

HS2

Common Design Elements - survey responses

November 2020

www.hs2.org.uk

Contents

Summary	3
Review of the engagement	3
Responses: Statutory bodies	4
Responses: Public	20
Engagement headlines	29

Summary

During January 2020, we asked for views and ideas on some of the detailed aspects of three of our proposed Common Design Elements (CDEs): parapets, piers and lineside noise barriers. This document summarises the responses we received.

The responses have also been shared with the Local Planning Authorities on the route of Phase One of HS2, who will be able to use them to help with their planning processes.

The design of the Lineside Noise Barriers is still underway, and we are considering how the design of these structures can satisfy the technical requirements and deliver a contextual response. When the noise barriers design has matured, we will issue an addendum to this report describing how this has been achieved.

Review of the engagement

Prior to public engagement, HS2 held detailed discussions with local planning authorities and the HS2 Independent Design Panel. This allowed issues and concerns to be raised and for these to be addressed in the initial design of CDEs.

Following these discussions we published an information booklet to introduce CDEs to the public, explaining the purpose behind parapets, piers and lineside noise barriers and showing how the designs had developed. The booklet also explained the factors that dictate the design of CDEs, including ensuring they can do their job effectively, offer value for money and last 120 years.

The booklet included a survey, which set out three issues for people to rank in order of importance. These three issues were applied to three settings along the line of route:

- Urban settings (built-up areas and city centre locations)
- Rural settings (smaller towns and villages, open countryside and agricultural areas)
- Transport corridor settings (where HS2 runs alongside existing main roads, motorways, railways and waterways)

In addition to the ranking exercise, a free text box was provided for people to explain their choices and outline ideas to help us make the most of the opportunity presented by each CDE. We also asked people to include the first section of their postcodes on their completed responses, allowing us to provide the results at a local authority level.

By sharing these results with local authorities we can help identify the issues that are important to their communities, so they can bear them in mind when they make their decisions. Where postcodes crossed local authority boundaries, we have allocated those responses to both local authority areas.

We hosted both the CDEs booklet and survey on <https://www.hs2.org.uk/documents/common-design-elements>. Printed copies were also made available. A news article was also created on all HS2 Phase One Commonplace websites and a news alert was sent to subscribers at the start of the engagement.

We created a presentation for use at existing HS2 engagement activities. This was based on the CDEs booklet and survey and signposted people to the CDEs webpage.

When the engagement period began we sent an email to line of route stakeholders including MPs, local authority leaders and chief executives along with ward councillors, parish and town councils and other groups and organisations. The email explained the purpose of the engagement, including an introduction to the CDEs, and signposted a link to the HS2 webpage to download a copy of the CDE document and survey.

Statutory bodies including Highways England, Natural England and The National Trust were also notified and duly responded. Local planning authorities were notified in advance through the Phase One HS2 Planning Forum and several, including Chiltern & South Bucks District Council, the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council and Warwick District Council submitted comments. For the purpose of this report, statutory bodies also include these four local authorities.

During the engagement period (2-30 January) we promoted the survey at existing HS2 engagement activities including meetings with parish and town councils, MPs, organisations and groups.

Responses: Statutory bodies

In total, we received 457 survey responses. 26 of these did not respond to the issues and only commented on the merits of HS2. They were therefore removed from the analysis. In addition, eight standalone responses were also received from seven statutory bodies along with a line of route M.P.

The responses received from the statutory bodies have been summarised in the following tables. We have included a HS2 response within each table as set out below.

The issues raised can be summarised by statutory body as:

Highways England

Concerns that the uniformity of the design may restrict the ability to respond to local character and recognised that the impact of patterning and texture will be limited due to the scale of the structures and the need for planting and access to deter graffiti. There was support for active uses beneath viaducts in urban areas, with concerns about wider lighting impacts whilst ensuring the design of CDEs takes into account safety of the strategic road network.

