

14, Babelake Street
Packington
Ashby de la Zouch
Leics. LE65 1WD
2nd March 2017

Dear Sirs,

**Route Refinement Consultation, HS2 Phase 2b, around Measham and
Packington - Response of the Residents of Packington**

Please find enclosed the response document prepared on behalf of the residents of the village of Packington, Leicestershire. Our response relates only to the section of the HS2 route that has been amended adjacent to the villages of Austrey, Appleby Magna, Measham and Packington.

Whilst our response concentrates primarily on the substantial adverse effects of the route change on Packington, we are aware of other significant detrimental impacts to residents, businesses and the environment elsewhere on this section of amended route.

We set out the complete opposition of the residents of Packington to the concept of HS2 in our submission to the consultation in 2013/14. Our opposition to this revised route in this response should not be seen as an endorsement of the unamended route.

Our research in formulating this response has revealed that the amended route has the greatest impact on people, businesses and the environment of any of the three routes originally shortlisted by HS2 Ltd for this area. We have set out in the documents our detailed reasons for reaching that conclusion.

As well as setting out why this route is the wrong route, we have included a detailed comparison between the three routes identified previously by HS2 Ltd. The “third” route, passing largely through open countryside, avoids large concentrations of housing, substantial business developments, conservation areas and sites of special scientific interest. We comprehensively demonstrate this to be the least harmful option.

We ask therefore, if Phase 2b must go ahead at all, that the “third” route, passing further to the east, be selected as the HS2 Ltd preferred route through this part on North-West Leicestershire.

Yours faithfully,

Christopher Miles
Chairman, Packington HS2 Response Team

Residents of Packington's formal response to consultation on the revised route of High Speed Two (HS2) Phase 2b around Measham and Packington.



Picturesque Packington Conservation Area and Village, as seen from the proposed HS2 line

Executive summary

High Speed Two (HS2) Limited have asked the question 'Do you support the proposal to re-align the route to the east of Measham?'

HS2 Ltd states that the right route for HS2 needs to balance different factors including serving communities effectively, delivering value for money for taxpayers and passengers and limiting disruption for local residents and businesses¹.

The residents of Packington have come together to submit a joint response, following a meeting attended by over 120 village residents on 6 January 2017, wherein it was agreed that the group would

'submit a robust objection to the route, submit alternative route(s), submit mitigating proposals if the line was to go ahead, comment on the compensation scheme'

The Packington HS2 Response Team has decided to completely reject this proposed change for reasons that will be outlined in the following topics:

- ! Conservation areas/listed buildings/environment
- ! Education and health
- ! Noise
- ! Compensation
- ! Businesses and jobs

This report includes details of inaccuracies in data used by HS2 Ltd.

We also recommend that HS2 Ltd considers an alternative third route which minimises the impact on the areas outlined below, including over 90% reduction in the number of homes impacted and significantly less impact on schools, businesses, history and the environment.

Conservation areas/listed buildings/environment

Packington is a historic village established prior to the Domesday survey in 1086. The proposed route of HS2 will have a significant impact on the historical nature and environment of the village. This includes the impact on the Conservation Area. The River MeaseSSSI and its tributary the Gilwiskaw Brook is the only Special Area of Conservation (SAC) on the entire HS2 route.

Education and health

Our village school is one of the best regarded in Leicestershire and is currently attended by 113 children from Packington and the surrounding area. The school will be only 350 metres from the proposed new route for the HS2 line.

¹Source: HS2 Ltd route consultation material, Nov 2016

The head teacher and governors have serious concerns about the adverse impacts of these operations on the health of the children in their care. The school uses the outdoor spaces on the school site as a teaching and learning space.

Noise

All parts of the village will be exposed to higher levels of noise pollution. HS2Ltd has so far failed to recognise the cumulative noise effect of HS2 plus the A42. Noise caused by HS2 alone would be at least 53dB for all of Packington. With those living closest to the route being exposed to much higher levels of noise, and the cumulative effect of HS2 and the A42/M42 being around 80dB, the level at which the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) states additional information and hearing protection should be made available when exposed to daily or weekly².

Compensation

The compensation package as proposed is wholly inadequate and inequitable. It doesn't reflect the impact on all houses and people in the village and is set by an arbitrary line on the map. Without revisions, the compensation being proposed would leave residents of Packington suffering significant and long term financial loss.

Businesses and jobs

The impact on businesses and jobs will be wide-ranging and unquantifiable but it will mean the loss of at least 230 jobs and its resulting impact on the local economy. Many of the businesses rely on the quiet and remote nature of their location.

To conclude, we do not believe the proposed route meets the objectives of limiting disruption to residents or businesses in the area. Letters of support from Andrew Bridgen MP and Councillor Nigel Smith are included in the appendices section.

Full details are set out in the following report.

²Source – <http://www.hse.gov.uk/contact/faqs/>

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Title page	1
Executive summary	2
Contents and list of appendices	4
Conservation/Listed buildings/Environment	5
Education and health	9
Noise	12
Compensation	14
Business and jobs	17
Construction phase	22
Possible third route alternative	23
Mitigation	28
Data inaccuracies	31
Appendices	32
1. North West Leicestershire District Council's Local Plan Policy E10	32
2. Current level of compensation for Packington based on HS2 proposals	34
3. Packington revised level of compensation proposals	35
4. Further improvements to proposed Third Route	36
5. Letter of support from Andrew Bridgen	41
6. Letter of support Nigel Smith	

Conservation/Listed Buildings/Environment

Packington – Historical and Environmental impact of HS2

Packington is a historic village established prior to the Domesday survey in 1086. The proposed route of HS2 will have a significant impact on the historical nature and environment of the village. This includes the impact on the Conservation Area, historic byways and the high concentration of listed buildings in the village, together with the significant risk of crossing the Gilwiskaw Brook, which is part of the River Mease SSSI and Special Area of Conservation.

Conservation Area

The Packington Conservation Area was designated by the District Council in 1992 under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990. The Packington Conservation Area Appraisal and Study by North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC) [http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/files/documents/packington_conservation_area_appraisal_and_study/Packington Conservation Area Appraisal and Study.pdf](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/files/documents/packington_conservation_area_appraisal_and_study/Packington%20Conservation%20Area%20Appraisal%20and%20Study.pdf) highlights ‘the special interest, character and appearance of the built and natural environment within and surrounding the existing Conservation Area’ (p.1). The Conservation Area is unusual in Packington in that it is mainly on the edge of the village and includes the fields between the Mill and The Manor House on Mill Street (map p.38), which is the closest part of the Conservation area to the proposed route for HS2. As well as protecting the land and buildings in the Conservation Area by preventing any inappropriate development in the past 25 years, this document also highlights and protects the views within, into and from the Conservation Area and the setting of it. This is important, not just to those that live in the Conservation Area, but to everyone that uses Mill Street, Vicarage Lane and the other parts of the village from where it is visible. The document highlights 16 listed buildings of special architectural or historic interest within the Conservation Area and a further 38 buildings which make a positive contribution to the special architectural or historic interest of the area in accordance with the criteria set by English Heritage (pp. 31-32).

The NWLDC appraisal also considers that the Sports Field on Measham Road, adjacent to the western boundary of the Area, makes a significant contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area (p.19). The Sports Field will be only 200 metres from the proposed route of HS2, significantly impacting on the young people and children using it.

The embankment and viaduct for HS2 across the Gilwiskaw Brook is immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area and will be 300 metres long and eight metres high (similar to two double decker buses on top of each other), with the train and electricity pylons on top of that. Building HS2 so close to the Conservation Area will

- be detrimental to the setting of the buildings that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- result in the loss of important views within and out of the Conservation Area

- be detrimental to the environmental quality in terms of noise

This impact from constructing and operating HS2 will be irreversible once it is built. It can never be undone and the Conservation Area will always suffer this blight.

The Conservation Area was established following the construction of the A42 in the late 1980s to protect the area from unwanted development and any further major projects. The North West Leicestershire District Council's Local Plan Policy E10 does not permit development which would be detrimental to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and the buildings that contribute positively to its character and appearance or which would affect its setting and views (see appendix 1). Even though the proposed HS2 route is just outside the Packington Conservation Area, constructing HS2 on this route will clearly be contrary to this Policy and the legislation underpinning Conservation Areas.

Whilst HS2 Ltd may not need to comply with the law on Conservation Areas; they should at least respect it and adopt the policy of NWLDC in finding the best route.

The 'Sustainability Statement including Post Consultation Update Appendix C2 - Cultural Heritage' prepared by Temple RSK for HS2 shows the impact on the Packington Conservation Area as 'minor'. This assessment is clearly wrong for the reasons set out above and reflects the limitations set out in the report which state that the appraisal is 'high level and should not be confused with a full and detailed environmental assessment' and 'has relied primarily on desk study'. A more detailed assessment coupled with a review of the NWLDC appraisal and policy would surely conclude that the impact on the Packington Conservation Area is 'major' and, therefore, the best option is for the route of HS2 to be moved.

It is essential that a detailed on-site review is carried out by HS2 Ltd to confirm this.

Historic Byways

Vicarage Lane in Packington, which runs along the edge of the Conservation Area, is part of the historic route from Derby to Coventry (NWLDC Conservation Area document, p.22) and is shown on historic maps of the area.

