

County Council comments on the draft Environmental Statement

Non-technical summary

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Ecology and biodiversity				
NTS (5.2 & 9.6)	<p>Survey and assessment work is ongoing and baseline information is limited and incomplete at this stage.</p> <p>The assessment for the working draft ES is provisional and has been undertaken based on a precautionary approach.</p>	That the finalised ES is based on comprehensive and up-to-date ecological survey work		<p>Overall, the ecological information provided is very high level. It appears that much of it is incomplete, or extrapolated. It is not clear to what degree the route has been subject to ecological survey, or to what extent it will be.</p> <p>As a result, impacts are assessed on a worse-case scenario, and come out as being significant at the district, county, regional and national levels, even when mitigation is taken into account.</p> <p>In the absence of the detailed results of habitat and species surveys, it is impossible at this stage to say whether the mitigation, as proposed, is appropriate.</p>
NTS (7.6)	<p>The scheme is being designed to seek to achieve no net loss in biodiversity at a route wide level.</p> <p>Habitat creation is required to fulfil the objective of no net loss in biodiversity insofar as reasonably practicable in the local area</p>	Delivery of net gain	Opportunity to deliver significant ecological benefits, rather than providing bare level of mitigation as implied by a target of no net loss.	<p>No net loss is unambitious; the scheme should be seeking to deliver net gain, in line with the NPPF (i.e. para. 170d)</p> <p>All efforts should be made to mitigate locally against impacts. Net gains can be delivered at a route-wide level.</p>
Landscape and visual assessment				
Section 8 Summary of environmental effects by	The amount of habitat to be created is not quantified within any of the documents. The NTS would be a useful place to summarise this information (this	Quantify the amount of habitat to be created as part of the Proposed Scheme, in section 8	The amounts of habitat to be created could be added to the section 8 of the NTS	This would show the balance between the permanent habitat loss which is detailed in the ecology and biodiversity sections of section 8, and the habitat created as part of the Proposed Scheme.

community area	is included for the Northern Forest and National Forest only)			This will not necessarily be a 'like for like' replacement in order to mitigate the environmental impacts of the Proposed Scheme, and the rationale for the amount of habitat creation proposed should be included in the ES
Section 8 Summary of environmental effects by community area	The viewpoints mentioned are representative viewpoints, and are not the only viewpoints possible.	Rephrase the description in section 8 of NTS to make it clear that the viewpoints are representative viewpoints	To improve the clarity of section 8 of the NTS	Suggest certain paragraphs are rephrased in the NTS which say for example: - <i>'Construction activities would be visible from 10 viewpoints within the area'</i> to say <i>'10 representative viewpoints have been chosen to indicate where there would be views of the Proposed Scheme, these views have been described in detail in the LVIA'</i>
Traffic and transport				
Section 7.15	Monitoring requirements for the operational phase of HS2 not adequately covered.	Further assessment work should be undertaken to establish a monitoring regime following implementation.	The assessment could miss significant adverse impacts.	The Full ES should consider the likelihood of residual adverse impacts arising from the operation of HS2. It will not be able to identify all residual impacts and HS2 should commit to engage with the local highway authorities to assess and mitigate detrimental impacts arising post opening.
Section 8.14	Text describes the likely problem of on street parking on residential streets around the Toton Hub station.	Further assessment work should be undertaken to establish a monitoring regime before and after implementation. So that the severity of the impact can be established once HS2 is operational and suitable mitigation implemented	The assessment could miss significant adverse impacts and not provide the baseline conditions to establish the scale of the impact.	Further assessment work should be undertaken to establish a monitoring regime of on street parking in Toton and surrounds before and after implementation. So that the severity of the impact can be established once HS2 is operational and suitable mitigation measures identified implemented at the expense of the HS2 scheme promoter.

Scope and methodology report

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Landscape and visual assessment				

Section 15 Landscape and visual	It is noted that the Landscape and Visual Assessment is to be carried out using the recognised Guidance documents - GLVIA and DMRB, and by a Chartered Landscape Architect.	No comments	No comments	The Guidance is as follows - GLVIA - Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3 rd Edition DMRB – Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11 and IAN 135/10194, which is accepted best practice.
	It is noted that landscape and visual receptors within 1.5 km of the Proposed Scheme will be assessed as part of the study area.	None	None	Via East Midlands acting on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council reserve the right to request that this area is extended in areas where the scheme is visible over a wider area, once the LVIA and associated drawings have been examined in detail.
	It is noted that the visual assessment will be carried out in winter at the construction stage, and in winter and summer of Year 1, and Year 15	None	None	Via East Midlands acting on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council accept this as best practice, and also note that the likely significant landscape and visual effects in operation Year 30 will be reported in the formal ES
	There is a lack of reference to the district level Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping exercise in the landscape baseline	Refer to district level Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping exercise	The landscape baseline does not make reference to Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping exercise, information held by the relevant District Councils	The Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping information is accessible on the following website http://www.nottsba.org.uk/projects.htm
	The definitions of level of visual significance require revision	The definitions in Table 29 Paragraph 15.5.32 require revision	The definitions as they stand do not define the levels of significance effectively	Table 29 Paragraph 15.5.32 – the significance levels in this table need to be reworded. For example, ‘ <i>Minor adverse – A discernible reduction in the existing view</i> ’, should read ‘ <i>Minor adverse – A discernible reduction in the quality of existing view</i> ’,
Landscape and visual Para 15.1.2	This paragraph recognises that all landscapes should be valued, and that it is not just the ‘special’ or ‘designated places’ that have value but ‘ordinary’ landscapes as well	To recognise all landscapes as having value, not just the ‘special’ or ‘designated landscapes’ such as the National/Northern Forests.	The value of the landscape between the National and Northern Forest areas may not be taken into account. These landscapes may not have any designation but are nevertheless locally valued	There are areas of the Proposed Scheme that have particular cultural significance, for example the ‘Hidden Valleys’ that amalgamate the landscapes specifically referred to in the works of DH Lawrence. The cultural value of these areas should be taken into account in the Landscape Assessment.
Sound, noise and vibration				
Scoping Methodology Report	Baseline data	Three rounds of baseline data collection covering existing sources, modelling and by targeted monitoring	Therefore, specific analysis of the data and checks on the extent and suitability of proposed mitigation	Sound levels will be published in the formal Environmental Statement (ES) to follow later.

		as per proposed methodology	measures with respect to the predicted change in noise and vibration levels at individual receptors is not possible at this stage.	
	Operational noise and Vibration	An assessment of operational noise and vibration has been undertaken at sensitive residential receptors,	Non -residential but sensitive Agricultural, heritage and ecological receptors and the assessment of tranquillity not considered at this stage	Reports for each Community Area state that the assessment of noise and vibration impacts on agricultural, heritage and ecological receptors and the assessment of tranquillity is ongoing
	Road traffic noise levels as result impacts of alterations surrounding road network during operation	Further assessment should be undertaken	These have not been assessed Review of this impact has not been possible	These are to be included in formal ES later
	Construction noise and vibration	Community level receptors that may be affected have been identified but not significance of effect or effect on individuals	Specific analysis of the data and checks on the extent and suitability of proposed temporary mitigation measures with respect to predicted noise levels from construction activities at individual sensitive receptors is not possible at this stage	<p>The formal ES will include the assessment of likely significant effects from construction noise and/or vibration on individual receptors and communities.</p> <p>Draft codes of practice that will be applied is referenced</p> <p>Lead contractors will be required to seek to obtain prior consent from the relevant local authority under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 (CoPA) for the proposed construction works. The consent application will set out BPM measures to minimise construction noise and vibration, including control of working hours, and provide a further assessment of construction noise and vibration, including confirmation of noise insulation/temporary re-housing provision</p> <p>The report states that any site-specific mitigation will be presented in the formal ES and would include an estimate of the number of properties that may qualify for noise insulation or temporary rehousing under provisions set out in the draft CoCP.</p>

Volume 1: Introduction and methodology

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Ecology and biodiversity				
ES Vol.1 (7.1.5 and 7.1.10)	<p>Survey and assessment work is ongoing and baseline information is limited and incomplete at this stage.</p> <p>The assessment for the working draft ES is provisional and has been undertaken based on a precautionary approach.</p>	That the finalised ES is based on comprehensive and up-to-date ecological survey work		<p>Overall, the ecological information provided is very high level. It appears that much of it is incomplete, or extrapolated. It is not clear to what degree the route has been subject to ecological survey, or to what extent it will be.</p> <p>As a result, impacts are assessed on a worse-case scenario, and come out as being significant at the district, county, regional and national levels, even when mitigation is taken into account.</p> <p>In the absence of the detailed results of habitat and species surveys, it is impossible at this stage to say whether the mitigation, as proposed, is appropriate.</p>
ES Vol.1 (9.6.4)	<p>The scheme is being designed to seek to achieve no net loss in biodiversity at a route wide level.</p> <p>Habitat creation is required to fulfil the objective of no net loss in biodiversity insofar as reasonably practicable in the local area</p>	Delivery of net gain	Opportunity to deliver significant ecological benefits, rather than providing bare level of mitigation as implied by a target of no net loss.	<p>No net loss is unambitious; the scheme should be seeking to deliver net gain, in line with the NPPF (i.e. para. 170d)</p> <p>All efforts should be made to mitigate locally against impacts. Net gains can be delivered at a route-wide level.</p>
ES Vol.1 (5.11)	HS2 Ltd is considering the need for green bridges as part of the Proposed Scheme, based on the results of ongoing survey work. Should the need for any green bridges be identified these will be assessed and reported in the formal ES.	Use of ecological network mapping	Minimising impacts on ecological networks, and/or contributing to the creation of robust ecological networks	<p>In order to inform the need for green bridges, as well as habitat creation more generally, ecological network mapping (using Condatis or equivalent) should be carried out, as previously advised.</p> <p>In the absence of this, and as an exemplar, the scheme should seek to provide green bridges at a regular frequency, topography permitting.</p>
ES Vol.1 (6.2)	Land would be required temporarily during the construction period	Retention of habitat features wherever possible	Minimising impacts	Wherever possible, features within land required temporarily for construction, such as hedgerows and in-field trees, should be retained and protected.

ES Vol.1 (6.8.3)	Where reasonably practicable, trees and hedgerows would not be removed during the bird nesting season, with site clearance for non-critical design elements phased accordingly	Avoid vegetation clearance between March and August inclusive		It should be more than possible to schedule site clearance to avoid the bird nesting season, with appropriate planning.
ES Vol.1 (6.21)	Overbridges, underbridges	Features should be designed to allow movement of wildlife	Contributing towards ecological connectivity	Overbridges should be designed such that their abutments over features (e.g. roads) are offset to allow wildlife to use them as underpasses. Similarly, underbridges should also be designed so that they can be used by wildlife.
ES Vol.1 (8.6.1)	The assessment includes the consideration of effects arising from habitat... fragmentation, severance of ecological corridors and networks			See comments relating to ecological network mapping.
ES Vol.1 (9.6.5)	The Environmental Memorandum (which forms part of the EMRs) will include a commitment to provide long-term management of habitat creation to ensure that the target value of these habitats is achieved.	Definition of 'long term'		How long is 'long-term'? Should be in perpetuity, and should be the same across the board for all habitats and locations
Landscape and visual assessment				
Section 6 Constructio n of the Proposed Scheme	Consider the use of innovative construction techniques which will have an environmental benefit.	Investigate and research the suitability of innovative construction techniques which will have an environmental benefit.	The opportunity to use innovative construction techniques, which will have environmental benefits may be missed if these are not considered at the pre-construction phase.	The type of techniques may include for example the use of 'green roofs' to infrastructure buildings, the use of 'vegetated wall systems' for culvert headwall s and retaining embankments. These techniques could also encompass underpasses or 'green bridges' to allow the movement/migration of protected species. (additional information to be provided in ecology comments)
Para 5.17.7 Permanent Features of the Proposed Scheme	<i>'Trees and shrubs planted within restored areas would be of local provenance'</i> This needs to take into account climate change by selecting source material from southern local provenance areas rather than the midland LPAs	Tree and shrub planting needs to be resilient to climate change in order to establish effectively and mitigate the identified adverse visual and landscape impacts of the Proposed Scheme	To make tree and shrub planting resilient to climate change	Refer to the Forestry Commission Map 'Regions of provenance and seed zones in Great Britain' as shown below: - https://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/FRMGuidelinesRoPmap.pdf/\$FILE/FRMGuidelinesRoPmap.pdf
Traffic and transport				

Volume 1 9.3.11	"No operational monitoring in relation to air quality is currently proposed. This will be confirmed in the formal ES."	Scheme promoter should undertake/fund roadside monitoring to determine the air quality impacts of traffic generated by the operation of the HS2 hub. Scheme promoter should also be responsible for undertaking and/or funding required mitigation.	Could miss significant adverse impacts.	<p>It is not currently possible to determine the AQ impacts from traffic generated by the new hub as the transport modelling has not been completed. As the AQ modelling may not predict all of the air quality impacts that occur as a result of the traffic generated by HS2, an allocation of funding should be made available by the scheme promoter and set aside to fund the delivery of any mitigation so that the funding of any future mitigation required does not fall to the LHAs.</p> <p>Ideally the scheme promoter should commit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging with the LHAs following completion of the transport modelling and potential mitigation to consider the air quality impacts of traffic generated by the HS2 hub Engaging with the LHAs to consider air quality impacts and potential mitigation as part of its highway scheme development Fund/undertake ongoing roadside air quality monitoring following the start of the operation of HS2 Fund mitigation measures should air quality issues arise following the implementation of roads improvement schemes and/or the start of the operation of HS2.
Volume 1, section 9.14	Monitoring requirements for the operational phase of HS2 not adequately covered.	Further assessment work should be undertaken to establish a monitoring regime following implementation.	The assessment could miss significant adverse impacts.	The Formal ES should consider the likelihood of residual adverse impacts arising from the operation of HS2. It will not be able to identify all residual impacts and HS2 should commit to engage with the local highway authorities to assess and mitigate detrimental impacts arising post opening.
Volume 1 9.14.13	Doesn't include an outline travel plan so that desired outcomes and measures that will be considered/ included in the "specific station travel plans" can be discussed and agreed as part of the ES.	An outline travel plan should be developed detailing the desired outcomes from them (including potential mode share) and the suite of measures that will be undertaken as part of the specific station travel plans. The outline travel plan should be discussed and agreed with the LHAs.	Development of outline travel plan to inform and act as template for specific travel plans.	<p>Would want to be involved in development of these to ensure all appropriate potential measures to address impacts on the highway are included.</p> <p>LHA should be consulted on the measures/outcomes included in the station travel plans.</p> <p>Scheme promoter should provide funding for the delivery/ monitoring of mitigation measures included in station travel plans.</p>

		<p>LHA should be consulted on the measures/outcomes included in the station travel plans.</p> <p>Scheme promoter should provide funding for the delivery/monitoring of mitigation measures included in station travel plans.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Volume 2: Community area reports/maps

General comments relating to the community area reports:

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Ecology and biodiversity				
ES Vol.2 LA05 – LA08 and related CT- 06 plans	General comments on landscaping and habitat creation	Maximising opportunities		<p>Reference should be had to the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping (BOM) to assist with decision making about where to locate new habitat - see http://www.nottsbag.org.uk/projects.htm</p> <p>Woodland planting should be reflective of local character (rather than a generic woodland mix), with species selected with reference to the relevant Landscape Character Area species list – see http://cms.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/home/environment/andimprovements/landscapecharacter.htm</p> <p>There are significant opportunities for habitat creation within cuttings; in particular, cuttings located on the Magnesian Limestone should deliver the creation of new areas of species-rich calcareous grassland. Elsewhere, other species-rich grassland should be targeted within cuttings.</p>

				<p>Elsewhere, habitat creation should target priority habitats, as listed in Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, and in the Nottinghamshire local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBPA), available at http://www.nottsba.org.uk/projects.htm#bap</p> <p>Access for future management and maintenance should be designed into habitat creation areas.</p> <p>Balancing ponds should be designed to be multifunctional. It is stated in ES Vol.1 that these are intended to be dry most of the time, however lining a small, deepened area so that it holds water for the majority of the time would mean that these features could be used by breeding amphibians.</p> <p>There are a number of instances where hedgerow planting, to act as boundaries between land parcels and or different land uses, has been omitted, for example alongside access roads. Hedgerows should be used wherever possible.</p> <p>It will need to be recognised that habitat sandwiched between HS2 and the M1 will be of limited value, as it will be inaccessible to much wildlife (e.g. bats, other mammals, reptiles, amphibians etc.).</p> <p>Wildlife ponds should be provided much more frequently as part of the wider landscaping works (i.e. not just as great crested newt mitigation). There are numerous such opportunities.</p>
ES Vol.1, ES Vol.2 LA05 – LA08	No quantification of losses and gains of habitats	Losses and gains to be quantified in easily accessible format. Gains to be broken down into new habitat (i.e. gains), and re-created habitat (i.e. replacement of what was temporarily lost)		<p>There doesn't appear to be any comparison of the losses (permanent and temporary) and gains in habitat presented anywhere in the ES.</p> <p>An ecological accounting exercise, based on the Defra metric (or equivalent), should be used to objectively quantify the value of the lost habitats, and the value of habitat gains, to demonstrate no net loss, and net gain (see comment elsewhere about net gain).</p>
Land quality				
<p>General Comment; Vol 2; Map Books</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of potential contamination identified within the Land Quality report are not identified on any of the maps. • Similarly, none of the buildings/structures identified for demolition are marked. • This makes it difficult to judge whether all of the potential areas of contamination/impact have been identified. 				
Landscape and visual assessment				

Section 11 – Landscape and Visual Landscape baseline	It is noted that published LCAs such as the Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment have been taken into account in the baseline assessment	The landscape actions for the relevant Landscape Character Policy Zones should be taken into account in the design of the Proposed Scheme	The opportunity would be missed to achieve some of the objectives of the Nottingham LCA by means of the Proposed Scheme	The landscape Policy Sheets for the relevant Landscape Character Areas of the Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment, can be accessed on the District Council websites, these contain the Landscape Actions for each Policy Zone.
Section 11 – Landscape and Visual Visual assessment	The viewpoint schedules for the Construction phase and the Operational phase do not tie together.	Amend viewpoint schedules so that the Construction phase and the Operational phase schedules tie together.	The clarity of document will be improved if these changes are made.	
General point	Content of Community Area Map books noted	None	None	Via East Midlands acting on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council reserve the right to make additional comments once all of the Community Area Map books have been examined in detail.
Community area maps-general point	The landscape and visual impact on the townscapes adjacent to the Proposed Scheme has not been sufficiently considered	Greater consideration in the design of the proposed scheme should be given to the landscape and visual impact on the townscapes listed opposite	The opportunity for greater consideration in the design of the Proposed Scheme to the landscape and visual impact on the townscapes	Greater consideration in the design of the Proposed Scheme should be given to the landscape and visual impact on the townscapes of: - Trowell Village, Strelley Village, the western edge of Hucknall, the southern end of Annesley Woodhouse, Selston, Huthwaite, Kirkby Woodhouse and Hilcote
Proposed scheme wide WDES plans - General point	Linkages proposed in Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping will not be made. Biodiversity objective and Landscape objectives may conflict.	Add linkages between habitats using the BOM as a guide	Linkages between habitats will not be made, increasing the fragmentation on habitats, and subsequent loss of species	It is noted that the design of habitat areas link areas of woodland for example, as would be encouraged by the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping exercise, more linkages of this type should be created using the BOM as a guide. Existing biodiversity features should not be compromised by landscape objectives for example the need to provide screening.
Proposed scheme wide WDES plans - General point	Landscape areas may be created that are difficult or impossible to maintain in the long term.	Consider long term maintenance in the design of landscape areas, do not create features that are unmanageable due to access, steepness of slope etc	Landscape areas may be created that are difficult or impossible to maintain in the long term and may not establish effectively and mitigate the identified adverse visual and landscape impacts of the Proposed Scheme	
Proposed scheme wide WDES	There is lack of clarity with the graphics used on the plans.	Improve the clarity of graphics used on all plans, please see the examples given in the detailed comments	The maps cannot be easily understood and may not be correctly interpreted.	The green washed areas are presumably existing woodland, but this is not included on the key. Some small white areas are shown adjacent to the route and it is not clear how these will be treated, is this

plans General Point	-			existing landscape be retained? or is this a proposed area of landscape treatment? For example, drawing CT-06-444 – white area in centre of the plan adjacent to Weavers Lane, is this existing landscape, or proposed landscape?
Traffic and transport				
WDES Volume 2 Community Area reports LA04, LA05, LA06, LA07, LA08 Chapter 5. Air quality in each document	<p>Air quality impacts of additional trips on the existing highway network generated by the operation of HS2; and air quality impacts of HS2 associated highway improvements required to deliver HS2 – The WDES is based on a qualitative assessment of traffic flows only. Upon completion of the traffic modelling a full detailed assessment of the air quality impacts of the additional traffic generated by the operation of HS2/HS2 hub on existing highway infrastructure will need to be undertaken. The outcomes/ conclusions of this assessment, as well as any mitigation required to address forecast air quality issues, should be identified/ agreed with the LHA.</p> <p>Similarly, the air quality impacts of any highways improvements delivered by the scheme promoter to enable access to the HS2 hub will need to be undertaken as part of scheme development (and if necessary mitigation measures agreed with the LHA).</p>	<p>Further air quality assessment is carried out following the completion of the traffic modelling and included as part of the ES.</p> <p>Where air quality is predicted to worsen due to traffic generated by the HS2 hub (its construction or its operation following construction), or if road/rail improvements that are delivered as part of HS2 delivery worsen air quality, mitigation must be identified, agreed by LHA, and funded by the scheme promoter.</p>	<p>Misses the opportunity to finalise the mitigation (e.g. sustainable transport infrastructure, travel planning, property improvements, etc.) that is required to address air quality issues resulting from traffic generated by the HS2 hub, or from road/rail improvements that are delivered as part of HS2 delivery.</p>	<p>It is not currently possible to determine the AQ impacts from traffic generated by the new hub or of any proposed highway improvements. The AQ assessment should include the air quality impacts of each individual highway improvement identified through the outstanding transport modelling (as well as their cumulative impacts). It should also include an assessment of the AQ impacts from traffic generated by the new hub on the existing highway networks.</p> <p>No works should go ahead without mitigation if they will worsen local air quality and create/or has the potential to create air quality issues. Therefore where air quality is predicted to worsen due to traffic generated by the HS2 hub, or if road or rail improvements that are delivered as part of HS2 delivery worsen air quality, mitigation must be identified, agreed with LHA, and funded by the scheme promoter. Such improvements could be infrastructure improvements to properties; walking, cycling or passenger transport improvements; as well as co-ordinated personal travel planning (including the provision of incentives) with communities and businesses.</p> <p>As the modelling may not predict all of the air quality impacts that occur as a result of the traffic generated by HS2, an allocation of funding should be made available by the scheme promoter and set aside to fund the delivery of any mitigation so that the funding of any future mitigation required does not fall to the LHAs.</p> <p>Ideally the scheme promoter should commit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging with the LHAs following completion of the transport modelling and potential mitigation to consider the air quality impacts of traffic generated by the HS2 hub