Historic England

Concern about the visual impact of noise barriers and support for transparent materials, including lighting within the structures; particularly under viaducts in urban areas, and suggestions for adding texture to concrete to both deter climbing and graffiti.

Warwick District Council

Concerns about the ability of concrete to reflect local identity, the visual impact of continuous noise barriers on the openness of the countryside, support for including local communities to help control graffiti, and concerns about the extent of public engagement on CDEs.

National Trust

Concerns regarding the use of concrete as the main material, in terms of visual impact and sustainability and support for the integration of noise barriers with wildlife which could also help limit graffiti.

Solihull MBC

Concerns that too many elements of the CDEs are fixed and not able to be influenced, the need for the structures to respond to local identity, and the need to ensure that all HS2 structures comply with the HS2 Design Policy.

Chiltern & South Bucks District Council

Concerns raised about the design of piers and lineside noise barriers and how they comply with previous guidance and assurances given through the select committee process.

London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham

Concerns that the design of noise barriers would need to reflect local identity; particularly around Old Oak Common Station along with the need for CDEs to reflect HS2's Green Corridor initiative.



Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
Design of structure and materials		
<p>National Trust</p>	<p>The Common Design Element proposals seem to be at an advanced stage, and we are disappointed that there appears to be little likelihood of influencing them. Information Paper D1: Design Policy states that “The Promoter will undertake wider public engagement on design development for common design elements, including for example interactive on-line materials, with associated local and route-wide publicity”. We are not aware of any public consultation on the design elements as they were being developed.</p> <p>We strongly urge that HS2 explore opportunities to decarbonise the construction of the railway. The consultation document notes the use of concrete for the CDEs has been fixed. We request further information from HS2 about why other materials and composites have been ruled out. We encourage HS2 Ltd to ensure there are opportunities for innovation in the design and construction of all phases of the railway to ensure the highest sustainability standards are met.</p> <p>Plain concrete, being a pale material, will have increased visibility in the landscape (except where seen against the sky). We are disappointed that that it is not possible to change the blanket use of concrete for the CDEs. ... Not only does concrete have a high carbon footprint, it can be a very visually intrusive feature. Therefore we strongly encourage the use of colour and texture of the concrete to reduce the visibility HS2.</p> <p>Use of special piers to mark the crossing of such features could be achieved with different texture, colour and/or recess design. Figure 8 of the consultation document notes that a recess could be patterned, adding detail to complement the local identity of specific assets. Whilst the use of texture often helps soften the</p>	<p>There has been a significant amount of engagement with the Phase 1 Planning Authorities through the Planning Forum in developing the CDE proposals to this stage. The present engagement is that referred to in Information Paper D1.</p> <p>The development of Common Design Elements (piers, parapets and noise barriers) has been undertaken in parallel with scheme design development throughout Phase One. Therefore, almost every time the public have been engaged on HS2 designs, some aspect of Common Design Elements has been incorporated in public consultation sessions from the earliest design stage. Wider engagement using interactive on-line materials was undertaken in January 2020 when designs had been developed with the 27 Local Authorities impacted by Phase One. This consultation just applies to Phase 1 and any proposed CDEs for Phase 2a will be engaged on through the P2a Planning Forum and subject to a separate consultation.</p> <p>HS2 design must meet rigorous requirements for safety, sustainability and resilience. Our Design Vision describes a principle of designing a railway to stand the test of time. Therefore, the whole-life carbon impact of the railway is considered for construction, operation and, where relevant, end-of-life, in line with industry best practice. Material selection and specification for Common Design Elements alongside civil engineering, stations and railway systems is optimised for the 120-year lifespan ensuring carbon impacts associated with maintenance and replacement are robustly considered. The design specification also reflects leading health and safety ambitions to remove the need for maintenance, designing out operational health and safety risk.</p> <p>Common Design Elements have been designed to respond to HS2 Requirements and so the assessment of materials was undertaken a</p>

