

**High Speed Rail 2
London – West Midlands
Additional Provision 4
and
Supplementary Environmental Statement 3**



**Response from
Staffordshire County Council
and
Lichfield District Council**

Contents

Introduction	1
General Comments	1
Volume 2 – CFA 22 Whittington to Handsacre Report	2
Volume 5 – Technical Appendices Environmental Topics and Map Books	3

Introduction

This document is a response to the HS2 London – West Midlands Additional Provision 4 and Supplementary Environmental Statement 3 (SES3) consultation; this response has been jointly prepared by Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council.

General Comments

In general, the Councils are satisfied with the amendments proposed in Additional Provision 4 and Supplementary Environmental Statement 3. However, concerns remain around the mitigation proposed for the Hilliard's Cross junction onto the A38 and request that an improved solution is developed through continued dialogue with the Highways Authority and Highways England. This should take into account impacts on the junction both from Phase 1 and Phase 2a construction traffic.

The Councils note that signalisation is included within the mitigation, although it is not immediately clear where the signals will be placed. However, we are aware that this approach has been considered in respect of previous planning applications and is deemed by Highways England to be unsafe due to restriction of forward visibility to the junction from the A38 northbound approach. Further, it appears that signalisation could present a risk of queuing back onto the local highway network from both the northbound and southbound slip roads.

The Councils' view is that there is insufficient information on the proposed mitigation at Hilliard's Cross to be able to properly assess the impacts of construction traffic at the junction or the mitigation itself and its potential impacts on the local highway network. It is recommended that further detail is provided and evidence that existing develop led schemes for the junction have been taken into account.

The Councils will continue to raise this matter with HS2 Ltd. to ensure that a satisfactory solution is developed. We would also request that HS2 Ltd. consider what would be required to make any improvements at this junction permanent, rather than temporary, given the length of time which they are planned to be in place.

In terms of the second key amendment in Staffordshire, it is stated that the revised diversion of the overhead power lines from Lichfield to Armitage will be underground and use trenchless techniques that should not affect local water bodies. However, it may be that some of the proposed works may require Land Drainage Consent. It would be desirable for HS2 Ltd. to liaise with the SCC Flood Risk Team to understand the nature and likelihood of flooding along the route which could potentially impact on the proposed works.

The Councils believe that, through ongoing dialogue and detailed design development, concerns outlined within this response can be addressed.

Volume 2 – CFA 22 Whittington to Handsacre Report and Map Book	
Paragraph reference	Comments and Points to Address
2.2.5 and 2.26	SES3-022-001 Changes to the existing junction between Wood End Lane and the A38 Rykneld Street at Hilliard’s Cross: Impacts are assessed as temporary but section 2.2.6 indicates that they may be permanent.
2.2.6	Temporary improvements to the junction between the A38 Rykneld Street and Wood End Lane appear to involve removal of vegetation and possible permanent retention of the retaining wall to a maximum height of 10.5 metres. Has a scoping exercise been undertaken to remove the need for consideration of Landscape effects?
Page 28, 5.2.27-5.2.28	The revised diversion route will increase the level of impact upon a section defined as a historic hedgerow on Tewnals Lane. No doubt the District Ecological Officer will wish to comment on potential impacts and mitigation in this instance. At this point the revised diversion route passes through the hedgerow; while not worsening the existing impact, the scheme should reinstate the hedgerow following completion of works with a suitable hedge of an appropriate native species mix.
Page 28, 5.2.30	The Vicars Wood and Tomhay Wood do not appear to be directly impacted by the proposed revised diversion route. From a historic environment perspective there is no comment to make here. The District Tree Officer may wish to comment on the specifics of this aspect of the revision.
5.2.46	Regarding the diversion of electricity transmission line, the hedges affected are narrow with no standard trees, and hedges will be replaced. I agree with the assessment that landscape effects should be temporary and not significant; however there may be the opportunity to enhance hedges, which would be welcomed.
5.2.56	States: “Locations of species records from surveys conducted in support of the AP2 revised scheme are illustrated on SES and AP2 ES maps EC-01, EC-04, EC-05, EC-11 and EC- 12, Volume 5, Map Book Ecology.” Only EC-04 maps appear to be in the Volume 5 Map Book.

5.1.12	There will be a requirement to temporarily close or divert Public Footpaths Nos 10(b) and 13(b) Curborough and Elmhurst; No 8(b) Lichfield City and No 17 Kings Bromley. HS2 Ltd. have stated that this will be a short term measure to allow for the temporary diversion of the electricity transmission line and the maximum path diversion will be 50 metres. All routes will be reinstated on their original lines following construction. In view of this there are no concerns.
--------	---

Volume 5 – Technical Appendices Environmental Topics and Map Books	
Paragraph reference	Comments and points to address
SES3 and AP4 ES Appendix EC-003-003	<p>SES3-022-001 Changes to the existing junction between Wood End Lane and the A38 Rykneld Street at Hilliard’s Cross:</p> <p>Impacts are assessed as temporary but s.2.2.6 of Volume 2 CFA22 Whittington to Handsacre makes it clear that the change may well be permanent. Therefore, utilising the precautionary principle that HS2 Ltd. states is the methodology used, impacts should be assessed as permanent and appropriate mitigation provided. We have not been able to locate any mitigation of habitat loss for this change.</p>
Volume 5 Technical Appendices: Transport Assessment (TR-001-000) 3.16.9 and table 7-305.3	<p>SCC has concerns that the documents provide insufficient information to be able to consider the proposed mitigation scheme at Hilliard’s Cross. An engineering scheme plan would aid our considerations and show the details of the scheme. Inputs for the Linsig model would also show assumptions around lane usage. The text suggests that two lanes would be available for right turners onto the southbound A38 slip road which would be required to merge early on the slip road. Can the geometry be provided for HGVs to use either or both lanes side by side and merge on the slip road?</p> <p>Does the model include the potential for vehicles to block back through the junction from the A38 southbound slip road because the slip currently experiences queuing due to the difficulty for HGVs to merge with the fast flowing traffic on the A38? It cannot be assumed that the exit is clear.</p>