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging with the LHAs to consider air quality impacts and potential mitigation as part of its highway scheme development Fund/undertake ongoing roadside air quality monitoring following the start of the operation of HS2 Fund mitigation measures should air quality issues arise following the implementation of roads improvement schemes and/or the start of the operation of HS2.
WDES Volume 2 Community Area reports LA04, LA05, LA06, LA07, LA08 Chapter 13. Sound, noise and vibration	<p>Noise impacts of additional trips on the existing highway network generated by the operation of HS2; and noise impacts of HS2 associated highway improvements required to deliver HS2 – The WDES is based on a qualitative assessment of traffic flows only. Upon completion of the traffic modelling a full detailed assessment of the noise impacts of the additional traffic generated by the operation of HS2/HS2 hub on existing highway infrastructure will need to be undertaken. The outcomes/ conclusions of this assessment, as well as any mitigation required to address forecast noise issues, should be identified/ agreed with the LHA.</p> <p>Similarly, the noise impacts of any highways improvements delivered by the scheme promoter to enable access to the HS2 hub will need to be undertaken as part of scheme</p>	<p>Further noise assessment is carried out following the completion of the traffic modelling and included as part of the ES.</p> <p>Where noise is predicted to worsen due to traffic generated by the HS2 hub (its construction or its operation following construction), or if road/rail improvements that are delivered as part of HS2 delivery worsen noise, mitigation must be identified, agreed by LHA, and funded by the scheme promoter.</p>	<p>Misses the opportunity to finalise the mitigation (e.g. sustainable transport infrastructure, travel planning, property improvements, etc.) that is required to address noise issues resulting from traffic generated by the HS2 hub, or from road/rail improvements that are delivered as part of HS2 delivery.</p>	<p>It is not currently possible to determine the noise impacts from traffic generated by the new hub or of any proposed highway improvements. The noise assessment should include the noise impacts of each individual highway/traditional rail improvement identified through the outstanding transport modelling (as well as their cumulative impacts). It should also include an assessment of the noise impacts from traffic generated by the new hub on the existing highway networks.</p> <p>No works should go ahead without mitigation if they will worsen local noise quality and create/or has the potential to create noise quality issues. Therefore where noise is predicted to worsen due to traffic generated by the HS2 hub, or if road/traditional rail improvements that are delivered as part of HS2 delivery worsen noise, mitigation must be identified, agreed with LHA, and funded by the scheme promoter. Such improvements could be infrastructure improvements to properties; walking, cycling or passenger transport improvements; as well as co-ordinated personal travel planning (including the provision of incentives) with communities and businesses.</p> <p>As the modelling may not predict all of the noise impacts that occur as a result of the traffic generated by HS2, an allocation of funding should be made available by the scheme promoter and set aside to fund the delivery of any mitigation so that the funding of any future mitigation required does not fall to the LHAs.</p>

	development (and if necessary mitigation measures agreed with the LHA).			<p>Ideally the scheme promoter should commit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging with the LHAs following completion of the transport modelling and potential mitigation to consider the noise impacts of traffic generated by the HS2 hub Engaging with the LHAs to consider noise impacts and potential mitigation as part of its highway scheme development Fund/undertake ongoing roadside noise monitoring following the start of the operation of HS2 (should it be required) Fund mitigation measures should noise issues arise following the implementation of road improvement schemes and/or the start of the operation of HS2.
WDES Volume 2 Community Area reports LA04, LA05, LA06, LA07, LA08. Chapter 14 traffic and transport in each report.	<p>The WDES is based on a qualitative assessment of traffic flows only. Upon completion of the traffic modelling a different access strategy and list of highway infrastructure requirements may emerge.</p> <p>CoCP will include a travel plan that we will need to accept to minimise construction worker impacts.</p>	The Full ES will need to be supported with a quantitative assessment of traffic and transport impacts both during construction and once operational. The full ES will need to demonstrate that all proposed transport infrastructure has adequate traffic capacity to accommodate the forecast travel demands at 2046 levels.	Misses the opportunity to finalise the supporting transport infrastructure and provide greater clarity on required transport infrastructure.	The HS2 traffic modelling is still in progress and therefore the WDES is based on expected traffic and travel forecasts rather than those more scientifically produced and accurate forecasts that will emerge from the East Midlands Councils Gateway transport model. LHA needs to be involved throughout as modelling outputs become available. This will enable NCC to understand and agree the model assumptions and to ensure that scenarios do not assume proposals that will not be funded by HS2 direct. NCC to date has been party to base survey methodology but no network impacts either during or post delivery of HS2 proposal. Without such information likely transport impacts can at best be guessed at.
Water resources and flood risk				
The following further information	Construction of surface water features/ drainage features.	All features need to be constructed in accordance with best practice.	If not designed to best practice standards drainage features may not provide additional benefits.	Demonstrate that drainage for infrastructure utilises SuDS throughout as a primary means of surface water management and that design is in accordance with best practice, CIRIA C753.

should be provided to the LLFA for the construction of the HS2 and associated infrastructure.	Details of ground conditions.	Permeability of ground surfaces to establish if infiltration is possible.	Infiltration features offer the most sustainable method of surface water management and should be used where possible	Provide infiltration testing results to demonstrate that infiltration is/ is not feasible at locations where ponds and attenuation basins are proposed.
	Increased surface water run-off.	Run-off from newly constructed infrastructure should not exceed pre-construction rates.	Increased unrestricted surface water run-off can increase flooding downstream.	The construction of any hardstanding surfaces that would lead to the increase of surface water discharge from the ES area should be restricted to Greenfield rates. Restricting rates to greenfield will ensure surface water discharge is at pre-construction rates and ensure that there is no increased risk of flooding downstream of the construction.
	Appropriate attenuation sizing.	There should be sufficient capacity for surface water storage	Inappropriate storage capacity can lead to surface water flooding.	All surface water run-off attenuation/storage features should have sufficient capacity for the 100 year (1%) event and include freeboard.
	Detailed design of drainage systems.	Where infrastructure requires construction of drainage systems to manage surface water, details should be provided.	Assess the suitability of the proposed scheme.	Provide detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including details on any attenuation system and outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations including climate allowances.
	Ongoing maintenance and management.	All features need to be maintained to ensure they function as intended.	Without proper maintenance and management features won't perform to design specifications.	Evidence of how the on-site surface water drainage systems / features shall be maintained and managed after completion ensuring long term operation to design parameters. Maintenance schedules and details of specific management activities should be provided.
	Multi-agency working	There may be a requirement to work alongside the EA and other RMAs to ensure the best outcomes.	Without involvement of other RMAs involved the full details of flood risks may not be understood.	In certain areas there may be a need to work in conjunction with the EA and RMAs in order to fully establish, understand and mitigate any flood risks.
The following comments are provided for crossings of ordinary watercourses	Reduction of capacity at watercourse crossings.	All crossings need to have sufficient capacity to convey flows without restriction/ increasing flood risk.	Restriction in channel capacity as a result of construction can lead to flooding.	Where there are crossings of ordinary watercourse as a result of construction details of current channel capacity and post construction channel capacity should be provided, in addition all crossings should be designed to convey the 1 in 100 year (1%) event.
	Cutting off informal flow routes.	Mitigation should be provided for any flow routes that are impacted.	Severed routes may lead to changes in flow regimes and/ or	Any informal/ ephemeral surface water flow routes may be severed by the construction of the line these need to be identified and mitigation provided. Where

es and where construction of infrastructure will sever surface water flow paths/ flood plains.			divert flows to new areas/ catchments.	construction cuts across the current uFMfSW further overland flow modelling should be conducted to establish these flow routes and sufficient mitigation provided where there will be impacts of diverting or severing these flow paths.
	Location/ Mapping of Ordinary Watercourses.	Any unidentified Ordinary Watercourses should be identified.	Cutting off any unidentified watercourses would increase flood risk.	The detailed river network used to identify the location of ordinary watercourses is not a complete record of all watercourse there may be others which will require site walkovers to confirm their locations, size, condition and the impacts of construction on these watercourses.
	Land allocation for compensatory storage.	All surface water/ flood compensatory storage should take place within the allocated ES area.	Land not within the ES boundary may not be eligible to be used for compensation at a later date.	Land has been allocated to provide compensatory storage for construction of infrastructure. It should be ensure that all compensatory storage can be provided within the allocated ES areas.
	Modelling catchments smaller than 3 Km ²	Any high risk areas where there is known flood risk issues should be modelled.	In high risk areas where watercourses are un-modelled the risk and impacts would not be fully know.	The flood map for planning only includes watercourses with catchments greater than 3 Km ² , there may be a requirement where there are known risks from a watercourse at crossing points to conduct further detailed hydraulic modelling.
	Consenting/ Permissions	Applications on Ordinary Watercourses would be subject to Land Drainage Consent	The LLFA should be able to fully assess the risk posed before any LDA Consent is granted.	Any consents required for the construction of HS2 should be given to the LLFA for consideration, there are costs associated with consenting applications.
Countryside access				
	Alternative routes must be open and available before the temporary or permanent closure of a public right of way or other form of access.			
	Non-motorised users (NMU) should not be diverted on to the public carriageway network without appropriate mitigation and safety measures being agreed for both temporary and permanent PROW diversions. NMUs should be accommodated away from the road network to reduce any safety risk but also to ensure that the attractive			

	qualities of the PROW network continue.			
	Consideration needs to be taken with the siting of construction compounds and other plant particularly where a public bridleway (due to equestrian use) exists either on a permanent or temporary alignment.			
	If and at the last resort construction vehicles and plant need to use the PROW network and the paths continue to stay open, measures must be in place to ensure users are safe and any signage and mitigation measures are designed to reflect that users have the legal right of way and construction plant must give way to legitimate public users.			
	Where construction plant has used the PROW network, surfaces must be repaired to an appropriate standard before the paths are reopened. Thought must also be given to the historical character and value of paths, for example, the reinstatement of a double hedged lane. In essence, paths must be designed with respect to their environment and retain their local character and 'feel' where feasibly possible.			
	HS2 Ltd need to keep the distances of both temporary			

	and permanent diversions to a minimum. Diversions and alternative routes which use the road network must be avoided or at least mitigated against; avoid unsafe areas such as compounds and plant equipment; be clearly signed and waymarked; constructed to a suitable standard for the type of traffic and location; be well drained; and any temporary diversions or alternatives to be fully open prior to the closure of definitive public rights of way.			
	Some existing paths may need to be upgraded to a higher status if a nearby path of higher status is closed (either temporarily or permanently).			
	Requests for Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders must be made to the County Council's Countryside Access team at least eight weeks in advance, and must include suitable approved alternative routes. Fees are applicable.			
	NCC require the sight and consultation of all draft legal Orders, maps, plans, schedules and any other legal paperwork regarding changes to the public right of way network. PROW changes must be clearly shown on detailed large scale plans as part of the legal process to ensure that NCC, the public, private landowners and HS2			

	Ltd are confident of the path alignment and there's no ambiguity.			
	The draft plans provided as part of the consultation do not show all definitive public rights of way, permissive paths, claims for PROW and other land used for public access. The alignment of some PROWs shown on HS2 Ltd.'s plans are incorrect. The status of PROWs are not shown on the plans.			
	There's a general lack of detail on the plans regarding affected paths. Further discussion and detail is required for those paths affected by changes to the road network leading up to but often away from the HS2 railway line.			
	It is noted that some diversions / changes on the plans to PROWs do not appear to follow a natural boundary or geographical feature such as a watercourse or existing hedge line? Further detailed contact and discussion is essential between HS2 and PROW Officers.			
	Signposts must be provided to the correct NCC specification at locations where a public right of way leaves the metalled highway network. Waymarking along paths may also be necessary. HS2 Ltd must provide an			

	appropriate signing schedule in consultation with the Authority.			
	The erection of structures on PROW, for example, safety barriers, kissing gates and bridleway gates, needs the express consent of NCC. Structures on PROWs can only be authorised for stock control, for the safety of PROW users or be a historical structure at the time of dedication.			
	Where structures are approved they must conform to the British Standard for Gaps, Gates and Stiles (BS5709:2018). Any structure erected on a PROW for any reason other than public safety becomes the property and responsibility of the landowner for future maintenance.			
	In essence structures should be kept to a minimum and HS2 Ltd should be aiming to adopt the least restrictive option for all public access i.e. a suitable gap for legitimate users.			
	In essence structures should be kept to a minimum and HS2 Ltd should be aiming to adopt the least restrictive option for all public access i.e. a suitable gap for legitimate users.			

	The materials and type of construction used for surfacing paths must be chosen to reflect the balance of user needs, maintenance costs, sustainability, local character and the local ecology.			
	The County Council will require a minimum width of 2m for footpaths and 4m for bridleways. Where a path is fenced on one or both sides it may be necessary to provide a greater width. The width of paths must be legally recorded on the HS2 Ltd.'s legal statement / Hybrid Bill to prevent any future ambiguity.			
	The surfacing specification for each individual path must be agreed with NCC in advance. Where a public right of way is shared with those with private access rights, the County Council will only be responsible for the future maintenance to a suitable standard for those exercising their public rights i.e. the County Council will not be responsible for maintaining a public footpath to standard suitable for the passing and repassing of private vehicular traffic.			
	Any new fencing erected adjacent to a public right of way will be the responsibility of the relevant landowner. NCC in its capacity of Highway Authority is not			

	responsible for maintaining fencing during or after construction of HS2. Fencing must not be electric, barbed or create a hazard to users.			
	HS2 Ltd must ensure that any planting schemes, screening, bunds and balancing ponds etc. do not impact on the PROW network. Any hedgerows or other vegetation planted by HS2 Ltd for safety or for other purposes and for other landowners will not be the responsibility of NCC. Future maintenance of these will be the responsibility of the landowner / manager.			
	The specification and standards for bridges carrying public rights of way must be in accordance with NCC's local specifications, British Horse Society (BHS) standards, Sustrans Bridges Guide and the Design manual for Roads and Bridges.			
	The liability for any new bridges including the surface, both over the HS2 railway line and those built as result of changes to the wider PROW network affected by the construction of HS2 will be the responsibility of HS2 Ltd.			
	The headroom in underpasses should be in accordance with NCC's local specifications, British Horse			

	<p>Society (BHS) standards, Sustrans Bridges Guide and the Design manual for Roads and Bridges. Underpasses should be designed with suitable drainage and be appropriately surfaced. HS2 Ltd will be responsible for underpasses including surfacing and drainage. Depending upon local circumstances there may be a requirement to provide lighting in underpasses. Lighting will be the responsibility of HS2 Ltd.</p>			
	<p>A risk assessment will be required on bridges provided for both PROW users and vehicles. A footway or margin may be required in certain locations where there is shared use by vehicles. The surface and any other infrastructure on a bridge will be the responsibility of HS2 Ltd.</p>			
	<p>Consideration may be needed, particularly on bridleways and for equestrians, for the provision of noise abatement from the railway line.</p>			
	<p>The County Council will be looking for PROW network improvements as part of the HS2 scheme. For example, physical path improvements such as surfacing or the creation of new routes improving the connectivity of the PROW network.</p>			

	HS2 need to recognise the importance of connecting settlements including links over county boundaries. There are a number of promoted routes along the Erewash Valley which need to be recognised and provided for, for example continued connectivity and bespoke signing, and changes to any promotional material.			
	Any diversion, newly created path or a crossing of the HS2 railway line must be designed to Equality Act 2010 standards and be full accessible to all members of the community. Where accessible ramps are provided depending upon the local circumstances it may be necessary to provide both steps and ramps.			

Community Area LA05 –Radcliffe-on-Soar to Long Eaton

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Ecology and biodiversity				
ES Vol.1 (5.13), Vol.2 LA05 (2.2.33)	Toton Station	Use of green/brown roof		The building should be designed to incorporate a green (or brown) roof to help mitigate against some of the extensive habitat loss at this location.
Health				
LA 05 Community	Housing quality and design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.4.43 Radcliffe on Soar, demolition of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider community 	

Area report & Map Book Radcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton – Draft Environmental Statement	Does the proposal seek to address the housing needs of the wider community by requiring provision of variation of house type that will meet the needs of older or disabled people?	<p>3 properties, not deemed to constitute an erosion of social networks and impact negatively on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolition of residential and business premises likely to have detrimental impact on health and wellbeing 	<p>engagement investment in areas impacted by demolition to help build community networks and community cohesion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any future housing as a result of demolition, needs to reflect the variation of house type that will meet the needs and capacity of the local population. 	
	Does the proposal promote development that will reduce energy requirements and living costs and ensure that homes are warm and dry in winter and cool in summer	Not applicable	Not applicable	
LA 05	<p>Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure.</p> <p>Does the proposal seek to retain, replace or provide health and social care related infrastructure?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no references made to any changes/reductions of health and social care infrastructure Public transport disruptions are documented (14.3.11, 14.4.19, 14.4.20) no reference to whether these disruptions or alternative routes will impact on people accessing health and social care services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration should be given to residents accessing health and social care services if road infrastructure is compromised. Consideration of impact on residents who receive health and social care at home and the disturbance of usual travel arrangements, particularly the elderly population of more remote 	

			and rural conurbations, ref: 8.3.15 re vulnerabilities in population.	
	Does the proposal address the proposed growth/ assess the impact on healthcare services?	No longer put bullets Reference to increase in workforce for construction phase to be 758 FTE for this area (12.4.3) but no consideration how this increase will put pressure on local health and care infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider demand on current services and increased of population in the short/medium and longer term due to workforce (8.4.38) Consider the impact of growth longer term due to increased and improved transport to the areas and this demand on services 	
	Does the proposal explore/allow for opportunities for shared community use and co-location of services?	Not applicable	not applicable	
LA 05	Access to open space and nature Does the proposal seek to retain and enhance existing and provide new open and natural spaces to support healthy living and physical activity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition of importance of open spaces to good mental health, physical activity and wellbeing (8.4.27) Temporary reduction and compromise of walks, cycling, sport and riding (ref 8.4.29, 8.4.31, 8.4.32, 8.4.34) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement with community who utilise the existing outdoor space to co-produce alternative provision Consideration to the impact on access of existing outdoor spaces during constructions phase (e.g. Toton Fields Local Nature Reserves 8.3.10) 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent loss of outdoor space (8.4.35) • Impacts on the visual landscape have potential to impact on neighbourhood quality (8.4.14) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure impacts of changes in visual landscapes are included and acted upon in ES 	
	Does the proposal promote links between open and natural spaces and areas of residence, employment and commerce?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporarily, construction will impact on active travel for social and work purposes, having a negative impact on physical activity associated benefits (ref 8.4.30) • Construction traffic deterring pedestrians and cyclists from using local road network (ref 8.4.28) • The route of Proposed Scheme intersecting with PRoW and the impact this will have on levels of physical activity (8.4.29) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure impact of PRoW is fully considered in ES • Work with community to co-produce safe, alternative routes to navigate their communities away from construction traffic 	

	Does the proposal seek to ensure that open and natural spaces are welcoming, safe and accessible to all?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary potential compromise of safe, welcoming and accessible outdoor spaces during construction (ref 8.4.29, 8.4.31, 8.4.32, 8.4.34) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider measures to mitigate any negative impact on utilisation of open and natural during construction and to re-establish once construction is over • Due to impact on PRow in this locality consider particular attention to the impact of disrupted access upon those with physical disabilities, such as wheelchair users, to ensure any particular needs are catered for as part of the planning for temporary diversions or permanent route/footpath changes. 	
	Does the proposal seek to provide a range of play spaces for children and young people (e.g. play pitches, play areas etc.) including provision for those that are disabled?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary reduction and compromise of play space (ref 8.4.29, 8.4.31, 8.4.32, 8.4.34) • Permanent changes to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement with community who utilise the existing outdoor space to co-produce alternative provision 	

