

April 2018

**HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS -
CREWE) BILL**

**HOUSE OF COMMONS
SELECT COMMITTEE**

**Petition No. HS2-P2A-000134:
Woore Parish Council**

Promoter's Response Document

INTRODUCTION

This Promoter's Response Document (PRD) forms the Promoter's response to Petition No. HS2-P2A-000134, from Woore Parish Council.

In this PRD, 'the Promoter' means the Secretary of State and HS2 Ltd acting on his behalf.

The purpose of the PRD is to advise you and the Select Committee of the Promoter's position in relation to the petitioning points raised. It is intended that the PRD will alleviate many of the concerns raised in the petition.

The Table of Contents overleaf lists the page number, petitioning points in the order they appear in the petition, and a summary statement of the issue(s) contained in the petition for quick reference. Other supporting material (e.g. reports, drawings and photographs) referred to in the response are attached where applicable.

Copies of the HS2 Phase 2A Information Papers referred to in the response can be found at <http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/high-speed-rail-west-midlands-to-crewe-bill>.

Department for Transport
High Speed Two (HS2) Limited

BACKGROUND

The parish council of Woore is in north east Shropshire. The parish covers an area of approximately 4,000 acres, most of which is farmland. It contains the settlements of Woore, Ireland's Cross and Pipe Gate and part of the settlement of Onneley. The parish is not on the proposed route of the Proposed Scheme itself, which is to the east of the parish.

PETITION NO. HS2-P2A-000134

WOORE PARISH COUNCIL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.	Petition Paragraph No.	Issue
4	A	Construction route through Woore
8	B	Consultation
12	C	Environmental Impact Assessment and Environmental Statement
16	D	Environmental Impact Assessment
18	E	Environmental effects on the Parish
19	F	Environmental effects: air quality
22	G	Environmental effects: sound, noise and vibration
27	H	Environmental effects: community
31	I	Environmental effects: health
35	J	Environmental effects: socio-economic
36	K	Environmental effects: traffic and transport
42	L	Environmental effects: highways
46	M	Alternatives to the Proposed Scheme
51	N	Select Committee visit

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: A

ISSUE RAISED: Background

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 1. The Parish is not on the proposed route of HS which is to the east of the Parish.

2. The reasons why we and the Parish are specifically and directly affected by the Bill are as follows:

- It is proposed that construction traffic going to and from several construction compounds which will be located in and around Madeley should be routed along the A525 to and from the Parish. Traffic leaving the compounds would then continue through the Parish from the A525 by turning either left or right on to the A51 and by thus proceeding northwards or southwards along the A51. Traffic going to the compounds will use the A51 and turn either left or right on to the A525.
- Other construction traffic will travel along the A51 to get to and from further construction compounds which will be located to the north east of the Parish.
- HS2 has also proposed certain highway modifications in the Parish in order to improve the flow of construction traffic along the A525 and A51.

3. The A51 and A525 through the Parish are shown as routes for construction traffic on Map Numbers CT28-109 and CT05-253 (Insets 11 and 12) in Volume 4 of the Environmental Statement (hereinafter referred to as "the "ES") published by HS2 Ltd on 17th July 2017.

4. It will be seen that the A51 runs roughly north to south, parallel with the proposed route of HS2. The A525 runs roughly west to east. The two roads meet and cross one

another at a staggered crossroads in the north of the Parish and at the centre of the village of Woore.

5. The settlements of Ireland's Cross and Pipe Gate constitute ribbon development southwards along the A51. That part of Onneley which is in the Parish is on the A525, to the east of Woore, and is located closest to the proposed route of HS2.

6. According to HS2 Ltd, between 300 and 550 HGV journeys associated with HS2's construction will be made through the Parish each weekday (a weekday being between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm) for a period of at least 4.5 years. Further journeys will be made during Saturday mornings. On occasions, it may be necessary for the A roads to be closed at night to allow HS2 Ltd to move particularly large or heavy equipment in convoy through the Parish. At the peak of construction works, an HGV journey connected with the construction of HS2 will be made through the Parish almost every minute of every hour between 8.00am and 6.00pm. At other times, an HGV journey connected with the construction of HS2 will be made almost every two minutes during those working hours.

7. The decision by HS2 Ltd to route traffic through the Parish appears to have been made very much late in the day.

8. It appears that, previously, the preferred route for construction traffic servicing the various Madeley compounds was not westwards along the A525 into the Parish. What exactly the preferred route then was has never been fully described to us by HS2 Ltd.

9. It also appears that, previously, construction traffic going to and from the satellite compounds located to the north east of the Parish would not have gone through the Parish. What exactly the previously preferred route for such construction traffic was is not clear to us.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. The Promoter proposes to use the A51 north and south of Woore, and the A525 east of Woore, as an HGV construction traffic route for the Proposed Scheme.

2. To the south of the A525 junction in Woore the predicted peak impact of traffic on the A51 London Road due to HS2 construction traffic would be a 10% increase in total traffic. The peak level of HS2 HGV construction traffic is predicted to be 548 two-way

HS2 HGV construction vehicles per day (274 per direction). Apart from a period of five months, HS2 HGV traffic would be less than half this level.

3. North of the A525 junction in Woore the predicted impact of traffic on the A51 London Road due to construction traffic from the Proposed Scheme would be a 3% increase in traffic. The peak level of HS2 HGV construction traffic is predicted to be 132 two-way HS2 HGV construction vehicles per day. Apart from a period of 10 months, HGV traffic would be less than half this level.

4. East of Woore the predicted impact of traffic on the A525 Newcastle Road due to HS2 construction traffic would be a 14% increase in vehicles during the peak movements. The peak level of HS2 HGV construction traffic is predicted to be 522 two-way HS2 HGV construction vehicles per day. Apart from a period of four months, HGV traffic would be less than half this level.

5. The impacts of construction traffic are understandably a particular concern for residents who live or work near the route of the Proposed Scheme. The Promoter is committed to ensuring that the adverse effects identified within the Environmental Statement (ES¹) are minimised, as far as reasonably practicable. This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E1: Control of Environmental Impacts.

6. The Proposed Scheme makes provision at Woore for road modifications to ensure that HGVs can safely use and pass each other along the A51 and A525 route. The junction of the A51 and A525 would be modified to allow construction vehicles to safely turn at the junction. The addition of several passing bays along the A525, and some localised widening to the A525, would allow two large vehicles to pass safely. As set out in Community Area (CA) Report 4, Whitmore Heath to Madeley, of the ES, no significant effects have been identified with regards to traffic congestion or delay at the junction of A51 and A525. There are currently no modifications planned at the junction of the A51 and A53.

7. Core working hours for the construction of the Proposed Scheme would be from 08.00 to 18.00 on weekdays (excluding bank holidays) and from 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays. The nominated undertaker would require that its contractors adhere to these core working hours for each site as far as reasonably practicable or unless otherwise permitted under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974. This is explained in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper D5: Working Hours.

8. A number of construction routes were considered as part of the design development of the scheme in order to avoid local roads and country lanes. The proposed construction route through Woore is currently considered the most suitable route available.

9. Construction traffic was not assessed in detail at the working draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) stage, and therefore although the decision to use the

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/hs2-phase-2a-environmental-statement>

A51/A525 through Woore as a construction traffic route was being pursued, there was not enough information on it to be presented in the working draft EIA Report.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: B

ISSUE RAISED: Consultation

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 1. We are concerned about the lack of consultation which HS2 Ltd has conducted with us and with Shropshire Council (SC) before it made its decision that construction traffic should be routed through the Parish. We contend that the routing of such traffic through the Parish will have considerable detrimental effects on the Parish (see later in this Petition) and we believe that, accordingly, HS2 Ltd's consultations with us and SC should have been much more extensive than they have been.

2. On page 7 of the Non-Technical Summary (hereinafter referred to as "the NTS"), which forms part of the ES, it is stated that HS2 Ltd has consulted and engaged with local authorities during the development of the design of the proposed scheme. HS2 Ltd did not consult with us nor, we believe, with SC.

3. On page 8 of the NTS, it is stated that HS2 Ltd published a draft Environmental Impact Assessment (hereinafter referred to as "EIA") Scope and Methodology Report for consultation in March 2016 which was issued to, amongst others, local authorities and parish councils. However, it was not issued to us and we have seen no evidence that it was issued to SC. We and (we believe) SC thus had no opportunity to respond to that consultation.