In addition, the routes of two Roman roads cross in Normandy Wood, a community planted wood to remember the Normandy landing, off Measham Road in Packington. These Roman roads are the 'Via Devana' running from Colchester to Chester and the Tamworth to Sawley Roman road.

Each of these historic byways will be significantly impacted by HS2 crossing them. This is contrary to NWLDC Policy E17, which prohibits development that would impact on the setting or amenity value of historic byways. It is also a complete disregard of this country's history.

Listed Buildings

As shown on the HS2 key environmental features map and in the Conservation Area document, there are nine listed buildings on Mill Street, which is the nearest part of Packington to the

proposed HS2 route. This is a high concentration for such a small street and includes the thirteenth century Holy Rood Church, which is Grade II* listed. All of these listed buildings are shown, in the Sustainability Statement – Cultural Heritage document prepared for HS2 Ltd by Temple RSK (pp.27-28), as having no direct or setting impact as a result of HS2. This cannot be the case given the proximity of the route to the Church, Manor House and Mill, particularly as all of these do not have foundations given their age. The excavation of cuttings and the extensive piling of the Gilwiskaw floodplain to create embankments and viaducts will create significant noise and vibration. Once in operation, trains operating at over 200 miles per hour will create significant increases in ground vibrations – Rayleigh waves. The combined impact of construction and vibration waves is likely to cause significant damage to the historic buildings that do not have foundations. Once inflicted, this damage could not be reversed. In addition to the damage to and potential loss of historic buildings, this will cause significant financial loss and emotional stress to those who own those properties.

The visual impact and noise will be intolerable for all of the historic buildings in Packington and their setting. The Noise Appraisal maps by Temple RSK (pp. 101-102) show the whole of Packington as having a noticeable increase in noise or with as yet unspecified noise abatement, this being reduced to mainly the Conservation Area (including this concentration of listed buildings) having a significant noise increase.

Strangely, Packington Mill which is mentioned in the Domesday Book and has been occupied as a home for 10 years is shown in the Temple RSK report as being derelict (p.28). Also, Measham Lodge, which is listed and 300 metres from the route, has not been included. These errors cast doubt on the accuracy of data used by HS2 Ltd and, therefore, any decisions made or conclusions reached based on that data.

HS2 Ltd has previously highlighted, in the 2013 route consultation, that the impact on clusters of historic buildings might be greater than for dispersed features and identified three such locations on the whole Birmingham to Leeds route, one of which was Packington. This reinforces the above point about the concentration of listed buildings in this small village. Temple RSK has, however, dropped this comment from the current consultation, which is perverse given that the route is now even closer to these buildings.

One other unique feature in the local district that will be severely impacted is the Grade I listed Sir John Moore School in Appleby Magna, which was designed by Sir Christopher Wren, and is not only the village school but also the focus for many village events. The revised HS2 route now passes very close to this important historic building and will, therefore, significantly impact it.

It is also worth noting that double glazing to help provide some mitigation against the noise is not allowed in listed buildings and, moreover, is not a good idea as they need to 'breathe'.

The assessment by Temple RSK for HS2 Ltd of 'no impact' for all of the listed buildings in Packington clearly cannot be correct and, again, shows the limitations of the report. Where they have a choice, it would appear that HS2 Ltd are prepared to sacrifice vernacular architecture and these historic buildings in favour of generic modern housing such as the 'unbuilt' canal-side development in Measham, which was one of the reasons behind the change in route closer to Packington.

Gilwiskaw Brook and River Mease SSSI and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

The River Mease is a meandering lowland river, which is unique as the only River SAC on the entire route (London - Birmingham, Birmingham - Manchester and Birmingham - Leeds). The SSSI and SAC extend from the River Mease up the Gilwiskaw Brook to Packington. The Mease and Gilwiskaw support a nationally significant population of spined loach (*cobitistaenia*) and bullhead (*cottusgobio*), two internationally notable species of native freshwater fish with a restricted distribution in England. The river contains a range of features, including pools, aquatic and bank-side vegetation and tree cover, which produce conditions necessary to sustain this population of fish. Additional interest to the Mease and Gilwiskaw is from the population of freshwater, white-clawed crayfish and otters. Both of these animals have a restricted distribution in the Midlands and receive special legal protection.

The Mease is being crossed high in the air on an 880 metres long viaduct plus embankments in Measham, and the Gilwiskaw Brook (500 metres upstream from the SSSI) is crossed by a 300metres long and eight metres high viaduct and embankment in Packington. The risks to this special environment during construction and ongoing operation are significant. Even if HS2 Ltd think that the risks can be mitigated through expensive special measures, it will be impossible to eliminate them completely. It will only need a small mistake during construction or for adverse weather or other unplanned events in the future for there to be pollution getting into this important water course causing irrecoverable damage to the environment and resulting in HS2 Ltd being prosecuted and fined.

In addition, these crossings of the Mease and Gilwiskaw will also impact on the views and reduce the enjoyment of the local community of this Special Area of Conservation.

Mitigation of Historical and Environmental Impact

This revised route for HS2 has created 'islands' of Measham and Appleby Magna between HS2 and the M42/A42 and moved closer to Packington, thereby causing significant impact, noise and disruption to these villages, including the Conservation Area, Listed Buildings and the River Mease SAC. As HS2 Ltd has now moved away from their objective of following the transport corridor of the M42/A42, it must, therefore, be possible to move further away from the villages of Packington, Measham, Appleby and Austrey to find a better alternative route.

In 2013, a third route was considered which is slightly longer (but this would appear no longer relevant as HS2 is now being justified based on increasing capacity not speed) through countryside further east and is mainly in cuttings, thereby impacting on significantly fewer people as it passes by two small villages. This alternative route would also avoid any conservation areas, impact on much fewer listed buildings, not be near schools and not need to cross the River Mease at all. It would, therefore, be beneficial if HS2 Ltd could utilise this alternative route and further details are provided later in this report.

Environmental - Community Orchard

A few years ago, a fundraising scheme was launched in the village with a view to establishing a community orchard for Packington. Agreement was reached with the National Forest Company to allow use of a piece of their land as the site for the orchard. The generosity of villagers and

village organisations meant that in excess of sixty fruiting trees could be purchased. These were planted by residents, with the advice and guidance of the National Forest Company. A walkway now leads through this orchard to a picnic spot looking down over Normandy Wood to the village. More recently, a permissive right of way has been agreed with a local farmer to create a largely off-road route to the orchard for children from the village school and for others.

This valuable community asset, the community orchard and the quiet picnic spot, now face destruction from the revised HS2 route. This is a blow to all who seek to make our community a better place, and a double blow those who made donations to the orchard fund, especially anyone who purchased trees in memory of a lost loved one.

The village will expect compensation for the loss of 60+ semi-mature fruit trees, together with the costs of planting new trees, a site on which to do so and the creation of a picnic area within that site.

Mammal entrapment

The rural landscape in this area is a mixture of arable farmland, pasture and mature and semi-mature woodland. Many native mammals live in, and roam across this landscape. This route amendment, deviating away from the M42/A42 corridor, will isolate an island of countryside and village between the railway and the Motorway/A road. HS2 Ltd will need to create appropriate 'green corridors' across the new route, away from road crossings. This will provide safe routes for wildlife to cross to and from the entrapped land, and to help to safeguard road users from roaming wildlife that would otherwise be forced on to road bridges or underpasses.

Education and Health

Packington Primary School

Our village school is one of the best regarded in Leicestershire and is currently attended by 113 children from Packington and the surrounding area. The school is set in a quiet, idyllic environment adjacent to the village church and is a delightful place for children to begin their education. As a consequence, the school attracts children from nearby Ashby de la Zouch as well as from Packington. A significant number of those children would need to cross the revised route in order to get to school.

The school will be only 350metres from the proposed new route for the HS2 line. There will be significant earth moving along the route to excavate cuttings and to relocate the excavated material to form embankments, the longest being over 900metres long and eightmetres high. These operations will create significant noise and airborne dust over a long period of time, destroying the schools peaceful atmosphere and posing a health risk to the children. The head teacher and governors have serious concerns about the adverse impacts of these operations on the health of the children in their care. The school uses the outdoor spaces on the school site as teaching and learning space, and for P.E. activities. The village recreation ground, which is only 200 metres from the line, is also used for school sport, for example regional cross-

country running competitions. An increase in airborne dust is likely to lead to an increase in respiratory problems in children attending the school, particularly when engaging in outdoor sport. This, in turn, may result in reduced attendance due to illness and a consequent lowering of attainment. Airborne dust from construction will also have a detrimental impact on the building fabric of the school, both inside and out and lead to an associated increase in cleaning costs.

The impact of construction noise on teaching and learning may lead to psychological problems in both pupils and teachers, again threatening attainment levels.

The construction of HS2 so close to the village may discourage people with young families from settling here. In any event, the journeys of the staff, pupils and parents accessing and leaving the school will be disrupted where they cross the construction route.

Once HS2 is operating, school activities will suffer noise disruption from frequent high speed train services, especially where crossing elevated sections on viaducts and embankments. The impact of constant noise disturbance on the mental health of young children trying to concentrate on lessons is covered elsewhere in this report.

It is probable that, due to the close proximity of the HS2 line, it will be necessary to install secondary glazing throughout the school, as a noise abatement measure, at a cost of many tens of thousands of pounds. This is money that neither the school nor the local authority has at their disposal.