		<p>accessibility to open space for riding school, adversely effecting users (8.4.35)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference to provision for those who are disabled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider provision for all 	
LA05	<p>Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity</p> <p>Does the proposal seek to minimise construction impacts such as dust, noise, vibration and odours?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects of pollutants through construction will be mitigated through Code of Practice (5.4.1, 5.3.6, 5.4.8) Potentially construction noise (including traffic) could have significant effects at communities closest to construction (13.4.8). Avoidance and mitigation measures to be reported in the formal ES 	<p>Ensure detailed assessments are in the ED as stated</p>	
	<p>Does the proposal seek to minimise air pollution caused by traffic and employment/ commercial facilities?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality impacts from traffic emissions during construction will be considered as part of formal ES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure detailed assessments are in the ED as stated 	
	<p>Does the proposal seek to minimise noise pollution caused by traffic and employment/ commercial facilities?</p>	<p>Potentially construction noise (including traffic) could have significant effects at communities closest to construction (13.4.8). Avoidance</p>	<p>Ensure detailed assessments are in the ED as stated</p>	

		and mitigation measures to be reported in the formal ES.		
LA05	Accessibility and active transport Does the proposal prioritise and encourage walking (such as through shared spaces) connecting to local walking networks?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severance of PRow permanent and temporary 14.5.16 • Alternative routes for PRow acknowledged 14.4.1 • Acknowledgment that presence of construction traffic may deter walkers 8.4.28 • Acknowledgement that presence of construction traffic may deter people from using active travel (walking) for work or accessing services, and choosing car instead, resulting in decrease in physical activity 8.4.30 	Consider engagement with local community to co-produce measures to mitigate temporary and permanent disruption Due to impact on PRow in this locality consider particular attention to the impact of disrupted access upon those with physical disabilities, such as wheelchair users, to ensure any particular needs are catered for as part of the planning for temporary diversions or permanent route/footpath changes.	
	Does the proposal prioritise and encourage cycling (for example by providing secure cycle parking, showers and cycle lanes) connecting to local and strategic cycle networks?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement that presence of construction traffic may deter cyclists, although no measures in place to encourage 	Co-production with local community to mitigate the impact in short/med/long term and seek alternative routes	

		<p>cycling (8.4.28, 8.4.30)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that construction traffic could deter people from using active travel (cycling) for work or accessing services and they may choose to use a car instead, thus decreasing physical activity (8.4.30) 		
	Does the proposal support traffic management and calming measures to help reduce and minimise road injuries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement of local accident clusters which are identified (14.3.7) • Assessment of accident risk due to construction traffic will be reported in formal ES 14.4.7 • Positive that CoCP states avoidance of HGV operating adjacent to schools during drop off/pick up (reducing risk of accident and perceived risk) 6.4.2 & 14.4.3 	Ensure road safety for all users of roads/paths nears roads in included in formal ES	
	Does the proposal promote accessible buildings and places to enable access to people with mobility problems or a disability?	No reference to enabling accessibility for people with mobility problems or disabilities	Consider needs of whole community, including those with mobility problems or a disability as part of formal ES	

LA05	Crime reduction and community safety Does the proposal create environments & buildings that make people feel safe, secure and free from crime?	8.4.38 increase in temporary population due to construction workforce Construction traffic impact (ref 8.4.28) (road safety) Acknowledgment that through community consultation fostering and maintaining good relationships between workforce and community (8.4.40) Suicide prevention is not referenced in the draft	As part of the ES consider impact increase in temporary population will have on community's perceptions of feeling safe and the cohesion of these 2 communities and consider impacts on social capital as described in 8.4.39 Work with community to co-produce safe, alternative routes to their navigate their communities away from construction traffic and once Proposed Scheme is finished Consider including mitigation measures relating to suicide prevention as part of the formal ES. Specific consideration to measures such as signage, staff training and bereavement support.	
LA05	Access to healthy food Does the proposal support the retention and creation of food growing areas, allotments and community gardens in order to support a healthy diet and physical activity?	No mention of supporting food growing	Consider the impact this scheme has on access to healthy food as part of the ES, including growing areas, allotments and community gardens Opportunity for local people to design food growing areas in new green spaces	

	Does the proposal seek to restrict the development of hot food takeaways (A5) in specific areas?	No mention of hot food takeaways	Any future commercial developments which are established from the Proposed Scheme should consider restrictions in hot food takeaways (A5)	
LA05	Access to work and training Does the proposal seek to provide new employment opportunities and encourage local employment and training?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to jobs creation (758 FTE) for this section, which, depending on skills of local people, could provide employment opportunity locally (12.4.3) Reference to increase in workforce locally due to construction leading to opportunities for local businesses to supply 12.4.4 Consideration to compensation of closure of business and loss of employment identified in 12.4.6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider measures to recruit from local population and utilise apprenticeships Opportunity for skills improvement linking with local education providers and engage with D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) 	
LA05	Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods Does the proposal connect with existing communities where the layout and movement avoids physical barriers and severance and encourages social interaction?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> severance of PRoW & waterways (6.3.5, 14.5.16, 8.4.29) and alternative routes 14.4.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider impact on identified vulnerable groups e.g. older people, young families on demolition of community asset (6.4.26) 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disruption to existing local social activities, e.g. Angling (6.4.9 & 6.4.28) equestrian activities (6.4.30) and local paint ball business (6.4.5) • Demolition of local community setting 'Greenwood Community Centre' which is deemed as significant major adverse effect (for all ages) 6.4.26 • Acknowledgement that construction, including traffic may defer communities from using their usual active travel for accessing services/work (8.4.28, 8.4.29, 8.4.30) • Demotion and impact on emotional wellbeing and sense of community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with community to co-produce plans as part of community engagement • Consider adding additional mitigation of avoiding using important local roads for construction traffic, which will worsen existing congestion and therefore exacerbate commuter stress. 	
--	--	---	--	--

		(6.4.25, 6.4.36, 6.4.19-31)		
LA05	Does the proposal seek to incorporate sustainable design and construction techniques?	Not applicable	not applicable	
LA05	Climate change Does the proposal incorporate renewable energy and ensure that buildings and public spaces are designed to respond to winter and summer temperatures, i.e. ventilation, shading and landscaping?	Not applicable	Not applicable	
LA05	Does the proposal maintain or enhance biodiversity?	References to effects during construction, avoidance and mitigation documented in 7.4.1, 7.4.45	No comment	
LA05	Health inequalities Does the proposal consider health inequalities and encourage engagement by underserved communities?	Limited focus on Health Inequalities (HI). Reference made to demographic characteristics of whole population (8.3.15) but this is not continued as a theme throughout.	Ensure HI is incorporated in final ES and in the approach to community engagement within the framework Consider further analysis as to whether plans impact negatively or positively on health inequalities	
Historic environment				
Volume 2 Community Area Report LA05 9.2.8	A list of heritage assets is provided but there is a statement made that the scheme is unlikely to have a significant effect on them.	It is far from clear on what basis this assumption of limited effect is made. The sites are uninvestigated, so their extent and state of preservation is not known	Minimising archaeological issues on the basis of limited information is not acceptable and will lead to loss, damage and destruction of archaeological remains.	
9.2.11	The SMR mentions intrusive field evaluation, but this section refers only to	The methodology applied in these area reports should match	As above	While we appreciate access issues may preclude field evaluation or geophysical survey, intrusive and site based

	non-intrusive work, not including geophysical survey.	the stated adopted methodology		survey work should nevertheless be a desired stage of work in accordance with ClfA best practice.
9.3.5	The significance of the area to the South od Redhill has been demonstrated to be of significance ranging from regional to national. It is not an area of “potential activity” – but evidenced.	There needs to be much clearer understanding of what we know and what we do not know		
9.3.6	The Iron Age settlement evidence at Redhill is assessed of moderate value – on what basis?	Explain and justify assessment in the context of evidence for an IA phase to the scheduled Roman site	Assuming arbitrary and minimal archaeological values risks underestimating archaeological risk, leading to destruction and damage of archaeological remains	The moderate value assessment would appear to be at variance with the evidence from excavation.
9.3.8	Iron Age Shield boss assessed as of low value	Reconsider the basis on which assessments of value are ascribed to allow for lack of knowledge, rather than assuming low value because of a lack of evidence.	As above	<p>We will not going to comment on detail on each of the values ascribed to non-designated assets on the basis of completely inadequate information, with the exception of the shield boss. The shield boss provides a good example of the potential dangers of ascribing low value to archaeological findspots or features on the basis of inadequate information.</p> <p>The ritual deposition of high status metalwork, including swords and shield bosses from the Bronze Age onwards is well attested in the Trent and other rivers. Some locations appear to be particularly favoured sites for such deposition. The proximity of this find to the site of the Roman shrine, which the report elsewhere posits has an IA antecedent, should have been identified as significant. The assessment of this rare item as being of low value appears from table 17 of the SMR to be because its “values are compromised by poor preservation or survival or of contextual associations to justify inclusion into a higher grade”.</p> <p>On the contrary, there is a clear archaeological context here – the River Trent in proximity to a probable ritual site.</p> <p>A further concern in this regard is the possibility that it demonstrates some inexperience on the part of the individual(s) preparing the report.</p>
9.3.10	The paragraph refers to evidence of Prehistoric activity, but what is actually being referred to – by and large- are	There needs to be much clearer understanding of what	As above	There needs to be closer attention to the quality of the data, and what it might actually reveal. Is a scatter of Medieval pottery

	casual findspots rather than the results of archaeological prospecting, investigative survey and fieldwork	we know and what we do not know, as well as what additional information is needed in order to understand the archaeology present and its significance.		sherds signs of manuring or the site of a Medieval occupation site?
9.4 onwards	The mitigation measures are so general we see little value in commenting on them in detail.			There are assurances that the right thing will be done, but with concerns over minimising archaeological value and assessing potential on the basis of inadequate and /or flawed evidence, we await to see how the evaluation work progresses.
LA05, map CT-05-430, Redhill Marina	Ratcliffe on Soar viaduct crosses nationally important archaeology, an extension of the Redhill Roman Shrine and Town scheduled monument.	<p>Mitigation needs to involve full total archaeological excavation of areas affected but also needs to consider the impact these excavation areas will have on our long term understanding of the site. Excavating the area of the viaduct piers alone may be insufficient mitigation.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to the implications of mineral extraction here before the scheme commences. Proposals to extract mineral in advance of its sterilisation by the viaduct will have major implications for this nationally important archaeology.</p>	<p>Proper understanding of the archaeological context of this regionally and nationally important site.</p> <p>Probable loss of information and understanding.</p>	The archaeological potential of the site is fairly well understood through previous phases of archaeological evaluation in support of previous proposals for minerals extraction – although the area shown on the minerals plan allocation areas differs from areas previously evaluated. The area has a clear archaeological significance, although its early Medieval potential is not fully understood. If the HS2 proposals precipitate extraction of the mineral there may need to be additional predetermination evaluation.
LA05, map CT-05-	River Soar Main Compound	The compound site possibly needs to be moved.	As intrusive investigations are not planned at this stage	There has been no formal archaeological evaluation to the east of the lane leading to Redhill Marina other than for EM Parkway, but we know the field in which the compound is proposed is rich

430, Redhill Marina		The compound area needs archaeological field evaluation	<p>(contrary to the requirements of the NPPF) it is likely mitigation proposals will be inadequate for the importance and complexity of the archaeology present over an extended area.</p> <p>The nature of the soils here means that use of the area as a site compound is likely to cause compaction and subsequent destruction of archaeological deposits and levels</p>	<p>in Roman archaeology. It is likely to be deeply stratified and contain well preserved organic remains.</p> <p>We know there is significant archaeology here, but the complexity and full potential of that archaeology is unknown. We can expect deeply stratified deposits with potentially high levels of organic preservation. Although the construction of the compound may involve only the stripping of topsoils, the use of the compound will inevitably cause compaction of the archaeological deposits, causing unacceptable loss of archaeological remains potentially (almost certainly) of national significance.</p>
LA05, map CT-05-430, Redhill Marina	New access track East of Redhill Farm and balancing pond	<p>Mitigation needs to avoid collateral damage to areas of archaeological sensitivity.</p> <p>The pond needs archaeological evaluation. The track may also require evaluation.</p>	Avoid damage to significant archaeology by considering relocating the track and pond.	<p>As above. The area report notes that shallow surface quarries will probably not be affected. This record is to the north of the compound and the road, but in the same general area. We do not know what these quarries are, but the soils here are deep and black, and probably overlies depths of Roman archaeology. It is possible the quarry pits were dug to remove Roman building material.</p> <p>While the track may feasibly only affect upper levels of this archaeology, the pond to which it leads will probably penetrate into significant archaeology. Extension to the existing track has not been archaeologically evaluated, but is in an area of high archaeological potential.</p> <p>The pond is in an area of high archaeological potential.</p>
LA05, map CT-05-430, Redhill Marina	Redhill Main Compound	Previous ground disturbance needs to be clarified and the site probably needs archaeological field evaluation.	Opportunity to address cumulative damage to this nationally important archaeological landscape not addressed, but simply added to.	High potential for continuation of the Roman urban settlement, but this area is not understood. It would be dangerous to assume that development associated with the power station has destroyed archaeological levels. Without understanding the archaeological potential, mitigation measures are likely to be inadequate. Archaeological finds have been recorded from nearby, but it is not known how the power station has affected ground levels.

LA05, Map CT-05-430-R1	Indicative site of Grid Supply Point	Archaeological field evaluation	Without proper assessment and evaluation of the site the context and hinterland of the important Roman town at Redhill will continue to be eroded through lack of appropriate mitigation	Some, but not all of this site, was evaluated as part of the A453 works. The archaeological potential is unknown but it is highly likely to have some. The value of such potential is currently unknowable. Geophysical investigation has limited usefulness on this geology, so alternative assessment methodologies need to be devised.
LA05 CT-05-431	Trent Crossing into Derbyshire	The archaeological potential of the Trent crossing and floodplain clearly needs archaeological field evaluation	Archaeological potential underestimated.	It is a concern that the archaeological report ascribes low value to the find of an Iron Age Shield boss from the River in the area. The find of such a high status piece of metalwork is worthy of note in any circumstance, but in such close proximity to the Redhill shrine it should have been identified as a potential ritual deposit, and the likelihood explored that this was a favoured location for such deposits.
LA05 CT-05-433	EM Hub	The industrial and pre-industrial archaeological potential of the area needs to be clarified.	Archaeological potential underestimated.	It will not be possible to identify appropriate mitigation measures without undertaking intrusive archaeological works. There is the potential here for ground remediation works to conflict with archaeological requirements. The provision of new balancing ponds will impact upon water courses which have been used as power sources since at least the Medieval period.
LA05 CT-05-430a	The new road infrastructure of the EMH	These will have a major impact upon the archaeology of the Erewash and its floodplain.	Archaeological potential underestimated.	The geoarchaeological potential of the Erewash needs to be understood in detail. We have very little idea what archaeological deposits will be impacted by the scheme because there has been little fieldwork in the area.
CT-06-434a	New balancing ponds and landscaping	As above	As above	As above
CT-05-434a	HS2 line	As above	As above	As above – but in addition the line will cross the early Medieval river crossing which is referred to in the place name, Stapleford; the name suggests there may be markers for the crossing (if the stapol is not the Anglo Saxon stone cross now in the village).
CT-06—435a	New balancing ponds and landscaping	As above	As above	As above
LA05, map CT-05-431	Impact on Thrumpton Hall design parkland and conservation area of Redhill Tunnel, Long Eaton and Toton viaduct.	Acknowledgement of direct impact (non-designated parkland and designated CA)	Restoration/enhancement of heritage of design landscape, not just focus on nature	9.3.5 of the Environmental Baseline is missing reference to the non-designated design parkland of Thrumpton Hall. Section 9.4.5 regarding temporary effects should make reference to

		and setting impacts (Grade I listed hall; CA)	conservation of 'woodland habitat creation' (9.4.5). Off-site mitigation in the form of repairs to designated and non-designated components of Thrumpton Hall, conservation area and parkland	heritage of design landscape not just focus on nature conservation of 'woodland habitat creation'.
LA05, map CT-05-429b	Impact of Ratcliffe-on-Soar viaduct on Holy Trinity Church, Ratcliffe on Soar (grade I); Manor Farmhouse (grade II) and Thrumpton conservation area.	Setting of grade I and II listed buildings and conservation area needs to be considered	No reference in section 9.3	Setting of grade I listed Holy Trinity Church is not referred to in the text of section 9.3, but the Ratcliffe-on-Soar viaduct will be within visual and audio influence of the church and Manor Farmhouse (grade II listed) and Thrumpton Conservation area.
LA05, map CT-05-433	Impact of East Midlands Station and main compound on non-designated heritage interest of existing Toton sidings.	Acknowledgement and consideration of the railway heritage interest of the Toton sidings.	No reference in section 9.3. The proper identification and recording of heritage interest stemming from the railway history of the site.	It is acknowledged in section 9.3.18 that Toton Sidings were the largest of their type in Europe in the 1950s. This is substantial C20th heritage interest linked to the colliery industry of the 1950s and proceeding WWII period.
Landscape and visual assessment				
LA05 – Ratcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton	The height and design of the proposed Long Eaton to Toton viaduct should be considered	Consider the design of a major viaduct structure, that is not visually intrusive.	The opportunity to design a major viaduct structure that is not visually intrusive will be lost.	Given the proposed height of the Long Eaton to Toton Viaduct, there will be extensive views along the open Trent Valley Corridor, between the wooded escarpment to the south and the urban edge to the north. The impact on views will be impossible to screen but a 'slender and elegant' structure will help to minimise the visual impact in this location.
LA05 - Ratcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton	The landscape and ecological mitigation of Toton Station East Midland Hub, needs to be more carefully considered	More carefully consider the design of Toton Station East Midland Hub	The opportunity to more carefully consider the design of Toton Station East Midlands Hub will be missed	Greater detailed design consideration is required concerning the landscape and ecological mitigation of Toton Station East Midland Hub site, due to the significant loss of Green Infrastructure
Sound, noise and vibration				
LA05 Radcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton	Potential significant airborne construction noise - Toton and Stapleford	Mitigation to avoid/reduce	Not considered at this stage	Site specific mitigation measures to follow in ES
LA05 Radcliffe on	Construction Traffic Impact on B5010 Derby Rd Stapleford to Nuthall area and	Consideration impact of construction traffic	Not considered in detail at this stage	The report states that the magnitude and extent of effect will depend on the level of construction traffic using the road. Residual significant temporary noise or vibration effects will be

Soar to Long Eaton	nearest residential and non - residential sensitive receptors			reported in the formal ES to follow later which will consider any amendments to construction routes considered necessary as part of the further work being undertaken.
LA05 Radcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton	Operational noise general	Reduction of airborne noise effects to avoid likely significant adverse effects	Not considered in detail at this stage	<p>The trains in this area will operate at speeds of up to around 280kph, however the majority of trains which are calling at the station will be slower on the approaches to the station.</p> <p>Mitigation, including landscape earthworks and noise fence barriers would substantially reduce the potential airborne noise effects that would otherwise arise from the Proposed Scheme. It is anticipated that the mitigation would avoid likely significant adverse effects due to airborne operational noise on the majority of receptors and communities.</p>
LA05 Radcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton	Operational noise Toton (occupants of residential properties in the vicinity of Lonsdale Drive and Banks Road, located closest to the Proposed Scheme).	Reduction of airborne noise effects to avoid likely significant adverse effects	Not considered in detail at this stage	See above
LA05 Radcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton	Operational noise (occupants of residential properties in the vicinity of Bessell Lane, Kelvin Close and Midland Avenue, located closest to the Proposed Scheme).	Reduction of airborne noise effects to avoid likely significant adverse effects	Not considered in detail at this stage	See above
LA05 Radcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton	Indication that may be exceedance maximum noise levels in vicinity Bessel Road, Stapleford Rd.	Identify those properties that may be eligible for noise insulation	Not considered in detail at this stage	See above
Traffic and transport				
WDES Volume 2 Community Area report LA05 Ratcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton. Paragraph 2.1.27	Concern that the decommissioning of the Ratcliffe on Soar Power station has not been considered.	Clarification re the R on Soar power station future use and decommissioning timetable.	The ES needs to consider the possible cumulative impacts of major works at the R On Soar power station.	It is understood that the R On Soar power station may be decommissioned around 2025. The ES needs to consider the possible cumulative impacts of major works at the R on Soar power station.

WDES Volume 2 Community Area report LA05 Ratcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton. Paragraph 2.2.26 to 2.2.29	Concern that the proposed new highway infrastructure in Nottinghamshire may not be feasible and will require departures from standards	The ES should report what departures from standards would be required at every highway interface.	Prior approval of Departures from Standard would have given added confidence in the design process and confidence that the scheme can go ahead in the form proposed.	There are a number of locations, in particular the realignment of the B5010 Derby Road in Stapleford where it is thought necessary to deviate from normal engineering standards. The ES should report what departures from standards would be required at every highway interface.
WDES Volume 2 Community Area report LA05 Ratcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton. Paragraph 2.2.31	The description of the East Midlands Hub station appears to make no allowance for a vehicle / tram route across the HS2 lines in an East- West direction.	To safeguard a corridor across the hub station to allow for future multi modal extensions between Nottingham and Long Eaton (and beyond)	Misses the opportunity to provide for a multi modal interchange and fully integrate travel opportunities locally.	The description of the East Midlands Hub station appears to make no allowance for a vehicle / tram route across the HS2 lines in an east- west direction. Similarly it is not clear if direct vehicle access can be gained through the HS2 hub station between the A6005 and A52 (T). Without a through route the likelihood of buses diverting to serve the site is minimal.
WDES Volume 2 Community Area reports LA05 14.5	Avoidance and mitigation measures doesn't include all of the options that we would expect to be included – e.g. doesn't include any travel planning with station workers, or station users	Targeted personal travel planning with staff and residents (as a proven mechanism for changing travel behaviour) should be included in the mitigation measures.	The ES doesn't (but needs to) include all proven mitigation measures	Surveys of the station users would identify areas within walking, cycling and public transport distance that station users are travelling from by car which could then be targeted for personal travel planning. The scheme promoter would also be expected to provide funding for all mitigation and should therefore commit to do so.
WDES Volume 2 Community Area reports LA05 14.5.5	Key operation transport issues – currently unable to determine the level of traffic generated by the HS2 hub and therefore the mitigation required	Following completion of the transport modelling the ES should consider and include all potential mitigation.	The ES doesn't (but needs to) include all proven mitigation measures.	Would expect the scheme promoter to discuss and agree measures to mitigate traffic generated by the operation of HS2 hub with the LHAs. The scheme promoter would also be expected to provide funding for all mitigation and should therefore commit to do so.
WDES Volume 2 Community Area reports	Parking and loading – nothing included in the mitigation concerning addressing the impacts of displaced parking on the highway network	Full assessment of the likely impacts of displaced parking on the highway network needs to be	Could miss significant impacts as assessment doesn't undertake an assessment of the impacts of parking; or	Would expect the scheme promoter to assess the likely impacts of displaced parking on the highway network; and then to discuss and agree measures to mitigate these impacts with the traffic generated by the operation of HS2 hub with the LHAs.

