

Consultation Response to Volume 2 General Responses to WDES Volume 2 CAR's

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------|--|-----------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 1 | INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| | 1.1 | General response to WDES Volume 2..... | 1 |
| | 1.2 | Introduction..... | 2 |
| | 2 | GENERIC COMMENTS ON WDES SECTIONS..... | 3 |
| | 2.1 | Agriculture, forestry and soils, Section 4..... | 3 |
| | 2.2 | Air Quality, Section 5 | 3 |
| | 2.3 | Community, Section 6..... | 4 |
| | 2.4 | Ecology and biodiversity, Section 7..... | 5 |
| | 2.5 | Health, Section 8 | 7 |
| | 2.6 | Historic environment, Section 9 | 8 |
| | 2.7 | Land quality, Section 10..... | 10 |
| | 2.8 | Landscape and visual assessment, Section 11 | 10 |
| | 2.9 | Socio Economic, Section 12..... | 14 |
| | 2.10 | Sound, Noise & Vibration, Section 13 | 14 |
| | 2.11 | Traffic and transport, incorporating PROW, highway design and Traffic Safety, Section 14..... | 15 |
| | 2.12 | Water Resources & Flood Risk, Section 15 | 17 |
| | 2.13 | Waste Management..... | 18 |

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General response to WDES Volume 2

1.1.1 This report provides the Council's generic comments for the various Community Area Reports (CAR) of the WDES Volume 2 within Derbyshire. It forms part of a suite of responses from Derbyshire County Council (DCC) and should be read in conjunction with the overarching comments made in respect of Volume 1 and others provided in Volume 3.

- LA05: Ratcliffe-on-Soar to Long Eaton LA06
- LA06: Stapleford to Nuthall
- LA07: Hucknall to Selston
- LA08: Pinxton to Newton and Huthwaite
- LA09: Stonebroom to Clay Cross
- LA10: Tibshelf to Shuttlewood
- LA11: Staveley to Aston
- MML01: Danesmoor to Brierley Bridge
- MML02: Unstone Green to Sheffield Station

1.1.2 More detailed comments on the CAR's are contained in separate local area volumes which also form part of this consultation response.

1.1.3 It has not been possible to conduct a full analysis of the WDES due to the relatively short duration of the consultation period and limited available data. It is the Council's expectation that HS2 Ltd pays due attention to the concerns raised in this response, addresses each point and mitigates accordingly prior to the deposit of the full ES. This will provide a robust position statement in which communities can have confidence and negate the necessity to see amendments through the Parliamentary process in the Commons and Lords.

1.1.4 The Council would welcome detailed dialogue on these matters going forward. The Council has significant concerns regarding the complexity of information contained in the CAR's. Examples of overlap between the different areas makes it difficult to follow. This is particularly confusing between LA10 and LA11 where several major structures such as the 40m viaduct over the M1 is shown in LA10 but described in LA11. The suggestion that the documents are simple to understand and that the average person only needs to read the chapter related to their locality to be assured that the assessment is sound is completely false. It is the Council's view that to make reasonable sense of the papers a person needs to have opened at least a number of volumes at the same time. Cross sections and photomontages would have been useful at this stage in helping illustrate the extent of the physical and visual impact of the proposed route through the area.

- 1.1.5 The very limited amount of detail presented in the WDES has resulted in limited understanding of the likely impact. For example, no earthworks are shown for access tracks and proposed river diversions and no there are no details of service diversions despite the need to relocate several pylons. These are significant implications of the proposal and more detail is required by the Council before any meaningful comments can be made.

1.2 Introduction.

- 1.2.1 In this section the Council's comments refer to the overall structure of the documents that form the WDES along with a number of general observations on the papers as a whole. To aid the reader we have, where possible, followed the sequence and order of issues raised and the methodology used by HS2 Ltd, namely:

- Agriculture, forestry and soils
- Air Quality
- Community – incorporating health related issues outside of the HIA.
- Ecology and biodiversity
- Health
- Historic environment
- Land quality
- Landscape and visual
- Socio-economics
- Sound, noise and vibration
- Traffic and transport, incorporating PROW, highway design and Traffic Safety
- Water Resources & Flood Risk.

- 1.2.2 Where a comment by the Council refers to a specific issue or map, a corresponding reference is included in the left hand column. Due to the limited time and information available, the Council has not been able to provide fully considered responses on every area of the environmental statement. The Council therefore wishes to reserve its right to make further comments and recommendations at a later date. There are a number of areas within the documents where the council has not offered a comment, this should not be taken as agreement or consent for the text. On these matters the Council would welcome further dialogue.

- 1.2.3 There are also a number of generic comments on issues not contained within the WDES itself namely:

- Future transport projects, including Key Cycle Network
- Opportunities for sustainable travel.