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>appearance of plain concrete we note that in areas under the railway it can look worse because texture can attract dirt not washed off by / concealed from rain. We suggest this is taken into consideration given the specific local setting and amount of dirt / pollution likely to be present under the railway</p>	<p>120-year lifespan considering the impact of maintenance. Non-concrete elements may require considerable maintenance and replacement multiple times during this lifespan. Following review, HS2 designers do not support the use of colour inclusions that can perform to the 120-year lifespan design requirement.</p>
<p>Solihull MBC</p>	<p>The questions posed within the Consultation Document, on pages 25 – 27, do not specifically ask for comment on the CDE designs in their own right. Furthermore, while it is stated what elements of CDE designs are fixed, there is insufficient detail as to why many of these elements are fixed. It is not clear what alternatives have been explored and discounted, with appropriate reasoning, and as a result there is insufficient rationale for the chosen CDE designs</p>	<p>The purpose of the CDE approach is that the design needs to be considered as a whole throughout the life cycle of the HS2 project. The design has been carefully considered to address the form and profile of the structures. These structures have been developed to create shadow lines through the profiles of the structures and use of drip lines which addresses how these appear in the wider landscape context as well as when viewed from nearby public routes. The designers have addressed potential differential weathering and potential rainwater staining by modelling the surfaces to control flows over and down the structures.</p>
<p>Highways England</p>	<p>The Common Design Elements public engagement relates to HS2 Phase 1 only. Highways England therefore expect that outcomes and decisions made for the Common Design Elements at Phase 1 will not be used as default for Phase 2a or Phase 2b.</p> <p>The appearance of structures in rural areas is very important, although any opportunities to create local identity through pattern or texture will be limited due to scale. Presume there will be limited public interaction in transport corridors, but large scale interventions that function at speed (from passing vehicles) could be considered.</p> <p>Presume there will be limited public interaction in such corridors and therefore community projects impractical, but large scale art and lighting projects should be considered.</p>	<p>The location and use of texture is carefully considered and designed through the pre-consultation process, working with Local Authorities and relevant Stakeholders. Designs will aim to respond to the local community, the location, and the setting of the structure in its context. There may be opportunity to use the scale of the structures to create a striking pattern that reflects the local area.</p> <p>HS2 piers carry massive loads with the frequency of trains, the 120-year design life requirement and braking forces that they must carry. In every case, designers seek to reduce the volume and size of structural elements.</p>
<p>Warwick District Council</p>	<p>Whilst we appreciate the cost and design efficiency benefits of having a common design of viaducts, parapets, piers and noise barriers we are uncertain how effective the concept of varying</p>	

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>areas of panels will be in reflecting local styles or materials. Anything which mitigates the bleakness of plain bare concrete will be welcome, particularly as weathering often worsens the appearance. Sense of local identify can only be successful if treated as a KDE.</p>	
<p>Chiltern & South Bucks District Council</p>	<p>Page 10 refers to option for texture or pattern to be applied on lower third of the external face of the parapet “where there is a perceived benefit of doing so” – perceived by whom? It would be better to have words to the effect that these have to be agreed at some point.</p> <p>The examples of piers illustrated in the booklet look extraordinarily lumpy compared with the examples we were shown in the summer - they seem to have much broader edges and appear less tapering. Not sure if this is accidental because of a choice of of different contexts, or whether there is new technical requirement for deeper piers. I'd recommend a comment on the desirability of a more slender, elegant appearance than shown.</p>	
<p>Landscape</p>		
<p>National Trust</p>	<p>We welcome the aspiration that all visible elements of HS2 are sympathetic to their surroundings including the character of the area. We note that the CDEs have been informed by the HS2 Design Policy but HS2’S Landscape Design Approach should also inform the design of structures given that their design is central to how well the railway integrates into the landscape through which it passes.</p> <p>There is no discussion in the consultation about how wildlife interacts with noise barriers. Planting measures or the use of green</p>	<p>Common Design Elements are used as appropriate for each carefully designed structure for the new railway. For example, each pier form is selected in response to what is being crossed, to the span, height and context of the crossing in addition to design and construction constraints. HS2 designers are focusing on siting every structure within its landscape along the route. This involves integration of multi-disciplinary requirements and functional performance alongside the response to local landscape character and context. These considerations lead to design of the appropriate landform, structural</p>