We are aware that the Governors do not want to see our village school environment ruined by the noise and dust of a major construction site, nor by the constant longer-term intrusion from HS2 trains. They are very concerned that the consequences of the new route would lead to lower standards of teaching and learning. This, together with significant disruption to journey times of staff and out of village pupils, will reduce the popularity of our school as a place both to work and to learn, putting the very future of the school at risk.

Secondary school students

Between the ages of eleven and fourteen, village children attend Ivanhoe High School in Ashby de la Zouch. Subsequently, between the ages of fourteen and eighteen they transfer to The Ashby School, also in the town. Because of the proximity of Packington to Ashby no free school transport is available and, consequently, most children walk to and from school. Their route to school along Ashby Road will cross the HS2 construction corridor. Whilst the High School students travel at predictable times in a morning, after-school activities mean that return times vary. Similarly, student journey times to and from The Ashby School, particularly for sixth form students, can be at any time of the day. The contractor for HS2 would need to ensure a safe, clean crossing point for child pedestrians throughout the day, even if this meant providing a shuttle bus across the works. In the event of a temporary closure of Ashby Road, the contractor would need to provide bus transportation between the village and the Ashby secondary schools, in both directions, for all students for the duration of the closure.

There will also be a wider impact on the secondary schools in Ashby de la Zouch. Ivanhoe College (ages 11-14) has approximately 1000 students whilst The Ashby School (14-19) has approximately 1700 students on roll. Because these schools each have a wide catchment area, many of their students travel to school by school bus. During the construction phases of HS2, the road networks around Ashby will suffer major disruption through diversion, closure or significant temporary traffic control. This will add substantially to journey times, not only of students on school buses, but also to those of teaching and support staff. This has the potential for seriously disrupting the smooth running of these schools, with an adverse impact on attainment by students.

Pre-school children

Packington Playgroup is held each weekday in the Memorial Hall, for nursery age children. Parents bring children from the village and the surrounding area. The disruption to journey times during the construction period will be substantial and may persuade out of village families to seek similar services elsewhere. The Playgroup has been in existence for well over forty years and is a valuable asset in the village. Residents would not like to see this asset threatened by HS2.

As previously mentioned, the village recreation ground will be only some 200 metres from the HS2 construction line. The play equipment is heavily used by families with pre-school children during the day, as well as by their elder siblings immediately after the school day. It is a regular meeting point of mothers with young children. All of the earlier concerns about dust and noise apply here too.

The impact of the proposed route on 'active adults'

The charity owned recreation ground is frequently used by family groups for all age sports and social activities. A number of community activities also take place here to raise funds for various community projects. In summer, it is periodically used for outdoor fitness classes, 'Fitness in the Park'. The annual duck race on the nearby Gilwiskaw Brook, running through the picturesque heart of the village Conservation Area, raises much needed funds for the Memorial Hall. All of these activities will be under threat if the new route is adopted, as it will be less than 300 metres away, seriously undermining community fund raising and community spirit.

A network of well-maintained footpaths runs adjacent to, within and across the potential new construction corridor. These paths are used extensively by local residents seeking healthy exercise, by dog walkers and by organised walking groups. Those groups regularly support 'Coffee and Chat' events at the village church and are a source of custom for the Bull and Lion village pub, and the village shop. Adoption of the revised route will devastate that footpath network, reducing the healthy walking options of residents and driving away organised walking groups and the income they generate for businesses and events in the village.

The 'Ashby 20' is a long established annual twenty mile road race that is regarded as the most challenging sub-marathon course in the Country. This race crosses the revised HS2 route a

number of times and it would be impossible to arrange an event of this nature if it were to cross a series of major construction sites.

We have mentioned elsewhere the likely impact of this route amendment on the business of Champneys Springs Health Spa and Fitness Club. If, as is likely, this business is unsustainable once construction work commences, the loss of the fitness facilities to local residents, both members and casual users, will be immense. It could have a serious detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of an element of the local population.

Noise

The proposed route change for HS2 has raised many concerns relating to increased levels of noise. These can be summarised as follows:


- ! All parts of the village will be exposed to higher levels of noise pollution
- ! At the public consultation held at the Appleby Hotel on the 19th January 2017, the HS2 team stated that the increase in noise caused by HS2 alone would be at least 53dB for all of Packington, with those living closest to the route being exposed to much higher levels of noise. We, therefore, expect the cumulative effect of HS2 and the A42/M42 to be significant, estimated to be an additional +20dB, totaling up to 80dB.
- ! Existing noise reduction solutions are expensive and have minimal effect on reducing noise pollution (typically, a reduction of 3 to 5dB). It is, therefore, strongly recommended that, regardless of the route, a low noise railway track should be used in conjunction with these existing approaches to mitigate against any increased level of noise
- ! The World Health Organisation recommends noise levels within classrooms should be below 35dB to allow for effective teaching. Packington Primary School, which is regarded as one of the best in Leicestershire, will be exposed to noise levels of over double this due to the proximity of the school to the proposed new route. While the use of various sound proofing methodologies could mitigate these to some extent within classrooms, they will do nothing to address the noise outside the school building, and will have a major impact on the way many parts of the curriculum are brought to life. The WHO identifies the degradation of cognitive function in children ranging from reading comprehension, attention/concentration/sleep disturbance/mental health and motivation. Even a moderate level of noise can cause psychological stress, annoyance, interference with activity, headaches, tiredness and irritability, which can impair intellectual function and performance of tasks. Exposure to intense levels of noise can cause personality changes and aggressive/violent reactions plus reduced ability to cope³.

³Sources: WHO 2015; Bronzaft and McCarthy, 1975; Shield and Dockerell, 2002

- ! The noise from the construction of the line is expected to be much higher than that from the actual HS2 line, particularly during periods of drilling and piling. While the majority of this work will be scheduled for daytime hours, it was made clear by the HS2 Ltd representatives at the public consultation meeting that this would not always be possible and some night working would be inevitable.
- ! In addition to construction noise, it is expected that the volume of traffic, both private and construction traffic, passing through the village will increase significantly during this period, and this is another source of noise and air pollution which is a major concern to all. This increased traffic will also increase the risk of road traffic accidents, including those involving pedestrians. The speed limit into the village from all sides is 60mph so any collisions would be significant.

The following table provides a useful insight into the impact of differing levels of noise

Common example	dBA	Effect	Impact on children
Breathing	0-10	Hearing threshold	
Conversation at home	50	Quiet	
Motorway traffic (15 m), vacuum cleaner, noisy party	70	Annoying , intrusive, interferes with phone use	Stress, tiredness, irritability, impaired intellectual function
Average factory, train (at 15 m)	80	Possible hearing damage	Inability to cope, violence, lowered performance
Jet take-off (at 305 m), motorcycle	100	Damage if over 1 minute	
Thunderclap, textile loom, chain saw, siren, rock concert	120	Human pain threshold	
Toy cap pistol, Jet take-off (at 25 m), firecracker	150	Eardrum rupture	

 - Anticipated HS2 + A42 combined volume

Evidence is available through a study which looked at the impact on reading scores for children near a railway line. Reading scores were compared between classes in same school. This included those exposed/not exposed to railway noise, and found that by 6th grade those on the noisy side were nearly a year behind those who studied on the quiet side⁴.

⁴Bronzaft and McCarthy, 1975

A further study found that noise in the home impaired a child's cognitive and language development⁵. The following map demonstrates the noise impact on Packington – the grey areas representing significant noise increase:



Compensation for homeowners

The compensation scheme being proposed by HS2 Ltd is woefully inadequate, inequitable and doesn't go anywhere close to reflecting both the financial impact of HS2 on the homeowners of Packington or compensate for the significant impact and disruption on their daily lives as a result of HS2. The proposed compensation falls short as it

- ! doesn't compensate home owners for the loss in value of their property
- ! doesn't reflect the value of houses in the vicinity – a 'one size fits all' compensation payment does not recognise the disproportionate loss suffered by houses of a higher value
- ! doesn't take account of the impact on homeowners, in terms of the mental and physical distress
- ! doesn't reflect the impact of 'blight' on the village
- ! doesn't reflect the environmental aspects – suffered based on the location of a property
- ! Is based on an arbitrary line on a map and is a 'cliff edge' scheme with no regard for houses which fall outside the HS2 bands, despite those outside the line of the maps being impacted

⁵Wachs and Gruen, 1982

Based on the scheme proposed by HS2 Ltd the current compensation would be £817,500 (see appendix 2).

It was recognised by PWC, in their report commissioned by the Government in 2014, that uncertainties for residents in the vicinity of HS2 are greater than they have been for other major construction projects, with 'blight' at the upper level of the scale. Unlike construction projects that would normally, on completion, offer those affected a level of benefit such as a motorway link or airport, this is not the case with HS2 and many areas will be permanently negatively impacted without benefits, as is the case for Packington.

PWC, CB Richard Ellis (CBRE) and the findings by others estimate the financial loss to homeowners will be significant and sustained for a long period of time. We have calculated compensation for homeowners based on estimates available. Average value of a property in the North of £425k suffering a loss if within 120m @ 40% (30% @300m and an average of 20%). CBRE stating that as far out as one kilometre losses could be 20%.

The length of time on the project makes it unreasonable to expect homeowners to put their lives on hold. The government has referred to the impact as temporary/transient. PWC reported the impact is likely to be beyond 13 years for HS1 and longer for HS2.