2 GENERIC COMMENTS ON WDES SECTIONS

2.1 Agriculture, forestry and soils, Section 4

- 2.1.1 The rural economy farming in particular, is a key economic sector in Derbyshire. The quality of soil/land, access to farms and around farms, (eg movement of animals), along with the visual amenity of the characteristic rural landscape are all essential elements of this successful economy. The impact of HS2 on these matters needs to be fully considered and, at present, the Council believes the WDES does not adequately address the issues. Further dialogue is welcomed. At this time therefore, the Council has limited comments to make. HS2 needs to be aware of the land classification to make sure that any high quality soils are conserved and preserved for future use.

2.2 Air Quality, Section 5

- 2.2.1 Please also refer to individual responses to each Community Area Reports (CAR).
- 2.2.2 Long Eaton; DCC welcomes the inclusion of a review of the impacts of viaduct design on urban airflow with specific reference to Long Eaton and the potential impact on environmental pollutant exposure.
- 2.2.3 DCC welcomes the inclusion of green walls and associated greening infrastructure to support mitigation of air pollution and improve the visual appearance of man-made structures. Such measures will also support irrigation and reduce flooding.
- 2.2.4 DCC welcomes engagement with borough and district Environmental Health teams throughout the process in order to ensure consideration of local impacts, suitable monitoring and appropriate mitigation measures. The Council has consistently advised the need to engage directly with the district team on these matters.
- 2.2.5 DCC welcomes the use of Euro VI vehicles within the fleet. However in the interests of supporting and leading 'good growth' the Council would strongly advocate the use of ULEV's where possible for rolling stock plant and machinery, (particularly construction vehicles).
- 2.2.6 DCC supports assessment and mitigation in line with the recently developed East Midlands Air Quality Network; Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Developers using the DfT Threshold Criteria for Transport Assessments [1] to assess impact and mitigations. However, it is noted that guidance includes the Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT, 1994), Guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessment. The IHT Guidelines suggest that the scoping of Transport Assessments should include all links and associated junctions where traffic will exceed 10% of existing tow-way traffic (or 5% in congested or other sensitive

locations) or such other thresholds as may have been established by the Highway Authority. However, it is concerning to note that these considerations are proposed to be addressed only in the formal ES. The Council requests that more detailed dialogue with the highway authority is undertaken as soon as possible on the Transport Assessment.

- 2.2.7 DCC notes the assessment of construction traffic impacts will use traffic data based on estimates of the average daily flows and assume vehicle emission rates and background pollution concentrations from the year 2023. Such modelling is based on assumptions regarding decreasing trends in air pollution levels. DCC recommend monitoring and assessment during the pre-construction, construction and operational phases to ensure accurate assessment of baseline and impacts.
- 2.2.8 DCC note the use of the DEFRA baseline data which utilises 1km grid squares; however the Council would wish to ensure monitoring at source where sensitive receptors are known in order to monitor actual impacts.
- 2.2.9 It is not evident from the report whether local monitoring data has been utilised during initial assessment or will be utilised during further assessment. DCC advocates the use of actual monitored data above modelled data where this is available.
- 2.2.10 DCC notes the reports seek to identify AQMAs within respective areas. It must be noted that AQMAs will be subject to change and whilst areas may not currently have AQMAs in operation the increase in traffic created by construction may result in poorer air quality at local levels, therefore requiring the declaration of AQMAs.
- 2.2.11 The report does not include the area around the A38 near junction 28 of the M1 identified within the Clean Air Strategy. This is a key omission and should be addressed.
- 2.2.12 DCC advises close consultation with borough and district councils to ensure accurate identification and positioning of sensitive receptors.
- 2.2.13 DCC welcomes the publication of evidence to support the assumption that CoCP measures will be effective in ensuring effective mitigation in order to support the statement “no significant effects from dust generating activities”.
- 2.2.14 The Council reserves its position on these matters until such time as more detailed information is available.

2.3 Community, Section 6.

- 2.3.1 Please also refer to individual responses to each CAR.

2.3.2 The Council is extremely concerned that there is no assessment for blight which is affecting the existing communities and businesses and which will continue until construction is completed in 2033.

2.3.3 The impact on social and economic wellbeing of those affected is unknown without the benefit of a more detailed economic impact assessment. See Volume 1 for further comments.

2.4 Ecology and biodiversity, Section 7.

2.4.1 The Ecology section of the SMR report would appear to be largely unaltered from the draft version we were consulted on in September 2017. As such, it fails to respond to the issues and criticisms DCC raised at that time.