4. On page 8, it is also stated that public consultation took place on the working draft EIA Report between 13th September and 7th November 2016. HS2 Ltd did not contact us at all until late September 2016 (and that was only by telephone) and we subsequently received certain documentation from them in early October 2016. However, it transpired that that documentation was wrong or incomplete

in that the Community Area Report for South Cheshire had been provided whilst the Community Action Report most relevant to the Parish, namely the one for Whitmore Heath to Madeley (hereinafter referred to as "CA4"), was not supplied. CA4 was not actually supplied until 2nd November 2016, a mere 5 days before the public consultation closed. We thus had insufficient time in which to respond to the consultation and we did not do so. We first had a meeting with HS2 Ltd on 14th November 2016, a week after the consultation on the working draft EIA Report had closed.

5. It is our understanding that no meeting took place between HS2 Ltd and SC until 28th April 2017.

6. On page 8 of the NTS, HS2 Ltd also states that a number of events were conducted in local areas along the proposed route of HS2 in support of the consultations which subsequently took place on both the working draft EIA Report and also the design refinements to the published November 2015 scheme. The event which took place closest to the Parish was that at the Madeley Centre, Madeley which apparently took place on 15th October 2016. We were not informed about that event taking place and thus did not attend. So far as we are aware, HS2 Ltd did not publicise the event in the Parish.

7. We can only assume that we and SC were not consulted by HS2 Ltd about its proposals, save as set out above, because, until quite recently, HS2 Ltd did not intend to route construction traffic through the Parish and thus did not consider that its proposals would have any effect on the Parish.

8. The lateness of HS2 Ltd's change of mind about the route of construction traffic may explain the lack of consultation with us and SC but such lateness does not excuse HS2 Ltd from complying with its obligations to conduct a full and proper consultation. If, in fact, HS2 Ltd did plan to route some construction traffic through the Parish all along, its failure to consult with us at a much earlier stage than actually happened is all the more inexcusable.

9. The lack of consultation with us and SC, and the apparent lateness of the decision to route construction traffic through the Parish, has had a number of unfortunate consequences, namely:

- We have had no adequate explanation of why HS2 Ltd thinks it necessary or appropriate to route such traffic through the Parish. It is clear from communications which we have had with HS2 Ltd that, until quite recently, routing such traffic through the Parish was a non-preferred option. The reasons why it then became the preferred option is not clear. We have no details of what methodology was used by HS2 Ltd to determine that routing traffic through the Parish was to be preferred to other available options or, indeed, details of what those other options were.
- Thus, prior to the publication of the ES, we had no real opportunity to argue that the selection of the Parish as a route for construction traffic was inappropriate.
- Consideration by HS2 Ltd of the environmental effects of selecting the Parish as a route for construction traffic has been either non-existent or inadequate.

10. In contrast to the position with the Parish, it appears that HS2 Ltd has been in consultation with the community of Madeley for a period of at least four years. We wonder whether the previously preferred route for construction traffic involved going through Madeley. We also wonder whether the change of the route of construction traffic, so that it now passes through the Parish, resulted wholly or partly from such consultation.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. Prior to the deposit of the Bill, the Promoter met with Woore Parish Council on 14 November 2016 and with Shropshire Council on 28 April 2017. The local elections in May 2017 and the General Election in June 2017 did result in a delay in discussing proposals further due to election purdah restrictions. However, following the General Election the Environmental Statement (ES) and Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) were subject to extensive formal public consultation that went beyond what was legally required. The engagement and consultations carried out during the development of the Proposed Scheme are summarised in the HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper G1: Consultation and Engagement.

Environmental Statement

2. Construction traffic was not assessed in detail at the working draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) stage, and therefore although the decision to use the

A51/A525 through Woore as a construction traffic route was being pursued, there was not enough information on it to be presented in the working draft EIA Report.

3. Insofar as is reasonably practicable site haul routes would be created adjacent to the route of the Proposed Scheme to transport construction materials and equipment to reduce HGV movements on public roads with access taken via the main road network. This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E17: Excavated Material and Waste Management.

4. Where it is not practicable to use site haul roads, HGVs would be routed, insofar as reasonably practicable, along the strategic road network and/or the main A road network. The A51 is part of the main A road network, which the Promoter has identified for use, rather than more local roads and country lanes. The A51 links to the A53 and the A500, which provide access to the strategic road network.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: C

ISSUE RAISED: Environmental Impact Assessment and Environmental Statement

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 1. The Town and Country Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 (hereinafter referred to as "the Regulations") require an ES to include: "A description of the reasonable alternatives (for example in terms of development design, technology, location, size and scale) studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option, including a comparison of the environmental effects."

2. We contend that (a) HS2 Ltd has not carried out any, or any adequate, EIA in respect of the Parish and that (b) the ES which it has published does not comply with the Regulations.

3. As regards (a), it is our contention that the situation of HS2 Ltd having not carried out any, or any adequate, EIA arises for the following reasons:

- The Parish appears not to be located within any of the Community Areas identified in the ES. (We comment further on this point later in this Petition.)
- Most environmental effects on the Parish thus appear to fall within the definition of "off-route effects".
- We contend that HS2 Ltd has adopted an inappropriately narrow or restrictive approach to what off-route effects it has been prepared to assess. Paragraph 1.2.3 on page 2 of Volume 4 of the ES sets out the definition of "off-route effects" as "those that may occur in locations beyond the scheme's route corridor and its associated local environment and which are not within the spatial scope of the Volume 2

reports or the Volume 3 route-wide effects report". In that Paragraph, HS2 Ltd then takes a leap which we contend is completely illogical. HS2 Ltd states that "the nature of the Proposed Scheme means that such potential effects are principally related to implications for other transport infrastructure". We think that by making this assertion, HS2 Ltd have wrongly circumscribed what environmental effects they examined outside Community Areas when carrying out their EIA. We contend that HS2 Ltd's conclusion that "off-route effects" are principally related to "implications for other transport infrastructure" cannot possibly be justified. HS2 Ltd's conclusion is certainly not shared by the residents of the Parish, many of whom will experience a wide variety of environmental effects resulting from a large number of HGVs travelling past their front doors every day for at least 4.5 years.

4. As regards (b), it is our contention that the ES, if it was to comply with the Regulations, should have contained "a description of the reasonable alternatives ... studied by" HS2 Ltd for routing construction traffic and "an indication of the main reasons for selecting" the Parish as a route for construction traffic, "including a comparison of the environmental effects".

5. We fail to see how, without carrying out an EIA on the Parish, HS2 Ltd was in a position to weigh the merits and demerits of putting the route for construction traffic through the Parish as against the merits and demerits of putting that route somewhere else. We would submit that there was at least one "reasonable alternative" to routing construction traffic through the Parish, namely routing such traffic through Madeley, an alternative which may have been considered and, indeed, preferred by HS2 Ltd for some very considerable time. At no point in the ES is there "a comparison of the environmental effects" of the two alternatives of routing construction traffic through the Parish and routing it through Madeley. The ES thus fails to meet the requirements of the Regulations.

6. We would additionally submit that, when HS2 Ltd weighs the environmental effects of the reasonable alternative traffic construction routes and the route it has actually chosen, the environmental effects of the chosen route on other off route

communities which lie on it, and not just those effects on the Parish, should also be taken into consideration as a whole.

Ask 3.

That HS2 Ltd should agree / be required to carry out a full and proper EIA in respect of the routing of construction traffic through the Parish and to publish an ES or other document which compares the environmental effects and costings of routing construction traffic through the Parish and along reasonable alternative routes;

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken as part of preparing the Bill, including air quality resulting from construction traffic.

2. The EIA findings are reported in the Environmental Statement (ES) deposited alongside the Bill. The ES identifies where there are likely significant effects from both the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme and the range of mitigation measures that could be used to reduce or eliminate these effects. The potential impacts of the Proposed Scheme in Woore have been assessed in detail and are set out in Volume 2, CA4 (Whitmore Heath to Madeley) report and the Volume 4, Off Route Effects Report of the ES. Furthermore, detail on traffic impacts and surveys that informed predicted effects in Woore can be found in Volume 5, Traffic and Transport report. The Promoter's position on compliance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive is set out in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper B6: Environmental Impact Assessment and Human Rights.

3. The assessment within the ES considers both the impacts on residents of Woore and other road users. Along with undertaking traffic surveys to determine the potential impact of the construction traffic on road users, proposed construction routes have been assessed to identify potential effects to air quality, noise and vibration from vehicles during the construction period. As set out in Section 5, CA4 Report of the ES, no adverse effects are predicted for air quality during construction. Noise and vibration levels from construction traffic routes have also not been predicted to result in an adverse effect on properties or residents.