LA05 14.5.12 LA05 14.5.26		undertaken and mitigation provided	therefore the mitigation required to address the likely impacts.	The scheme promoter would also be expected to fund mitigation measures should displaced parking issues arise following the implementation of road improvement schemes and/or the start of the operation of HS2 (and set aside funding in case such impacts arise in the future).
Water resources and flood risk				
LA-05, CT-05/06-434a - Toton, Bessel Lane / Trowell / A52 area	There is evidence of known flooding issues within this area.	Ensure that causes of historic flooding are considered and that there will be no increases to the flood risk in the area.	Bessel lane is in close proximity to the proposed HS2 hub station and should be addressed	We have reports of flooding within this area that should be investigated further to establish flood mechanisms. Options for alleviating flood risk should be identified and considered as part of the works and it should be ensured flood risk is not increased as a result of the proposals.

Community Area 06 - Stapleford to Nuthall

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Ecology and biodiversity				
ES Vol. 2 LA06 (7.3.5), CT-05-440a and CT-05-441a	Potential impacts on Sellers Wood SSSI, Bulwell Wood SSSI and Annesley Woodhouse Quarries SSSI	Protection of SSSIs during works		All three sites are adjacent to land required for the Proposed Scheme. It is imperative that these sites are protected from indirect impacts.
ES Vol.2 LA06 (2.2.27), CT-05-440A	Loss of New Farm Wood Ancient Woodland	Retention of as much of the woodland as possible		The loss of this ancient woodland in its entirety, largely to accommodate construction works, is wholly unacceptable. Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat, and working areas must be designed so that this woodland can be substantially retained.
Health				
LA06	Housing quality and design Does the proposal seek to address the housing needs of the wider community by requiring provision of variation of house type that will meet the needs of older or disabled people?	Extensive demolition a total of 72 buildings affecting residential properties and commercial sites to include a garage , 2 rural farms, police	Community Engagement is essential as the impact to the neighbourhood quality and character should not be underestimated. Therefore any future	

		<p>station and medical facilities .</p> <p>A total of 5 Satellite compounds to be developed to support the construction and demolition.</p> <p>Sections: 2.3.31-2.3.32 2.3.54, 2.3.60, 2.3.77, 2.3.87, 2.3.92, 4.4.36</p> <p>The creation of viaducts, cuttings, embankments and tunnels will impact on the three areas. Options appraisal are defined specifically for the Strelley Tunnel.</p> <p>Map p28 2.3.21 and section 2.5, 2.3.6</p> <p>Reference made to the draft code of construction practice (CoCP) is advocated as well as the inclusions of Local Environmental Plans (LEMP)</p>	<p>housing due to the demolition needs to reflect the different housing types.</p> <p>In addition the level of compensation for example the impact to 2 rural farms cannot be fully assessed at this point. Therefore should be addressed within the formal ES.</p> <p>The draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) refers to community engagement framework delivered by experienced community relations personnel. To consider the inclusion of existing partnership linked to the Local Authority and the Health and Wellbeing Boards e.g. local voluntary sector organisations</p> <p>Consider adding: commission access to expert counselling services for dealing with loss related to demolition.</p>	
	Does the proposal promote development that will reduce energy requirements and living costs and ensure that homes are warm and dry in winter and cool in summer	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
LA06	Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure	Health Section 8 Community Impact to the Stapleford to	Consider Consultation and stakeholder engagement due to the	

	<p>Does the proposal seek to retain, replace or provide health and social care related infrastructure?</p>	<p>Nuthall area parishes of Sandiacre, Stanton-by-Dale, Trowell, Strelley and Nuthall. Rural, with villages including Strelley and Nuthall and a scattering of isolated dwellings and farmsteads. There is a number of Primary and Secondary Schools in the location of the development (section 2.1). The pertinent areas to Nottinghamshire are Stapleford and Nuthall. Reference to the Scope and Methodology Report (SMR) should be commended acknowledged the identification and an assessment of health determinants to include to include temporary and permanent impact affecting the following areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neighbourhood quality; - Access to services, health and social care; - Access to green space, recreation and physical activity; and 	<p>risk of loss of community assets and loss of property. The demolition of fertility clinic (CARE Fertility Nottingham) will have access implication for Nottinghamshire wide residents.</p> <p>Potential travel disruptions across all the communities must be consider to access health and social care amenities particularly the most vulnerable the elderly population in rural settings. The impact of the well-being of the school community e.g. Young people with special needs for autism school and a secondary school pupils access to their schools.</p> <p>Moo-Haven animal rescue centre to be closed for approximately four years and six months and permanent loss of 5.8% of land: a major adverse effect which would be significant due to its links autistic children engagement with the welfare of the animals (see EIA</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - social capital - neighbourhood quality <p>The demolition of a fertility clinic (CARE Fertility Nottingham) on Lawrence Drive in the Nottingham Business Park. The nearest alternative CARE facilities located in Leicester and Derby.</p>	summary and Checklist).	
	Does the proposal address the proposed growth/ assess the impact on healthcare services?	<p>Chapter 8 Health and Map 28 section 2.3.29 construction compounds (workforce population numbers)</p> <p>There is reference to the demolition of a fertility clinic medical facility (CARE Fertility Nottingham) as stated above. Otherwise there is no other consideration to health and care infrastructure given the increases in the work force to support the construction and satellite compounds.</p>	Consider the inclusion of the impact of the reduce fertility clinic care as part of the EIA.	
	Does the proposal explore/allow for opportunities for shared community use and co-location of services?	There is no reference to co- location of services following the demolition of a fertility clinic medical facility (CARE Fertility Nottingham)	To be considered as part of the EIA and the formal ES.	
LA06	Access to open space and nature Does the proposal seek to retain and enhance existing and provide new open	Section 2.1.11 the route of the proposed scheme would cross	Landscaping and woodland habitat creation considered as	

	and natural spaces to support healthy living and physical activity?	<p>several public rights of way (PROW) including bridleways and public footpaths, which provide important links between scattered dwellings and surrounding villages.</p> <p>11.1.4 – 11.3.18 landscape character areas (LCA) significantly affected has been subdivided into fifteen LCAS. & areas will be significantly affected within the Stapleford to Nuthall area</p> <p>Impacting on tranquillity through the introduction of vehicles and large-scale machinery.</p> <p>A loss of playing fields the viewpoints most likely to be impacted see viewpoint location maps la0 6 map book series lv – 03 and lv – 04</p> <p>Reference to mitigation set out in the draft code of contract action practice (Co CP) as stated however this is suggested where it is reasonably practical and assessment as part of the ES</p>	<p>part of the ES to mitigate against the negative impact to the communities.</p> <p>To consider the above as part of the involvement of the affected communities via inclusion within the community engagement framework</p>	
	Does the proposal promote links between open and natural spaces and	<p>Section 2.1.11</p> <p>References to impact of physical activity</p>	<p>PROW to be considered as part of the formal ES and for</p>	

	areas of residence, employment and commerce?	<p>/active travel due to the loss and realignment of PROW and increased Construction traffic.</p> <p>Section 8 and 6.4.6 .The loss of open space potential impact on mental and emotional wellbeing of residence.</p> <p>A loss of recreational playing fields has been reference alongside the significant percentage impact to the communities</p>	inclusion in the draft CoCP measures that will mitigate any negative impact.	
	Does the proposal seek to ensure that open and natural spaces are welcoming, safe and accessible to all?	As above	As above	
LA06	<p>Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity</p> <p>Does the proposal seek to minimise construction impacts such as dust, noise, vibration and odours?</p>	<p>Section 2.4</p> <p>The report outlines that there will be 11 trains hour each way passing through the Stapleford to Nuthall area. Services expected to operate between 05:00 and midnight from Monday to Saturday and 08:00 and midnight on Sunday. at speeds of up to 225mph (360kph).</p> <p>Mitigation references:</p> <p>2.2.12 Noise fence barriers and Landscape planting and woodlands</p> <p>2.4. 7 maintenance and disposable waste material a nominated undertaker.</p>	Ensure that avoidance and mitigation processes are detail ed assessments present in the ED	

		<p>13.5.5 procurement process of trains and track utilising international technology to enable the railway to be quieter</p> <p>5.3.6/3 the identification of sensitive receptors to changes in air quality and the generation dust – impact on the community schools and businesses.</p> <p>Mitigation references:</p> <p>5.4.1 draft code of construction practice (Co CP) reference to Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) section 13</p> <p>noise management criteria during evening and night-time operations period</p> <p>noise insulation or temporary re – housing for qualifying properties</p>		
	Does the proposal seek to minimise air pollution caused by traffic and employment/ commercial facilities?	As above	As above	
	Does the proposal seek to minimise noise pollution caused by traffic and employment/ commercial facilities?	As above	As above	
LA06	<p>Accessibility and active transport</p> <p>Does the proposal prioritise and encourage walking (such as through shared spaces) connecting to local walking networks?</p>	<p>Section 14.2.4</p> <p>Public Rights Of Way Survey (PROW)</p> <p>Qualitative assessment assess the</p>	<p>Ensure that the involvement of the affected communities via enablement & inclusion within the</p>	

		<p>pedestrian and cycle activity along the footpaths of the local roads affected by the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Nine bus routes operate on five roads that are crossed by the route of the Proposed Scheme includes a school bus.</p> <p>Mitigation references to The draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and the development of local traffic management plans.</p> <p>Proposed alternative sustainable modes of transport or vehicle sharing for construction workforce and visitors – travel plan framework.</p> <p>Temporary road closures and diversions - increase travel times congestions and delay will be an issue.</p> <p>In addition temporary bus route diversions and relocation of bus stops affecting three bus routes that includes a school bus.</p> <p>The realignment of some of the PRow would increase journey distance and time for non-motorised users</p>	<p>community engagement framework of the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p> <p>Ensure the earliest involvement of the relevant Local Authority personnel to develop the local traffic management plans.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		and may result in significant effects		
	Does the proposal prioritise and encourage cycling (for example by providing secure cycle parking, showers and cycle lanes) connecting to local and strategic cycle networks?	As above	As above	
	Does the proposal support traffic management and calming measures to help reduce and minimise road injuries?	As above	As above	
	Does the proposal promote accessible buildings and places to enable access to people with mobility problems or a disability?	As above	As above	
LA06	Crime reduction and community safety Does the proposal create environments & buildings that make people feel safe, secure and free from crime?	Sections: 2.3.31-2.3.32 The Satellite compounds and the workforce of over 2000 over the duration of the development. Section 8.4.35 Acknowledgment that through community consultation fostering and maintaining good relationships between workforce and community. Suicide prevention is not referenced in the draft tween workforce and community	Consider the inclusion of security measures in the ES as the sites may impact on community safety Consider including mitigation measures relating to suicide prevention as part of the formal ES. Specific consideration to measures such as signage, staff training and bereavement support	
LA06	Access to healthy food Does the proposal support the retention and creation of food growing areas, allotments and community gardens in order to support a healthy diet and physical activity?	Section 11.3 Allotment s have been cited as part of the Environmental baseline.	Consider the impact this scheme has on access to healthy food as part of the ES, including growing areas, allotments and community gardens	

			Opportunity for local people to design food growing areas in new green spaces	
	Does the proposal seek to restrict the development of hot food takeaways (A5) in specific areas?	No mention of hot food takeaways	Any future commercial developments which are established from the Proposed Scheme should consider restrictions in hot food takeaways (A5)	
LA06	Access to work and training Does the proposal seek to provide new employment opportunities and encourage local employment and training?	2.1.12 The socio – economic profile identifies that the professional, scientific and technical sector accounts for the largest proportion of business (14%), with construction (13%) followed by retail (10%) and manufacturing (8%). 12.4.8 - Table 32 – 12.4.19 Potentially significant effects on business activities and employment due to the development demolition of business units at Nottingham Business Park. Estimated 1,063 jobs137 would either be displaced or possibly lost within the Stapleford to Nuthall area. 12.4.2 Premises demolished with their occupants	Consider measures to recruit from local population and utilise apprenticeships Opportunity for skills improvement linking with local education providers and engage with D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)	

		and employees needing to relocate to allow for construction of the Proposed Scheme. Potential employment opportunities arising from construction employment creation has been considered as part of the route-wide assessment (see Volume 3: Route-wide effects).		
LA06	Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods Does the proposal connect with existing communities where the layout and movement avoids physical barriers and severance and encourages social interaction?	Section 2 Strelley and Nuthall (Nottinghamshire County) are villages Public Rights of way (ProW) as a recreational resource and provides links to scattered dwellings and surrounding villages are impacted by the development 2.1.10 The Strelley and Nuthall villages are located closer to the Proposed Scheme, and have fewer local services and community facilities	Ensure that the involvement of the affected communities via enablement & inclusion within the community engagement framework of the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).	
LA06	Minimising the use of resources Does the proposal seek to incorporate sustainable design and construction techniques?	Not applicable	Not applicable	
LA06	Climate change Does the proposal incorporate renewable energy and ensure that buildings and public spaces are	Section 10 Flood risk monitoring	No comment	

	designed to respond to winter and summer temperatures, i.e. ventilation, shading and landscaping?			
	Does the proposal maintain or enhance biodiversity?	Section 7 Ecology and Biodiversity outlines important sites of special scientific interest (SSSI) as significant areas for focus.	To ensure full impacts on biodiversity are explored in the formal ES and attempts made to ensure biodiversity is enhanced.	
LA06	Health inequalities Does the proposal consider health inequalities and encourage engagement by underserved communities?	Section 8 Demographic and health profile undertaken however the statements appear quite generically applied to all Community Area Reports There is no clear focus on health inequalities (HI).	Ensure HI is incorporated in final ES and in the approach to community engagement framework. Consider further analysis as to whether plans impact negatively or positively on health inequalities	
Historic environment				
(LA06) CT-05-434b	Derby Road over bridge and HS2 line	These will have a major impact upon the archaeology of the Erewash and its floodplain.	Archaeological potential underestimated.	The geoarchaeological potential of the Erewash needs to be understood in detail. We have very little idea what archaeological deposits will be impacted by the scheme because there has been little fieldwork in the area. As above – but in addition the line will cross the early Medieval river crossing which is referred to in the place name, Stapleford; the name suggests there may be markers for the crossing (if the stapol is not the Anglo Saxon stone cross now in the village).
LA06 CT-05-436	Compounds and line of HS2	Mitigation proposals based on good evidence	Highly likely that archaeological issues will be underestimated here.	Lack of fieldwork in area has led to under-representation on the HER. Early coal mining remains of archaeological potential, but these also mask earlier remains. Need to adopt positive response to evaluation and mitigation.
LA06 CT0-06-436	Balancing ponds and earthworks.	Mitigation proposals based on good evidence	Highly likely that archaeological issues will be underestimated here.	Lack of fieldwork in area has led to under-representation on the HER. Early coal mining remains of archaeological potential, but these also mask earlier remains. Need to adopt positive response to evaluation and mitigation.
LA06 CT-05-437	HS2 and compounds	Early coal mining remains need	As above.	As Above

		identification and mitigation		
LA06 CT-05-438	HS2 and compounds	Good comprehension of the landscape archaeology associated with Strelley Hall, and mitigation measures to match the loss of landscape features and early mining remains.	As above.	Significant piece of historic landscape, already damaged by M1. The archaeological features need to be disentangled and understood properly; mining remains, of interest in their own right, may obscure other parkland features. Strelley Hall contains the remains of an important Medieval fortified tower house, the associated park is early and long lived. However, a lack of fieldwork in area has led to under-representation on the HER. If the tunnel is bored this will reduce potential for damage. Need to adopt positive response to evaluation and mitigation.
LA06 CT-06-438	Landscaping and tree planting	Consideration of the suitability – or otherwise- of block tree planting	Opportunity to restore landscape to that more typical of historic parkland.	Mitigation planting should respect the historic parkland.
LA06 CT-05-439	HS2 route and compounds	Need good understanding of the remnants of the historic parkland around Nuthall, so that appropriate mitigation measures can be identified. Impact on the historic core of the village needs to be understood again so appropriate mitigation measures can be identified	Loss of landscape features, loss of archaeological information.	Another complex area, where early coal mining remains are in amongst historic parkland features. It would be easy to dismiss the landscape here as damaged beyond legibility by the M1 and other unsympathetic modern development. There are areas and views of significance, and they need to be appreciated and understood so that appropriate mitigation measures can be identified.
LA06 CT-06-439	Landscaping and planting	Consideration of the suitability – or otherwise- of block tree planting	Opportunity to restore landscape to that more typical of historic parkland.	Mitigation planting should respect the historic parkland.
LA06 CT-05-440a	Route, earthworks and compound	Woodland may conceal well-preserved archaeological remains – needs Lidar.	Loss of landscape features, loss of archaeological information.	Early coal mining remains in the area, need identifying and appropriate mitigation. Earlier archaeological features may also exist here, but effectively be masked by post Medieval activity. There has been very little archaeological fieldwork in the area, so it would be very easy to under-estimate archaeological potential.

		Early coal mining remains need appropriate mitigation. Area under-represented on the HER – needs proper evaluation.		
LA06 CT-06-440a	Landscaping and ponds	As above	As above	As above.
LA06 CT-05-441a	Route, earthworks and compound	Woodland may conceal well-preserved archaeological remains – needs Lidar. Early coal mining remains need appropriate mitigation. Area under-represented on the HER – needs proper evaluation.	As above	Early coal mining remains in the area, need identifying and appropriate mitigation. Earlier archaeological features will also exist here, but effectively be masked by post Medieval activity. There has been very little archaeological fieldwork in the area, so it would be very easy to under-estimate archaeological potential. Lidar of Hellhole wood and adjacent areas of woodland shows extensive earthworks, all of which are unrecorded on the HER.
LA06 CT-06-441b	Planting, ponds and mitigation	As above	As above	As above.
LA06, map CT-06-438	Trowell Moor Cutting No.2 (Strelley Portal) and mined tunnel	Acknowledgement of Strelley Conservation area (9.3.4 fails to mention it). Reference to the permanent effects on All Saints Church and other designated listed buildings Strelley – which will be of high magnitude and a significant adverse impact. Acknowledgement of the non-designated	Design of the tunnel portal at the southern entrance to Strelley should be considered in detail to ensure that the appropriate landscape mitigation is utilised, taking into consideration the design landscape of Strelley Hall and the setting of All Saints Church. Off site mitigation to enhance the condition of heritage assets affected.	Permanent additional blighting of Home Farm Nuthall, and other designated assests within the noise and visual influence of HS2 should be mitigated. Noise barriers are visually intrusive in their own right and the lack of space for landscaping measures limits opportunities. Alternative schemes to enhance the heritage assets affected are appropriate. In particular the 'blight' impacts should be addressed through capital works that reflect the devaluing of the assets for economic uses. This work could be undertaken directly, by HS2, led by conservation expertise to ensure the improvements in the fabric of the assets is delivered to appropriate standards and timescales. Conservation repairs should be undertaken at the following sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Saints Church Strelley (1248224); Strelley Hall, Stables, kitchen garden and icehouse (1248225; 1277994; 1278007; 1248330)

		historic parkland of Strelley Hall.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strelley Conservation Area (public realm works – wall repairs, Monk stones conservation) Strelley Hall ancillary buildings: garden wall; ice house etc.
LA06, CT-06-439&440a	Nuthall, J26 M1	Acknowledge effects on Nuthall Conservation area, designated listed buildings and non-designated historic parkland.	Permanent adverse noise should be formally acknowledged, impacts on: Home Farm Nuthall (B@R); Nuthall Conservation Area; St Patrick's church and other listed buildings on Nottingham Road; Nuthall Temple parkland.	<p>Permanent additional blighting of Home Farm Nuthall, and other designated assets within the noise and visual influence of HS2 should be mitigated. Noise barriers are visually intrusive in their own right and the lack of space for landscaping measures limits opportunities. Alternative schemes to enhance the heritage assets affected are appropriate. In particular the 'blight' impacts should be addressed through capital works that reflect the devaluing of the assets for economic uses. This work should be undertaken directly, by HS2, led by conservation expertise to ensure the improvements in the fabric of the assets is delivered to appropriate standards and timescales.</p> <p>Conservation repairs should be undertaken at the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nuthall designated heritage identified on the 'at risk' registers (HE and NCC): Summer House (ref 1246177); Home farm (1248230;1277939); Garden Bridge (1249173). Nuthall designated heritage not on H@R: Nuthall Temple gate pier (1248188); 1, 3, 7 Nottingham Road (1248184;1248185;1278021); Old Rectory and adjoining rectory grange (1278022); St Patrick's Church and churchyard (1248182;1248183)
LA06, CT-06-442	Beacon Hill Farm	Not on HER but seems to be on the Sanderson map.	Note the effects on a non-designated heritage asset	Requires further on-site investigation to establish heritage interest.
Landscape and visual assessment				
9.2	The difference between the SMR and the actual methodology apparently being used has been noted in response to LA05			
9.3.7	Assessment of moderate and low value are based on inadequate evidence	Assessment criteria need to be re-considered. Limited evidence is not evidence of limited		Assessment process is flawed.

		archaeological potential.		
9.3.9-11	These three paragraphs demonstrate limited familiarity with the evidence (such as it is) and its potential meaning.	The information needs to be properly considered, with survey and evaluation undertaken to properly understand the archaeological potential of each area.		Again, probably little point in exploring the issues in any detail, other than picking up on one particular statement; "From excavated evidence it appears that most Roman sites in this area were abandoned after 70AD". We can only think this bizarre comment comes from the Broxtowe fort excavation report, such as it was. The two excavators could not agree on the nature of the site they jointly dug. The excavation was undertaken in the 1930's. Many more sites in the area have been dug or evaluated since, and yes, most date to after AD70, but vary from the 2 nd , 3 rd and 4 th Centuries AD.
9.3.12	It would be good to see landscape and topographic consideration of the two churches and the river in an early Medieval context. Is the A/S cross the "stapol" of the place name?	Need to consider the landscape relationship and legibility of the two churches and the river crossing.	Failure to try and understand the fragments of significant landscape history	
9.3.13	Strelley Hall has a Medieval core, and is surrounded by a moat	Need to consider the parkland and early industrialisation of the Strelley estate	Failure to try and understand the fragments of significant landscape history	Although damaged, this is an important and incompletely understood piece of historic landscape.
9.3.14	It is good to see consideration of the early mining remains, also known as bell pits.	Need to consider how to differentiate between different mining techniques and what recording /protection examples affected require	Loss of important examples of early mining. Loss of opportunity to characterise mining remains, some potentially of national significance	The earliest bell pits did not join up underground, as indeed 9.3.14 states, but later ones, possibly from 16 th /17 th century did, and were the beginning of pillar and stall working, which may well have developed first here in Notts, possibly in connection with the development of pumping systems; the various brainchildren of Huntington Beaumont and the Willoughbys.
	No mention of the historic landscape around Nuthall, hammered by the M1 and other modern development, but with landscape features still extant and legible.			
9.4 onwards	Mitigation measures are so general as to preclude useful comment at this stage.			
Area Maps – LA06 Stapleford to Nuthall Map CT-05-435b Construction phase WDES	The location of the proposed main compound at Stanton Gate should be reconsidered.	An alternative location for the main compound should be considered.	The opportunity to agree an alternative location for the main compound, which has less landscape character impact, will be missed	The proposed main compound at Stanton Gate is poorly located within the Erewash Valley landscape. The total land take for the construction works is vast, and this impacts an area with significant landscape character.