2.4.2 Generally, the approach taken is as expected, and can be supported. However;

- Survey methods will “follow recognised methodologies (deviating only where considered appropriate)” it is not currently possible to comment on the detailed approaches taken in respect of survey methodologies.
- The suggestion that the scheme will only seek to deliver no net loss of biodiversity causes some concern at this stage. A firm commitment that the scheme will deliver no net loss of biodiversity would be warmly welcomed by DCC, and would better fit with government policy and aspirations, and accord better with other regimes such as planning policy and the National Planning Policy Framework. Early agreement should be sought with stakeholders about how ‘no net loss’ is measured and demonstrated, including clarity in how irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland will be considered and addressed.
- DCC very strongly encourages early, meaningful and sustained dialogue with ecological consultees and stakeholders throughout the process, from data acquisition and survey planning, through scheme detail design and on to mitigation/compensation development and to the delivery phase. Such consultees should naturally include statutory nature conservation bodies, local authorities and wildlife and environmental charities. Engagement and consultation with forums such as the Ecology Technical Group, (voluntarily formed by wildlife charities), local authority ecologists and others would be particularly useful.

2.4.3 DCC encourages the use of green or brown roof design for the built infrastructure to help mitigate habitat loss.

Volume 2: Community Area reports

2.4.4 LA05: Ratcliffe-on-Soar to Long Eaton

2.4.5 The ecology sections of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement have been written taking account of a mix of ecological survey and assessment work, including desktop studies, consultations and field surveys. However, it is quite apparent that whilst the desktop study work is largely complete, much of the field survey work has yet to be finished and in some areas may not yet have even been started due to access restrictions. The result is that whilst the ecology sections of the ES appear to have a reasonable understanding of the potential impacts of the Proposed Scheme upon designated sites, (both statutorily designated and non-statutorily designated sites), and to a lesser extent the potential for impacts on habitats along the route, the potential for impacts on species and other receptors is currently poorly understood. Firm proposals for mitigation and compensation are lacking especially in relation to these impacts and the Council requests that further dialogue is undertaken in this regard.

2.4.6 Taking the Volume 2 report for area LA05 as an example of the above approach, is exemplified in paragraphs 7.2.2 and 7.2.3:

- 7.2.2 In the absence of field surveys and fully developed mitigation, the assessment has been undertaken on a realistic precautionary approach.
- 7.2.3 Field surveys are ongoing but are limited to locations where landowner permission has been obtained and to areas accessible to the public. The findings from these ongoing surveys will be taken into account in the formal ES.

2.4.7 Section 7.3 adequately describes the designated sites found along the route. The baseline identification of habitats however frequently awaits clarification or verification through further survey, the results of which area awaited. With regards to protected and notable species, the baseline has been established only through desktop study identifying the presence of species within the wider area. Habitat suitability assessment for those species, the results of field surveys, are generally absent. Similarly, section 7.3 includes reference to areas of land which will be used for ecological enhancement, including for example, the River Erewash Floodplain Local Wildlife Site, a site already of county-level ecological importance. However, in the absence of ecological surveys to establish the existing ecological value of this area and detailed ecological mitigation and enhancement proposals, it has not been possible for the Council to undertake any kind of ecological loss/gain calculation or ascribe any ecological value to the enhancement proposals. More detailed information is awaited.

2.4.8 Section 7.4 Effects arising during construction. Based on the information available, the initial avoidance and mitigation measures proposed, (i.e. those measures implemented to minimise or avoid ecological impacts before assessing the residual impacts arising from the proposals), seem reasonable. With regards to the assessment of impacts and effects (7.4.4), these seem reasonable where

the attribute of concern is a designated site or other feature which is mapped and where direct construction-related impacts are easily foreseen. The assessment of impacts on habitats however has less certainty, pending the results of further survey.

- 2.4.9 The level of assessment of impacts on species is however rather disappointing. In each respect, whilst the potential presence of these species is acknowledged and the likely sources of impacts are identified, impacts on specific receptors, (bat roosts, otter holts, great crested newt ponds etc), cannot be considered effectively as surveys are not sufficiently complete. On that basis, the approach is simply to conclude that impacts are possible but of unknown significance, and to accordingly assume that impacts could be of up to county or regional level importance. At this stage, this is a less than ideal situation, but DCC would suggest that if this persists to the formal ES, the lack of robust data to inform an impact assessment would be deeply troubling. More active dialogue is therefore requested.
- 2.4.10 'Other mitigation measures' which could be implemented are pending the results of the ongoing ecological surveys. Again, whilst many of the ideas suggested could be appropriate, the lack of detail and the lack of a firm commitment to deliver these measures makes their worth difficult to assess, and again, it would be troubling if this were to persist into the final version of the ES. More active dialogue is therefore requested.
- 2.4.11 The next section summarises the likely residual significant effects, taking account of the mitigation already proposed. It is troubling to see that for a great number of receptors, impacts are still foreseen that could be significant at the county (sometimes district/borough) level, even taking into account the mitigation measures already proposed. Whilst operational impacts (section 7.5) are less widespread and affect a much narrower suite of receptors, it is troubling that here too, significant impacts of up to regional-level significance are foreseen, even following the implementation of mitigation measures.
- 2.4.12 The ecology section of the report seemingly fails to resolve whether more can, or should be done to address these residual impacts. More active dialogue is therefore requested.
- 2.4.13 Overall then, whilst the assessment of impacts on designated sites appears reasonably robust, on the data available, the lack of data in relation to other receptors, and the lack of proposals for the mitigation of impacts, means the scheme would appear to deliver significant ecological impacts, the scale and significance of which are currently unknown. The Council have therefore not been able to provide a robust response to this issue.