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	walls could be effective visually and for the movement and habitation of local wildlife.	form, and selection of the Common Design Element appropriate to for that location. Approaches vary according to whether the route lies within rural, suburban or urban locations Local communities are involved in design development for the railway through public engagement activities. The output of designer analysis of the local context will be discussed with Local Authorities prior to each Schedule 17 planning submission.
Solihull MBC	Whilst SMBC acknowledges the desire for a standardised appearance for piers, parapets and lineside noise barriers and that their design is influenced by technical requirements, their visual impact upon the character of the Borough, particularly within the rural areas and villages where they are proposed, and how they respond to the context within which they will be viewed, is a concern. It is considered vital that a thorough analysis of local context is undertaken prior to the submission of Schedule 17 requests for approval, to ensure that proposed designs respond appropriately to local context.	The CDE approach seeks to balance the objective to deliver a route-wide identity that is robust and can maintained over the 120-year design life of the railway. This needs to be cost effective through use of repeatable elements whilst making provision for local variation and distinctiveness with the opportunity for the controlled application of patterning or texture to defined parts of piers, parapets and noise barriers.
Highways England	<p>The common design elements approach raises the issue of whether there is an inherent contradiction in being sympathetic to the local context/place on the one hand and creating a recognisable and common line-wide identity on the other.</p> <p>There are some common design elements, such as the overhead line structures, that are more integral to the railway itself than other elements with more visual impact and potential for interaction with passers-by, such as the parapets, piers and noise barriers. These latter elements have the most potential to respond to the local context through form and materiality, yet are presented as a single common design with limited opportunities such as pattern and texture offered to mitigate their potential homogenising impact.</p>	<p>Noise barriers are required under the provisions of the HS2 Act to address the mitigation of noise on sensitive receptors. Noise barriers are not intended to be used for visual screening but provide protection to receptors along the route. The assessment of the noise impact from the scheme determines the height and extent of noise barriers that will be provided. Landscape earthworks or false cuttings are being used in place of noise barriers where there is sufficient land and materials available to deliver an effective design which integrates noise mitigation into the landscape approach. The CDE design for noise barriers is being developed to respond to local context through options such as cranking the top section, providing a simplified form if the noise barrier is not visible and through the potential for patterning.</p>
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham	We have reviewed the document and consider that proposals for noise barriers would need to be considered and respond to the context and surrounding area. A single blanket approach along the route in relation to aesthetics/design or to meet operational	We are sensitive to the visual intrusion of noise barriers. Therefore a key part of the design development for the railway is to seek ways of reducing the need for noise barriers. At the highest level this is by addressing the sources of noise from rolling stock within the