4. As stated above, a number of construction routes were carefully considered before the proposed route through Woore.

Haul routes

5. Where it is reasonably practicable, haul routes adjacent to the proposed line of route would be used to reduce HGV movements on public roads. This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E17: Excavated Material and Waste

Management. However, in this case, due to the location of the compound requiring access on the A525 which is between the two tunnels at Whitmore Heath and Madeley, a site haul route cannot be used to access the A53 or A500 directly to the M6.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: D

ISSUE RAISED: Environmental Impact Assessment

PETITION PARAGRAPH:

1. Many of our criticisms of the ES, as set out above, were made in the submission which we made in response to HS2 Ltd's consultation about the ES. The MP for our constituency, the Rt Hon Owen Paterson, then requested that HS2 Ltd should comment on the points we had raised.
2. HS2 Ltd did so in a letter to our MP dated 8th November 2017 written by Mr Thurston, its Chief Executive. In that letter, in relation to our assertion that HS2 Ltd had failed to carry out an EIA in respect of the Parish, Mr Thurston stated as follows: "The potential [environmental] impacts of HS2 in Woore have been assessed in detail and are set out in Volume 2, CA4 (Whitmore Heath to Madeley) Report and the Volume 4, Off Route Effects Report."
3. We consider that statement to be inaccurate. In CA4, the word "Woore" appears 5 times. In contrast, the word "Madeley" appears 1129 times. Whilst we acknowledge that a word count is only a very rough way of judging what attention has been paid by HS2 Ltd to environmental impacts in different communities, we would submit that the comparison of the times the two place names have been used serves to highlight starkly the lack of attention which has been paid to the effect of HS2's construction on the Parish.
4. Where Mr Thurston's statement, quoted above, is accurate is in it saying that information about the Parish is set out in both documentation concerning Community Area 4 and in Volume 4 relating to off route effects. Why all such information is not contained exclusively in one or the other set of documentation is not entirely clear to us. Section 10 of Volume 5 of the ES relates to Community Area 4, of which the Parish does not appear to form part. However, some of the technical

data about traffic flows set out in Table 327 in Section 10 relates to certain roads which are within the Parish, namely part of the A525 Bar Hill Road between Gravenhunger Moss and the Proposed Scheme and the A525 Newcastle Road between Gravenhunger Moss and the London Road. Moreover, some of the junctions dealt with at Paragraph 10.2.15 onwards of Section 10 are also within the Parish. In contrast, modifications to those very same roads and junctions are treated as off-route highway modifications in Volume 4 of the ES.

5. We would submit that HS2 Ltd's approach is inconsistent and illogical and that it causes confusion.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. The Petitioner is referred to the Promoter's response to paragraph C of the Petition.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: E

ISSUE RAISED: The environmental effects on the Parish

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 1. In our submission, "the nature of the Proposed Scheme" of routing construction traffic through the Parish is such that its potential environmental effects on the Parish (and on other communities along the construction traffic routes) are significant and worthy of a full and proper assessment. Those effects are, in our submission, likely to be particularly significant on the Parish because of its geographical configuration. Ribbon development along the "A" roads in the Parish is a significant feature and thus a large proportion of the dwellings (we calculate about 170 of the approximately 460 dwellings in the Parish) front directly on to those roads and will be directly impacted by construction traffic. We will now deal with various specific environmental effects addressed in the ES.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. The Petitioner is referred to the Promoter's response to paragraph A of the Petition.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: F

ISSUE RAISED: Environmental effects: air quality

PETITION PARAGRAPH:

1. It seems to us that the exhaust fumes resulting from the large number of HGV journeys and from the traffic jams which such journeys are likely to cause will have "residual adverse effects on air quality" (a term used on page 84 of the NTS) in the Parish and that such effects merit a full assessment by HS2 Ltd.
2. In addressing, in CA4 relating to Madeley and Whitmore Heath, the effect of the Proposed Scheme on air quality, HS2 Ltd states (on page 93 of the NTS, at Paragraph 5.3.6) that "Several locations have been identified in the area as sensitive receptors, which are considered to be susceptible to changes in air quality due to their proximity to dust-generating activities or traffic routes during construction or operation".
3. At Paragraph 5.3.7, HS2 Ltd go on to state that "Most of the receptors located close to the route of the Proposed Scheme are residential. Other receptors include Baldwin's Gate CE Primary School, Sir John Offley CE Primary School and Moss Lane Surgery." These receptors have been identified because, unlike any in the Parish, they are within a Community Area and thus covered by CA4.
4. We would suggest that the Parish also contains a "sensitive receptor" located close to "traffic routes", namely Woore Primary School which is located on the A51 and which is thus on a route for construction traffic. Children attending the School will undoubtedly experience poorer air quality both while travelling to and from the School and during school hours. HS2 Ltd should, we contend, have treated the School as a sensitive receptor. It has not done so.

5. We submit that HS2 Ltd has managed to draw an artificial and somewhat arbitrary line between the area covered by CA4 and the Parish when almost exactly the same construction traffic will, if HS2 Ltd's proposals are implemented, flow along the roads of both areas – the A525 goes through the Parish straight into Community Area 4. We submit that that artificial line or distinction is wrong and illogical. As a consequence of that distinction, it has assessed the effect of construction traffic on air quality within the Community Area of Madeley and Whitmore Heath but not its effect on air quality within the Parish.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. Construction routes were assessed to confirm any likely effects of the change in emissions from vehicles using those roads during the construction period. These were primarily the main roads within the Whitmore Heath to Madeley area, including the M6, the A51 London Road; the A5182 Trentham Road, the A525 Bar Hill Road; and the A53 Newcastle Road.

2. The assessment of construction traffic emissions has used traffic data based on an estimate of the average daily flows at the peak year during the construction period (2020-2026). The assessment assumes vehicle emission rates and background pollutant concentrations from year 2020. This is because both pollutant emissions from vehicle exhausts and background pollutant concentrations are anticipated to reduce year by year as a result of vehicle emission controls, and so the year 2020 represents the worst case for the construction assessment.

3. As set out in the Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 5: Technical appendices, CA4: Whitmore Heath to Madeley, Air Quality report, air quality assessments have been undertaken at The Chalway, London Road, Woore; Rose Cottage, Newcastle Road, Woore; Oak Cottage, London Road, Irelands Cross, Woore; Nantwich Road, Woore; and The Square, Woore. As shown in tables 15-17 of the report, there are no significant effects predicted on air quality during the construction phase of the Proposed Scheme on assessment locations in Woore. For more information, please refer to HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E14: Air Quality.

Air quality: assessment of route-wide construction traffic

4. The air quality assessment undertaken for the Proposed Scheme examines the potential for impacts and effects upon sensitive human and ecological receptors. Air quality changes could occur during construction as a result of associated traffic movements and highway interventions. During operation, the main changes in air quality would arise as a result of changes to road layouts and traffic flows. This assessment examined the predicted traffic changes during construction and operation. All road links where specific criteria were exceeded were assessed. This

criteria is based on where an air quality impact may occur (based on advice in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges). A detailed air quality assessment was then made for each of these affected links.

5. The Promoter has committed to adhere to emission standards for its construction vehicles and non-road mobile machinery (NRMM). These standards include construction HGVs being Euro VI compliant. The commitment is set out in section 7 of the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), and the emission standards are cited in Appendix A and Appendix C of HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E14: Air Quality.

6. The construction vehicle emission standards also include future targets for the use of Ultra Low Emission Vehicles and CO₂ fleet averages.

7. For further information, see HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper D3: Code of Construction Practice.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: G

ISSUE RAISED: Environmental effects: sound, noise and vibration

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 1. On page 86 of the NTS, HS2 Ltd lists roads along which it states that "noise from construction traffic is likely to increase noise levels outside residential properties". That list of roads does not include the A525 and A51 running through the Parish because the Parish does not fall within a Community Area and yet that list does include the A525 where it runs through Community Area 4. This is, we submit, illogical.

2. In the same way that the ribbon development in the Parish increases the proportion of houses which will be substantially affected by exhaust fumes emitted by construction traffic, it will also increase the proportion of houses affected by noise and vibration caused by construction vehicles. Some of the houses which front on to the A525 and A51 have no or only small front gardens and thus will be particularly affected by noise and vibration.

3. We note that, on page 86 of the NTS, HS2 Ltd state that, in respect of the operation of HS2, "At individual residential properties [within the Community Area of Whitmore Heath to Madeley], the mitigation measures, including noise insulation, will reduce noise inside the majority of residential properties such that it will not reach a level where it will significantly affect residents". We query why such noise insulation is not proposed for residential properties in the Parish.