2.5 Health, Section 8

- 2.5.1 Please refer to individual responses to each CAR.

2.6 Historic environment, Section 9

- 2.6.1 The comments below are without prejudice and combine both archaeological and built historic environment comments under the general heading of the 'historic environment'.
- 2.6.2 The comments made by other consultants have been reviewed as part of this process and are supported in principal. These include:
- Historic England; with reference to their current comments dated 8th March 2017.
 - The National Trust; with reference to their response (6th September 2017) to mitigate the effects of HS2 between Tibshelf and M1 Junction 29, with reference to Hardwick Hall and Estate.
- 2.6.3 Further, as the historic environment is inextricably linked to Derbyshire's rich landscape character, the comments provided in the landscape section of this response are also supported. It is advised these are taken into consideration to help mitigate any adverse visual impacts as far as is practicable.
- 2.6.4 For historic environment, the intention is to consider impact on features within a 500m rural or 250m urban span outside the land to be taken for the rail corridor itself. In the case of linear features such as canals, the impact of severance is far greater in extent than could be envisaged within 500m of the rail corridor in that severance at any location for current navigations is critical to the operation of that entire navigation into the future. Severance or impact on a 1km reach could jeopardise operation of many more km of existing or proposed navigation / waterway.
- 2.6.5 As an example, severance of Chesterfield Canal at Norwood (west of Wales) would deny all chance of restoration and re-opening of the canal as a viable navigation right back to Chesterfield itself, (14 miles/22km or more), and would similarly inhibit opportunity for the Rother Valley Link circuit creation. Severance even at Staveley would, prevent use of the 5 miles of existing restored canal right back to Chesterfield. Severance at either location could thus put the whole of the partially restored historic feature at risk. This has significant implications for the wider growth ambitions of northern Derbyshire generally and the visitor economy specifically. There needs be a higher priority impact set for severance of a linear water feature which requires continuity and maintenance of a fixed water level.
- 2.6.6 For landscape and visual assessment it is standard practice to look at a 2km study area. This is particularly relevant for sections with a rail corridor on elevated embankments or new structures.
- 2.6.7 The historic environment study is at a very early stage and it is consequently difficult for the Council to make specific and detailed comments, in particular with regard to archaeological impacts. The WDES contains an incomplete desk-based

assessment of heritage assets, mapping only designated heritage assets. There is:

- no archaeological field evaluation (even non-intrusive work),
- no details of the risk-modelling approach for prioritising archaeological surveys beyond a proposed methodology,
- no assessment of historic landscape character, and
- no historic environment viewpoints or visualisations.

- 2.6.8 NPPF policy embodies a process of understanding heritage significance at the point of determination and then making a determination on planning balance. The lack of progress and consultation thus far on heritage assessment risks leaving the final ES with a weak historic environment baseline and undermines the overall growth strategy which is the express value of HS2.
- 2.6.9 This problem is exacerbated by an almost complete lack of engagement and consultation thus far on historic environment matters. It is regrettable there has been no consultation to date from the consultants carrying out the ES with either Derbyshire HER (beyond the supply of shapefile data) or with the County Council's archaeological officers. DCC has not been invited to meetings with Historic England (e.g.) to discuss the settings of some of the county's principal archaeological assets. This approach risks the omission of important additional data layers within the HER (for example the 'grey literature' library) and the local expertise of the relevant officers. More critically, it is endangering a consensus approach to achieving the best possible design and mitigation outcomes in relation to the county's heritage assets and the associated tourism economy.
- 2.6.10 DCC's greatest concern in relation to the historic environment work to date is the general under-assessment of setting impacts to designated heritage assets within the WDES volumes, particularly where there is no direct impact (i.e. because the scheme passes close to the asset). This is particularly noticeable with some of the higher value assets such as the groups at Hardwick Halls/Park, Bolsover Castle, and Sutton Scarsdale Hall, but also applies to other assets such as the Grade II Listed Brookhill Hall at Pinxton (Vol 2 LA08 9.4.5). This under-assessment partly arises from an overly coarse-grained approach to heritage weighting e.g. weighting the Hardwick assets the same as some Grade II Listed Buildings. However, there also seems to be a reluctance on the part of the consultants to assess at the higher levels of impact where there are no direct impacts or where there are existing detractors. In some cases these assessments clash directly with the results of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) study (for example at Hardwick), and the conclusions reached lack credibility. Where the contribution of setting to significance for internationally important heritage assets hinges critically on designed views over the Vale of Scarsdale, this should be properly acknowledged in the relevant setting studies and reflected in the levels of change and effect assessed.