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>standards would not be appropriate or acceptable as the context and setting varies significantly along the route. Appreciate that the document is Guidance therefore, any specific proposals relating to the design and location of noise barriers at the Old Oak HS2 station and approaches, should be discussed with OPDC and LBHF.</p> <p>The HS2 Common Design Elements document should also consider how the proposed HS2 corridor route-wide will provide opportunity to green this corridor and create and promote habitats for biodiversity.</p>	<p>procurement process. Alternative noise mitigation measures such as local landscape earthworks and landform will be used where possible. Landscape, ecological and wider environmental aspects of the location will be incorporated into the landform when siting noise barriers in context. This will be discussed with Local Authorities and relevant Stakeholders through the Schedule 17 process. Our approach is being developed with the 27 Local Authorities route-wide.</p> <p>Meeting the 120-year design life requirement with maintenance regimes that support effective operation of the railway without extensive line closures and keeping construction costs within the affordable cost envelope have further informed design decisions. For example, transparent noise barriers were reviewed. They presented a major cost challenge in addition to designs not being available that can respond to the HS2 design Requirements, given the frequency and speed of trains passing in close proximity.</p>
Historic England	<p>The sound barriers will, in places, rise to a considerable height. If they are to be added to, for example, to a low-lying viaduct they could become unnecessarily intrusive. At the same time they provide a barrier to even seeing that a train is passing, let alone any outward vision for the passengers. In some locations (although this probably relates largely to key design elements) a transparent solution might be considered.</p>	<p>A key aspect for setting each part of the railway line within its context is the careful assessment of landform, ecological mitigation and the provision of space for local species identified through survey and study. Provision of crossing points for wildlife will be provided in strategic locations with the use of under-passes and green bridges where required. The design will take into account where noise barriers need to allow for movement of certain species.</p>
Highways England	<p>It is not clear how inherent issues such as graffiti which blank concrete walls will attract, will be addressed through the design itself, other than deterring access with security fencing for example. It could be argued that tagging or graffiti is an expression of ownership in itself and care should be taken in using this term. It is unclear if the potential of landscape design has been fully considered to both deter access and better integrate the common elements (or even replace barriers if berms or false cuttings are used). This appears to be a missed opportunity.</p> <p>With regard to the SRN itself, it is unclear how the proposed approach will fit with existing highway and landscape design that may be more sympathetic to the context. Although it is uncertain where figure 16a is for example (it may not be the SRN), the noise</p>	<p>Clearly, security must also be retained, for example green wall solutions were considered for noise barriers and discounted given the security risk presented by a climbable surface.</p>

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>barrier as illustrated is visually obtrusive and monotonous and most likely to attract graffiti. Note generating a local sense of ownership to deter vandalism in a transport corridor would likely prove very difficult.</p> <p>From the figures provided within the consultation material, it has been interpreted that Lineside Noise Barriers have also been designed to provide visual screening. Is this an intentional approach and if so, how has the need for visual screening influenced the noise barriers design? If Lineside Noise Barriers and visual screening are separate elements, will HS2 Ltd be consulting on visual screening as a separate Common Design Element?</p>	
<p>Warwick District Council</p>	<p>We are particularly concerned about the effect on the landscape and environment of extended lengths of noise barriers. It is most unfortunate that such barriers are necessary as they are neither a feature of conventional railways nor of the artist' impressions produced years ago. The situation is particularly fraught because without the actual trains designed and tested it is not even certain that the proposed barriers will be effective.</p> <p>We are not at all clear what proportion of the route through this District is to be lined with noise barriers. The latest published drawings on the website we are aware of (January 2015) indicate that only certain sections will have such barriers but we understand these locations may be subject to revision. For the sake of passengers on the train as well as the local residents we trust that the concrete trough effect indicated in Figure 4 will not be typical.</p> <p>We consider the artist's impression of a noise barrier in the rural area given by Figure 14b to be appalling. It has all the appeal of the Berlin Wall. Should it be necessary to add a security fence as</p>	

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>indicated in Figure 1 then the prison effect would be overwhelming. We assume that illustrated arrangement would not be normal as the wall itself should provide the necessary security. It must be remembered that the majority of the route in Warwick District is in the West Midlands Green Belt where openness is a key feature. Transport systems such as railways are normally acceptable as the traffic is transient but walls such as those proposed compromise the openness and would normally be considered inappropriate. It is imperative that their extent is minimised to that required to protect communities from noise.</p>	
Community		
Historic England	<p>The proposals do not allow for the addition of any form of lighting to the railway structures themselves. So, for example, under the viaducts in urban areas where some lighting would be desirable to highlight the elegance of the structures and for the purposes of public amenity and safety it would be good to provide the possibility of incorporating that into the structure. The alternative of having to have independent structures to provide lighting will not necessarily be the most elegant solution.</p>	<p>Where the context of the structure is urban and likely to be experienced by many people, the provision of lighting beneath the viaducts is being considered during design. Various techniques can be employed, for example using recesses within piers to conceal cable ducting and mounting lights on piers. Each structure will be designed to sit within its local context and aspects such as lighting will form part of the Schedule 17 process.</p>
Highways England	<p>The appearance of structures in urban areas very important, with many opportunities to reinforce a sense of place. Vacant spaces under viaducts should generally be avoided, but involving local communities likely best way forward. Due to limited public interaction in a rural area and context, is this likely to be practicable in most locations? Lighting would likely be considered intrusive.</p>	
Warwick District Council	<p>Lighting is very important in these [urban] areas. Types of lighting needs to be carefully considered.</p>	