Successive Secretaries of State, Ministers for Transport and a previous Prime Minister have stated their intention to ensure fair compensation for residents. Compensation needs to take into account that the loss in property values results in significant, undesirable effects on people i.e.

1. Traps people in their homes – The 'blight' and resultant inability to sell will lead to residents being unable to; move, downsize or re-mortgage without bearing a substantial financial loss. This will see HS2 putting some homeowners into negative equity or unable to meet financial commitments
2. The impact of HS2 on Packington residents will be so significant and cover a number of years that it will impact life decisions and choices
3. Impacts older/retired residents wanting or needing to downsize or release equity to fund care. Packington has a higher % than average of the number of residents within this age category
4. Causes stress, worry and upset even before any work has commenced
5. Deprives people of their basic human right to enjoy their property (HRA Article 1 of the first protocol)
6. Places a property tax on homeowners near the line who are, effectively, subsidising HS2 with the loss in value on their homes that are not being fully compensated
7. Paralyzes the local property market. If existing homeowners can't afford to move, without bearing a significant loss in value, it prevents young families moving into the village

We plan to redress some of the above by fighting for fair compensation for the residents of Packington. Our estimate of compensation is in excess of £33m as set out in appendix 3 and is

based on using the findings of PWC in conjunction with the statements of Government Ministers in committing to fair compensation.

The proposed compensation package consists of a payment for

- 1. Property Value compensation**– paid when the route is confirmed
- 2. Construction noise and disruption compensation**– paid 12 months prior to construction commencing on the section enabling homeowners the time and funds to install sound proofing and other measures to mitigate this
- 3. Ongoing blight**– paid on date first train test runs to those within an agreed distance of the train line

1. Compensation for significant blight on property values

This has been calculated based on the impact on property values of HS2. It reflects property values for Packington and seeks recognition that values vary in different parts of the country. Data available estimates that the value of house prices can expect to fall by up to 40% and will not fully recover. Given the extensive length of the project and long recovery time in value homeowners will need to be fully compensated for the fall in value and can't be expected to wait 10-20 years for prices to recover.

2. Compensation to recognise the burden of living near a high-speed rail construction site for many months/ years

A fixed fee paid to every homeowner in the village, irrespective of house price or distance from the line, recognises the fact that construction will significantly impact on those near the line for years. The construction of HS2 will affect the daily lives of those living in Packington impacting on access to GP's surgery, sports facilities, shopping, for children travelling to secondary schools, and, over-all, on ease of access to and from the village – adding journey times to and from work. This payment also includes an element to facilitate homeowners adding noise and pollution reducing enhancements to their properties.

3. Blight of living beside a high-speed train line

This element of compensation is in recognition of the impact the HS2 will have on everyday life such as noise, pollution, impact on house price and enjoyment of one's property (HRA Part 2, section 1) once the train is operational.

Need to sell

In addition to the above, we propose a compensation fund to assist anyone who has a need to sell their home in Packington but can't do so at the un-blighted market value within three months. It should be available as soon as the route is confirmed. The proposal of three months is a reasonable time frame to enable a resident to sell and is comparable with the timeframe in which you would expect a home to sell in the area without the threat of HS2. The fund will meet

the need to either purchase the property or meet the shortfall in sale price, due to the blight of HS2.

Village Fund

In addition to the above compensation package which relates to individuals and their property, we would be looking to HS2 Ltd to provide a compensation fund for the village. This would be set aside to make good any amenities that HS2 permanently or temporary negatively impact. This would include:

1. Purchasing land and replanting the village orchard
2. Mitigating pollution and noise to the village sports field and recreation ground or, if required, relocating
3. Funding temporary amenities such as a doctors or pharmacy service or providing uninterrupted access to them
4. Making good any shortfall in funding to the Village Memorial Hall from reduced access and participation of clubs and bookings
5. Funding transport for secondary school children to their schools within Ashby, the vast majority of whom currently safely walk to them along Ashby Road

Businesses and jobs

The impact of the revised HS2 route on locally based businesses will be significant. In the worst instances the consequences will be severe, leading to business relocation or closure. Affected businesses are already reporting stress/anxiety at the prospect of having to

- ! Close
- ! Relocate
- ! Suffer an impacted livelihood

Feelings of futility e.g. 'our voice will not be heard' are commonplace.

Future impacts will be

- ! Loss of business
- ! Relocation
- ! Pollution/dust impacts during construction will be massive. The Packington area supports numerous farms, all providing 'made in Britain'/'green' produce for the UK market
- ! Logistics disruption. Two main roads to Packington will be severed
- ! Employee travel disruption. Two main roads to Packington severed
- ! Noise pollution
- ! Employee stress/anxiety

- ! Reduction in employee performance
- ! Loss of employment and a downturn in the local economy

Affected businesses will doubtless wish to make their own representations in order to achieve an outcome that best suits their individual business objectives. Consequently, we have set out the magnitude of those impacts, as we see it, without attributing compensation costs to them. The exception to this is in respect of the Severn Trent Waste Treatment Works, where the company, as a privatised public utility, will have an obligation to provide an uninterrupted service. In this instance, we have included estimated costs of them doing so; however, this may be a significant underestimation of the true costs.

Champneys Springs

Surrounded by wide-open parklands, Champneys Springs was the UK's first purpose-built Health Resort, and has been open now for 26 years. It is marketed on the basis of its tranquil, quiet, rural location and its outdoor sports facilities as well as its indoor pool, gym and spa treatments. It plays host to national football teams for pre-season conditioning, corporate events and celebrity guests from sport and entertainment fields. Guests run, walk and cycle around the locality, using roads, lanes and footpaths. The Health Resort is in the Packington Parish and is accessed by a long, private drive from Gallows Lane, Measham.

The Resort employs 200 staff and has 89 bedrooms, catering for 100 residents, alongside 60 day guests. The health and fitness club has 1000 members drawn from around the area. A source at Champneys Springs has informed us that last year's turnover was £6.2m.

The proposed HS2 route takes out a large section of Gallows Lane and a cutting for the line 12 metres deep and some 50 metres wide cuts across the entrance drive to Champneys Springs.

Gallows Lane is an essential route for heavier vehicles needing to avoid the centre of Measham and the 7.5 tonne restrictions through Packington. Access through this route will need to be uninterrupted, with an appropriate re-routing of Gallows Lane constructed before any work on HS2 can begin. Similarly, if Champneys Springs is to continue in business, a new access drive will need to be constructed from the diverted Gallows Lane, including a temporary or permanent bridge across the railway corridor. No access to Champneys Springs will be possible from the only other road in the area, Babelake Street, Packington. This is a rural byway, frequented by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. It is single car width with no passing places and would be wholly unsuitable for delivery vehicles and member and guest traffic.

The regular functions of the business will be severely disrupted both during the construction period and once the railway becomes operational. Members and guests will face significant disruption in accessing the Resort, as well as impairment of their enjoyment of the facilities.

Whilst the disturbance from high speed trains passing in close proximity to the Health Resort could be disastrous, the dust, noise and disruption during construction is likely to prove fatal to the business long before the first train runs.

Following recent discussions about the route change with management at Champneys Springs we were told:

‘We are very concerned about the impact HS2 and the construction phase will have and don't see how a Health Resort can run so close to such disruptions and noise levels.’

The options open to the business are:

a) **Continue operating**- by accepting the disruption and consequent loss of business arising from it. This is likely to result in a substantial claim for additional costs and loss of income / profits. It is unlikely that this will be an acceptable solution to the Company.

b) **Relocate**- with the Company seeking the full cost of building a completely new resort elsewhere, including the cost of purchasing a new site and the cost of new marketing and brand-building, redundancy costs for any of the 200 staff who could not relocate and recruitment and training costs for new staff in the new location.

c) **Close**- with the Company seeking full compensation for the value of the closed facility, loss of profit in respect of this defunct arm of their business and redundancy costs for 200 staff.

The impact of both b) and c) on this area would be the loss of up to 200 jobs, loss of business to local suppliers for food, laundry / linen supplies and maintenance contractors and the loss of a valuable local amenity with health and fitness consequences for local residents.

Severn Trent

The company operate a waste water and sewerage treatment works in Packington, serving Ashby, Packington and a number of trade discharges. The old works was completely replaced circa 2002-4 with a new one designed on a population equivalent of 33,000 (of which 15,000 is domestic).

The proposed revised route for HS2 passes directly through this works on an embankment eight metres high. This will undoubtedly result in the need to completely relocate the treatment works. The HS2 route also impacts on major waste water sewers from Ashby de la Zouch to the treatment works, which will require diversion to the new treatment works site.

The estimated cost of this work is £20m. This is for the construction of a new treatment works on a new site, including write-off of current assets and an additional £5m for diversion and renewal of affected sewers. These costs may be significantly increased if new phosphorous removal technologies are required to meet new, tighter phosphorous discharge consents in order to protect the River Mease SAC.

In recent years, housing development in the area has been restricted, by either lack of capacity at the Packington treatment works or by the potential detrimental impact of the quality of outflows from the works on the River Mease SAC. If the future of this site is under threat from HS2, there is no incentive for the company to invest in additional capacity to meet growing housing need. Similarly, the company are likely to carry out only essential maintenance on the plant to keep it in operation until HS2 construction work begins. This will seriously limit the potential for additional housing in and around Ashby, making the achievement of new, more demanding government targets impossible to achieve.