- 2.6.11 Due to its scale and length, the HS2 line will impact on areas of the historic environment with multiple overlapping sensitivities. This is particularly evident on the M1 Corridor alignment which cuts through the aforementioned trio of Grade I Listed Buildings of international significance. It is these assets in particular, and their encompassing historic landscapes, which have the potential to be impacted on by the route and so it is vital that impacts and mitigation strategies are considered more holistically. Unfortunately, the current WDES considers the measure of any impact on these heritage assets individually, so the wider collective impact is under-represented.
- 2.6.12 'Historic Environment Overview' sections in each LA volume are drawn from known data alone, principally sites on National Heritage List for England (NHLE) and Derbyshire Historic Environment Record (HER). Although this is inevitable given the stage the project is at, it is important to acknowledge that known data provides a partial overview. Large parts of the route through eastern Derbyshire are historically under-researched and imperfectly understood and have few known sites. This is sometimes achieved, but not always (e.g. Vol2b LA08 9.3.9 "Romano-British activity within the 500m study area is limited to two areas where pottery has been recovered").

2.7 Land quality, Section 10

- 2.7.1 The report does not mention the potential contamination arising from previous land use as railway or rail sidings which applies across the whole HS2 route. It should be noted that the previous heavy industrial heritage (coal etc) in the county has left many scars such as post-contaminated land, pumping station and capped degraded sites. In addition to the points raised earlier regarding the quality of farmland and waste/minerals excavation and disposal, this issue requires more detailed discussion with the Council.
- 2.7.2 Given the limited information available, the Council has no further comment to make at this time but does have individual responses in some CARs.

2.8 Landscape and visual assessment, Section 11

General Issues

- 2.8.1 The whole consultation exercise would have been easier if plans in the various Map Books had been orientated with the north point to the top of the plan or certainly no worse than a 90 degree turn clockwise. For example, drawing reference CT-06-602a has a north point orientated at about 170 degrees making it exceedingly difficult to orientate the plans with other maps and plans used to reference other data.
- 2.8.2 Throughout Volume 2 there is repeated reference to the commencement of consultation with Local Authorities along the route of HS2. With regard to landscape and visual issues this has largely been in the form of presentations by HS2 on the overarching approach with more specific consultation on the

definition of landscape character areas (LCA) and the location of representative viewpoints along the route. Overall, engagement has been very limited and it remains unclear as to the extent that comments provided by local authorities and others have been considered and addressed in the WDES.

- 2.8.3 The approach using local Landscape Character Areas is welcomed and supported in principle but some concern has already been expressed to the HS2 consultants with regard to the definition of these areas. These are described throughout Volume 2 as 'adaptions' of existing published landscape character assessments such as the 'Landscape Character of Derbyshire' document. With regard to this point see below the response made to Arup+ in relation to the definition of local LCAs:

"Without the detailed descriptions of the proposed landscape character areas defined within the study, it is not clear what distinguishes one LCA from another. For example, it is not clear what distinguishes Sutton Estate Farmlands to the north of Sutton Scarsdale from the Wooded Farmlands to the south. Both of these areas fall within the Estate Farmlands LCT as defined in the Derbyshire LCA and there seems very little justification for the separation of these two areas based on either their 'estate' or 'wooded' characteristics. If Wooded Farmlands was to be defined as a separate LCA I would expect it to form the area to the east of the HS2 corridor with a boundary formed by the District boundary and consistent with the Wooded Farmlands in the Derbyshire LCA.

I am a little concerned about the negative connotations attached to some LCA names... [which] give the impression (from their names) of poor quality areas and as a result, likely to be judged as landscapes of low sensitivity and quality. However, these are areas where there has been (and still is) significant investment in their regeneration and are still in the early stages of recovering from past industrial activities associated with coal mining. It is important to distinguish landscape character from landscape impacts and not conflate the two. I would not wish to see the current baseline be a justification for sub-standard design particularly when the local authorities in the area are striving to improve the environmental quality of these areas. The loss of a contiguous river corridor within the assessment is also worrying because river floodplains are linear landscapes and it is important visually and functionally that this linearity and connectivity is maintained as part of any development and this could have ramifications for the detailed design of the route.