4. So that consideration can be given to whether such insulation is needed in the Parish is another reason why HS2 Ltd should have carried out a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on the Parish and why it should be required to carry such an Assessment now. Similarly, we consider that such an Assessment is needed to assess the impact of vehicular vibrations on certain Heritage Assets referred to later

in this Petition and on the major gas pipeline which run under the A525. There is a belief that old tunnels run from the Manor House under the staggered junction of the A51 and A525, where highway modifications are proposed. We submit that the impact of vibrations from vehicles on any such tunnels needs to be assessed.

Ask:

- fund measures (such as the installation of double glazing in homes abutting on the traffic construction route) to reduce or eliminate the environmental effects of such traffic in terms of noise and vibration and pay compensation to property owners whose owners are affected by noise and vibration;

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

Noise impacts

1. There are no likely significant noise effect on residents of Woore reported in the Environmental Statement (ES). For more information on construction noise, please refer to HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E13: Control of Construction Noise and Vibration.
2. The Promoter's policy on assessing and controlling the noise and vibration impacts represents its interpretation of the Government's Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE). The Promoter's setting of values for effect levels had due regard to established practice, research results, guidance in national and international standards, guidance from national and international agencies and independent review by academic, industry and Government employees. They have also been subjected to further independent scrutiny during Parliamentary proceedings and are provided as draft route-wide assurances for the Proposed Scheme.
3. Adverse effects are not predicted on the A525 and A51 therefore the list of roads within the ES does not include these roads.

Noise mitigation

4. Airborne noise may be caused by construction activities such as demolition, earthworks, viaducts, bridges, road realignments, station construction, utility works and track works.
5. Best practicable means (BPM) as defined by the Control of Pollution Act 1974 (CoPA) and Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA) would be applied during construction to control noise.

6. Measures to control noise would be applied in the following order: selection of quiet and low vibration equipment, review of construction methodology to consider quieter methods, location of equipment on site, control of working hours, the provision of acoustic enclosures, the use of less intrusive alarms, local screening of equipment and perimeter hoarding.

7. Where, despite the implementation of BPM, the noise exposure exceeds the criteria defined in the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), noise insulation or ultimately temporary rehousing would be offered in accordance with the noise insulation and temporary re-housing policy in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E13: Control of Construction Noise and Vibration.

8. Contractors would undertake and report such monitoring as is necessary to assure and demonstrate compliance with all noise commitments. Monitoring data would be provided regularly to and be reviewed by the nominated undertaker and would be made available to the local authorities.

9. Contractors would be required to comply with the terms of the CoCP and appropriate action would be taken by the nominated undertaker as required to ensure compliance.

11. This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper D3: Code of Construction Practice and HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E13: Control of Construction Noise and Vibration.

Vibration effects on buildings

12. Vibration effects on buildings are concerns that are raised from time to time. These phenomena are well understood and the Promoter is able to design out such effects. There is further detail in the Environmental Statement: Sound, noise and vibration: methodology, assumptions and assessment (route-wide).

13. The effects of vibration from construction road traffic can potentially arise from two sources:

- ground-borne vibration produced by the movement of heavy vehicles over irregularities in the road surface; and
- airborne vibration arising from low frequency sound emitted by vehicle engines and exhausts.

14. In the case of ground-borne vibration, the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) advises that ground-borne vibration is linked to heavily trafficked roads with poor surfaces and sub grade conditions. The DMRB also advises that ground-borne vibration is much less likely to be the cause of disturbance than airborne vibration,

although it is acknowledged that where it does occur this can be more severe. Nevertheless, irregularities which cause significant ground-borne vibration can be rectified through maintenance works. On the assumption that the surface of public roads used by construction traffic would be maintained throughout construction of the Proposed Scheme, the effects of ground-borne vibration from construction road traffic are not considered to be significant.

15. The Petitioner's concern that HGVs being used for the works might cause damage to properties is unfounded. In accordance with the draft CoCP, the contractors appointed to construct the railway would be required to employ 'Best Practicable Means' (BPM) as defined by the Control of Pollution Act 1974 to control noise and vibration.

Heritage: protection of listed buildings

16. The Promoter fully recognises the importance of listed buildings and heritage assets and the contribution these bring to the wider historic landscape. The design has sought to avoid or minimise the loss of heritage assets and the impact on listed buildings.

17. Details of the significant effects on listed buildings arising during construction and operations of the Proposed Scheme are reported in Volume 2 of the ES. The effects on all listed buildings within 2 km of the route, both due to physical impacts and changes to their settings, are reported in Volume 5 of the ES.

18. The Promoter is satisfied that a set of suitable controls would be established under the powers of the Bill and draft Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) relating to the management of and mitigation of impacts upon listed buildings and other cultural heritage assets. This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E1: Control of Environmental Impacts.

19. Paragraph 1 of Schedule 18 to the Bill dis-applies controls under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in relation to listed buildings which are directly affected by the Proposed Scheme works and identified in Table 1 of that Schedule.

20. Under the planning regime established under Schedule 17 to the Bill the nominated undertaker will be required to seek approval from the relevant qualifying authority for the use by large goods vehicles of any routes to and from a working or storage site, a site where material will be re-used, or a waste disposal site (this does not apply to routes where the number of movements per day is 24 or less, nor to motorways and trunk roads or any part of the route beyond a motorway or trunk road). Paragraph 6 (6) of Schedule 17 allows the relevant qualifying authority to refuse to approve a lorry route approval or apply conditions on grounds which include "to preserve a site of archaeological interest or nature conservation value, and is

reasonably capable of being so modified". This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper B2: The Main Provisions of the Planning Regime.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: H

ISSUE RAISED: Environmental effects: community

PETITION PARAGRAPH:

1. The increase in traffic along the A roads of the Parish caused by HS2 construction vehicles will deter people from walking along those roads. This will particularly be the case in respect of the A51. The pavements along the A51, south of the junction with the A525, are not continuous. In consequence, anyone who wants to walk from the southern boundary of the Parish on the A51 to the junction with the A525 will have to cross the A51 either twice or thrice (depending on which side of the A51 they start from). Crossing the A51 now can be a hazardous exercise. In our submission, the dangers of crossing the A51 will increase significantly if HS2 Ltd's construction traffic uses that road.
2. It will be particularly the case that, during HS2's construction, pedestrians will be affected by the passing of construction traffic. In particular, the elderly and disabled will be deterred from going out and some parents will not allow their children to go out. Isolation among the elderly and disabled will thus increase and the social development of the young may be adversely affected. In addition, it is likely that parents who currently walk their children to school will, for fear of the HGVs passing by, chose to make their journeys to school by car, thereby adding to levels of traffic within the Parish, increasing the number of vehicles parked on roads whilst dropping off and picking up children, and increasing the possibility of traffic hold ups and delays.
3. The amenity of all residents in the Parish, and particularly the amenity of those many residents whose homes are on the A525 and A51, will be significantly affected by construction traffic.

4. The effect of construction traffic on community facilities such as the Woore Victory Hall, the Cricket, Bowls and Tennis Clubs, St Leonard's Church, the Methodist Chapel, the public houses and the Post Office / Village Shop and other shops, most of which are close to the A51 / A525 junction, and all of which are located on the proposed routes for construction traffic, are not addressed in the ES.

5. CA4, at Paragraph 6.4.15, addresses the impact of construction works and construction traffic on Madeley Cemetery. St Leonard's Church is surrounded by a graveyard. The Church is located on the A51 and is thus on a construction traffic route. It is also close to where the A51 meets the A525, which is where highway modifications are planned to take place. Unlike with Madeley Cemetery, no mention is made of the impact which construction traffic will have on amenity for visitors to the graveyard.

6. None of the above matters are addressed in the ES. We contend that they should have been.

7. We submit that the sales of properties within the Parish will be affected (and are being affected) by the prospect of construction traffic going through the Parish and will be affected if such traffic does proceed through the Parish. The stress caused by sales not proceeding will have an adverse effect on the health of residents.

Ask: pay compensation to businesses in the Parish which suffer loss of business or extra costs by reason of the routing of construction traffic.

Ask: pay compensation to house owners whose house sales are blighted by the fact that construction traffic will be routed through the Parish and / or is being so routed.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. Please see the first three paragraphs of the Promoter's response to paragraph A of the Petition.