The Bull and Lion

The village pub is a Marston's owned establishment. Following the death of the long-term landlord, the business went through a period of decline and came close to closing. The present tenants have done an excellent job of reviving the business and it is once again a thriving public house. Meals are available to individuals or groups. A number of Rotary Clubs from the surrounding area use the Bull and Lion for their meetings, followed by a meal. Walking groups, using the excellent network of local footpaths, often call for lunch and a drink. Trade from the village is supplemented by many customers from Ashby, attracted by the village pub atmosphere.

The disruption that will arise during the construction period of HS2 on this new route will put much of this custom at risk. The footpath network will be destroyed, driving away walkers, Rotary Clubs are likely to seek new venues due to travel disruption, Ashby customers will decline for the same reason, compounded by the noise and dust of nearby construction sites.

The future of our village pub, an essential amenity in Packington, will be put at risk.

Daybreak Services

Our village store, Daybreak Services, is a vital resource in Packington. Not only does it serve village residents but also customers from the surrounding area who prefer a personal service with none of the larger town parking problems. There is also a significant passing trade. The store also operates a wholesale supply business, especially in fruit and vegetables, to local restaurants, residential care homes, golf clubs etc.

This business will be affected in a number of ways during the lengthy construction period. Out of village customer numbers are likely to decline because of the extent of the disruption to the road network around the village. Whilst the wholesale side of the business may not suffer a decline in trade, the disrupted road network will extend delivery times and impact on overall delivery costs. Passing trade is also likely to suffer as motorists seek out new routes to avoid disrupted areas.

Beech House Farm and Ashby Self Storage Ltd

The proposed route passes directly through the farm, impacting directly on Beech House and the premises of Ashby Self Storage Ltd. It will be impossible for these businesses to continue operating from this site.

It is unlikely that the farm will be a viable business if this route is adopted. It is probable that substantial compensation will be payable not only for the land directly lost to the railway but also for Beech House itself and the liquidation of the business.

Ashby Self Storage Ltd, operates from this site, it too is unlikely to be able to continue in this location.

The options open to the business will be:

- a) **Relocate**-with the company seeking the full cost of building a new facility elsewhere including the cost of purchasing a new site with scope for future expansion, the cost any necessary advertising for the new location and any business losses due to the relocation process, including compensation for disruption to customers' businesses.
- b) **Liquidation**- with the company seeking full compensation for value of the business closure, including loss of future profits.

This latter option would have serious knock-on implications for other local businesses and individuals who are storage customers of the company.

The following additional businesses wish to register their opposition to the route change

- ! Livesey Brothers Ltd
- ! Context Design Ltd
- ! SRM Consulting Associates Ltd
- ! Precious Blue Dot Ltd
- ! Hughcroft Builders Ltd
- ! Heart of England Thatchers Ltd
- ! CC Marine Enterprises Ltd

Construction phase

We have concerns over the impact of the construction phase on the village infrastructure, its residents and their lives. The main concerns include, but are not limited to;

1. The number of road, river, and bridleway crossings on the previous route from the A444 was seven in the previous consultation, but similar crossings on the new proposed route from the A444 is **twelve**
2. We believe that the extra cost in building bridges, viaducts, tunnels etc. to negotiate these highways will be significantly higher than the previous route
3. Earth movement to create viaducts, embankments, and cuttings will be significantly increased due to the more undulating terrain of the proposed route
4. During the construction period the roads will act as pinch points for local people. In the case of Packington, it will mean that every route to the south-west, west, north and north-east, will be affected for a long period, bringing even greater hardship for residents than the previous HS2 route
5. The increase in traffic volume will impact on the fabric of the roads and require significant and regular upkeep (as can be evidenced by recent construction traffic over a much shorter period on Babelake Street)
6. The increase in traffic volume will also lead to a higher risk of road traffic accidents, involving both other vehicles and pedestrians
7. Construction traffic will have difficulty in negotiating the narrow lanes into and out of Packington and all roads have a limit on all vehicles over 7.5tonne
8. The Gilwiskaw Brook Bridge on the Measham Road in Packington is not designed to take heavy lorries
9. During construction and the lifetime of the HS2, the noise element will greatly affect our residents. The dust and pollution in the air and on the roads will also be a significant factor to the people living in Packington
10. The proposed viaduct and embankment across Vicarage Lane and over the Gilwiskaw is longer than the previously proposed route, due to the revised line of approach, bringing it much nearer to the centre of Packington. During the construction phase, it would be

reasonable to assume that there would be lengthy periods of piling, along with constant loud noise disturbance

11. During the construction phase, there will be a negative effect on jobs, businesses and the ability to sell homes. Some businesses in the Packington area will cease to operate due to the impact of the traffic conditions (see Jobs and Businesses section)
12. The proposed route cuts through numerous public footpaths and bridleways, some of which have historic significance. One in particular, near Measham Road, was the route taken by monks from Derby to Coventry many centuries ago. The network of footpaths is well used and is a source of activity for numerous walking groups and individuals
13. The section of line from Champneys Springs on Gallows Lane to the viaduct over the Gilwiskaw will be passing through an area which has many underground water passages and form springs if interrupted. With this in mind, a detailed flood risk assessment should take place before selecting this route

Possible third route alternative

We firmly believe that there is a viable alternative 'third route' to the 2013 original route and the 2016 current proposed route which would impact on at least 90% fewer people / properties / businesses and we would like to place on record our formal request for this route to be considered. A detailed analysis sets out below why the third route is the least disruptive to people, houses and businesses.

The Central part of the 2013 River Mease avoiding route HSL08 (the section from south of Austrey to Lount, referred to below as the THIRD ALTERNATIVE route, being the third of the final three routes considered by HS2 to pass Measham) although not perfect it is significantly better than the original route and the current proposed route and demonstrates how truly horrendous both of the other proposed routes are.

	2013 original route	2016 current proposed route	2013 Third route	Comparison - 2013 Third route is
Line length ⁶	18.5km	18.6km	20.8km	2.2km longer = 24 seconds longer at 330kph

⁶ Measured from a point on HSL08 route south of Austrey (and equivalent on 2016 consultation route) to lines recombine north of Ashby, parallel to Lount. Note that at south end of HSL08, Maps show HSL08 line still approx 500m from 2016 route – this missing length is not counted in as it is undefined, but likely to almost identical in length, construction & effect to the 2016 route. 2016 route counting started from nearest point to end of HSL08 line. All routes measured in Google Earth. 2013 route HSL08 measuring based on publish map vectorised. 2016 route based on KML from ESRI data.

	2013 original route	2016 current proposed route	2013 Third route	Comparison - 2013 Third route is
Cutting⁷	11.4km	8.7km	11.8km	Noise / visual reduced. Cost difference depends on depth
At Grade⁷	0.9km	1.5km	2.1km	
Embankment⁷	5.6km	7.1km	6.1km	Less embankments therefore less long distance noise/ visual intrusion
Viaducts⁷	0.6km	1.3km	0.8km	Less viaducts = much less cost
Towns / villages affected (300m or less to edge of settlement)	Austrey (~300m to edge), Measham (~35m to edge), Oakthorpe (~250m to moved A42), Packington (~250m to edge of settlement, ~150m Ashby Rd), New Packington (~55m to edge), Ashby de la Zouch (~170m to edge)	Austrey (~200m to edge), Appleby Magna (~290m to edge), Measham (~100m to edge), Packington (~130m to edge of settlement), New Packington (~75m to edge), Ashby de la Zouch (~110m to edge)	Newton Burgoland, (~135m to edge), Twycross Zoo (~280m to edge) Heather (~245m to edge)	Much less effect on villages. Ashby not affected at all. Alternative route is in long cuttings past both Newton Burgoland and Heather significantly reducing noise and visual impact on these villages
Number of houses affected⁸	25 (within 50m) 135 (within 120m) 701 (within 300m)	22 (within 50m) 42 (within 120m) 687 (within 300m)	3 (within 60m) 14 (within 120m) 174 (within 300m)	75% less impact on properties! The 174 within 300m can be reduced to only

⁷Totals calc to metre, but rounded to nearest 100m.

⁸2016 route buildings count ref LCC for parishes on the route – It is missing Austrey at minimum & may not include some new builds. (added in for Austrey – 2 off <50m, none < 120m, 30 off <300m for 2016 route, 0 off <120m, 3 off <300m for 2013 route). Added in for new builds that are finishing / occupied now – 37 <300m if 2013 route or 57 <300m if 2016 route – Hastings park, Ashby, & 3 <60m, 20 <120m for New St, Measham, both areas for 2013 original route. 2013 third alternative route - counts visually on Google Earth with edge cases measured individually to centreline with Google Earth measuring tape. Obvious farm buildings not counted, but farm houses are counted. Assume accurate to within about +/- 10%

	2013 original route	2016 current proposed route	2013 Third route	Comparison - 2013 Third route is
	Total 701	Total 687	Total 174	60 properties (over 90% reduction) – see comments below
Number of schools affected	1 within 500m (Packington). Oakthorpe within 500m of moved A42	4 within 500m (Appleby Magna, two in Measham & Packington)	1 within 500m (Newton Burgoland)	Less impact on schools. NB. Route is in a cutting past Newton Burgoland
Businesses and jobs affected	425+ jobs at risk in businesses directly impacted	812 jobs at risk in 35 businesses directly impacted	Very few, possibly no businesses or jobs directly impacted	Possibly all jobs and businesses saved
River Mease (SSSI & SAC) & Gilwiskaw Brook⁹	Crosses Both	Crosses Both	Crosses Neither	No risk to SSSI & SAC, project cost & timescale risk reduced
Agricultural BMV land affected	Grade 1 - 0km Grade 2 – 7.0km	Grade 1 - 0km Grade 2 – 6.0km	Grade 1 - 0km Grade 2 – 3.6km	Only 60% of the good farm land take
Ancient woodland	0km	0km	0.3km	Impact on ancient woodland can be avoided by moving line by approx. 50m south locally
Number of listed / historic properties affected	15 listed within 350m (No Grade I)	24 listed within 350m (including Grade I Sir John Moore School)	17 listed within 350m (No Grade I) Most passed in cuttings	Impact reduced as mainly in cuttings. Opportunities exist to reduce impact of third route to 9 – see below.
Number of conservation areas	1 residential Conservation Areas within	3 residential Conservation Areas within	1 residential within 500m and 1 crossing of Ashby	Significantly less impact on Conservation

⁹All of Gilwiskaw counted, as lower reaches are part of Mease SSSI & SAC. and upper reaches feed into SSSI & SAC.