A potential weakness of the LVIA process is that it often under-assesses the adverse effects of existing development on landscape character and visual amenity and where existing adverse effects are recognised they are then applied as a mitigating factor for new development – in other words poor quality development leading to more poor quality development. The local authorities in the area do not support that approach and are keen to secure not only mitigation of potential adverse effects associated with HS2 but environmental enhancement to redress long standing harm to the landscape. In this section that might include

enhancements as the route passes close to Hardwick Park such as the consideration of a land bridge that might be used to reconnect the landscape and reinstate an original historic access route to the Hall. At Coalite, where the route directly impacts on the site, consideration might be given to the role HS2 could play in remediating the contamination associated with this site, which could open the door to less intensive redevelopment of the remaining site to create greater opportunity for landscape and green infrastructure enhancements.”

- 2.8.4 DCC is concerned at the way the landscape and visual impact assessments have been constructed. Within each CAR forming Volume 2 of the WDES, the LVIA outlines the number of LCAs defined within each area and then compares this number with the number of LCAs where there would be significant adverse effects on landscape character. Invariably those areas that receive the most significant adverse effects are those that are directly impacted by the line of the route. Other LCAs within the study area may not experience any direct landscape effects or only short-term effects associated with the construction and are unlikely to experience significant long-term landscape effects. DCC do not accept that counting up the number of significantly affected areas and comparing those against those areas that won't be significantly affected is a basis for overall acceptability. By taking all the community areas together for Derbyshire, there are at least 15 LCAs that will still experience significant adverse effects in year 15 of operation. This constitutes what would be perceived as a near continuous landscape corridor running through the County and the fact that other areas within the wider study area remain less affected doesn't justify a less than optimal environmental design for the scheme in these areas.
- 2.8.5 Furthermore, it is difficult to appreciate how the particular characteristics of the landscape, whether locally defined in the WDES or at a county scale, have informed the overall design of the scheme. As such the scheme proposes landscape mitigation that is very much at odds with the established character of the landscape such as that shown on drawing number CT-06-457-L1 near Sutton Scarsdale; rather than mitigating the adverse effects of the scheme the landscaping is likely to add to them. Overall, the general approach to landscape mitigation appears to be uniformly planting trees along both sides of the route to screen the route. There are locations along the route such as the section of the route north of the M1 near Deepdale Farm, Sutton Scarsdale (drawing no LV-04-394 (Volume 2: Tibshelf to Shuttlewood)) where the planting of trees to screen views seems to be at odds with the description of the established landscape character and would be inappropriate. In this area defined as Sutton Estate Farmland LCA (page 182, Volume 2: Tibshelf to Shuttlewood), the landscape is described as having an “open character combined with the rising topography contributes to a larger sense of landscape scale” with “the perception of the valley landscape and its relationship with the historic features”; an observation supported by the Derbyshire landscape character area which describes the area as being “an open landscape with long distance views” with “a paucity of tree cover”. It is difficult to appreciate how this description of landscape character has informed the landscape mitigation proposals in this section of the route.

- 2.8.6 It is not clear why embankments haven't been graded out into the surrounding farmland to allow for farming to continue up to the boundary of the route and allow for better integration with the established landscape character. The Council note that the grading out of embankments is shown in other sections of the route such as to the north of Wales/Kiveton Park, (drawing number CT-06-641 LA11: Staveley to Aston), even though in this case the entire slope would be planted, which seems to render the grading out of the embankment pointless.
- 2.8.7 There appears to be discrepancies in the extent of the proposed landscape planting between the drawings in the CT-06 series of plans (proposed scheme) of the map books and those shown in the LV-04 series of plans. The CT-06 series show no planting on embankments and cuttings whereas the CT-04 series sometimes show embankments and cuttings as being planted e.g. LV-04-394. This discrepancy needs to be clarified to fully understand the likely impact of the proposed scheme.
- 2.8.8 With respect to visual impact assessment, comments and concerns on the approach have also been provided to the consultants operating on behalf of HS2 in the preparation of the WDES. The general concern shared with the consultants in earlier correspondence (Arup+, 16 March 2018) is as follows;
- "From a general point of view it will be important that the LVIA takes a balanced view to the assessment of landscape and visual effects so that it can be used to inform the design of the route as part of an iterative process. In this context it will be important to have a range of views that assess the proposed corridor in wider views as well as at close quarters where the effects are likely to be greatest and most significant. My understanding from the presentation by HS2 Ltd at their Birmingham office in January is that landscape mitigation will primarily be focused on addressing significant effects so it will be important that adverse effects are accurately assessed in the first instance if the appropriate mitigation is to be applied. The concern is that impacts of a low to moderate nature would not be assessed as significant with respect to the LVIA methodology and would therefore not justify any significant mitigation or enhancement".*
- 2.8.9 In this regard, DCC is concerned that the viewpoints identified in the LV-03 and LV-04 series of plans in the Volume 2 Map Books only identifies the "Significantly Affected Viewpoints" and may well have underestimated the impact from more distant locations particularly where these might be elevated vantage points. The detailed assessment work forms part of Volume 5 which is not available at the present time so DCC would wish to reserve its right to comment on this information when it becomes available.
- 2.8.10 Although drawings at this stage may still be indicative, DCC is concerned with the way certain landscape details are shown on the plans. All balancing ponds and river realignments such as that shown for the River Doe Lea on drawing number CT-06-633 should be designed and NOT engineered so that they integrate with existing features and maximise their value for ecology. The precise location and

design of balancing ponds should be carefully considered so that they also sit comfortably alongside existing landscape features and do not in themselves introduce other incongruous elements into the landscape. This should also include access roads and tracks shown for the maintenance of these features. More detailed discussions regarding the creation, maintenance and transfer and indemnity of all assets, including balancing ponds, is requested by the Council.