Road safety and traffic management

2. Under the planning regime established under Schedule 17 to the Bill the nominated undertaker will be required to seek approval from the relevant qualifying authority for the use by large goods vehicles of any routes to and from a working or storage site, a

site where material will be re-used, or a waste disposal site (this does not apply to routes where the number of movements per day is 24 or less, nor to motorways and trunk roads or any part of the route beyond a motorway or trunk road). Paragraph 6 (6) of Schedule 17 allows the relevant qualifying authority to refuse to approve a lorry route approval or apply conditions on grounds which include “to preserve the local environment or local amenity, or to prevent or reduce prejudicial effects on road safety or on the free flow of traffic in the local area”. This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper B2: The Main Provisions of the Planning Regime.

3. As well as aiming to reduce the impacts on vehicular traffic, the needs of non-motorised users (i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) have also been considered when developing new road layouts. Alterations to major rural roads would be designed using the UK’s national standards given in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) published by Highways England.

4. The reason the community facilities named in the Petition are not referred to in the Environmental Statement (ES) is because they are not assessed as experiencing a predicted adverse effect.

5. The nominated undertaker would ensure that a Route-wide Traffic Management Plan (RTMP) and Local Traffic Management Plans (LTMP) would be produced in consultation with the highway and traffic authorities and the emergency services.

6. The RTMP would include, as appropriate: Measures to ensure that the timely maintenance and condition of public roads, cycle ways and public rights of way does not deteriorate due to use by the construction traffic; the requirement for vehicle and driver safety; the proposed traffic and construction vehicle management strategy.

7. The LTMP would include, as appropriate: temporary and permanent closures and diversions of highways and other public rights of way; a list of roads which may be used by construction traffic in the vicinity of the site, including any restrictions to construction traffic on these routes, such as the avoidance of large goods vehicles operating adjacent to schools during drop-off and pick-up periods and any commitments set out in the HS2 Register of Undertakings and Assurances. For more information, please refer to HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E3: Management of Traffic During Construction, HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E4: Highways and Traffic During Construction – Legislative Provisions, and HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper D3: Code of Construction Practice.

8. The Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) and the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), together with the various controls set out in the Bill, are intended to ensure that the impacts of the Proposed Scheme, including those relating to construction traffic, will not exceed those assessed in the ES. As part of these controls, the nominated undertaker would require contractors to seek to minimise that any disruption to local communities from construction traffic, and that public vehicle access is maintained, where reasonably practicable.

9. The proposed construction works in the vicinity of Madeley Cemetery would include the construction of the Proposed Scheme over Manor Road and realignment of Manor Road. These works would result in significant noise effects during the daytime on the cemetery due to construction works and construction traffic. Visitors to the cemetery would experience significant adverse visual effects due to views of the construction works. In addition, the use of Manor Road as a construction traffic route would result in a significant increase in HGVs passing the cemetery. The significant noise, visual and HGV effects would result in an in-combination effect on amenity for visitors to the cemetery for up to one year in total. This would result in a major adverse effect, which is significant hence its inclusion in the Volume 2: Community area 4 report of the ES.

Business support and compensation

10. The ES considers the significant effects of the Proposed Scheme on individual businesses and the wider economy and identifies a range of mitigation measures that could be used to reduce or eliminate these effects. In addition, the draft CoCP sets out a series of measures and standards that the Promoter and the contractors appointed to deliver the Proposed Scheme would be required to meet for the duration of the construction of the Proposed Scheme. This would ensure that potential impacts are kept to a practicable minimum.

HS2 Property Schemes

11. The Promoter appreciates that there may be a problem of generalised blight whereby it may become more difficult to sell properties on the market because of the possibility of the rail scheme, before the scheme is certain or before the Compensation Code can be applied or in areas to which the Compensation Code would not apply.

12. The Promoter has, for several years, operated the Need to Sell Scheme. This has no outer limits, whereby eligible property owners (which may include agricultural owners) can have their property acquired by the Government at un-blighted market value. See paragraph 4.1 of HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper C5: Generalised Blight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: I

ISSUE RAISED: Environmental effects: health

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 1. Section 9 of CA4 contains a plethora of information about such matters as the vulnerabilities of sections of the local population and deprivation levels within the area covered by it. Such information is said to have been gleaned after engagement with, among others, Staffordshire County Council.

2. HS2 Ltd do not appear to have gathered comparable information for the Parish. It certainly has not engaged with SC.

3. Section 9 contains comments, in relation to the Community Area covered by it, such as:

- “The term ‘neighbourhood quality’ is used in this assessment to describe a combination of factors that have the potential to affect residents’ feelings about their local environment. If these factors are altered to a sufficient degree, there would be effects on mental health and wellbeing. The Proposed Scheme will affect the quality of neighbourhoods through environmental changes resulting from the presence of construction sites, construction activities and construction traffic on local roads. This section assesses how changes to neighbourhood quality may influence people’s level of satisfaction with their local environment and perceptions about issues such as personal safety and security”; and

- “The presence of construction traffic, including HGVs, on rural roads is also likely to give rise to concerns about road safety, which may affect perceptions of neighbourhood quality”; and

- “The presence of construction traffic, including HGVs, on the local road network, which may deter their use by walkers, cyclists and equestrians”.

4. All such comments, insofar as they relate to construction traffic, are as equally applicable to the Parish as they are to the area covered by CA4. We contend that HS2 Ltd should have assessed the effect of construction traffic on health in the Parish in the same way as it has done for the Community Area covered by CA4.

5. Nowhere in the ES is there mention of the fact that many residents in the Parish use a health centre located in Madeley and a hospital located in Newcastle-under-Lyme. The most direct route to both from the Parish is along the A525. The impact of construction works and construction traffic in making those routes inaccessible for residents of the Parish merits detailed assessment. Also worthy of assessment is how ambulances will access the Parish.

PROMOTER’S RESPONSE:

1. The route-wide section of the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) provides a summary of the potential route-wide effects of the Proposed Scheme during construction and operation the potential effects of these for protected characteristic groups and what measures are proposed to avoid or reduced these. In the section for the Whitmore Heath to Madeley area there are no specific equality effects identified. The Promoter confirms that all known equality effects in Woore were assessed as part of this. However, where the characteristic of affected individuals is not known, the EqIA is unable to judge whether there is a disproportionate or differential effect. As such, should this information subsequently be made available, the potential for further equality effects would be addressed.

2. As stated in the Promoter’s response to paragraph B of the Petition, the Promoter met Shropshire Council on 28 April 2017.

3. A Health Assessment of the Proposed Scheme was undertaken as part of the design and planning process, prior to deposit of the Bill. The inclusion of the Health Assessment in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was implemented to accord with the 2017 EIA Regulations. Reflecting the broader scope of assessment that is required under the 2014 Directive to include; resource efficiency, sustainability, biodiversity protection, climate change, health and the risks of major accidents and natural disasters.

4. The Heath Assessment qualitatively assesses the potential effects of construction and operation of the scheme on a range of social, economic and environmental

factors that are known to influence health. A quantitative assessment of health effects has been undertaken, for health and wellbeing effects associated with noise and air quality, this has been based on established assessment methodologies. The Health Assessment does not describe the health effects on individuals as an individual's response to such changes depends on many factors, including, for example, their existing health status.

5. The Health Assessment identifies reasonably practicable measures to prevent or to reduce adverse health effects, or to provide mitigation or compensation to those affected. Health effects have been assessed at locally within each Community Area or route-wide, depending on the nature of the health determinant. The assessment of local effects is reported in Volume 2 and assessment of route-wide effects is reported in Volume 3 of the Environmental Statement (ES). The Promoter does not consider it necessary to carry out a further health impact assessment.

6. The integrated approach to health and environmental assessment includes an emphasis on integrated stakeholder engagement. Information obtained through stakeholder engagement helped to inform the health assessment. Engagement on health issues formed part of the wider EIA consultation process and health considerations have been a key element of community engagement activities.

Traffic Management Plans

7. The draft Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) and the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), together with the various controls set out in the Bill, are intended to ensure that the impacts of the Proposed Scheme, including those relating to construction traffic, would not exceed those assessed in the ES. As part of these controls, the nominated undertaker would require contractors to seek to minimise any disruption to local communities from construction traffic, and ensure that public vehicle access is maintained, where reasonably practicable.

8. The Promoter recognises that close co-operation with the emergency services would be required during the detailed design phase, the construction planning phase and during the construction phase. The Promoter would consider all aspects of safety during the construction, commissioning and operation of the railway and to ensure that through continuous consultation with the emergency services, accessibility would be assured where reasonably practicable through the design process and implemented during the construction and commissioning phases.