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
Safety and security		
National Trust	<p>We suggest that in some locations it may be applicable and suitable that noise barriers also act as the security barriers as this can help to avoid too many different intrusions in sensitive rural settings.</p> <p>There is a risk that noise barriers will attract graffiti. Adding a planting buffer in front of the noise barriers or other clear wall spaces can effectively reduce the risk of graffiti and provides some conservation benefit.</p>	<p>Security advisors undertake risk assessments on every aspect of the railway. Where possible, and appropriate, HS2 is investigating the use of noise barriers as a security barrier to reduce the number of visual intrusions into the landscape.</p> <p>Public access to the lineside noise barriers will be controlled, as far as possible, by landform and landscape planting, and by appropriate fencing where necessary. HS2 will need to maintain access to lineside structures for safety, operational and maintenance purposes. For these reasons planting is not suitable immediately against noise barriers.</p>
Warwick District Council	<p>Plain concrete panels provide canvasses for graffiti artists in both rural and urban locations. Whilst a sense of pride or ownership of the space may protect the area this is going to be a major problem. Hopefully graffiti can be confined to specific locations where it may even be encouraged. It will be essential to involve the local communities in helping to solve this problem.</p> <p>Where a noise barrier becomes the security fence great thought needs to be made regarding the deterrent for graffiti. Encourage and control it and then it becomes less obtrusive eg. Belfast / Manchester.</p> <p>Concern that the security fence has not been shown.</p>	<p>HS2 will paint over graffiti with concrete coloured paint and have a zero-tolerance policy for leaving graffiti in place. This approach has been successfully implemented on the High Speed 1 railway and is adopted following extensive research and analysis of different approaches.</p> <p>Where the context of the structure is urban and likely to be experienced by many people, the provision of lighting beneath the viaducts is being considered during design. Various techniques can be employed, for example using recesses within piers to conceal cable ducting and mounting lights on piers. Each structure will be designed to sit within its local context and aspects such as lighting will form part of the Schedule 17 process.</p> <p>Opportunities for art and graffiti as art can be explored through local engagement with Planning Authorities.</p>
Historic England	<p>We trust that adding texture of any magnitude will not enable climbing particularly where the wall also forms the security barrier.</p> <p>It will need to be considered how cleanable the surface finish is in terms of resistance to graffiti which will run counter to introducing any texture into the concrete. That is traditionally one of the ways in which concrete can become an attractive material, by polishing</p>	<p>Grffiti prevention measures are encouraged over graffiti minimisation and/or removal. HS2 should be considering prevention of graffiti as a first line of defence rather than cleaning when it does happen. Public access to lineside noise barriers should be prevented where possible by strategic design of fencing, planting, bunds, ditches, ponds and other</p>