- 2.8.11 It is not clear the extent to which the lighting associated with construction compounds and satellites has been considered as part of the LVIA and the concern is that these impacts have been significantly down played. Light pollution particularly from those compounds where some overnight accommodation is proposed, could be considerable and more information is requested by the Council.
- 2.8.12 There are a number of errors and inconsistencies on the LV series of drawings. For example: earth bunds are shown on LV-04-391 but not on the corresponding CT-06-453; incorrect earthworks around balancing ponds LV-04-392; access track details are shown on LV-04-395 but not CT-06-458.
- 2.8.13 There are a very limited number of photomontage locations. DCC requests that this number is increased to include, as a minimum, the most significant structures and embankments along the route. This should include the 40m high M1 North Viaduct (LV-04-397a) and other very large embankments and cuttings.

2.9 Socio Economic, Section 12

- 2.9.1 The socio-economic benefits of the HS2 proposals, but also the potential negative impacts, cannot be under estimated. It is acknowledged the WDES does not fundamentally address the social and economic impacts and, as stated in Volume 1, a more detailed economic impact assessment would be welcomed. Blight to properties, severance of communities, noise and other disturbance from construction traffic etc. all need to be fully considered, understood and mitigated. The Council would very much welcome more detailed discussion.
- 2.9.2 For example, there is concern regarding ongoing blight to land and property along the route. This has impacted further extension of the Chesterfield Canal by limiting funding. Large swathes of land will be sterilised for use during the construction period. DCC urge HS2 to fully compensate those affected and support the business community.
- 2.9.3 Please refer to individual responses to each CAR and Volume 3 response.

2.10 Sound, Noise & Vibration, Section 13

- 2.10.1 Please also refer to individual responses to each CAR plus other comments made in Volume 1 regarding residential amenity.

- 2.10.2 DCC support the undertaking of baseline measurement around sound levels, and the use of quantitative methods to assess sound and vibration in the formal ES.
- 2.10.3 DCC welcomes assessment against the World Health Organisation guidance around night noise.
- 2.10.4 The report states assessment will take into consideration changes in noise in the future. The electrification of road vehicles should not be overestimated, given the rural location of Derbyshire. Issues such as the provision of charging points and the range of vehicles are likely to have a bigger impact on peoples willingness to switch to electric vehicles here than in a more urban environment.
- 2.10.5 DCC would support continued noise and vibration monitoring through production and operation stages in order to assess the effectiveness of mitigation measures.
- 2.10.6 DCC would welcome supporting evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of mitigation measures outlined.
- 2.10.7 DCC welcome the inclusion of the impact of changes in traffic flows on noise.
- 2.11 Traffic and transport, incorporating PROW, highway design and Traffic Safety, Section 14**
- 2.11.1 The Council is very concerned regarding the limited level of engagement from HS2 with the Highway Authority; the fact that an informed Transport Assessment (TA) has yet to be provided makes it impossible to provide informed and meaningful comment. Unfortunately, without the TA, the Council is unable to truly evaluate the impact the proposals will have on the traffic and transport elements of proposed route and planned construction arrangements. The Highway Authority also has grave concerns in relation to the confidence of information/data provided within the WDES in relation to highway network impacts. DCC requests a far more detailed dialogue about the construction proposals and the outputs from the TA with HS2 as these are seen as essential to supporting the general growth strategy and specifically to ensuring appropriate mitigation of construction traffic on the highway network.
- 2.11.2 There is a considerable lack of detail showing the alterations to the existing highway network. Given this lack of information, the Council is unable at this time to undertake a technical assessment to inform this response. DCC is particularly concerned regarding the impact of works to the M1 junctions and alignment. Construction work on the M1 corridor needs to be very carefully sequenced to ensure the absolute minimum disruption to users and the effective movement of goods, people and services that support the local economy.
- 2.11.3 The project proposes to alter considerable sections of highway network within Derbyshire and by doing so will realign and sever numerous highway sections. DCC is extremely disappointed at the lack of engagement around these specific elements. Where a highway section is to be severed by the project and the

remaining sections of highway will provide no public benefit, DCC will stipulate that these sections of highway be stopped up and ownership reverted to the subsoil owner/adjacent land owner. In depth consultation will need to be undertaken in relation to the stopping up of any highway section within Derbyshire. The current discussions undertaken by HS2 on property and asset matters does not include such issues and will need to be addressed.