	2013 original route	2016 current proposed route	2013 Third route	Comparison - 2013 Third route is
affected	500m with impact on settings and views (Packington)	500m with impact on settings and views (Appleby Magna, Measham & Packington)	Canal (see below) (Coleorton Hall - improvement 1 below would take route over 500m away)	Areas, with ability to reduce impact further to only canal
Impact on Ashby canal regeneration	Yes – blocked without cost increasing vertical movement, as limited horizontal movement does not help.	Yes – blocked without cost increasing vertical movement, as limited horizontal movement does not help. Impacts planned Marina.	No – already on embankment, so just bridge required. Well away from moorings (0.5km to nearest vessel). No Marina in area	No major impact on canal
Number / type of road impacted	<p>A512 (significant length), A42 (significant length), A511, A444</p> <p>7 B roads (Leicester Rd, Ashby Rd, B4116</p> <p>New St, Burton Rd, Tamworth Rd</p> <p>Atherstone Rd, No Man's Heath Rd)</p> <p>9 unclassified (Willesley Woodside, Huntingdon Way</p> <p>Repton Rd</p> <p>Rectory Lane</p> <p>Dingle Lane</p>	<p>A512 (significant length), A511, A444</p> <p>9 B roads (Leicester Rd, Ashby Rd, Measham Rd, B4116 Gallows Ln, Leicester Rd, Bosworth Rd, Atherstone Rd, No Man Heath Rd, Snarestone Rd)</p> <p>9 unclassified (Business Trk, Farm Trk, Cottage Ln, Redhill fm trk, Roe House Ln, Appleby Hill, Newton Ln, sports field access, unknw ln)</p>	<p>A512, A511, A444</p> <p>6 B roads (Alton hill, Heather Ln, Swebstone Rd, Odstone Ln, B4116 Ashby Rd, Orton Hill)</p> <p>8 unclassified (Corkscrew Ln, unknown ln nr Newton Burg, farm track, Derby Ln, unkwn tracks x 2, Orton Ln, Warton Ln)</p>	Less bridges, less impact on A512 and A42. Fewer B roads to be crossed

	2013 original route	2016 current proposed route	2013 Third route	Comparison - 2013 Third route is
	Salt St Newton Ln, sports field access, unknw ln)			

The 2013 Sustainability report by Temple RSK shows how the long list of route options were distilled in to three final routes around Measham (HSL06, HSL07 & HSL08). On page 39 the report states that 'each route section option was considered broadly acceptable by HS2 Ltd in terms of operational, cost and sustainability performance'. The Third Alternative route was therefore acceptable to HS2 Ltd and since 2013 one of its few drawbacks, the additional 2km, is no longer an issue for journey times as HS2 is now based on increasing capacity rather than speed.

There are also many local improvements to the Third Alternative 2013 route that would reduce some of the few negative impacts still further, including 114 less properties within 300m of the line. Full details can be seen in appendix 4, but a summary is below:

- 1). Slight movement of the northern end of the route closer to A42 J13 quicker, distancing the line from historic building (Alton House and Coleorton Hall). This would also reduce BMV land (routing through poor soil areas, given over to modern <20 year old tree planting areas) and also reduce the number of house within 300m,
- 2). Change would be required for Newton Burgoland, where the line could move slightly to the east – 50m closer to caravan storage / 150m E along Ashby canal crossing / 120m E on Odstone lane (crossing more at right-angles to avoid Newton Burgoland marshes) then slightly more west of Heather, avoiding Heather Hall and putting more distance from the edge of Heather. This would also reduce the number of houses with 300m of the line,
- 3). Change would be required for Twycross Zoo, moving the line south east slightly, but also lowering the line further into cutting (possibly cut & cover tunnel locally), with design to be lowest possible ground vibration / acoustic noise.

Mitigation

We believe that the current route is the worst of the three routes considered by HS2 Ltd; however, if the 2016 consultation route is chosen by the Secretary of State, we would request

the following changes are made to mitigate the noise impacts and visual intrusion on the residents of Packington.

The new 2016 HS2 route proposal is too high in the landscape. It will produce higher noise levels across a wider area and affect a larger number of people than the original 2013 route proposal, especially children who are sensitive receptors. The following, therefore, represent the minimum level of mitigation of the currently proposed route:

- ! HS2 should at minimum lower the rail level of the viaduct at Gilwiskaw Brook to the road level of the adjacent A42 bridge or lower
- ! The rail level should be at ground level at the sewage works south of Packington and not on a high embankment as the majority of Packington suffers high noise levels from this direction due to the prevailing wind, especially affecting the school
- ! This section of line should be designed to 340kph rules (as the line is 275kph a few miles north) allowing the line coming north of Measham to be slewed toward the A42 earlier taking the route almost to the 2013 route as it passes Packington. This will take it further from Champneys Springs, Packington School and the ancient buildings in the Packington conservation area / Mill Street, and will avoid the sewage work relocating

Detail

1. HS2 viaduct rail level too high at eight metres above water, the road bridge road level is only three metres above water. Issues include visual impact on the Packington Conservation Area and listed buildings and much increased train noise, funnelled along the valley to Packington, especially Mill Street. Noise from the road will not be reduced, it may even increase / be focused by funnelling of the noise under the HS2 viaduct due to differences in height
2. The meadow between the A42 and Mill Street, Packington does not act as a major flood plain, due to maximum flow constrained at the A42 and gradient and open-flow down to Mill Street. The road bridge culvert size is only 2.3m x 2.3m (so ~5m²) so the height and length of the HS2 viaduct is excessive. The Environment Agency show 1 in 1000 year flood to be less than 90cm¹⁰ in the area. HS2 rail level spec is 1 in 1000 year flood level + 1m, so drop to 3m to rail level – making it cheaper to build, less area of brook would be shaded, better for aquatic life. Obviously, if the bridge needs more mass for strength, some of this can be sub-surface (below brook level)
3. Vicarage Lane farmland accommodation road / public bridleway / ancient track should then go up the hill and over HS2 at the same level as the current A42 bridge (currently shown as cut off) before either returning down to the original level on the far side or staying high to the road bridge
4. Going north from lowered Gilwiskaw Brook viaduct, the line should continue at this lower level whilst passing Ashby to reduce noise into Ashby and towards Ashby Road in Packington

¹⁰EA website – accessed 16/01/2017 - online maps & depths in detailed view - <https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map?eastings=435947&northing=314808&address=10002346663&map=SurfaceWater> low risk = 1 in 1000 year risk. (EA confirm by email this information is valid)

5. Around the Measham Road / Packington sewerage works area, the line is too high in the valley. This will have a high noise impact on all of Packington in the prevailing winds, as all in the village already know from the A42 Junction 12 raised area. The line should be dropped to ground level at the sewerage works (so it is below the surface in the rest of the area) and add false cutting / sound bunds, where at level or where needed to increase cutting heights to 5m+
6. Measham Road from Packington to FiveWays road junction will need minor adjustment to go over HS2, but the false cutting can be locally increased in height a metre or two to access a new road bridge, or re-route a 100m or so to cross the line on a natural hill
7. Assume balancing pond to west of Measham road, opposite sewerage works – can extend and enhance Jubilee wood
8. The green tunnel would allow HS2 to curve towards the A42 slightly earlier than planned (accepting that the two lines will have spread slightly due to portals / centre wall of green tunnel) HS2 2016 Gradient is 2% of the Measham – Packington section – Noted that this is an acceleration / braking zone for slower track just North of Ashby, but better energy efficiency / reduced maintenance to use a lower gradient, as it has to get to that height in section North of Ashby
9. Even though section north of Ashby is now only 275kph max, the Measham – Packington section is still designed to 400kph rules – it should be reduced to say 340kph allowing some extra horizontal adjustment of the track route i.e. further from the corner of Measham then swing in close to the A42, close to the original 2013 horizontal route before Packington. This slew and the lowering of the line (so not needing as wide a tract of land compared to being on a eight metre embankment) would avoid Packington sewerage works being completely rebuilt elsewhere, reducing costs by millions of pounds
10. This slew towards the A42 north of Measham would allow the HS2 cutting to be west of the B4116, despite the deeper cutting to be lower at Measham Road and allow a more topographically convenient (for HS2) crossing point for the B4116 bridge, more right angled (less skew-angled) with approaches that meet highway regulations. It would also hide the line better from the Champneys Spring health resort (especially from the road entrance) and may allow access to this major employer during construction
11. Unstable ground especially due to previous open cast mining (e.g. three miles from Ashby North – washboard effect on A42) and due to geological faults in the Ashby / Measham area, will push HS2 to use slab track bed instead of ballasted bed, likely also requiring a massive quantity of driven piles (as the A42 did). It is likely the slab track bed will continue into the Packington section –the issue is that slab bed may be noisier
12. Noise reduction bunds (even at five metres high) should be used in preference to concrete or other artificial noise barriers, except where it isn't possible (i.e. on viaduct) or dual system need for extra noise reduction – the issue with concrete / plastic / GRP etc. is that over time they can become damaged / not replaced after removal for access, and are a magnet for graffiti and anti social behaviour
13. Although HS2 Ltd is using A42 noise to mask HS2 noise, the characteristics of the noise are different (A42 – white noise, HS2 – crescendo of noise every 3 minutes @ 9 trains each way per hour), especially onto Gilwiskaw viaduct (including embankments) which is currently a

