network on Sheffield Road. The HS2 Project team have not sought 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.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has 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 are required to provide the Highway Authority with detailed information surrounding these proposals and in depth discussions are required. Also amendment is shown to Westfield Lane again this proposal has not been discussed with the Highway Authority.</p>
-----------	--

1.15 Water Resources & Flood Risk, Section 15.

Document: Volume 2: CFA LA11: STAVELEY TO ASTON	
Paragraph reference	Full ES comment
15.1.2	There are several water features, surface water drains and ponds that do not yet fall within the remit of the named consultees but have been constructed under planning approval as part of the Markham Vale regeneration scheme. HS2 Ltd do not appear to have included these within their surveys nor assessments.
15.3.5	<p>The level of detail is insufficient to allow pin-point accuracy of the water features listed in the table.</p> <p>Table 36: Note that tributaries of the Doe Lea and Smithy Brook are hydrologically connected to the Chesterfield Canal restoration and as such, any impact identified as a result of HS2 construction should take impact on the Chesterfield Canal into account.</p>
15.3.20	<p>There are several water features, surface water drains and ponds that have not been identified in previous sections of the report so presumably this assessment does not include them and will need revising.</p> <p>The recently GCN Ponds (part of the Markham Vale project) adjacent to the western end of the Staveley East embankment (not identified by HS2 Ltd) are surface water fed.</p>
15.3.22	Bluebank Pools LWS needs to be included.

15.3.27	Table 38: Chesterfield Canal has been classed as low risk of flooding. The canal restoration is not complete and it will not be hydrologically stable until such time as it has. HS2 should undertake a study on the flood risk impact of the resulting isolated 5 mile section.
15.4.5	The impact of the realignment of the Doe Lea at Staveley on the Chesterfield Canal restoration is not clear.
15.4.15	There is insufficient detail provided regarding the replacement flood storage areas to replace those lost due to the construction of Staveley East Embankment. New floodplain is indicated at Map CT-06-634 to the north west of and including across part of the Markham North Tip but this is omitted entirely on map LA10 - CT-06-459-L1 and the proposed flood mitigation extents cannot be determined for consideration or comment.
15.4.16	<p>It 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 seeks 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 RMA's giving different advice. DCC has 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, this is unacceptable.</p>
15.4.28	There are several water features, surface water drains and ponds that have not been identified in previous sections of the report so DCC assumes that this assessment does not include them and will need revising.
15.4.35	The recent GCN Ponds (part of the Markham Vale project) adjacent to the western end of the Staveley East embankment (not identified by HS2 Ltd) are surface water fed.

15.4.37 and 15.4.39	<p>HS2 advises the project will result in the total loss of both the Doe Lea Flash LWS and Poolsbrook Flash LWS. It is unclear how HS2 intend to mitigate for loss of either the flood storage (see 15.4.43) within the existing river corridor upstream of the impacted site. How the provision of substitute habitat suitable for sustaining the variety of ecology present in these Local Wildlife Sites (see 7.4.4) will be provided is unclear. These provide a mosaic of habitat and are known to support a great crested newt population. A new floodplain is indicated at Map CT-06-634 to the north west of and including across part of the Markham North Tip but this is omitted entirely on map LA10 - CT-06-459-L1 and the proposed flood mitigation extents cannot be determined for consideration or comment.</p>
15.4.44	<p>The impact of the realignment of the Doe Lea at Staveley on the Chesterfield Canal is not clear.</p>
16. References	<p>Consultants should refer to the DCC adopted Waterways Strategy.</p>