<p>Area Maps – LA06 Stapleford to Nuthall</p> <p>Map CT-05-438 Construction phase WDES</p> <p>Map CT-06-438 Proposed scheme WDES</p>	<p>The proposed woodland mitigation, adjacent to the southern tunnel entrance, will screen long distance views from historic buildings within the Strelley Conservation Area</p>	<p>Amend the design of the mitigation proposed from proposed woodland to a proposed hedge line</p>	<p>The opportunity to add more carefully designed mitigation will be missed</p>	<p>Strelley Conservation Area and Strelley Hall Historic Park and Garden</p> <p>The southern tunnel entrance immediately abuts the boundary of the Strelley Conservation Area. The northern tunnel entrance emerges outside the boundary of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>A proposed area of woodland with a surrounding hedgerow is shown as mitigation between the southern tunnel entrance and Strelley Hall and All Saints Church. The EMD Team would not recommend this proposed mitigation because this closes down long-distance views from Main Street, over the M1 Corridor, to wooded skylines on distant ridge lines to the south west: which are characteristic of this part of Nottinghamshire. A carefully positioned hedge line could achieve the same screening effect without closing down the views from Main Street completely</p>
Sound, noise and vibration				
LA06 Stapleford to Nuthall	Potential significant airborne construction noise effects Stapleford, Trowell, Strelley, Nuthall	Reduction of airborne noise and vibration effects to avoid likely significant adverse effects	Not considered in detail at this stage	The report states that mitigation measures to be employed during construction could avoid or reduce noise and vibration likely significant effects, with any residual locations experiencing noise or vibration likely significant effects to be reported in the formal ES to follow later which will identify any site-specific mitigation as part of the further work being undertaken
LA06 Stapleford to Nuthall	Adverse construction noise or vibration effects on the nearest parts of residential communities and nearest noise sensitive non-residential receptors B6003 Toton Lane, A609 Nottingham Rd.	Reduction of airborne noise and vibration effects to avoid possible significant adverse effects	Not considered in detail at this stage	The report states that the magnitude and extent of effect will depend on the level of construction traffic using the road. Residual significant temporary noise or vibration effects will be reported in the formal ES to follow later which will consider any amendments to construction routes considered necessary as part of the further work being undertaken.
LA06 Stapleford to Nuthall	Potential significant effects during operation on Stapleford (Derby Rd) and Trowell (Trowell Park Drive)	Reduction of airborne noise and vibration effects to avoid possible significant adverse effects	Not considered in detail at this stage	<p>Taking account of the avoidance and mitigation measures the initial assessment has identified effects on a precautionary basis with the potential to be considered significant on a community basis due to increased airborne noise levels in line with the SMR at or around the identified Nottinghamshire Locations.</p> <p>Mitigation, including landscape earthworks and noise fence barriers would substantially reduce the potential airborne noise</p>

				effects that would otherwise arise from the Proposed Scheme. It is anticipated that the mitigation would avoid likely significant adverse effects due to airborne operational noise on the majority of receptors and communities.
Traffic and transport				
LA06, map CT-06-434b, Bessell Lane and B5010 Derby Road Alterations and Drg. No. 2DE02-ACI-HW-DPP-L002-229400 B5010 Derby Road 222-S2 Plan & Profile	1. Creating a direct link along Bessell Lane from the B5010 Derby Road to the A52 Trunk Road and the new HS2 Station hub is totally inappropriate for the existing local highway network and urban area. If this direct link is required for other reasons then the proposals are completely inadequate. Bessell Lane would need to be widened, straightened and the junction with Derby Road significantly upgraded (roundabout or traffic signalised with additional lanes). 2. The excessive raising of Derby Road over the HS2 line resulting in it being 2m higher than existing level at the centreline of the Bessell Lane junction. This creates unacceptable visual intrusion (presence of substantial retaining walls directly adjacent residential and retail properties), cutting off access (pedestrian and vehicular) to existing adjacent properties.	1. Bessell Lane <u>not</u> to be directly linked from Derby Road to the A52 and HS2 station and therefore to be stopped off at a suitable point and remain in it's present state as a residential/ light industrial access road. 2. HS2 line to be lowered so as to avoid any raising of the existing Derby Road. 3. Any necessary change to the Derby Road overbridge structure will be significant (possibly total re build) and hence the Highway Authority would expect HS2/Network Rail to own and maintain the resultant structure – at present the Highway Authority is responsible for the structure.		No vertical design is shown for the Bessell Lane approach to Derby Road. There is sub-standard stopping sight distance for Derby Road eastbound approach to Bessell Lane junction and substandard visibility to the right for vehicles turning out of Bessell Lane. Approach gradients to the crest are too steep (6%). The existing gradient is 3.8% on the west approach and 2.4% on the east approach. The proposed should be no steeper than the existing especially as there are side road junctions on both approaches which if the proposed gradients were steeper then unacceptable/unsafe adverse cambers would be created for certain turning manoeuvres. Most of the crest and sag K values are too small – should be in accordance with the design speed based on 30mph speed limit (60kph design speed). No proposed highway boundary/highway land dedication is shown. No details of structures are shown and how they tie in with the existing/new highway cross section. No highway cross section features are shown eg footways, verges, boundary fencing etc are shown. No vertical design is shown for the proposed carriageway channels.
LA06, map CT-06-436, A6007 Stapleford Road Bridge extension over M1 and new HS2	New western limit of A6007 bridge over the M1 is the start of a tight bend and so forward visibility for eastbound traffic on approach to bridge may be compromised by new bridge parapets etc.	Make sure correct forward visibilities are achieved. No piers for the HS2 Stanton Gate Viaduct to be within the A6007 highway boundaries (including visibility splays).		No proposed highway boundary/highway land dedication is shown. No highway cross section features are shown eg footways, verges, boundary fencing etc are shown. No vertical design is shown for the proposed carriageway channels.

bridge over A6007 Stapleford Road and Drg. No. 2DE02-ACI- HW-DPP- L002- 229700 A6007 Stapleford Road 224- S1 Plan & Profile				
LA06, map CT-06- 436, A609 Nottingham Road Underbridge and Drg. No. 2DE02-ACI- HW-DPP- L002-229800 A609 Nottingham Road 226-S1 Plan & Profile	One section of the new A609 alignment is too steep (8% or 1 in 12.5) and will be unacceptable to the Highway Authority. No Headroom height is stated.	The existing gradient in 6.45% (1 in 15.5) and the proposed should be no steeper than this – the desirable maximum gradient on new designed roads in Nottinghamshire is 5% (1 in 20). Proposed abutment/wing walls for the underbridge (exact details not shown) should not restrict the necessary forward visibility splays – the road has bends on both approaches to the bridge. The underbridge is to be owned and maintained by HS2/Network Rail.		One of the sag K values proposed is 13. This is unacceptable as the speed limit of the road is 40mph and hence the Absolute Minimum Sag K value should be 20. No proposed highway boundary/highway land dedication is shown. No highway cross section features are shown eg footways, verges, boundary fencing etc are shown. No vertical design is shown for the proposed carriageway channels. Carriageway widening is required where proposed bends are less than 400m – this doesn't appear to be shown.
LA06, map CT-06- 439, A610 Broxtowe Viaduct	No headroom height is stated and no viaduct piers/abutment/wing walls are shown.	No viaduct piers/abutment/wing walls are to be within the A610 Highway boundaries.		

LA06, map CT-06-439, B600 Nuthall Viaduct	No headroom height is stated and no viaduct piers/abutment/wing walls are shown.	No viaduct piers/abutment/wing walls are to be within the B600 Highway boundaries.		
LA06, map CT-06-441a, B6009 Long Lane Underbridge	No detail of where the abutment/wing walls are to be with respect to the highway boundary – the walls should not restrict the necessary design speed forward visibility splays – the road has bends on both approaches to the bridge. No headroom height is stated.	The underbridge is to be owned and maintained by HS2/Network Rail. B6009 is de restricted (National Speed Limit) and hence parapet walls will need to be protected by a road restraint system.		The proposed maintenance access road junction onto the B6009 east of the HS2 line is too close to an existing business access (35m) and will compromise visibility for vehicles turning out – needs to be moved nearer to the HS2 line underbridge. Full detailed design will be required for the two proposed accesses shown either side of the underbridge.
Water resources and flood risk				
LA-06, CT-05/06-439 Nuthall, Nottingham Road / B600 adjacent to M1 crossing	There is evidence of known flooding issues within this area.	Ensure that causes of historic flooding are considered and that there will be no increases to the flood risk in the area.	There are a number of properties which currently have drainage issues adjacent to where HS2 crosses the B600	There is a known flooding issue with properties on Nottingham Road, to the east of the proposed line. The area surrounding the properties has been shown as potentially required during construction and as such it is critical that the organisation ensures the flood risk is not increased.
LA-06, CT-05/06-436 - CT-05/06-437 Trowell, Nottingham Road / Ilkeston Road	There is evidence of known flooding issues within this area.	Ensure that causes of historic flooding are considered and that there will be no increases to the flood risk in the area.	Reports of flooding in Trowell in the vicinity of the proposed line.	We have reports of flooding within this area that should be investigated further to establish flood mechanisms. Options for alleviating flood risk should be identified and considered as part of the works and it should be ensured flood risk is not increased as a result of the proposals.

Community Area 07 – Hucknall to Selston

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Ecology and biodiversity				

ES Vol.2 LA07 (7.3.7), (7.4.15), CT-06-441a	Loss of calcareous grassland at western end of Hucknall Airfield	Recreation of as much calcareous grassland as possible	Lost opportunity to safeguard calcareous grassland	Part of the western end of the former Hucknall Airfield, which is an LWS designated for its calcareous grassland, will be permanently lost to the scheme. Other parts will be lost to woodland planting. This is not acceptable, and it would be appropriate to reduce the extent of woodland planting and prioritise calcareous grassland. A further opportunity would arise from taking up the hard surface of the runway and restoring this to calcareous grassland.
ES Vol.2 LA07 (2.2.12), (7.3.7) and CT-05-442	Impact on Watnall Coppice Ancient Woodland	Retention of as much of the woodland as possible		Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat, and working areas must be designed so that as much of this woodland as can be retained.
ES Vol.2 LA07 (2.2.12), (7.3.7) and CT-05-443 and CT-06-443	Impact on ecological connectivity in Park Forest area	Examination and retention of ecological connectivity	Creation of green bridge	The Park Forest area is a substantial woodland corridor, which must be assumed to provide a significant level of ecological connectivity at this location (unless shown otherwise). Whilst already severed by the M1, there is an underbridge on Kennel Lane, which is likely to be used by wildlife including commuting bats. To retain this connectivity, it will be necessary for a green bridge to be constructed in this area, for example where the proposed overbridge on the realigned Annesley Footpath 2 is located. Such an overbridge would therefore be multifunctional, carrying the path but also providing a wide vegetated verge. Alternatively, the northern part of the Misk Hill and Park Forest Cutting should be developed as a cut and cover tunnel.
ES Vol.2 LA07 (2.2.12), (7.3.7) and CT-05-444 and CT-06-444	Loss of Weavers Lane Grassland LWS	Avoidable loss of LWS	Locate balancing pond elsewhere	The use of a site of county-level importance for its wildlife for a balancing pond is not acceptable. The balancing pond should be located elsewhere, on land of lower ecological value.
ES Vol.2 LA07 (2.2.12), (7.3.5) and CT-05-446	Impact on Bogs Farm Quarry SSSI	Minimisation of construction area		A small area of the SSSI is used for construction works. Work areas must be designed to minimise such impacts as far as possible.
ES Vol. 2 (2.2.27) and CT-06-445	Impact on ecological connectivity at Selston	Provision of green bridge	Enhanced ecological connectivity	The realignment of the Salmon Lane M1 Overbridge provides an excellent opportunity to develop a green bridge across both the M1 and HS2. This would then facilitate long term future opportunities to develop ecological linkages to the west of the M1.

CT-06-447a	Habitat creation at Langton Colliery			Landscaping works should seek to create a network of ponds around the periphery of the western part of Langton Colliery, next to the Maghole Brook and the River Erewash.
Health				
LA07 Community Area report & Map Book Hucknall to Selston Draft Environmental Statement	Housing quality and design Does the proposal seek to address the housing needs of the wider community by requiring provision of variation of house type that will meet the needs of older or disabled people?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No detailed discussions around new permanent housing developments evident or specific details provided around the housing that will be provided for the workforce in the main compound. Demolition of residential and business properties likely to have significant impact for those individuals affected (page 128, para 8.4.34) 	Will be important to fully consider the impact of the demolition on those residents impacted.	
	Does the proposal promote development that will reduce energy requirements and living costs and ensure that homes are warm and dry in winter and cool in summer	As above	Might be beneficial to consider for the worker accommodation but otherwise as above.	
LA07 Hucknall to Selston	Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure Does the proposal seek to retain, replace or provide health and social care related infrastructure?	There appear to be no plans to remove any health and social care infrastructure which is	No comments	

		positive (page 91, para 6.4.10)		
	Does the proposal address the proposed growth/ assess the impact on healthcare services?	There doesn't appear to be consideration for how the large numbers of staff (up to 550) living in the A608 main compound will increase pressure on healthcare services such as GP's and what will be done to manage this. For example there is no mention whether the A608 Mansfield Road main compound will also include families of those working on the project. This may be covered elsewhere, as implied in Volume 1 (page 28, para 2.3.24). No specific details yet around the impact of the proposal on access to healthcare services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be beneficial to consider the impact of the main compound on the local healthcare services and how this will be managed. • Important to consider the impact of the proposal on access to healthcare services within the formal ES as identified (page 126, para 8.4.20), as currently not clear. 	
	Does the proposal explore/allow for opportunities for shared community use and co-location of services?	Not applicable	To consider if felt appropriate for any of the existing services.	
LA07	Access to open space and nature Does the proposal seek to retain and enhance existing and provide new open and natural spaces to support healthy living and physical activity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of major or moderate adverse impacts on landscapes due to the predominately rural landscape (page 176, para 11.4.7). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further exploration into how altering the current environment will impact on health will be required within the formal ES as acknowledged (page 125, para 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics of the area and access to open spaces will be negatively impacted during construction and running. • 5% of the Park Forest along with its footpaths and trails will be lost permanently (page 127, para 8.4.25). • Steps identified to minimise this are Public Rights of Way (ProW) diverted and permanent diversions considered not significant enough to deter users (page 90, para 6.4.5), replacement of trees where possible (page 90, para 6.4.5), replacement of trees where possible (page 91, para 6.4.14). 	<p>8.4.13) as currently not clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New spaces should be co-designed with local community 	
	Does the proposal promote links between open and natural spaces and areas of residence, employment and commerce?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of actively promoting such links. • Recognition that construction traffic 	To work with the local community to establish how these links can be maintained and promoted.	

		may deter pedestrians (page 127, para 8.4.24)		
	Does the proposal seek to ensure that open and natural spaces are welcoming, safe and accessible to all?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of major or moderate adverse impacts on landscapes due to the predominately rural landscape (page 176, para 11.4.7). • Aesthetics of the area and access to open spaces will be negatively impacted during construction and running. • 5% of the Park Forest along with its footpaths and trails will be lost permanently (page 127, para 8.4.25). • Steps identified to minimise this are Public Rights of Way (ProW) diverted and permanent diversions considered not significant enough to deter users (page 90, para 6.4.5), replacement of trees where possible (page 91, para 6.4.14). 	Further exploration into how altering the current environment will impact on health will be required within the formal ES as acknowledged (page 125, para 8.4.13) as currently not clear. New spaces should be co-designed with local community	

	Does the proposal seek to provide a range of play spaces for children and young people (e.g. play pitches, play areas etc.) including provision for those that are disabled?	No explicit reference to play spaces or provision for those who are disabled.	Beneficial to engage with the local community to consider spaces for young people and provision for those who are disabled.	
LA07	Does the proposal seek to minimise construction impacts such as dust, noise, vibration and odours?	Emissions are intended to be controlled and managed during construction through implementation of the Code of Construction Practice (page 82, para 5.4.1). Important given background (ambient) particulate matter (PM2.5) levels exceed World Health Organisation guidelines across the majority of Nottinghamshire (Nottinghamshire Air Quality JSNA, 2015)	Further exploration into exactly how air pollution and noise will impact on health will be required within the formal ES as acknowledged as currently not clear (page 129, para 8.5.2). Important that the impact of this is monitored throughout construction.	
	Does the proposal seek to minimise air pollution caused by traffic and employment/ commercial facilities?	No direct atmospheric emissions from the operation of trains (page 84, para 5.5.3)	Important to ensure that there are no other significant direct or indirect effects of operation on air quality in the formal ES.	
	Does the proposal seek to minimise noise pollution caused by traffic and employment/ commercial facilities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts to reduce noise as much as feasibly possible are evident. • Noise fence barriers installed near more densely 	As above	

		<p>populated areas (page 208, para 13.5.6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No trains running during the majority of the night (page 207, para 13.5.2) • Railway quieter than the current minimum European standards (page 208, para 13.5.5). 		
LA07	<p>Accessibility and active transport</p> <p>Does the proposal prioritise and encourage walking (such as through shared spaces) connecting to local walking networks?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that construction traffic may deter pedestrians (page 127, para 8.4.24) • Public Rights of Way (ProW) will be diverted and permanent diversions are not considered significant enough to deter users (page 90, para 6.4.5), 	Engage with local community to determine how this can be prioritised and supported	
	<p>Does the proposal prioritise and encourage cycling (for example by providing secure cycle parking, showers and cycle lanes) connecting to local and strategic cycle networks?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that people using active travel to work may choose instead to travel by car (page 127, para 8.4.24) 	As above	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appears to be no specific actions to prioritise and encourage cycling. 		
	Does the proposal support traffic management and calming measures to help reduce and minimise road injuries?	<p>Increased traffic is likely to alter accident risk level (page 217, para 14.4.16)</p> <p>Avoidance of HGVs operating adjacent to schools is positive (page 89, para 6.4.1) especially given in Nottinghamshire, children are more susceptible to RTCs (Nottinghamshire Road Safety JSNA, 2013)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further exploration of impact required within formal ES, as identified (page 217, para 14.4.16) Engage with Nottinghamshire Road Safety Partnership and link with Nottinghamshire's Sustainable Community Strategy 2010 – 2020. Risk to be monitored throughout construction phase. Strict speed restrictions around residential areas may be beneficial Consider offering road safety awareness sessions for local schools or important target groups near construction sites 	
	Does the proposal promote accessible buildings and places to enable access to people with mobility problems or a disability?	No explicit reference to provision for those who are disabled.	To consider needs of people with mobility problems or a disability.	
LA07	Crime reduction and community safety	No explicit reference	To consider whether the compounds	

	Does the proposal create environments & buildings that make people feel safe, secure and free from crime?		influence the community's sense of safety due to unfamiliarity.	
LA07	Does the proposal support the retention and creation of food growing areas, allotments and community gardens in order to support a healthy diet and physical activity?	No explicit mention around supporting food growing areas	Engage with the local community to incorporate food growing areas and community gardens in redesigned green spaces.	
	Does the proposal seek to restrict the development of hot food takeaways (A5) in specific areas?	No mention of development of any food takeaways	Ensure any change in plans do restrict the development of hot food takeaways	
LA07	Access to work and training Does the proposal seek to provide new employment opportunities and encourage local employment and training?	Reference to construction jobs being potentially accessible to locals (page 199, para 12.4.4) and local businesses benefiting from increased trade from workers (page 199, para 12.4.5)	Where possible prioritising recruitment of staff from local communities to enhance local investment and benefit from this project	
LA07	Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods Does the proposal connect with existing communities where the layout and movement avoids physical barriers and severance and encourages social interaction?	Acknowledgement that the local community may experience increased difficulty accessing community services as a result of increased journey times during construction (page 126, para 8.4.20) Demolition of properties within this area is not deemed significant enough in number to erase social networks (page 128, para 8.4.34)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on social cohesion will need to be further explored in the formal ES as the proposal is likely to have a significant impact on this rural community. Work within the community engagement framework (page 124, para 8.4.5) will be essential in minimising negative impacts 	

		Community engagement framework in place in an attempt to support social cohesion (page 124, para 8.4.5).	<p>on social cohesion. This should include their involvement in determining appropriate resolutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As it is recognised access to services is already limited in this area (page 126, para 8.4.20) could attempts to improve this, with the local community, be included in plans. 	
LA07	Minimising the use of resources Does the proposal seek to incorporate sustainable design and construction techniques?	Not applicable	Not applicable	
LA07	Climate change Does the proposal incorporate renewable energy and ensure that buildings and public spaces are designed to respond to winter and summer temperatures, i.e. ventilation, shading and landscaping?	Not applicable	Not applicable	
	Does the proposal maintain or enhance biodiversity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans require destruction of a relatively large number of habitats during construction and operation. Provision of new habits will be provided during construction (page 104, para 7.4.1) and operation 	To ensure full impacts on biodiversity are explored in the formal ES and attempts made to ensure biodiversity is enhanced.	