similar length to the train so ramp up / down of volume is very sharp (similarities to acoustic shock). Near the A42 (e.g. around Ashby) there is an opportunity for HS2 Ltd to produce lower overall noise numbers by designing sound reduction features to double up reducing noise from the A42

Construction mitigation

If the HS2 were to follow the proposed route, the residents of Packington would demand that the following points be a priority in mitigating the disruption to family lives during the construction time-period:

- 1 Because of the proximity to schools, public play-areas, church, listed buildings and houses, we would expect that a strong policy would be put in place to regulate working hours and the people of Packington to be notified of this policy before any commencement of construction
- 2 The route, running in an arc from south-west to north close to Packington, will enable dust and noise to affect the lives of Packington residents. The prevailing winds from the south-west and west of Packington double or even treble this aspect of the construction phase. The proximity of the proposed rail line to Packington will require stringent safeguards to be in place so that residents can be protected
- 3 During the construction phase, Packington residents would want the ability to maintain freedom of passage on all routes
- 4 To restore ALL FOOTPATHS within the route of HS2
- 5 No construction traffic over 7.5 tonnes to be allowed to pass through Packington
- 6 Speed limit for all construction traffic on roads approaching Packington to be 30 mph
- 7 A Flood Risk Assessment be made before selecting this route. If this route is selected, safeguards are to be put in place to protect flooding on Measham Road, properties near the sewage farm and all properties to the west of the Gilwiskaw

Data inaccuracies

During the writing of this report, the group have identified the following data errors within information used and provided by HS2 Ltd:

- ! Packington is hidden by writing on some HS2 maps
- ! Packington Mill on Mill Street is shown as being derelict, whereas it has been occupied for over 10 years
- ! Measham Lodge is a listed building and is only 300m from the line, though it is not reflected in the Temple RSK report on Cultural Heritage
- ! Noise impact for Packington at the Appleby Hotel event showed the line through a cutting, which is not the case for Packington. Question over the validity of the consultation on this point
- ! The 2013 consultation included acknowledgement that the impact on clusters of listed buildings might be greater than for buildings which stood alone. This is omitted from the 2016 data

Appendices

Appendix 1

North West Leicestershire Local Plan Policies in respect of the Historic Environment

Policy E10

Development will not be permitted within Conservation Areas, or where it would affect the affect the setting of such areas, which would

1. Be detrimental to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area in terms of:
 - ! scale, proportions and massing;
 - ! layout, grouping and setting;
 - ! detailing and materials of construction.
2. Be detrimental to the setting of buildings which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
3. Result in the loss of open spaces or important views within, into and out of the Conservation Area.
4. Result in the loss of particular features which contribute positively to character and appearance of the Conservation Area, including:
 - ! Walls and other means of enclosure;
 - ! Ground surfaces;
 - ! Natural features (such as trees and hedgerows); and
 - ! Features of archaeological interest.
5. Be detrimental to environmental quality in terms of :
 1. Traffic generation;
 2. (ii) Noise and other forms of environmental intrusion.

Appendix 1 - NWLDC Policies

North West Leicestershire Local Plan Policies in respect of the Historic Environment

Policy E10

Development will not be permitted within Conservation Areas, or where it would affect the affect the setting of such areas, which would

6. Be detrimental to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area in terms of:
 - ! scale, proportions and massing;
 - ! layout, grouping and setting;
 - ! detailing and materials of construction.
7. Be detrimental to the setting of buildings which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
8. Result in the loss of open spaces or important views within, into and out of the Conservation Area.
9. Result in the loss of particular features which contribute positively to character and appearance of the Conservation Area, including:
 - ! Walls and other means of enclosure;
 - ! Ground surfaces;
 - ! Natural features (such as trees and hedgerows); and
 - ! Features of archaeological interest.
10. Be detrimental to environmental quality in terms of :
 3. Traffic generation;
 4. (ii) Noise and other forms of environmental intrusion.

Policy E16

Development will not be permitted which would adversely affect the setting of a Listed Building, in terms of scale, massing, form, siting, design or materials of construction.

Policy E17

Where a historic byway makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the surrounding landscape, development which would significantly diminish that contribution, or otherwise detrimentally affect the setting or amenity value of such byway will not be permitted.

Appendix 2 - Current HS2 Ltd Compensation

Packington response documents to HS2 proposed route November 2016 & 2013					
Appendix - Compensation Package					
Houses within Packington Package	Number of houses	Average house price	% loss	Average payment per household	Compensation
1	350	£443,438	40%	£177,375	£62,081,376
2	350			£20,000	£7,000,000
3	350				£817,500 *
4	350				
Minimum levels of compensation to be paid by HS2 Ltd to residents of Packington					£69,898,876
Houses within close proximity					
5	200			£10,000	£2,000,000
Minimum level of compensation to Packington & houses in close proximity to the village					£71,898,876
Definitions					
Number of Houses - based on the numbers of house within the Packington boundary as at December 2016					
Average house price - based on the average house price of properties at December 2016, uplifted by 20% to cover the impact of the announcement of HS2 2013 & Nov 2016					
% loss - based on the estimate of 'This is money' of the financial impact of the value of homes within close proximity to HS2 route.					
* 7 Houses at £22500, 24 houses at £15000 and 40 houses at £7500					
Estimate based on current HS2 maps					
House close proximity - area as compensated for during M42 route					

Appendix 3 Packington-Proposed Compensation

Packington response documents to HS2 proposed route November 2016 & 2013				
Appendix – 3	Number of houses within	Packington boundary		350
Packington compensation Package				
1. Property value compensation				
Package	Number of houses	Zone	Average house price **	% loss ***
	7	120-180m	£406,485	40%
	24	180-240m	£406,485	30%
	40	240-300m	£406,485	20%
	60	300-500m	£406,485	20%
	219	Remainder of Village	£406,485	10%
2. Construction compensation				
	350	Packington boundary		£25,000
		Temporary funding	during construction (based on 18 months)	548 days
		GP surgery		£517,500
		Mobile Pharmacy		£129,800
		Fund sporting resource/club	- during disruption to Ashby	£78,000
		Transport/ shuttle bus / taxis		£274,000
		School / sound proofing / improvements		£1,000,000
		Recreational facilities - purchase land / build		£1,000,000
		Replace village orchard - purchase land/ replant		£50,000
		Provide funding for village facility		£500,000
		Make good village roads		£250,000
£2,300,000				
3. Future compensation				
	7			£22,500
	24			£15,000
	40			£7,500
	279			£5,000
£2,212,500				
Packington compensation package (amount to be indexed from Jan 2017) ****				
£35,358,382				
* Number of houses within HS2 current compensation zones, based on current HS2 maps				
** Average house price for Packington based on XXX				
*** % loss of house value based on the estimate of 'This is Money' of the financial impact on the value of homes within close proximity to HS2 route				
**** compensation figure based on January 2017 to be indexed linked				

Appendix 4 POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO THIRD ROUTE

The Third Alternative route is much lower impact compared to the other 2 routes already, however it looks like no optimisation exercise has ever been conducted. It can be improved even further by local adjustment.

The adjusted route has the following general characteristics:

Looks to avoid the villages impacted by the Third Alternative route, at the expense of a small increase in isolated individual homes within 300m (most likely farm houses – see section below).

Looks to maximise route in modern (<30 years old) forest areas, and minimise use of farm land. See discussion below

It looks to avoid historic buildings better.

Designed with an absolute minimum track radius of 6000m. Some HS2 documents state this curvature is good for 360kph (actually 5900m quoted). Therefore for standard train speed of 330kph and given that the line directly north of this section is only 275kph, this looks to be a safe conservative minimum radius to use. Note that last curve into 275kph section is 5000m.

The adjusted Third Alternative route never leaves the original Third route by more than 450m, but reduces the number of homes affected as follows. Note that these numbers are only for the section of line adjusted from Orton Hill to Melbourne Rd, just north of Lount.