- 2.11.4 DCC needs to be provided with detailed phasing plans for the project and robust travel plans/arrangements to identify the transport activities to and from the proposed site compounds. Also, far more detail is required in relation to siting of the access points off highway to ensure they are safe and suitable.
- 2.11.5 DCC is extremely disappointed and surprised that throughout the documents there is no mention of where the responsibility lies for ongoing maintenance of new drainage infrastructure, sustainable or otherwise, that is to be constructed by the project. This element must be addressed and clearly identified. Unless the infrastructure purely drains the highway network DCC, as Highway Authority, will not adopt this infrastructure and the responsibility will remain with the subsoil owner or a responsible body.
- 2.11.6 Within all the supporting plans for the project a large number of 'HS2 Access roads' are proposed. The supporting documentation does not make reference to whether these are to be permanent or temporary elements of infrastructure. As they do not appear to derive any highway related benefit, the Highway Authority would like to clearly inform HS2 that there is no intention to enter into any form of negotiation in relation to future adoption of this infrastructure.
- 2.11.7 Within all the supporting plans for the project there is an overwhelming number of main construction compounds, satellite construction compounds and construction traffic routes. Unfortunately, given the lack of information within the WDES, DCC is unable to provide a meaningful assessment at this stage. It is to be noted that all these elements will have a significant and strategic impact upon the highway network and the Highway Authority requires detailed information and discussion before a robust assessment can be made.
- 2.11.8 The project strategically identifies the need for both temporary and permanent Traffic Regulation Orders to be produced and implemented. Unfortunately, no reference has been made as to how these will be managed and by whom. The Highway Authority would like to inform HS2 that given the volume of Orders that will be needed, DCC does not have the resource currently available to support this activity. The Council would welcome detailed dialogue to understand how this work will be resourced to facilitate these orders.
- 2.11.9 The Highway Authority would like to document its disappointment at the level of detail and the sweeping statements contained within the Draft Code of Construction Practice. Greater detail and the use of accurate information is

required to enable the Highway Authority to assess and comment upon the proposals.

- 2.11.10 DCC has concerns regarding management and maintenance liabilities of new routes. See previous comments on wider asset development and transfer.
- 2.11.11 DCC is concerned with the approach to public rights of way along the route. There are a number of temporary diversions or permanent route/footpath changes proposed. Many cross country routes are diverted to highway, and several greenways and proposed routes are not identified at all in the proposals. DCC would welcome HS2 improving accessibility of the existing network and maintaining the character and improving connectivity.
- 2.11.12 DCC are concerned at the lack of thought in the document on the potential to use sustainable transport to reduce the impacts of the construction of the line and then longer term to mitigate the effects of people seeking to access the stations. For example there are real opportunities to use existing underutilised rail routes such as the Erewash Valley rail line to transport construction materials to the site of the Toton hub station or to remove waste. This line could also be used to help transport materials and waste from the area around Clay Cross where HS2 will join up with the Erewash Valley route. The same is true of the Ivanhoe line between Burton Upon Trent and Leicester which could be used to transport materials to work sites in Leicestershire. Once the HS2 line is operational both of these lines could also provide valuable links to the new stations sites. For example the proposed Maid Marion service from Mansfield to the Toton hub station using the Erewash Valley line could help reduce the need for car travel to the site from parts of Nottinghamshire. The same would be true if conventional rail passengers services on the Ivanhoe line were reintroduced through South Derbyshire and extended to serve Toton.

2.12 Water Resources & Flood Risk, Section 15

- 2.12.1 Building on previous general comments, DCC has a general concern as to who will be adopting and maintaining the Highway Balancing Ponds post construction. DCC was 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. The Council is concerned that the creation of assets as a result of HS2 are proposed to be transferred in this manner and would wish to have more detailed dialogue with HS2 on how this should be funded.
- 2.12.2 DCC expect the design to utilise SuDS as the primary method to manage surface water.

- 2.12.3 If the management of the SuDS is to return to private landowners, the Council would welcome landowners receiving appropriate ongoing support and guidance where there is a change in habitat management or new habitat created.
- 2.12.4 Where major adverse effects have been identified with regard to flood risk and land drainage, the Council expect suitable mitigation to be provided which reduces or removes these risks.
- 2.12.5 Please also refer to individual responses to each CAR.

2.13 Waste Management

- 2.13.1 The Council has reviewed the HS2 route in relation to the locations of the Council's closed landfills, for which DCC has a responsibility. Based on the information available and presented in the WDES, the current line of HS2 does not give rise to any concerns, however if the alignment of HS2 were to change at all, then further consultation would be required.