9. Emergency vehicles are able to operate on a blue light system should the need arise and are able to circumvent other road traffic including queuing traffic and general traffic congestion, utilising manoeuvres they currently undertake. Measures set out in the draft CoCP are designed to reduce the effects of highway works and construction traffic. Specific liaison with the emergency services at a local level, through the relevant Local Traffic Liaison meetings, as well as specific meetings with the emergency services, are set out within the Route-wide Traffic Management Plan,

prepared in accordance with the CoCP and discussed with the highway authorities along the Proposed Scheme's route as well as representatives of the emergency services.

10. Further details are given in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E3: Management of Traffic During Construction.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: J

ISSUE RAISED: Environmental effects: socio-economic

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 1. Traffic congestion, caused by HS2 construction traffic, will cause delays and expense for local businesses, including farmers whose vehicles use the A Roads. It will also cause loss of business as customers will be put off from travelling to the Parish by the congestion and by the loss of parking.

2. Later in this Petition, we touch upon how the Post Office / Village Shop is located immediately adjacent to proposed highway modifications. In our submission, the loss of parking resulting from highway modifications could threaten its viability. The Post Office provides banking for many in the Parish – the nearest bank is six miles away and is inaccessible for local residents who do not have a car. The Village Shop is the only general store in the Parish. If the Post Office / Village Shop did close, it would be a disaster for the Parish.

3. We believe that HS2 Ltd's ES should have considered the above matters. It did not.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. Please refer to the Promoter's response to paragraphs A, C and H of the Petition.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: K

ISSUE RAISED: Environmental effects: traffic and transport

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 1. In the Technical Appendices which form Volume 5 of the ES, HS2 Ltd set out current and projected traffic flows on highway links affected by its construction traffic.

2. We submit that those projections, insofar as they relate to the construction traffic routes in the Parish, are flawed. We contend that the baselines for the projections are based on traffic surveys which were carried out when traffic levels through the Parish would not have been at their height. For example, in the summer, visitors to Bridgemere Garden World, which is located on the A51 to the north of the Parish, significantly swell the number of vehicles using the A roads in the Parish. HS2 Ltd's surveys would not show this. Nor would they show the significant number of journeys made through the Parish by agricultural vehicles in the spring and early autumn.

3. We also submit that HS2 Ltd's projected traffic flows are flawed. Between March 2018 and March 2022, Highways England intend to upgrade the busy 28km stretch of the M6 between Junction 15 near Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent and Junction 13 at Stafford to make it a smart motorway. Highways England are currently carrying out an upgrade of the M6 between Junctions 16 and 19 to make that stretch of the M6 a smart motorway. Those works are causing traffic congestion and traffic jams on that stretch of motorway and, to avoid those problems, many motorists have taken to using the nearby A road network, causing increased traffic levels and congestion on those roads. The intended works between Junction 13 and Junction 15 will inevitably have the same consequences.

4. Whenever traffic jams (for example, as a consequence of accidents) occur on the M6 between Junctions 13 and 15, the A roads through the Parish already experience much heavier traffic levels as motorists seek alternative routes to the M6. As a result, traffic jams are not an infrequent occurrence. The intensity of traffic congestion and the frequency of traffic jams are, we submit, likely to increase hugely during the Junctions 13 to 15 smart motorway works, in the very same period that HS2's construction will get under way.

5. HS2 Ltd's traffic flow projections thus completely fail to take into account the effect of the Smart motorway works.

6. It has been suggested that one reason why HS2 Ltd wish to route construction traffic along the A roads through the Parish is to meet the concerns of Highways England about the impact of HS2 construction traffic on traffic flows along the M6 if all such traffic went by motorway rather than by the A roads.

7. Increased traffic congestion will inevitably affect air quality (see Section F above).

8. In the ES, HS2 Ltd's analysis of traffic density focusses on the effects it will have at junctions. Highway modifications are intended to prevent congestion where HS2 Ltd have determined that highways are too narrow for the free flow of traffic and where such modifications are possible. However, it appears to us that HS2 Ltd have no proposals to widen certain parts of the A51 as it passes through the Parish even though that road appears to be no wider than parts of the A525 which it does intend to modify and even though problems already frequently occur when HGVs travelling in opposite directions experience difficulties in passing and sometimes (where there are pavements) have to mount those pavements in order to pass. In fact, when representatives of HS2 Ltd met with us in the Parish on 15th February 2018, they witnessed with us an HGV heading southwards along the A51 having to mount the pavement to get past an oncoming HGV heading northwards. That occurred a few hundred yards to the south of the staggered crossroads where the A51 and A525 meet.

9. We submit that the narrowness of the A51 in the areas either side of its junction with Cherry Tree Lane poses a particular problem. There are no pavements on either side of the A51 there and delays frequently occur when HGVs cannot pass one another there. HS2 Ltd have not proposed any

highway modification there and have not, so far as we can see, made any reference to that problem in its published documentation.

10. Thus, we consider that HS2 Ltd has erred in either failing to identify essential highway modifications which are needed to avoid congestion at certain “pinch points” or has concluded (but not stated publicly) that such modifications, while ideally needed, are not possible. Either way, this means that HS2 Ltd is underestimating the effect that its construction traffic will have on congestion. It also means that HS2 Ltd, when comparing the respective merits and demerits of alternative routes for construction traffic, has failed to give proper weight to a matter which weighs against the Parish being, from HS2 Ltd’s point of view, the preferred route.

Ask:

5. That, in the event that it is decided that the route of construction traffic should be through the Parish, HS2 Ltd should agree / be required to:

- appoint independent monitors to ensure that HS2 Ltd’s contractors comply with their obligations, for example, only to drive construction vehicles through the Parish during the hours specified by HS2 Ltd in the ES.

PROMOTER’S RESPONSE:

1. The Environmental Statement (ES) includes a full transport assessment (Volume 5 Appendix – TR – 001-000) and provides details on impacts of construction traffic. The Volume 2 (CA4) report of the ES outlines the effects resulting from the construction of the Proposed Scheme.

2. The Transport Assessment outlines the numbers of worker trips, car/light goods vehicles and heavy goods vehicle movements along the roads proposed as construction traffic routes and for each construction compound.

2. Following a meeting with Woore Parish Council in January 2018, the Promoter provided the Council with detailed traffic data collected at 5 sites in the vicinity of Woore along with a map showing the specific locations. This data underpins the traffic assessment in the ES. Data was collected via both an ATC (Automated Traffic Count) using tubes placed in the road and information captured manually.

3. The Promoter would like to highlight that the Smart Motorway Scheme should be completed by March 2022 whilst the peak impacts of the Proposed Scheme do not

occur until late 2022 and 2023. Once completed, the Smart Motorway Scheme is designed with the intention of increasing capacity and so should reduce congestion.

4. The Promoter is proposing to use the M6 motorway as a construction route wherever practicable, for example to access the IMB-R at Stone. The construction route of which Woore forms a part includes use of the M6.

Adequacy of traffic flow projections

5. The ES accompanying the Bill fully complies with all UK and EU legal requirements and has been developed in accordance with the accepted best practice methodologies recommended by a range of UK institutional bodies. The document has satisfied the requirements for Parliamentary deposit and the Bill has secured its Second Reading. The Promoter is satisfied there are no fundamental deficiencies in the ES.

6. The count data and the traffic analysis undertaken is appropriate for this stage in the development of the project. It is sufficient for the purposes of developing the highway proposals and mitigations in sufficient detail to determine the necessary limits of the Bill powers and for assessing the environmental effects of the proposals.

7. Precise traffic impacts would depend to a considerable extent on details of design and construction planning which would not be undertaken until after Royal Assent. The Promoter's approach has been to make reasonable worst case assumptions on likely peak traffic generation and highway requirements so as not to risk underestimating adverse environmental effects and undertake the transport assessment that, though at a high level, is sufficiently robust to draw conclusions on the significant environmental effects.

8. In relation to assessment of off-peak traffic flows, the time periods (08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00) against which the construction has been assessed were selected as they represent the time when the road network is likely to be at its most busy and HS2 construction traffic at its highest. Checks were conducted to ensure that the selected AM/PM peaks periods were the busiest for baseline traffic. Assumptions for HS2 construction traffic flows are consistent throughout the day – the number of vehicles per hour (over a ten hour period). Construction transport assessments assume 10 percent of construction traffic arrivals at each worksite with 50 percent of the workforce travelling in the AM Peak; the workforce assumption is a reasonable worst case assumption since the site start time is 09:00 and closure will be 18:00 and consequently employees are more likely to arrive in the hour prior to the AM peak and leave an hour following the PM peak. As explained in paragraph 3.9.7, Volume 5 Traffic and Transport Assessment (TR-001-000) Part 1, in the ES.