		(page 119, para 7.5.7) but unlikely to enhance biodiversity due to the overall negative impact on existing areas		
LA07	Does the proposal consider health inequalities and encourage engagement by underserved communities?	Overall appears to be a limited focus on health inequalities.	To ensure engagement from undeserved communities and needs of the most vulnerable members of the community are considered.	
Historic landscape				
9.3.4 – 9.3.7	Assessments of significance/value are based on flawed or a total absence of evidence	Assessments of value should await the outcomes of appropriate investigations	Underestimating archaeological value will lead to damage and destruction of archaeological sites with inappropriate mitigation for their loss	As an example; the report notes two scatter of Roman finds, and ascribes to them low value. The report suggests the finds might derive from a Roman settlement. How can these be of low value if we do not know if these finds relate to one or two Roman farmsteads, Roman manuring practices, or the remains of a villa? The find scatters show an archaeological potential which needs to be investigated and then have their potential assessed – as per NPPF 189.
9.3.8	“There is no evidence for prehistoric activity within the study area”	Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. A programme of fieldwalking on arable along the route will produce flintwork and other finds.	As above	
9.3.14-16	No mention of pre-19 th C coal mining remains	Need to consider evidence for early coal mining and undertake appropriate assessment and evaluation of sites affected	As above	
	No mention of the very early hunting park at the northern end of the area, the approximate location of which is	The later colliery workings have obscured earlier archaeological	As above	It must not be assumed that later coal mining has obliterated earlier archaeological and landscape features. Some have gone, but many are simply obscured and their real potential and value is currently hidden.

	demonstrated by farmhouses called "Park" on Sanderson's map of 1835	features and landscape remnants. With care these can be picked out and are still legible in the landscape.		
Overall Considerations of the relevant Community Area reports	A number of farm buildings are proposed for demolition and are invariably down as low or moderate value. In and around the forest, isolated farms will probably have a Medieval origin.	Need to assess properties with regard to their archaeological potential as well as their standing built heritage significance	As above	The Erewash and Sherwood Forest are both significantly under-represented on the Notts HER. It cannot be assumed that the HER offers a reasonable overview of the area's potential in the way that, for instance, it may be assumed for the Trent Valley. Our knowledge base is low, and with that comes a limited ability to predict where as yet unknown archaeology is likely to be found. Having said that, there are issues we can point out which will help develop the programme of survey and investigation - like the point about isolated farms in the Forest and in its hinterland.
La07, LV-03-384 & 385	Annesley Hall Parkland, impacts arising from noise	Acknowledgement of the permanent impact on the setting of the hall and parkland arising from operation. Additional impacts to construction period.	Off-site mitigation through enhancement of the condition of H@R elements of the affected heritage assets.	Annesley Hall, stables, garden terraces and parkland are identified on the H@R. Blighting impacts could be offset by capital investment to improve the condition of assets. Work must be led by professionals with conservation expertise.
La08, LV-04-388	BrookHill Hall Parkland	The parkland falls partially within Notts. Acknowledge the permanent noise impacts of operation phase.	Investigate and enhance the remnant design landscape features of the parkland.	Offset impacts on the setting of the grade II listed hall by enhancing the parkland through properly considered planting enhancements.
Landscape and visual assessment				
LA07 – Hucknall to Selston	The historic landscape around Felley Hall to the west of the M1 corridor has not been referred to in the text of this Community Area Report	Add reference to Felley Hall and its surrounding landscape into the text.	The opportunity to refer to Felley Hall and its surrounding landscape will be missed.	The historic landscape around Felley Hall to the west of the M1 corridor has not been referred to in the text of this Community Area Report.
Area Maps – LA07 Hucknall to Selston	There is potential for 'historic tip reworking' as a result of the Proposed Scheme	Consider the potential for 'historic tip reworking'	The opportunity to carry out 'historic tip reworking' will be missed	There is an opportunity to carry out 'historic tip reworking' to remove coal deposits within existing spoil tips, as part of the Proposed Scheme. Potential sites which have previously been considered as having potential, and which are close to the proposed route are:- the former Silverhill, Hilcote, Dimminsdale (Langton Hall), and Bentinck Collieries.
Sound, noise and vibration				

LA07 Hucknall to Selston	Potential significant airborne construction noise effects Westville, Hucknall and Selston	Reduction of airborne noise and vibration effects to avoid likely significant adverse effects	Not considered in detail at this stage	The report states that mitigation measures to be employed during construction could avoid or reduce noise and vibration likely significant effects, with any residual locations experiencing noise or vibration likely significant effects to be reported in the formal ES to follow later which will identify any site-specific mitigation as part of the further work being undertaken.
LA07 Hucknall to Selston	Potential significant effects during operation on B6009 Long Lane and the B6009 Watnall Road between the M1 crossing point and the A611 to the east of Hucknall; Common Lane, continuing along Wood Lane to the north of Hucknall; Whyburn Lane, continuing along Wood Lane to the north of Hucknall; Forest Road and Salmon Lane between the A611 at Annesley and Selston; B6018 Park Lane, which links Selston and Kirkby-in-Ashfield; B6019 Kirkby Lane, which connects Pinxton with Kirkby-in-Ashfield.	Reduction of airborne noise and vibration effects to avoid possible significant adverse effects	Not considered in detail at this stage	The report states that the magnitude and extent of effect will depend on the level of construction traffic using the road. Residual significant temporary noise or vibration effects will be reported in the formal ES to follow later which will consider any amendments to construction routes considered necessary as part of the further work being undertaken.
LA07 Hucknall to Selston	Indication that may be exceedance maximum noise levels in vicinity of Langton Lodge in the vicinity of the B6019 Kirkby Lane York Lodge in the vicinity of the B6019 Kirkby Lane	Identify properties that may be eligible for noise insulation	Not considered in detail at this stage	Taking account of the avoidance and mitigation measures the initial assessment has identified effects on a precautionary basis with the potential to be considered significant on a community basis due to increased airborne noise levels in line with the SMR at or around the identified Nottinghamshire Locations. Mitigation, including landscape earthworks and noise fence barriers would substantially reduce the potential airborne noise effects that would otherwise arise from the Proposed Scheme. It is anticipated that the mitigation would avoid likely significant adverse effects due to airborne operational noise on the majority of receptors and communities
Traffic and transport				
LA07, map CT-06- 444, A608	Extending the M1 grade separated roundabout as proposed will make the use of the junction unsafe for road users	Keep the existing roundabout layout and design another method		

<p>Mansfield Road South Overbridge; LA07, map CT-06-445, A608 Mansfield Road North Overbridge and Drg. No. 2DE02-ACI-HW-DPP-L002-231400 A608 Mansfield Road 239-S1 Plan & Profile</p>	<p>– long straights will encourage higher speeds on entering the tight bends at the ends of the straights which will encourage misuse and will be highly dangerous, vehicles using the M1 southbound exit slip road are expected to enter the roundabout onto the straight section of circulatory carriageway and hence encountering overly fast vehicles on the circulatory carriageway which is unsafe and against the fundamental principles of roundabout design where all entries and exits join the traffic calming curve of the circulatory carriageway.</p>	<p>for the HS2 line to cross the A608 – suggest tunnelling under the A608.</p>		
<p>LA07, map CT-06-445, Salmon Lane Realignment, Salmon Lane HS2 Overbridge, Salmon Lane M1 Overbridge and Drg. No. 2DE02-ACI-HW-DPP-L002-231600 Salmon Lane 241-S2 Plan & Profile</p>	<p>The gradient proposed for the east approach to the M1 overbridge is too steep (11.3% or 1 in 8.8) and will be unacceptable to the Highway Authority. There is sub standard visibility (achieved stopping sight distance on proposal is 68m) over the proposed crest which will be unacceptable to the Highway Authority. First five properties on Salmon Lane west of the M1 will have their vehicular accesses removed by the proposed realignment which will create a standard 1 in 2 (assumed) embankment batter slope at the ends of their drives (chainages 125 to 200) raising the new road up to over 1.0m higher than the present road/footway level which will be unacceptable to the Highway Authority.</p>	<p>The existing gradients on the east side of the M1 is between 5.5% (1 in 18) and 10% (1 in 10). As this will be a section of new road the maximum gradient on new designed roads in Nottinghamshire is 5% (1 in 20) with an absolute maximum gradient of 8% (1 in 12.5) in excessively hilly areas. The minimum stopping sight distance on the west approach to the crest is to be 90m (end of 30mph speed limit). The minimum stopping sight distance on the east approach to the crest is to be 120m</p>		<p>The crest K value and the sag K value on the east side of the crest are too small – should be in accordance with the design speed based on 40mph speed limit (70kph design speed) for the crest and 50mph (85kph) for sag. No proposed highway boundary/highway land dedication is shown. No highway cross section features are shown eg footways, verges (need to include necessary visibility lines on inside of bends), boundary fencing etc are shown. No vertical design is shown for the proposed carriageway channels. Carriageway widening is required where proposed bends are less than 400m – this doesn't appear to be shown.</p>

		<p>(road is derestricted but 85th percentile speed likely to be around 40mph as reasonably steep approach). Suggest lowering the HS2 and therefore lowering the crest levels.</p> <p>The overbridges are to be owned and maintained by HS2/Network Rail and Highways England.</p> <p>Vehicular accesses to all properties on Salmon Lane must be satisfactorily provided.</p>		
<p>LA07, map CT-06-446, B6018 Park Lane Realignme nt and Park Lane HS2 Overbridge and Drg. No. 2DE02-ACI-HW-DPP-L002-231800 B6018 Park Lane 242-S1 Plan & Profile</p>		<p>The overbridge is to be owned and maintained by HS2/Network Rail.</p>		<p>No proposed highway boundary/highway land dedication is shown. No highway cross section features are shown eg footways, verges (need to include necessary visibility lines on inside of bends), boundary fencing etc are shown. No vertical design is shown for the proposed carriageway channels.</p>
<p>LA07, map CT-06-447a, B6019 Kirkby Lane</p>	<p>No detail of where the abutment/wing walls are to be with respect to the highway boundary – the walls should not restrict the necessary design speed forward visibility splays and loss of</p>	<p>The underbridge is to be owned and maintained by HS2/Network Rail.</p> <p>B6009 is de restricted (National Speed Limit)</p>		

Underbridge	control overrun areas – the under bridge is on a tight bend. No headroom height is stated.	and hence abutment/wing walls will need to be protected by a road restraint system and set back far enough to give adequate visibility on the inside of the existing tight bend and far enough back on the outside of the bend to allow for overrun due to loss of control (downhill section on sharp bend). The existing B6019 has a very poor alignment through this section – suggest thought be given to realigning this section of road to reduce the severity of the “S” bend and this would result in making this section of road safer the underbridge structure being more square to the road – proposed underbridge is on a big skew which is more difficult and expensive to construct.		
LA07, map CT-06-448a, Brookhill Lane Realignme nt and Drg. No. 2DE02-ACI-HW-DPP-L002-232100	Only part of the realignment is in Nottinghamshire (Approx. chainage 0+700 upwards). The rest of the realignment including where the HS2 crosses in in Derbyshire and so their comments will need to tie in with our’s. No viaduct piers/abutment/wing walls are shown (Derbyshire section).	Brookhill Lane is de restricted (National Speed Limit) and so Forward visibility around main bend (360m radius) needs to comply with this design speed. No viaduct piers/abutment/wing walls are to be within		No proposed highway boundary/highway land dedication is shown. No highway cross section features are shown eg footways, verges, boundary fencing etc are shown. No vertical design is shown for the proposed carriageway channels. Carriageway widening is required where proposed bends are less than 400m (Derbyshire section) – this doesn’t appear to be shown.

Brookhill Lane 244-S1 Plan & Profile		the proposed Brookhill Lane Highway boundaries (Derbyshire section).		
LA07, map CT-06-448a, Farmwell Lane Realignme nt; Farmwell Lane Underbridge and Drg. No. 2DE02-ACI-HW-DPP-L002-232200 Farmwell Lane 245-S1 Plan & Profile	Only part of the realignment is in Nottinghamshire (Approx. chainage 0+700 upwards). The rest of the realignment including where the HS2 crosses in in Derbyshire and so their comments will need to tie in with our's. Farmwell Lane is currently unadopted (potentially under a Section 38 Agreement?) but it is a significant business/industrial access road constructed to industrial access standards and so may be adopted in the future and therefore comments are given. No abutment/wing walls are shown (Derbyshire section). The gradient proposed for the east approach to the Underbridge is too steep (8% or 1 in 12.5) and will be unacceptable to the Highway Authority.	The existing gradient in 5.5% (1 in 18.3) and the proposed should be no steeper than this as this road is used extensively by fully laden HGVs – the desirable maximum gradient on new designed roads in Nottinghamshire is 5% (1 in 20). This Forward visibility around designed bends (360m radius) needs to comply with this design speed (abutment/wing walls must not encroach into the visibility lines).		No proposed highway boundary/highway land dedication is shown. No highway cross section features are shown eg footways, verges(need to include necessary visibility lines on inside of bends), boundary fencing etc are shown. No vertical design is shown for the proposed carriageway channels.
LA07, map CT-06-448a, A38 West Box Structure and A38 East Box Structure	No edge of highway detail is shown – a large sheer drop onto HS2 will be created. Level of top of roof of box structures in relation to level of existing A38 is stated – existing highway drainage system, and existing public utilities underground plant are likely to be present potentially up to 2.0m below existing surface of road and verges.	High containment road restraint barriers will be required at the back of the Highway on both sides - A38 is a very busy high speed road with merging and diverging traffic at the HS2 crossing point. Existing highway drainage systems need to be maintained satisfactorily above the new structures.		No proposed highway boundary is shown. No highway cross section features are shown eg footways, verges, boundary fencing etc are shown.
LA07 CT-05-442	Route, earthworks and compound	As above	As above	As above. Here Watnall Coppice is likely to contain well preserved archaeology. There is Roman activity in the area which is not at all understood

LA07 CT-06-442	Planting, ponds and mitigation	As above	As above	As above.
LA07 CT-05-443	Route, earthworks and compounds	This area has a range of features of a range of dates, but the landscape is not well recorded or understood. Lidar would greatly assist in identifying surviving earthwork features in woodland, but open areas will need geophysical investigation and appropriate levels of evaluation.	As above	High potential for previously unrecorded and potentially significant archaeology here. There is considerable time depth to this landscape, and it has considerable complexity. The history of the areas of parkland affected needs clarification in order to understand them properly and mitigate their loss or damage.
LA07 CT-06-443	Planting, ponds and mitigation	As above	As above	As above.
LA07 CT-05-444	Route, earthworks and compounds	As above	As above	As above.
LA07 CT-06-444	Planting, ponds and mitigation	As above. Also, the watercourses in this area have a long history of management for power, field survey by experienced archaeologists is needed to identify surviving water management features.	As above	As above. Limited fieldwork in this area means the archaeological potential is likely to be underestimated.
LA07 CT-05-445	Route, earthworks and compounds	As above. In addition here, properties to be demolished that are shown on Sanderson's map of 1835 will probably have Medieval origins and will need appropriate recording.	As above	As above, and again limited fieldwork in this area means the archaeological potential is likely to be underestimated.
LA07 CT-06-445	Planting, ponds and mitigation	As above.	As above	As above

LA07 CT-05-446	Route, earthworks and compounds	As above. In addition, this area is part of a very early and important hunting park, some park features survive, but few are recorded and the area is not well understood. Evaluation is needed, using appropriate techniques including field evaluation.	As above	As above. Because of the later colliery's impact on the area, it would be easy to assume there is low archaeological potential here.
LA07 CT-06-446	Planting, ponds and mitigation	As above.	As above	As above
LA07 CT-05-447a	Route, earthworks and compounds	Early modern coal mining remains in the area are well preserved and obscure a much earlier landscape with surprisingly good preservation in places. This area is poorly understood. Appropriate levels of evaluation are needed to inform suitable mitigation measures	As above	The coal mining associated with the Portland collieries are worthy of appropriate mitigation. Earlier landscape features and buried archaeology exists here, albeit obscured by the later industrial archaeology.
LA07 CT-06-447a	Planting, ponds and mitigation	As above.	As above	As above
LA08 CT-05-447b	Route, earthworks and compounds	This area has been subject to considerable modern development. Its archaeological potential is unclear. Evaluation techniques that disentangle the later impacts from buried and upstanding archaeological remains are needed.	As above	Earlier landscape features and buried archaeology exists here, albeit obscured by the later industrial archaeology and modern development.
LA08 CT-05-447b	Planting, ponds and mitigation	As above	As above	As above

Water resources and flood risk				
LA-07, CT-05/06-442 - CT-05/06-442-R1 Hucknall	There is evidence of known flooding issues within this area.	Ensure no increase to flood risk.	The majority of issues are located to the east of the Hucknall catchment.	The route passes to the west of Hucknall which has suffered from significant flooding in the past. Sufficient evidence should be provided to ensure that HS2 will have no detrimental impact on surface water flood risk in the Hucknall catchment.
LA-07, CT-05/06-445 - CT-05/06-446 Selston	There is evidence of known flooding issues within this area.	Ensure that causes of historic flooding are considered and that there will be no increases to the flood risk in the area.	There are a number of historical flooding locations within the 1km boundary.	We have reports of flooding within this area that should be investigated further to establish flood mechanisms. Options for alleviating flood risk should be identified and considered as part of the works and it should be ensured flood risk is not increased as a result of the proposals.

Community Area 08 - Pixton to Newton

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Ecology and biodiversity				
ES Vol.2 LA08 (7.4.22), CT-05-449 and CT-06-449	Presence of great crested newts in Normanton Brook area	Sufficient mitigation		It is unclear if the presence of great crested newts has been identified in the Normanton Brook/Nunn Brook Park area. This species is known to be present here, but it is unclear how mitigation can be delivered when the habitat mitigation area is required for construction, and therefore presumably cannot be created in advance of the impact. It should be noted that Nunn Brook Park, owned by Nottinghamshire County Council, could be made available for some of the necessary mitigation works for this species.
Sound, noise and visual assessment				
LA08 Pinxton to Newton and Huthwaite	Potential significant airborne construction noise effects in following B6018 Park Lane in Selston, from the works along the B6018 Mansfield Road, turning right towards Commonsides and continuing towards Station Road, Beaufit Lane and the B6019 Town Street in Pinxton, then to the B6019 Alfreton Road and the B6019 Pinxton Lane in	Reduction of airborne noise and vibration effects to avoid possible significant adverse effects	Not considered in detail at this stage	The report states that the magnitude and extent of effect will depend on the level of construction traffic using the road. Residual significant temporary noise or vibration effects will be reported in the formal ES to follow later which will consider any amendments to construction routes considered necessary as part of the further work being undertaken.

	South Normanton, and finally turning right towards the B6019 Mansfield Road up to junction 28 of the M1. B6027 Common Road in Huthwaite; and B6026 Blackwell Road in Huthwaite along B6026 Huthwaite Lane up to the B6026 Cragg Lane in Old Blackwell.			
Traffic and transport				
LA08, map CT-06-450, B6026 Huthwaite Lane Realignment	Only part of the realignment is in Nottinghamshire (Chainage 0 to approx. 0+50). The rest of the realignment including where the HS2 crosses in in Derbyshire and so their comments will need to tie in with our's. Chainage zero of the proposed realignment does not tie in tangentially/smoothly with existing B6026 Blackwell Road creating a kink which will be unacceptable to the Highway Authority.	Realignment needs to tie in with existing smoothly/tangentially.		Carriageway widening is required where proposed bends are less than 400m – this doesn't appear to be shown.