Area		<60m	>60 to <120m	>120m to <300m	Comments
Orton Hill	HS2 route	1	2	1	
	Adjusted	1	0	2	
Twycross & Gopsall	HS2 route	0	0	1	
	Adjusted	0	0	2	
Newton Burgoland (& surrounds)	HS2 route	0	3	45	
	Adjusted	2	1	7	
Heather	HS2 route	2	1	54	
	Adjusted	2	2	8	
Alton Hill	HS2 route	0	1	4	
	Adjusted	0	0	2	
Farm Town	HS2 route	0	0	8	
	Adjusted	0	0	1	
Coleorton Hall / farm	HS2 route	0	0	29	
	Adjusted	0	0	2	
Melbourne Rd	HS2 route	0	1	3	
	Adjusted	0	1	1	
TOTALS	HS2 route	2	6	143	
	Adjusted	3	11	21	
	Change	2 more	4 more	120 less	In total 114 less

Notes - As per main report on the Third Alternative route count, these results are counted visually on Google Earth with edge cases measured individually to centreline

with Google Earth measuring tape. Obvious farm buildings not counted, but farm houses are counted. Assume accurate to within about +/- 10%.

These totals include Melbourne Rd (previously outside the area in the main report), due to 1 house worse impacted by straightening the connection into the Lount to Kegworth section.

The adjusted has only been assessed horizontally –Vertical assessment is still work in progress; however it is expected that the majority of areas will be roughly similar in vertical profile.

Impact on Isolated houses (most likely Farm houses):

Although impacts on any dwelling cannot be good, the basis for avoiding villages at the expense of isolated houses, predominantly farm houses, is as follows:

Where farm houses are impacted, it is likely the farm will already be impacted due to land take, HS2 have to engage individually with farmers on compensation due to land take, loss of crops and due to disconnection of areas of farm land.

These individual compensation claims hopefully allow farmers, with the help of land agents and the NFU / CLA, to get their rightful compensation, whereas houses in villages get little or no compensation

Given that most farms tend to have large areas of land, new farms houses / building can, in some cases, be built well away from the line. When like for like (not betterment), we would expect this to occur at HS2's expense and with HS2, Council planning and the government allowing this with little planning issues & allowing new build to complete before demolition of the previous property.

Decision to Impact Modern forest land to reduce Productive land take

Advantages:-

- Route available through most of Ashby area
- Almost no residential property on route
- Land is usually lower quality – not BMV farmland
- Tree screening is already in place, before construction
- Sound bunds can be screened with trees with looking out of place
- Less landowners to work with (much reduced risk of petitions)
- 5:1 Replacement planting for lost trees is a win/win for HS2 & Forestry companies.
- Possibly some saplings / smaller trees can be transplanted

Disadvantages:-

- Full vegetation free zone required, to avoid leaf-fall on track
- Wildlife corridor replacement routes will be required regularly – most likely at every bridge
- Some land is ex mining / quarrying, so may need extra base material / engineering.

Detail:

For the Northern half of the route (north of Newton Burgoland), the route has been adjusted into National Forest land where-ever possible. This is based on the presumption that lower grade, less productive land has moved from farming to become part of the National Forest (first formed 25 years ago), and that the best and most versatile land is still in productive use. HS2 of course replaces lost forestry land at a ratio greater than one to one (believed to be 5 to 1). A large portion of this replacement forestry should be via additional payment (commuted sums) to National Forest etc. for off-site planting in the Ashby Area. This would bring lasting improvement to North West Leicestershire / South Derbyshire area.

Although farms will be compensated for land take, disruption etc. the monetary compensation needs to be spent against farming (land etc.) purchases within 3 years or

risk capital gains. As is being found on Phase 1 of HS2, there is no land available (or prices are unreasonably high) to farmers affected, as everyone on the route of the line is "in the same boat" at the same time. (It needs to be said that although outside of the scope of this document, we feel that farmers receiving compensation due to compulsory purchase of land that has been in the farm for tens or hundreds of years should not be subject to Capital Gains on this compensation.)

Using modern forest land, will also remove noise impacts on livestock farms (though most farms in the area are arable).

It may also be true (but would need to be proven) that land given over to modern tree planting is more likely to be at the extremes of individual farm's land or where disconnection issues are less, reducing the number of accommodation bridges and areas of disconnection within individual farms.

A minor disadvantage is that HS2 will require full width (25m each side) vegetation free zones to reduce risks of leaves on the line, which will increase land take compared to if the route was across open farmland. As there will be some disconnection of wild life corridors, all bridges over the route will need to be extended by 5 to 20 metres to allow green lanes to be formed, separated from the main use of the bridge (road / path) by hedges and possibly some trees. These trees would need to be of lower risk of causing leaves on the line, but would screen the cut of the line from roads to some extent.

A major advantage for HS2 is that large areas of this forest is in the ownership of a very small number of organisations, allowing HS2 to progress the route design knowing that there will be a much reduced number of entities to work with, most of which will be business based, proactive and will know what compensation is required. This will most likely be tree planting of large areas elsewhere, which will count towards HS2's tree replacement ratio. As long as HS2 too are proactive to match, these entities are unlikely to become petitioners at government committee stage, accelerating the parliamentary stage and reducing associated costs.

Impact on Schools

Only one school is within 500m of the Third Route compared to four on the current proposed route. The adjusted line moves further away from Newtown Burgoland school by 160m, to 400m. The line will still be in a cutting in this area, as previously, to reduce noise.

Impact on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas

As set out in the main report, the Third Alternative route already has a third less impact on Listed Buildings and has no Grade 1 buildings within 350m when compared to the current proposed route. The improvements to the Third Route in taking the line further away from Newton Burgoland, Heather Hall and Coleorton Hall would reduce the 16 listed buildings on the Third Alternative route down to 9. A significant improvement compared to the 24 on the current proposed route.

Postives:-

Coleorton Hall – Conservation Area and 11 listings (of which 2 were within 350m of Third Alternative route) - route is now 370m from edge of Coleorton Hall Conservation Area (was previously 90m) and is unlikely to be seen from the conservation area, due to the topology of the land between. No listed buildings within 575m.

Newton Burgoland – 6 listings within 350m of Third Alternative route reduced to 2 (at Grange Farmhouse) which move from 78m from route to 236m on the adjusted route.

Neutral:-

Ashby Canal – Crossing is moved 215m east. It is still away from all bridges, buildings and moorings and is in an area where the canal is in a low cutting, reducing the impact

of a bridge, which would likely be the same proportions as the HS2's original line of the third route.

Alton House – crossing moves from east to west at a similar distance (215m) from George's Stephenson's house. Although line is lower, trees in the area are not mature and will not reduce visual impact for 10 – 20 years

Heather Hall – 3 listings – Adjusted route is almost identical to Third Alternative route to within metres. The Lodge is still within 60m, The Hall within 115m and the Stable Block within 170m.

Negatives:-

Coleorton Farm – Listed Building – route swaps to other side of farm, to remove impact on Coleorton Hall Conservation Area and listed buildings, however distance reduces from 160m to 140m from route. A tighter radius curve (than current 5000m) would increase distance line to farm and is feasible given that this is the start of the 275kph section north with an immediate curve on HS2's section of radius of 3455m. However one possible better solution, given the local topology (top of hill, land high above surrounding area, line is in cutting), then going under A512, is that this bridge is extended to form a short (600m) green tunnel, removing cutting scar from the skyline of the surrounding area and reducing spoil generation.

Note – routes assessed on 26/2/2017 against Historic England 16/2/2017 ERSI data :

Battlefields - HE file dated 16/02/2017 – there are no battlefields in the areas concerned

Building Preservation Notices - HE file dated 16/02/2017 – there are no BPNs currently in the areas concerned

Certificates of Immunity – HE file Date 16/02/2017 – there are no Cerificates of Immunity currently in the areas concerned

Listed Buildings – HE file Date 16/02/2017 – used in counting listed buildings in this document.

Parks and Gardens – HE file Date 16/02/2017 - There is only Coleorton Hall parks and gardens - see Coleorton Hall earlier in document.

Scheduled Monuments.zip 16/02/2017 18537851.

World Heritage Sites - HE file dated 16/02/2017 – there are no World Heritage Site in the areas concerned.



Figure 1 - 2016 Consultation route (left) together with 2013 Third Alternative route and improved Third route (in green)

FREEPOST HS2
PHASE 2B ROUTE REFINEMENT CONSULTATION

Our ref: NL2022

01 March 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing in response to the change of route for Phase 2 of HS2 which runs through my constituency of North West Leicestershire. Firstly I would like to state that the first proposed route was unacceptable given the costs to the local economy in job losses and disruption and I welcome this being dropped.

However the new proposed route is also an unacceptable option. Local surveys are suggesting job losses from businesses that would be forced to relocate or close because of this route would run into many hundreds.

The impact on several villages in my constituency is considerable. Appleby Magna will be dissected and the proposed line runs close to the Grade 1 listed Sir John Moore School and will potentially unsettle its foundations.

The announcement is impacting Measham with work having to cease of part of a new housing estate. In addition to this, the level it is due to run at is causing significant problems with the restoration of the Ashby Canal which is the lynchpin of the regeneration efforts in the village.

The historic village of Packington is also adversely affected as the route would run through a Conservation area and over the River Mease SSSI which is the only Special Area of Conservation on the entire HS2 route.

Given that HS2 is supposed to be about capacity rather than speed, I would ask that this route is reviewed once more and consideration given to routes which would have a lesser impact on the lives of residents and businesses in my constituency

Yours faithfully

Andrew Bridgen MP

CC Andrew Jones MP