9. During construction works for the Proposed Scheme, the nominated undertaker would require that the impacts on the local community from construction traffic are minimised by its contractors and that public access is maintained where reasonably

practicable. Impacts on local traffic would be managed in accordance with Local Traffic Management Plans, which would be developed with the relevant highway authority and other key stakeholders.

10. This and other measures to control traffic impacts are set out in the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and would be developed further during the detailed design phase.

11. The future baseline includes demand from existing and committed development in the areas local to the Proposed Scheme, with future growth taken either from local planning projections and models or from the DfT's transport forecasting Trip End Model Presentation Program (TEMPro). These include wider growth and proposed development that has not yet been approved but which is included in the local plans or TEMPro.

Road modifications in Woore

21. 12. The rationale for road modifications is set out in Volume 4: Off-route effects of the ES. Paragraph 5.1.2 sets out that:

“Highways modifications are required to facilitate the construction and maintenance of the Proposed Scheme. The proposed modification works include: kerb realignments at junctions to allow safe turning; widening of existing highways that are currently too narrow for construction vehicles to use safely; and the provision of passing bays to allow safe passing of HGV traffic, including abnormal loads, and HS2 maintenance vehicles.”

22. In the case of Woore, modifications would be in place to ensure safe turning at the junction of A51/A525 and also the localised widening of the A525 where it is currently deemed too narrow for construction vehicles to use safely. In terms of Cherry Tree Lane, additional construction traffic to this route would not be substantial with only 130 two-way movements in the peak month.

Code of Construction Practice – contractor's responsibilities

14. The draft CoCP sets out a series of proposed measures and standards of work, which would be applied by the nominated undertaker and its contractors throughout the construction period to:

- provide effective planning, management and control during construction to control potential impacts upon businesses and the natural and historic environment; and
- provide the mechanisms to engage with the local community and their representatives throughout the construction period.

15. The nominated undertaker and its contractors would comply as a minimum with applicable environmental legislation at the time of construction together with any additional environmental controls imposed by the Bill. For this reason, the applicable statutory requirements are not repeated within the CoCP. Further guidance on specific areas, such as soil handling and dust management, would be considered with reference to industry best practice guidance documents as set out in each discipline section of the CoCP. The reference to guidance documents within the CoCP is not intended to be exhaustive.

16. The draft CoCP has been produced in conjunction with the ES with the aim of ensuring that likely significant construction effects that are reported in the ES would either be avoided or mitigated. Site specific controls, which would be included within the Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMPs), will be developed during the detailed design stage.

17. This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper D3: Code of Construction Practice and HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E1: Control of Environmental Impacts.

Code of Construction Practice – compliance

18. Regarding the Petitioner's wish to ensure that the CoCP is complied with properly, section 7 of HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper D3: Code of Construction Practice explains how the requirements of the draft CoCP would be passed onto contractors and enforced:

"The provisions of the CoCP will be written into all HS2 construction contracts. We will put measures in place to monitor the effectiveness of the CoCP and establish a process for handling complaints, with an independent arbitration service provided by a Construction Commissioner.

To ensure compliance with the environmental mitigation set out in the CoCP the nominated undertaker will develop an environmental management system (EMS) in accordance with BS EN ISO 14001 the International Standard for Environmental Management Systems, full details of which are available from the International Organisation for Standardization."

19. The Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) is a suite of documents, which includes the CoCP, that has been developed in consultation with local authorities and other relevant stakeholders in relation to the environmental impacts of the design and construction of the Proposed Scheme. Any nominated undertaker would be contractually bound to comply with the controls set out and as may be developed during the passage of the Bill through Parliament. Further information on EMRs is provided in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper E1: Control of Environmental Impacts.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: L

ISSUE RAISED: Environmental effects: highways

PETITION PARAGRAPH:

1. In addition to the environmental effects on the Parish of construction traffic passing through it, HS2 Ltd propose to carry out certain highway modifications in the Parish which will themselves, we contend, have environmental effects. We believe that HS2 Ltd have failed to assess such effects properly.
2. Consideration of the environmental effects of the modifications is set out in Table 2 on pages 29-31 of Volume 4 of the ES.
3. Of the 12 highway modifications considered, one of these modifications is at the junction of the A51 and A525 (Newcastle Road). Another modification, not mentioned in Table 2, is the junction of the A51 and A525 (Audlem Road)
4. The modification mentioned in Table 2 is summarised as the removal of street furniture and it is not regarded by HS2 Ltd as having potential for likely significant effects.
5. We do not understand why that modification is simply described as the removal of street furniture when it appears to entail road widening, the removal of parking spaces located outside the Post / Office / Village Shop and the loss of on street parking on the A51. This misdescription of the modification at the junction of the A51 and A525 makes us think that the potential likely significant environmental effects of such road widening have not been properly assessed.
6. The modification to the junction the A51 and A525 (Audlem Road) is also road widening.

7. Those two modifications will take place at the very centre of the Parish's communal life, close to the Post Office / Village Shop, another shop and a public house. When visiting the shops, motorists park their cars both on the A51 and on the A525 (Newcastle Road), close to the junction of those roads.

8. Within the vicinity of the proposed modifications are, as shown on Map CT-28-109 of the Volume 4 Map Book, a number of what are described there as "Heritage Assets". Those Assets are the Manor House (WHM 102), the Tudor House (WHM 103), the font in the churchyard of St Leonard's Church (WHM 104) and the Church itself (WHM 105). All those Assets are Grade II Listed Buildings. Two of the Assets, the Manor House and the Tudor House, directly abut on the proposed modifications.

9. The proximity of the proposed modifications to those Assets and the fact that the modifications will take place at the centre of the village of Woore, leave us at a loss to know how the modifications are considered not likely to have significant environmental effects, including (a) socio-economic effects caused by the removal of parking, and a consequential loss of business, for the Post Office / Village Shop, (b) cultural heritage effects in terms of the possible vibration effects on listed buildings and the effect on the settings of listed buildings and (c) community effects in terms of, for example, property owners being deprived of access to their homes (e.g. the Manor House and the Tudor House) while highway modifications are carried out.

10. The two highway modifications represent the removal of road safety measures implemented in 1998 with a view to improving pedestrian safety at the communal centre of Woore and limiting traffic speeds in the vicinity of the staggered crossroads. They are, therefore, likely to make the A Roads and the staggered junction of them more dangerous.

11. We submit that the failure by HS2 Ltd to consider the environmental effects of the modifications at the junctions of the A51 and A525 (Newcastle Road) and the A51 and A525 (Audlem Road) contrasts markedly with the consideration given to five temporary highway modifications which are located wholly or partly outside the Parish (see Table 2 on page 29 of Volume 4 of the ES). Of these modifications, four are considered by HS2 Ltd to have potentially significant environmental effects requiring a fuller assessment. It

appears to us that, on the face of them, those modifications cannot possibly have potential significant environmental effects which are more significant than the modifications proposed for the junction of the A51 and A525 (Newcastle Road) and the junction of the A51 and A525 (Audlem Road).

12. Thus, in our submission, HS2 Ltd has failed to assess adequately the environmental effects of the highway modifications which it proposes to carry out in the Parish.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

Junction of A51 Nantwich Road and A525 Newcastle Road temporary modifications, Woore

1. In designing modifications for construction of the Proposed Scheme it may be necessary to remove existing street furniture and modify the kerb lines at the junction to facilitate the turning manoeuvres for larger vehicles. However, it is not proposed to remove the existing parking in the vicinity of the Post Office. The Promoter would engage with the responsible highway authorities with regard to the detailed design of any modifications that are required to the junction and any changes to the proposals to ensure that any disruption impacts are minimised.

2. There may be the need for the occasional movement of any abnormal loads through the junction. The process for dealing with these would be covered by Local Traffic Management Plans which would be prepared by the appointed contractor and which would set out any temporary measures including if needed, the temporary suspension of parking to facilitate safe passage. Any such measures would be short-term and notified in advance to the responsible highway authority and local community.

Impacts on heritage assets

3. Please refer to the Promoter's response to the paragraph G of the Petition.

4. Additionally, the Bill requires the nominated undertaker to provide reasonable access for pedestrians going to or from premises abutting a highway affected by the nominated undertaker's works.

5. Vehicular access to property and land would be maintained as far as reasonably practicable. However, there may be works which cannot be undertaken without hindering or preventing access to either off-street parking and/or the premises servicing areas. The Promoter would require the nominated undertaker to ensure that liaison takes place with the occupiers of premises whose access is liable to be particularly affected by the Proposed Scheme. Reasonable notice would be given of planned alterations to access.