Volume 3: Route wide effects

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Health				
Route-wide effects	Housing quality and design Does the proposal seek to address the housing needs of the wider community by requiring provision of variation of	7.5.14 p36 Housing “Those affected by involuntary relocation	Ensure liaison with local authority housing departments to	

	house type that will meet the needs of older or disabled people?	would be likely to experience adverse effects, which may include: stress associated with the move itself; negative feelings associated with attachment to existing homes; feelings of frustration or anxiety related to uncertainty and lack of control; practical issues such as specific adaptation requirements; and reduced access to family, social networks, employment or education. These effects may occur prior to, during and after the relocation process.	mitigate for the impact of housing relocations.	
	Does the proposal promote development that will reduce energy requirements and living costs and ensure that homes are warm and dry in winter and cool in summer	Not applicable	Not applicable.	
Volume 3: Route-wide effects	Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure Does the proposal seek to retain, replace or provide health and social care related infrastructure?		No comment	
	Does the proposal address the proposed growth/ assess the impact on healthcare services?	There is no reference to the impact of the construction or operation of the route on access to health care.	That access to health and care services should be referred to as an impact within the route wide effects. Impact due to construction and impact of access on journey times to	

			healthcare and by healthcare service vehicles should be considered in transport planning.	
	Does the proposal explore/allow for opportunities for shared community use and co-location of services?	Not applicable	Not applicable	
Route-wide effects	Access to open space and nature Does the proposal seek to retain and enhance existing and provide new open and natural spaces to support healthy living and physical activity?	The cumulative impact of the route on access to physical activity is not considered. Section 5.1, 5.11 page 22 However, there needs to be recognition throughout that the effects of construction and reduced access to open green space as a result will be significant. This should be mitigated against in the longer term. particularly in relation to physical activity and community connectedness.	Recognition of the effects on construction on access to open space during construction and longer term should be planned for to mitigate for the detrimental impact on use of these areas for recreation in including physical activity. Consider adding the following mitigations to the statement - 1) "Compensate communities for the loss of local amenities and support their relocation, replacing 'like-with-better' rather than 'like-for-like' via a process that involves the community in the decision-making" 2) "There may be opportunities to facilitate new greenway links between communities utilising the HS2 corridor to bridge connections that have yet to be formally established"	

			Ensure construction sites and all companies contracted to service them are registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme, which will include monitoring against 'Enhancing the appearance' and 'respecting the community' standards	
	Does the proposal promote links between open and natural spaces and areas of residence, employment and commerce?	7.5.8 Traveller stress. "Temporary and permanent closure or diversions of roads or public rights of way, changes to traffic flows and congestion around junctions during construction may affect journey times along the affected routes."	There should be an overall approach to mitigations to reducing the impact of the development of connectivity within communities which can have negative health impacts.	
	Does the proposal seek to ensure that open and natural spaces are welcoming, safe and accessible to all?	This is implied in the above statements but the detail of how spaces will be welcoming, safe and accessible is not included.	Recognition of the effects on construction on access to open space during construction and longer term should be planned for to mitigate for the detrimental impact on use of these areas for recreation in including physical activity. There should be an overall approach to mitigations to reducing the impact of the development of	

			connectively within communities which can have negative health impacts.	
	Does the proposal seek to provide a range of play spaces for children and young people (e.g. play pitches, play areas etc.) including provision for those that are disabled?	Some of the proposed sites for development include loss of or changes to open space and recreational grounds.	No comment	
Route wide effects	Air quality, noise and neighbourhood amenity Does the proposal seek to minimise construction impacts such as dust, noise, vibration and odours?	No comments	No comments	
	Does the proposal seek to minimise air pollution caused by traffic and employment/ commercial facilities?	<p>Air pollution 3.3 p12 The main air pollutant emitted from construction sites is dust, which can potentially be carried a few hundred metres from construction sites. Dust generation from the Proposed Scheme would be strictly controlled by the application of best practice measures set out in the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</p> <p>Air emissions 7.5.12 p. 36 3.4. Assessment of effects during operation. There would be no direct atmospheric emissions from the</p>	<p>Mitigations thought to be sufficient. Look for specialist comment from CRCE.</p> <p>Consider potential additional local impact on NOx particulate matter emissions due to construction. Opportunity to mitigate by promoting active travel on routes in longer term effected through individual and workplace travel planning interventions around the affect areas.</p>	

		operation of trains that would cause an impact on air quality. Indirect emissions from sources such as rail and brake wear have been assumed to be negligible		
	Does the proposal seek to minimise noise pollution caused by traffic and employment/ commercial facilities?		No comment	
Route wide	Accessibility and active transport Does the proposal prioritise and encourage walking (such as through shared spaces) connecting to local walking networks?		Consider potential additional local impact on NOx particulate matter emissions due to construction. Opportunity to mitigate by promoting active travel on routes in longer term effected through individual and workplace travel planning interventions around the affect areas.	
	Does the proposal prioritise and encourage cycling (for example by providing secure cycle parking, showers and cycle lanes) connecting to local and strategic cycle networks?	NA -Applicable to connectivity re Toton station	No comment	
	Does the proposal support traffic management and calming measures to help reduce and minimise road injuries?	Transport effects – during construction. Potentially negative. HS2 Ltd would discuss with local authorities measures to ensure road safety during construction works. The nominated undertaker, in line with the draft CoCP, would produce traffic	Transport effects – during construction. Potentially negative. Ensure timely notification to allow coordination with highways authorities to minimise stress caused by road transport disruption. Work with local authorities and	

		<p>management plans including measures to address road safety and reduce the risks to non-motorised users from construction vehicles on the roads.</p> <p>7.5.8-7.5.9 p35 7.5.11 p35 safety. However, road safety is likely to be a key issue of concern to local communities, and this could contribute to adverse effects on wellbeing through increased levels of anxiety, as well as potential behavioural changes such as reduced uptake of walking and cycling on construction traffic routes.</p>	<p>highways England and network rail for opportunities for school and community road and rail safety within affected communities.</p>	
	Does the proposal promote accessible buildings and places to enable access to people with mobility problems or a disability?	See EIA	No comment	
Route wide effects	<p>Crime reduction and community safety</p> <p>Does the proposal create environments & buildings that make people feel safe, secure and free from crime?</p>	<p>7.2.4. There is no mention of mental health in the list of health determinants. There is no reference to suicide risk and preventions plans.</p>	<p>Liaise with local authorities along the route to liaise on suicide prevention plans. Ensure mitigations are in place along the route to the infrastructure developments to reduce risk of suicide in line with Public Health England: Preventing Suicide in Public</p>	

			Places (November 2015): Area 1. Restrict access to the site and the means of suicide; Area 2. Increase opportunity and capacity for human intervention; Area 3. Increase opportunities for help seeking by the suicidal individual; Area 4. Change the public image of the site; dispel its reputation as a 'suicide site'	
Route wide effects	Access to healthy food Does the proposal support the retention and creation of food growing areas, allotments and community gardens in order to support a healthy diet and physical activity?	Not applicable	Not applicable	
	Does the proposal seek to restrict the development of hot food takeaways (A5) in specific areas?	As above	As above	
Route wide effects	Access to work and training Does the proposal seek to provide new employment opportunities and encourage local employment and training?	7,5,4 p 33. Education, employment and income <i>Construction employment and training</i> "The extent of beneficial health effects within the local communities along the route of the Proposed Scheme from direct construction employment would depend on the number of people who are able to, and choose	In order for the jobs to benefit local communities. Consider specifying a requirement to recruit within the local community within contracts in relation to the Social Value Act. Potential negative impact of displacement of jobs on low income groups. Consider targeting these workers by affected business and supporting with	

		to, take up opportunities for construction employment and training". Direct and indirect business impacts and associated income and employment impacts 7.5.4-7.5.7 p34	retraining into opportunities through the construction of the HS2.	
Route wide effects	Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods Does the proposal seek to incorporate sustainable design and construction techniques?	Not applicable	not applicable	
Route wide effects	Minimising the use of resources Does the proposal seek to incorporate sustainable design and construction techniques?	15 Waste and material use	No Public Health response as will be covered by other in Place.	
Route wide effects	Climate change Does the proposal incorporate renewable energy and ensure that buildings and public spaces are designed to respond to winter and summer temperatures, i.e. ventilation, shading and landscaping?	15 Waste and material use	No Public Health response as will be covered by other in Place.	
	Does the proposal maintain or enhance biodiversity?			
Route wide effects	Health inequalities Does the proposal consider health inequalities and encourage engagement by underserved communities?	No specific reference to health inequalities.	It is recommended that the authors systematically consider the impact on health inequalities within each part of the health chapter of the Route wide report and also that broader chapters of the Environmental Statement that have a health impact. This should seek to identify	

			the most negatively affect groups and those that are least likely to be able to respond to displacement or reduction in access to services.	
Landscape and visual assessment				
Route Wide Effects	Sufficient offsite mitigation should be included to mitigate the significant landscape impacts identified in the LVIA	Sufficient offsite mitigation should be included to mitigate the significant landscape impacts identified in the LVIA	Sufficient offsite mitigation may not be included to mitigate the significant landscape impacts identified in the LVIA	Via East Midlands acting on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council reserve the right to request additional off-site mitigation once the LVIA has been examined in detail, especially where views of the route affect the edge of built settlement. Off-site planting may achieve biodiversity and landscape character objectives.
Route Wide Effects	Sufficient offsite mitigation should be included to mitigate the significant visual impacts identified in the LVIA	Sufficient offsite mitigation should be included to mitigate the significant visual impacts identified in the LVIA	Sufficient offsite mitigation may not be included to mitigate the significant visual impacts identified in the LVIA	Via East Midlands acting on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council reserve the right to request additional off-site mitigation once the LVIA has been examined in detail, especially where views of the route affect the edge of built settlement. Off-site planting may achieve biodiversity and landscape character objectives.
Route Wide Effects	The Northern Forest and National Forest are the only landscape scale initiatives mentioned in this document, however there are other landscape scale initiatives such as RSPB Futurescapes projects, and the Wildlife Trusts' Living Landscapes Initiative.	Incorporate the objectives of the RSPB Futurescapes Trent and Tame River Valleys into landscape scale mitigation: and the Wildlife Trusts' Living Landscapes Initiative	Objectives of the RSPB Futurescapes Trent and Tame River Valleys, and Wildlife Trusts' Living Landscapes Initiative may not be taken into account in landscape scale mitigation.	Additional information can be found on the links shown below:- www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/documents/futurescapes/futurescapes-trent-and-tame-.pdf https://www.wildlifetrusts.org/about-us/vision-and-mission/living-landscapes The Living Landscape areas affected by the Proposed Scheme are the Sherwood Forest Living Landscape area, and the Trent Valley Living Landscape area
Route Wide Effects	The Northern Forest and National Forest are the only landscape scale initiatives mentioned in this document, however there are other landscape scale initiatives (see detailed comments)	Incorporate the objectives of the other landscape scale initiatives into the Proposed Scheme mitigation.	Other landscape scale objectives may not be taken into account in landscape scale mitigation	The Proposed Scheme to take into account the management objectives for the Annesley Hall and Strelley Hall Historic Parklands. The Proposed Scheme to take into account the management objectives for the Erewash Valley Trail (see Broxtowe Borough Council website).
Sound, noise and vibration				
Route wide effects:	Route wide health effects from operation	A summary of any route-wide health effects arising from the	Not considered at this stage	Will be presented in the health section of this report in the formal ES

		operation of the Proposed Scheme and how these compare to health effects arising from exposure to existing noise sources in the study area		
Traffic and transport				
WDES Volume 3 Route Wide effects, paragraph 14.5.3	The assessment scopes out the cumulative impact of excavated fill materials without explaining why.	The scale of impact criteria that have been used in arriving at this decision should be provided.	-	The assessment scopes out the cumulative impact of excavated fill materials without explaining why at the very least it should explain the rational for this.
WDES Volume 3 Route Wide effects, section 14.6	This section examines the likely route wide effects during the operational phase of HS2 and claims decongestion benefits arising from modal switch from conventional rail and car to HS2.	The full ES will need to provide quantitative evidence to justify this claim, since the generation of new car borne passengers to the HS2 Hub station could lead to a worsening of highway congestion both locally and on a route wide basis.	-	This section examines the likely route wide effects during the operational phase of HS2 and claims decongestion benefits through reduced future traffic congestion and reduced conventional rail congestion arising from modal switch. It is not clear if the East Midlands Gateway Transport Model will be able to capture and provide the evidence of this on a route-wide basis? Difficulty here as the disbenefits will be concentrated around the stations with the wider benefits being over a wider geography.
Planning policy				
Table 6	Chesterfield Borough is incorrectly listed as WPA and then also listed as a district council under the 'Local area' column but should be shown as a Borough Council.	None	None	None
Para 15.4.39	Care should be taken when relying on estimates of capacity based on Environment Agency permitting as standard permits are based on a range of size thresholds and may significantly exceed the actual amount of capacity that has valid planning permission due to restrictions on daily vehicle movements and onsite stockpile/storage limits etc.			

	Even where recovery facilities have both planning permission and an environmental permit, they may not yet be built or operating so it may be misleading to rely on 'consented' rather than 'operational' capacity when assessing the actual level of treatment capacity available.			
--	---	--	--	--

Volume 4: Off route effects

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Traffic and transport				
WDES Volume 4 Off -Route effects, section 14.6	This report provides an overview of the likely off route effects which are at an early stage of design. In which case it has not proved possible to establish if there any significant impacts that need assessing in Nottinghamshire.	Identify and report any necessary off route impacts on railway stations in Notts. And off route highway modifications likewise.	-	It is not clear if the East Midlands Gateway Transport Model will be able to capture and provide the evidence for the necessary impacts on an off -route basis? It would be advisable for HS2 Ltd could clarify the methodology for providing quantitative assessments.
	Outstanding general issues not included above Impact of diversion routes and necessary TM measures as part of the CoCP. Impact on existing pt routes during construction. Impact around hub of parking in residential areas. Plan checking to ensure highways alterations are designed to an appropriate standard for NCC adoption. Acceptable access arrangements depending on predicted flows.			

	Area wide network impacts from additional traffic generated to this attractor.			
--	--	--	--	--

Draft ES: Draft Code of Construction Practice

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Air Quality				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CoCP procedures for monitoring/mitigation dust and air pollution throughout the works are outlined and the relevant guidance/methodologies/monitoring requirements are identified to ensure air quality is not adversely affected by dust generation and/or emissions during the proposed works. <p>These are general policies and procedures. There are no specific measures detailed for any of the phases of works proposed at this stage.</p> <p>General Comment; The correct processes and procedures for assessment of risk to air quality have/are being undertaken. The assessment of risk is presently still on-going; therefore, conclusions at present are based on a prediction of risk and an assumption the CoCP procedures will mitigate risks associated with dust generation during the works. No assessment has been undertaken at present for emissions from construction traffic. Final assessment will be presented in the final ES.</p>				
Construction traffic effects 5.2.3	The assessment of construction traffic will be reported in the formal ES	Traffic emissions is a key requirement when considering Air Quality Impact in urbanised areas No assessments have been undertaken	This has not been assessed and will be reported in the final ES No assessments have been undertaken	Assessment has been undertaken for dust emission which are proposed to be mitigated by CoCP procedures; however, apart from gathering baseline data no assessment of air quality risk from traffic/construction traffic and or combustion plant emissions has been undertaken to date.
Construction traffic effects 5.4.9	A detailed of air quality impacts from traffic emissions in the area will be undertaken and reported in the formal ES.			
Summary of likely residual significant effects 5.4.13	Any significant residual effects from construction traffic emissions will be reported in the formal ES.			
Avoidance and mitigation measures 5.5.1	No specific mitigation measures for air quality are proposed during the operation of the Proposed Scheme.			
Operational traffic effects 5.5.4	Direct and indirect effects from changes in air quality, such as those arising from increased levels of traffic, will be			

	considered for all receptors within 200m of affected roads. These will include human receptors and those ecological habitats considered to be sensitive to changes in air quality. Any effects will be reported in the formal ES.			
Combustion plant emissions 5.5.5	Emissions from any stationary sources, such as combustion plant at East Midlands Hub station, will be included in the formal ES. Concentrations of NO2 will be predicted at sensitive receptors and any effects will be reported in the formal ES.			
Land quality				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CoCP procedures for investigation/assessment/remediation areas of contamination throughout the works are outlined and the relevant guidance/methodologies/monitoring requirements are identified to ensure that land quality/human health/environment is not adversely affected during the proposed works. The responsibility for these procedures is placed on the individual undertakers/contractors responsible for each phase of the works. These are general policies and procedures. There are no specific measures detailed for any of the phases of works proposed at this stage. 				
<p>General Comment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The appropriate assessments at Desk Study level has been undertaken for each phase of the proposed works; however, without the background data behind the findings presented it is difficult to determine whether all the potential sources, pathways and receptors have been identified. <p>Although Conceptual site models for each phase have been developed the assessment of risk related to the contaminant sources identified and their potential risk to human health, ground & surface waters, ecosystems and buildings appear to me to be overly optimistic. Even works affecting former ironworks and gas works have Low to Moderate risk associated with them (pre- investigation/remediation). Personally, without any site-specific investigation data this should be assessed as Moderate to High risk. Although the process is qualitative not quantitative and is a subjective method of assessment I do not believe that the applicants are undertaking a conservative/worst case scenario approach to the assessment but rather a liberal/best case approach.</p>				
Other mitigation measures 10.4.41	At this stage, no additional measures are considered necessary to mitigate risks from land contamination during the construction stage beyond those that are set out in the draft CoCP and/or instigated as part of the site-specific remediation strategies that would be developed at the detailed design stage, if required. These measures would ensure that risks to people and property from contaminants in the ground would	Site specific remediation strategies required for each identified contamination site.	No site investigation works to be undertaken until the construction phase. Onus of remediation placed on individual undertakers for works within the phase of works.	<p>The applicant has identified contaminated areas; however, has not yet undertaken site investigation works.</p> <p>Although desk top study information has been compiled, a conceptual site model developed, and a qualitative assessment undertaken, no quantitative data has been gathered. The qualitative assessments are therefore a prediction of potential risk.</p> <p>Onus of remediation/monitoring placed on individual undertakers/principal contractors for works within each phase.</p>

	be controlled such that they would not be significant. For example, measures might include excavation and treatment of contaminated soils or controls to manage movement of landfill gas and leachate.			
Monitoring 10.5.7	Volume 1, Section 9 sets out the general approach to environmental monitoring during operation of the Proposed Scheme. Requirements for monitoring would be determined as part of the investigation, treatment and validation of contamination on a site-specific basis as part of the detailed design process. Monitoring requirements may include water quality, air quality and/or (landfill bulk and trace gases), depending on the site being considered.	Site specific monitoring strategies required for each identified contamination site.	No site monitoring works to be undertaken until the construction phase. Onus of monitoring placed on individual undertakers for works within the phase of works.	
Landscape and visual assessment				
Section 12.4	This paragraph describes arrangements for establishment maintenance only. The long-term arrangements for the maintenance and management of habitats created are not described.	Develop an outline arrangement for the long-term maintenance and management of habitat areas created as part of the Proposed Scheme, including how this is to be funded.	An outline method for the long-term maintenance and management arrangements (including the cost), for the habitat areas created will not be agreed at the outset, which may mean these will not establish effectively and will not achieve the mitigation predicted in the EIA	It is possible that the railway corridor may provide a means for invasive species to migrate along the route - Himalayan Balsam or Japanese Knotweed for example: the maintenance and management plan should contain provision for the management of invasive species.
Water resources and flood risk				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CoCP procedures for the protection of water resources (ground/surface) and mitigation of potential flooding throughout the works are outlined and the relevant guidance/methodologies/monitoring requirements are identified to ensure that water resources are properly protected and managed during the proposed works. The responsibility for these procedures is placed on the individual undertakers/contractors responsible for each phase of the works. These are general policies and procedures. There are no specific measures detailed for any of the phases of works proposed at this stage. 				

General Comment; The correct processes and procedures for assessment of risk to water resources and flooding have/are being undertaken. The assessment of risk is presently still on-going; therefore, conclusions at present are based on a prediction of risk, which appear to have erred on the side of best case rather than worst case scenarios. Final assessment will be presented in the final ES.				
Scope, assumptions and limitations 15.2.3	This assessment is based on desk study information, including information provided to date by consultees and stakeholders, as well as surveys of accessible water features.	Desk study information undertaken within each area; however, of site specific surveys have not been undertaken at all identified locations, due to land access/accessibility issues.	No delineation in the assessment section of the report between areas which have been surveyed and which have not and had a precautionary assessment undertaken	Difficult to determine within the assessment where an actual risk and predicted risk level are applied.
Scope, assumptions and limitations 15.2.4	Where surveys have not been undertaken due to land access constraints, a precautionary approach has been adopted in the assessments of receptor value and impact magnitude.			
Scope, assumptions and limitations 15.2.8	The assessments in this working draft ES are based on professional judgement using the information that it currently available. A precautionary approach has been adopted regarding assessing the potential for adverse impacts to occur. The surveys, analysis and modelling work currently in progress, and the results of the consultation process, will be used to refine the assessments reported in the formal ES.	Site specific assessments required	Survey, analysis and modelling work in progress, final assessments to be presented in the final ES	Difficult to comment on at present based on professional judgement utilising information gathered to date. further comment once final ES is presented.
Assessment of impacts and effects 15.5.5	There are no significant adverse effects related to water resources and flood risk arising from operation of the Proposed Scheme.	Final assessments required		Bold statements considering survey, analysis and modelling assessments are still on going. Findings of the final ES will hopefully be more informed.
Other mitigation measures 15.5.6	There are no further measures required to mitigate adverse effects on surface water resources, groundwater resources or flood risk.			