6. This is explained further in HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper D10: Maintaining Access to Residential and Commercial Property During Construction and HS2 Phase 2A Information Paper D3: Code of Construction Practice.

A51 and A525 (Audlem Road) junction modifications

7. There are currently no changes proposed to the Audlem Road. The changes proposed at the A51/A525 junction would not give rise to any new significant effects as the Promoter is not proposing the removal of parking.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: M

ISSUE RAISED: Alternatives to the Proposed Scheme

PETITION PARAGRAPH:

1. In our submission, there are alternatives to routing construction traffic through the Parish. We set out details of these below. The order in which those alternatives are set out does not indicate an order of preference as to which of the alternatives we consider better or best.
2. The Madeley Chord (hereinafter referred to as "the Chord"): The Chord is a disused railway line. It linked the West Coast Mainline (hereinafter referred to as "the WCM" with a line (which is now also disused) which served the now closed Silverdale Colliery.
3. We submit that the Chord could be restored to use and thereby provide a link to the WCM.
4. Freight trains could then travel along the WCM and the Chord to deliver and take away materials, aggregate and construction machinery to a railway siding created in the vicinity of where HS2 Ltd presently proposes to construct a 750 metres long viaduct crossing the Chord, the WCM and the Silverdale line. Such freight trains could travel at night, when there is capacity on the WCM, and thereby greatly reduce the need for construction traffic to go by road through the Parish.
5. Using the Chord would appear to meet HS2 Ltd's professed desire "to make best use of rail to transport all materials and waste from the [construction] sites" (see Paragraph 1.3.3 of Appendix TR-001-000 -Annex A (Framework Travel Plan) in Volume 5: Technical Appendices Traffic and Transport and Transport Assessment Part 2 to the ES).
6. Accessing the M6 at Junction 15 via Madeley: Construction traffic could be routed along Manor Road through Madeley

and thence via Baldwin's Gate and Whitmore to Junction 15 of the M6. That route to the M6 is about 7.7 miles long and is about 5 miles shorter to the M6 than the construction traffic route via the Parish now being proposed by HS2 Ltd. Whilst Manor Road is not an A road and modifications would need to be made to it to facilitate the passing of HGVs, no schools or other sensitive receptors are located on it and it passes significantly fewer houses than does the construction traffic through the Parish.

7. Accessing the M6 via the old Market Drayton to Newcastle-under-Lyme Railway Line: If a road was constructed along the route of this railway line towards the M6 and a works junction to the M6 was created, construction traffic could be routed along this road rather than through the Parish. We submit that the construction of the road could easily be achieved by using spoil from HS2's construction to raise the road to the level of the M6.

8. Accessing the M6 via Keele Services: If Keele Services was used as a means of getting construction traffic on and off the M6, the journey that traffic would then make could be:

- Either via Three Mile Lane to Keele and then to Madeley. At 3.9 miles, this is the shortest journey and would largely be conducted on A Roads;
- Or via Three Mile Lane on to Stoney Low Lane and along that Lane to where it meets the old Silverdale Colliery line. From there, either loads could be transferred on to trains which would go along a renovated Silverdale Colliery line or that line could be taken up and a road created along its route so that construction traffic could go straight along it from Stoney Low Lane.

9. The Whitmore to Madeley Tunnel from Swynnerton to the north side of Madeley Tunnel (hereinafter referred to as "the WMT"): It is our understanding that HS2 Ltd has been required to carry out a detailed appraisal of the cost and feasibility of constructing the WMT. In our submission, one desirable consequence of the WMT would be the removal of the need for construction traffic to go through the Parish or a significant reduction in the level of such traffic. A haul route along the length of the HS2 line would be created by the WMT and the break in such a haul route, caused by the creation of separate tunnels at Whitmore Heath and Madeley, and which partly

necessitates construction traffic being routed through the Parish, would be remedied. It appears to us that the construction of the WMT would thus remove the need for Madeley cutting and Madeley Tunnel south satellite compounds or lead to a reduction in the size of those compounds (and thereby reduce the quantity of construction traffic needing to access them).

10. Using the M6 to route construction traffic to the satellite compounds located to the north east of the Parish: Rather than going straight along the A51 from Yarnfield, through the Parish and on towards Nantwich, and then turning right up Checkley Lane, construction traffic would get on the M6 at Junction 14, get off at Junction 16 and go down the A51 from Nantwich towards Woore but turn left up Checkley Lane to the satellite compounds.

Ask:

4. That HS2 Ltd should agree / be required to use one or more of the alternative construction traffic routes specified in Section M of this Petition, thereby eliminating the need for construction traffic to go through the Parish or reducing the amount of such traffic which would go through the Parish.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. A number of construction traffic route options were carefully considered before the proposed route through Woore. These include use of Keele Services to access the M6 and bringing back into use the Stoke to Market Drayton line. Please see the Promoter's response to paragraph C of the Petition. Alternative proposals from Woore Parish Council are discussed below.

Madeley Chord alternative

2. At a meeting with Woore Parish Council in January 2018 it was agreed to meet with Council representatives to discuss their proposal to reinstate the Madeley Chord. At the site visit on 16 February 2018, the Promoter discussed the challenges associated with bringing back into use the Stoke to Market Drayton line and the Madeley Chord and that this does not represent a viable alternative to the current proposal.

Access the M6 at junction 15, via Madeley

3. Manor Road and Holly Bush Lane are minor local roads which pass through Madeley Park. Sections of the road are narrow and there is limited scope to upgrade

this route. The proposed construction routes use the established A-road network as far as possible before using the local road network, only where necessary.

Access the M6 via the old Market Drayton to Newcastle-under-Lyme Railway Line

4. It is not feasible to establish a works access off the M6 primarily because the spacing of junctions would be an issue.

M6 via Keele services

5. Access from the M6 was considered via Keele services. However on investigation, the connection to Three Mile Lane and access to the line of route resulted in a number of environmental and logistical issues that made this option unsuitable. In addition, the access off Keele services would require a significant amount of cost and work to redesign the services to facilitate access and it is not confirmed whether this would be approved by Highways England and the operator of the motorway services area.

6. The proposed creation of a new track across farmland via Keele services would lead to the purchase of a significant amount of land currently unaffected and is not considered a suitable location. The Stoke to Market Drayton railway is currently not in use and it remains a Network Rail asset with the track and rail infrastructure still in situ. There is the potential that this could be used. However, it would require significant work and the issues of costs, access through Keele services and providing a link to the railway remain.

Whitmore Heath to Madeley tunnel

7. Following deposit of the Bill in July 2017, further work has been undertaken to understand the potential advantages of an alternative single tunnel option (a 6.4km long twin bored tunnel with porous portals, two shafts at minimum safe depth below the tracks of the West Coast Main Line railway). The results of that work are set out in a report published by the Promoter on 15 March, 2018². Overall there are environmental and engineering benefits of the single tunnel option compared to the Proposed Scheme although these would come at a considerable increase in the cost of the Phase 2A project.

8. At this early stage the Promoter cannot say exactly what the impact of construction traffic on Woore would be if a longer tunnel were to be adopted. However, while there would likely be a reduction in peak numbers of HGVs compared to those quoted in the Environmental Statement, it would likely still be necessary for construction traffic to use the A roads through the village.

² A copy of the report can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-2a-select-committee-in-principle-case-whitmore-heath-to-madeley-tunnel>.

Using the M6 to route construction traffic to the satellite compounds located to the north east of the Parish

9. There are already substantial haul roads proposed within the scheme which are generally accessed from the main road network to minimise the impact on the local road network. The ability to construct a continuous haul route is limited by blockers (such as roads, railway and riverine constraints) and would entail substantial construction activities which would need to be carried out by road until the haul roads were established. Furthermore, in general, when rail systems installations occurs, civils haul roads are no longer available for use and therefore would also require the use the local network.

HOUSE OF COMMONS SELECT COMMITTEE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (WEST MIDLANDS - CREWE) BILL

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION OF: Woore Parish Council

PETITION NO: HS2-P2A-000134

PARAGRAPH NO: N

ISSUE RAISED: Select Committee visit

PETITION PARAGRAPH: 1. That the Select Committee considering the Bill should visit the Parish in order to understand its geography and to obtain an understanding of the impact of HS2 Ltd's proposals on the Parish.

PROMOTER'S RESPONSE:

1. This is a matter for the Select Committee, not the Promoter. The Petitioner should approach the Clerk to the Select Committee directly with this request. The Petitioner will be aware that the Select Committee undertook a two day tour of the route of the Proposed Scheme in March 2018.