HS2a Information papers

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments

map number				
Sound, noise and vibration				
E9: CONTROL OF AIRBORNE NOISE	Noise impacts at sensitive receptors during the operation of HS2 from railways and altered roads.	Outline measures that will be put in place to control airborne noise from altered roads and the operational railway	See next column	<p>The Information Paper for Phase 2a sets out the hierarchy of control measures to be adopted to control airborne noise.</p> <p>The paper then sets out the noise level thresholds to be adopted which represent the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect level (LOAEL) and Significant Observed Adverse Effect level (SOAEL) in accordance with the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE). In the detailed noise assessments to follow in Phase 2b, these threshold levels will then inform the need for further assessment of noise mitigation opportunities and noise insulation eligibility from the operational phase of HS2 from both Railway and Road (Altered/New) associated with the development.</p> <p>OBSERVATIONS:</p> <p>I have concerns over the approach taken in the setting of these levels as LOAEL and SOAEL are likely to follow a dose-response relationship which will be related to the existing noise character at a given location. Attempting to adopt a single noise measure is likely to underestimate the noise impact at many locations particularly where pre-existing noise levels are much lower.</p> <p>If a single noise measure were to be adopted I would question the levels chosen. To illustrate this point the SOAEL for daytime noise is 65dB which aligns with the noise levels for eligibility in the Noise Insulation Regulations. However, in the Noise Policy Statement for England the definition of SOAEL is <i>“the level of noise exposure above which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur”</i>. The WHO Guidance indicates that external levels greater than 55dB in the daytime and evening can cause <i>“serious annoyance”</i>. Additionally the night time SOAEL of 55dB seems high considering the WHO Night-time Noise Guidance (NNG) advises that for levels between 40-55dB: - <i>“Adverse health effects are observed among the exposed population. Many people have to adapt their lives to cope with the noise at night. Vulnerable groups are more severely affected”</i> and levels above 55dB are considered <i>“increasingly dangerous to public health”</i>.</p>

				<p>Given that the paper indicates that SOAEL will be the trigger for eligibility for noise insulation, it seems that there is a risk of adverse health effects to some of the exposed population who are not eligible for noise insulation as a result. In addition, while the Noise Insulation Regulations and the eligibility criteria within are long standing, the application of the criteria for noise insulation in my view is flawed. A property which is predicted to experience a noise level just above the SOAEL, receives noise insulation which significantly reduces the noise impact, whereas a property just below the threshold is not entitled to any noise insulation and thus results in experiencing a greater impact. The HS2 project provides an opportunity to review this approach and could consider scaling the noise insulation offer in relation to predicted noise impacts to provide a more effective and balanced approach to providing the mitigation benefits of noise insulation.</p>
<p>E10: CONTROL OF GROUND- BORNE NOISE AND VIBRATION FROM THE OPERATIO N OF TEMPORA RY AND PERMANE NT RAILWAYS</p>	<p>Ground-Borne noise and vibration impacts at sensitive receptors during the operation of HS2 from railways</p>	<p>Outline measures that will be put in place to control airborne noise from altered roads and the operational railway</p>		<p>The Information Paper for Phase 2a sets out the steps to be taken in the design of the track bed to minimise the levels of ground borne noise and vibration.</p> <p>The paper also sets out the threshold levels for LOAEL and SOAEL for both ground borne noise and vibration which will then be used to inform the design following detailed assessment to follow later in Phase 2b.</p> <p>GROUND-BORNE NOISE</p> <p>Again, I would query whether the levels chosen are appropriate. There is no distinction made between day/night, however for ground-borne noise the LOAEL is set at 35dB LAMax and the SOAEL is set at 45dB LAMax. Whereas the WHO NNG identifies that 32dB LAMax is a level at which effects upon motility during sleep are observed and levels above 42dB LAMax is likely to lead to people waking in the night or too early. Therefore, in my opinion the levels of 35 and 45 respectively are 3dB too high.</p> <p>GROUND BORNE VIBRATION</p> <p>The threshold levels have been taken from those within BS6724, however I would again question whether it appropriate to assign these levels to LOAEL and SOAEL as the levels in</p>

				BS6724 relate specifically to likelihood of complaints and not observed effects.
E11: CONTROL OF NOISE FROM THE OPERATION OF STATIONARY SYSTEMS	Noise impacts at sensitive receptors from stationary systems associated with HS2	Outline measures that will be put in place to control airborne noise from altered roads and the operational railway		<p>The paper states that the Rating level of any equipment when assessed in accordance with BS4142:2014 is to be no more than 5dB above the background noise level. Where this level is exceeded, then it will be mitigated to reduce the level as far as reasonably practicable.</p> <p>Again, I have concerns over the approach being adopted. First and foremost, it is my view that the target should be to achieve noise levels which <u>do not exceed</u> existing background noise levels to avoid 'noise creep' – particularly as the majority of trackside equipment will run 24hrs a day. Where this can't be achieved then the noise levels should be mitigated to as low as practically possible. Therefore, in my opinion the suggested target Rating level is 5dB too high.</p>
E12: OPERATIONAL NOISE AND VIBRATION MONITORING FRAMEWORK	Compliance with noise and vibration levels during the operational phase	Outline approach to operational monitoring of noise and vibration levels.		<p>The paper states that noise and vibration monitoring will be carried out at different times during the lifetime of the Proposed Scheme at a combination of carefully selected monitoring locations.</p> <p>Where measured performance is worse than expected then this will be investigated, and corrective action taken.</p> <p>Results of measured performance compared to expected conditions, and monitoring reports will be shared with the relevant Local Authorities at appropriate intervals.</p> <p>It is recommended that the monitoring positions are agreed with the LA's and that the LA's have the ability to request additional/alternative monitoring locations when HS2 becomes operational.</p>
E13: CONTROL OF CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND VIBRATION	Noise and vibration impacts at sensitive receptors during the construction phase	Outline measures that will be put in place to control noise and vibration during construction		<p>The noise levels adopted for LOAEL and SOAEL appear to be taken from BS5228-1. Higher noise levels during periods of construction are normally justified on the basis that they are a temporary operation. However, I am not sure that it is appropriate to attempt to link construction noise levels to LOAEL and SOAEL, thereby giving two different LOAEL and SOAEL's for the same location (Construction and operational).</p> <p>The vibration levels appear to replicate those from BS6472 and I would reiterate my previous comments for operational</p>

				vibration levels with regards to whether they are appropriate levels for LOAEL and SOAEL.
Draft Code of Construction Practice	Noise and vibration impacts during construction of HS2	Outline measures that will be put in place to control noise and vibration during construction including thresholds for insulation and temporary re-housing		<p>The draft CoCP states that the contractor will employ BPM to minimise noise and vibration at source and where required local screening of equipment.</p> <p>Where despite BPM, noise levels exceed criteria defined in CoCP, the contractors may offer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Noise Insulation or 2) Temporary rehousing <p>The levels are stipulated in the CoCp with varying trigger levels depending on the time of day/evening and align with the SOAEL levels defined in E13. These trigger levels are taken from BS5228:1 which is the accepted industry standard.</p> <p>Similarly, the CoCP defines vibration levels for the protection of occupants and users of buildings and separate vibration levels to protect buildings from damage. These levels appear to have been taken from BS6472:1 (<i>Guide to evaluation of human exposure to vibration in buildings Part 1: Vibration sources other than blasting</i>) and BS7385 (<i>Evaluation and measurement for vibration in buildings — Part 2: Guide to damage levels from groundborne vibration</i>) respectively.</p> <p>The CoCP states that where vibration levels may exceed threshold levels for damage to buildings that the occupants will be notified in advance of the works along with information on the type of works and proposals for vibration monitoring. It does not however state what actions will be taken in the event of vibration levels exceeding the levels to protect occupants users of buildings.</p> <p>The CoCP requires nominated undertaker's contractors to seek to obtain from the local LA a S61 consent prior to the start of works. This will ensure that the LA's are engaged in the assessment of predicted noise impacts and agree appropriate mitigation and permitted noise and vibration levels (where applicable) prior to the commencement of works.</p>
Landscape and visual assessment				

HS2 Phase 2a Information Paper E19 Soil Handling and Land Restoration July 2017	The general approach to soil handling and land restoration is accepted	No comments	No comments	<p>Via Environmental Management and Design (EMD) Team to provide comments on Phase 2b documents as soon as these Information Papers are available.</p> <p>Initial comments to be provided by Andy Bryan – Via East Midlands – Contaminated Land Officer</p>
HS2 Phase 2a Information Paper E20 Maintenance of Landscaped areas July 2017	The general approach to the maintenance of the landscaped areas is accepted	No comments	No comments	The general approach to the maintenance of the landscaped areas is accepted, in particular the variable period of establishment maintenance to be implemented by the nominated undertaker is noted; this may be a minimum of 10 years for areas of ecological woodland compensation planting to allow this to establish effectively. This Information Paper goes some way to meeting the requirements of Point 3 above.
HS2 Phase 2a Information Paper E20 Maintenance of Landscaped areas July 2017	There is no mention about the management of invasive plant species in this paper	Include a summary paragraph about the management of invasive plant species	That the management of invasive plant species is not considered at the earliest opportunity	<p>Via Environmental Management and Design (EMD) Team to provide comments on Phase 2b documents as soon as these Information Papers are available.</p> <p>Invasive plant species are defined as those mentioned in Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended - Schedule 9, and the Weeds Act 1959</p>
HS2 Phase 2a Information Paper E22 Mitigation of Significant community effects on Public Open Space and Community Facilities July 2017	The general approach to the mitigation effects on POS and Community Facilities is accepted	No comments	No comments	Via Environmental Management and Design (EMD) Team to provide comments on Phase 2b documents as soon as these Information Papers are available.

HS2 Phase 2a Information Paper E28 Green Infrastructure and the Green Corridor July 2017	Contents of report noted	No comments	No comments	Via Environmental Management and Design (EMD) Team to provide comments on Phase 2b documents as soon as these Information Papers are available.
HS2 Landscape Design Approach July 2016	Contents of report noted	No comments	No comments	
Phase 2a Information paper e14; Air Quality				
<p>3 Objectives</p> <p>3.1 This document sets out the approach HS2 Ltd will follow to try to avoid emissions to air causing significant adverse effects on communities and to prevent air pollution. The measures set out are intended to maintain good air quality for those people living and working close to the Proposed Scheme as far as is reasonably practicable. For the most part, these measures which reduce emissions which have harmful impacts on human health and will also reduce emissions which influence climate change (carbon).</p> <p>3.2 HS2 Ltd.'s Environmental Policy⁴ commits to developing an exemplar project and commits to protecting the environment through the avoidance and prevention of pollution, and by meeting all compliance obligations. The policy also states that Hs2 Ltd will seek to avoid pollutant emissions to air or reduce such emissions and minimise public and workforce exposure to any such pollutant emissions.</p> <p>4 Potential Air Quality Effects</p> <p>4.3 The construction of the Proposed Scheme will have impacts on air quality using on-road and off-road machines using conventional engines, and through the emissions of dust from demolition and construction.</p> <p>Dust from Construction and Mineral Sites</p> <p>4.8 The conclusion of the Environmental Impact Assessment is that there will be 'no significant effect' on any receptors (residential, property-based or ecological) along the route of the Proposed Scheme from dust-generating activities during construction and mineral works, after the provisions of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) have been applied. The CoCP forms part of EMRs, so it is a requirement under the EMRs that dust emissions during construction and mineral activities should be minimised as far as reasonably practicable and with the objective that there is no significant effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is consistent with the findings presented in the Vol 2; Community Area Reports for each section of the route through Nottinghamshire. <p>Highway Vehicle Emissions</p> <p>4.10 During construction, highway construction traffic will cause temporary significant effects for local air quality, <i>but this is confined to the M6 corridor around Stafford</i>. These effects are from changes in nitrogen dioxide concentrations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This appears inconsistent as my interpretation of the Vol 2; Community Area Reports for the route through Nottinghamshire it is stated that <i>no assessment of construction related emissions has been undertaken to date</i>. The findings of this assessment will be presented in the final ES document. <p>Control Measures are suggested for areas where significant air effects have been identified, managed through the CoCP. These may need to be implemented in the phases through Nottinghamshire also, dependent upon the air emission assessment to be presented in the final ES statement.</p>				

Phase 2a Information Paper e18; Land Quality

3. Contaminated land

3.3 A total of 975 sites were assessed along the route of the Proposed Scheme. The sites were selected based on records of their previous use, such as landfills, which may have caused contamination. Of these sites, 171 were taken forward for further assessment as they are located either on or near areas where construction will take place, and, either singly or in combination, are considered to potentially contain substances...

- The high-risk sites identified from the further assessment are all located within Staffordshire

No sites along the route within Nottinghamshire have been assessed as High Risk; even though; Railway Yards, Former Landfills, Colliery Sites, Iron Foundries, Textile Factories and Former Gas Works Sites have all been identified along the route. At worst these sites are assessed as having a moderate risk. Without any form of investigation undertaken I believe these assessments do no err on the side of caution and once investigations and further assessment is undertaken a number of these sites will prove to have a higher potential risk than initially proposed. Management of such contaminated sites is proposed in the later sections of this report and investigation and remediation will be undertaken for such sites; however, my concern at present is that potentially contaminative sites have not been assessed as potentially high risk at this preliminary stage.

Phase 2a Information Paper e17; Excavated Material & Waste Management

2.2 Only if excavated material is not required or is unsuitable for the construction of the Proposed Scheme will it be considered waste.

3.1 The construction of the Proposed Scheme will lead to the generation of approximately 40 million tonnes of excavated material, approximately 98% of which will be reused as part of the Proposed Scheme for the construction of engineering and environmental mitigation earthworks. The remaining excavated material is surplus to requirements or is unsuitable for reuse due to contamination and cannot be remediated.

3.2 The Proposed Scheme will also lead to the generation of approximately 130,000 tonnes of demolition material. It is anticipated that at least 90% of this material will be diverted from landfill through reuse, recycling and recovery.

3.3 It is estimated that construction of the Proposed Scheme will lead to the generation of approximately 435,000 tonnes of construction waste, at least 90% of which will be diverted from landfill through reuse, recycling and recovery.

As previously stated independent of this document, it is my belief that these targets are aspirational and not based on quantitative estimates. There will be more unsuitable materials generated in relation to the scheme than is presently acknowledged and even with the implementation of remediation measures (contaminated land), screening and recycling (construction and demolition) there will be significantly more waste materials generated by the proposed scheme than is presently predicted.

County Council comments on the draft Equality Impact Assessment

Scope and methodology

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments

Volume 2

LA 05 – Radcliffe on Soar to Long Eaton

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Health				
Ratcliffe-on-Soar to Long Eaton (LA05); EIA looks only at the impact of demolition of social housing. Does not address the impact 0-15, and older people living	Age: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - disproportionate representation of residents aged 0 to 15, in comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages - a disproportionate representation of residents aged 65 to 84, in comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages - a disproportionate representation of residents aged 65 to 84, in comparison to 			

outside of social housing accommodation	the route-wide and/or regional averages			
LA05	<p>Disability – the EIA looks only at the impact of demolition of social housing, and the animal rescue centre (impact on children with autism) The EIA doesn't address disability across the wider community</p> <p>Disproportionate representation of residents whose day-to-day activities were limited 'a lot' by a health problem or disability which has lasted or was expected to last for more than 12 months.</p>			
LA05	<p>Religion or belief – EIA looks at the demolition of Jehovah Witness place of worship only. The impact on Hindu's and Sikh's is not addressed.</p> <p>A disproportionate representation of residents with Hindu beliefs, in comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages. These were located in the Ratcliffe-on-Soar to Long Eaton. There were a disproportionate representation of residents with Sikh beliefs, in comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages.</p>			

LA05	<p>Coincidence of multiple Protected Characteristics Groups (PCGs)</p> <p>Report identifies the LSOAs in which there was a disproportionate representation of three or more PCGs. This included Bilborough, Nottingham, within the Stapleford to Nuthall area.</p>			
	<p>Housing quality and design</p> <p>Does the proposal seek to address the housing needs of the wider community by requiring provision of variation of house type that will meet the needs of older or disabled people?</p>	<p>Pg. 64</p> <p>Demolition of Social Housing The Nook (Ratcliffe-on-Soar to Long Eaton, LA05) Impact on those 55-59 age group. The Move-on scheme supports people who have been living in supported housing to move into mainstream social housing.</p> <p>In addition, preference for ground floor flats goes to applicants who require level access accommodation due to a medical condition or disability.</p> <p>The number of lettings to households from BAME groups reflects the composition of the</p>	<p>Search undertaken in May 2018 found only one property currently available within a 5 radius of the Nook and Bonsall Court, suggesting that there may be limited alternative</p> <p>Need to consider the construction of a similar develop as near as possible to the Nook and Bonsall Court</p> <p>Work with District Council in identify suitable housing supply to meet the demand.</p> <p>Risk to social cohesion and access to physical activity for children. Need to identify alternative suitable venues near the</p>	

		<p>Long Eaton community. It is assumed, therefore, that there may be a higher than average proportion of residents who are elderly, and/or have a disability.</p> <p>Pg. 67</p> <p>Greenwood Community Centre (Ratcliffe-on-Soar to Long Eaton, LA05)</p> <p>Greenwood Community Centre is located on Chester Green in Beeston. The centre contains both indoor and outdoor facilities, has wheelchair access, disabled toilets and a secure outdoor play area.</p> <p>There is the potential for the permanent loss of this facility to result in a disproportionate effect on children and young people using the community centre for education and recreational purposes.</p>	Greenwood Community Centre.	
--	--	---	-----------------------------	--

	<p>Access to healthcare services and other social infrastructure</p> <p>Does the proposal seek to retain, replace or provide health and social care related infrastructure?</p>	<p>Pg. 65</p> <p>There may also be the potential for differential effects for older and BAME residents, particularly if displaced residents are required to relocate to alternative accommodation outside of the local area, potentially disrupting access to facilities and services and leading to the loss of existing social ties. Disabled residents may also be differentially impacted if there is no suitable alternative accommodation available to meet their requirements, for example ground floor or level access accommodation.</p>	<p>The profile of residents of the Nook has not been established at this stage. HS2 Ltd have sort clarification on information through stakeholder engagement and desk-based research in order to understand the potential equality effects, need to find a solution to access health and social care that meets EIA codes</p>	
	<p>Social cohesion and lifetime neighbourhoods</p> <p>Does the proposal connect with existing communities where the layout and movement avoids physical barriers and severance and encourages social interaction?</p>	<p>Pg. 66</p> <p>Kingdom Hall (Ratcliffe-on-Soar to Long Eaton, LA05)</p> <p>Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses is located on New Tythe Street in Long Eaton. It is a place of worship used by Jehovah's Witnesses, including a Punjabi Jehovah's</p>	<p>Need to work with the community and construct alternative places of worship</p>	

		<p>Witness group. There are two other Kingdom Halls located within 5km radius. It is understood that all three of these facilities are currently at capacity.</p> <p>The construction of the Long Eaton and Toton viaduct would require the demolition of the Kingdom Hall on New Tythe Street. In the absence of mitigation, there is the potential for the permanent loss of this facility to result in a disproportionate effect on Jehovah's Witnesses in the area due to the loss of a place of worship associated with their religion.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Community Area 06 – Stapleford to Nuthall

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Health				
Stapleford to Nuthall (LA06); EIA does not address impact on	Age: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - disproportionate representation of residents aged 0 to 15, in 			

children and older people living in these areas	<p>comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 16 to 24 age sub-group, just one LSOA had a disproportionate representation, in comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages. - a disproportionate representation of residents aged 85 and over, in comparison to the route and/or regional averages. 			
LA06	<p>Disability – the EIA looks only at the impact of demolition of social housing, and the animal rescue centre (impact on children with autism) The EIA doesn't address disability across the wider community</p> <p>Disproportionate representation of residents whose day-to-day activities were limited 'a lot' by a health problem or disability which has lasted or was expected to last for more than 12 months.</p>			
LA06 Map EQ-14-302	<p>Race – EIA – not address at all – major gap</p> <p>A disproportionate representation of residents with mixed ethnicity, in comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages. This was located within this area.</p>			

Map EQ-16	<p>A disproportionate representation of residents from Black ethnic subgroups, in comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages.</p> <p>- Located in the north-east of the Stapleford to Nuthall area in this map area.</p>			
Stapleford to Nuthall area	<p>Religion or belief – EIA looks at the demolition of Jehovah Witness place of worship only. The impact on Hindu's and Sikh's is not addressed.</p> <p>A disproportionate representation of residents with Hindu beliefs, in comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages. These were located in the</p> <p>- Stapleford to Nuthall area</p>			
	<p>Housing quality and design</p> <p>Does the proposal seek to address the housing needs of the wider community by requiring provision of variation of house type that will meet the needs of older or disabled people?</p>	<p>Pg. 68</p> <p>Moo-Haven Animal Rescue Centre (Stapleford to Nuthall, LA06)</p> <p>Moo-Haven Animal Rescue Centre, located in Stanton-by-Dale, provides a temporary home for neglected animals in the local area. The centre, which has</p>		

		<p>riding school facilities, also hosts fundraising events, which are frequented by children, including autistic children.</p> <p>There is the potential for the permanent reduction in capacity to result in a disproportionate impact on children and young people using the facility for recreational purposes.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

LA 07 – Hucknall to Selston

Community Area report, Paragraph Number or map number	Key issue/concerns	Key requirement	Missed opportunities	Detailed comments
Health				
Hucknall to Selston (LA07); EIA does not address impact on young people and older people living in these areas	<p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 16 to 24 age sub-group a disproportionate representation, in comparison to the route-wide and/or regional averages. - a disproportionate representation of residents aged 65 to 84, in comparison to 			

	<p>the route-wide and/or regional averages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a disproportionate representation of residents aged 85 and over, in comparison to the route and/or regional averages. 			
LA07	<p>Disability – the EIA looks only at the impact of demolition of social housing, and the animal rescue centre (impact on children with autism) The EIA doesn't address disability across the wider community</p> <p>Disproportionate representation of residents whose day-to-day activities were limited 'a lot' by a health problem or disability which has lasted or was expected to last for more than 12 months.</p>			