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>or by various forms of abrasion to reveal the aggregate, or through the use of textured shuttering (most commonly planks). However, there does not seem to be any scope within the document for that kind of design refinement.</p>	<p>such barriers. HS2 will need to maintain access to lineside structures for safety, operational and maintenance purposes. For these reasons planting may not be suitable immediately against noise barriers.</p>
<p>Highways England</p>	<p>Due to limited public interaction in a rural area and context, is this (graffiti) likely to be an issue in most locations? Landscape likely to be the best way to deter access while also helping to integrate structures. Due to the context (urban) and high degree of interaction, this will be a key issue to address. Natural surveillance, design and art preferable to overt security measures.</p> <p>Highways England requires common design elements in relation to the SRN to be design in accordance with the latest DMRB standards.</p> <p>It is noted that one of the purposes of parapets is to prevent vehicular access to the railway. Does the preventing of vehicular access extend to stopping heavy or fast moving errant vehicles? The designs presented in figure 6a & 6b show a slim Parapet and Highways England would therefore challenge how appropriate such a design would be in safely stopping fast moving or heavy vehicles departing the SRN.</p> <p>Figure 15b illustrates examples of viaduct piers and parapets in a transport corridor context. For maintenance access purposes, Highways England recommends HS2 piers be installed outside of the highway boundary. Where a pier is required within the highway boundary, particularly in the central reservation, consideration should be given to the need for impact protection systems. In the event of a collision, impact protection will limit the impact on HS2 assets and operations and mitigate driver safety concerns.</p>	<p>Where graffiti has taken place, HS2 will remove or paint over graffiti with concrete coloured paint and have a zero-tolerance policy for leaving graffiti in place. This approach has been successfully implemented on the High Speed 1 railway and is adopted following extensive research and analysis of different approaches.</p> <p>Parapets on public road bridges crossing the HS2 railway are being designed to Highways standards. Our designers are currently developing testing regimes for HS2 'overbridge' parapet impact compliance. If other CDEs are required near the Strategic Road Network the design will follow Highways standards. The design of vehicle restraint systems and derailment protection will not be compromised by CDEs.</p>

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>At some locations, Common Design Elements will not act/be delivered in isolation. It is assumed Lineside Noise Barriers will not provide derailment protection or errant vehicle protection. Highways England would need certainty that the delivery of Common Design Elements would not constrain or prevent the delivery of vehicle restraint systems and/or derailment protection. What consideration has been given to the required spatial provision for Common Design Elements with vehicle restraint systems and/or derailment protection.</p> <p>While theoretical, Figure 15a, depicting the route running within a transport corridor setting, appears to show a significant distance for rail running in parallel with the road. Highways England would like to understand if there are SRN interfaces on Phase 1 where this type of design would be applicable. Further work would be required to understand if such a design is deliverable within the available spatial provision</p>	
OTHER: Key Design Elements		
Solihull MBC	<p>Page 5 of the consultation document states that HS2 will “talk to people about how they design Key Design Elements”. SMBC would seek assurance that the evolution of KDE designs, which include that for Balsall Common and River Blythe Viaducts, will be developed with full collaboration between HS2, the LPA and relevant stakeholders as part of the Schedule 17 process. CDE components may not be satisfactory for KDE structures.</p> <p>SMBC would expect all physical elements of HS2 to be designed to the ethos and commitments set out within HS2’s design policy, regardless of their status as CDE, KDE, or otherwise.</p>	<p>The design of Key Design Elements is being developed by HS2 with relevant stakeholders and Local Planning Authorities. We confirm that HS2’s design policy applies to all HS2 infrastructure.</p> <p>The engagement material did seek to explain the terms CDE and KDE. Page 5 of the engagement booklet states: ‘Key Design elements are structures that are particularly significant and / or in particularly sensitive places. You can find a list of them in Table 1 of HS2 Information Paper D1: Design policy....’ This follows page 4 that is entitled ‘What is a Common Design Element?’ and includes the text: ‘three different Common Design Elements:</p> <p>a. Parapets (part of bridges and viaducts) – see page 9.</p>

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>The consultation document does not clearly distinguish between Key Design Elements (KDE) and CDE. It is noted that some KDE structures, like viaducts, may include CDE designs.</p>	<p>b. Piers (another part of bridges and viaducts) – see page 11.</p> <p>c. Lineside noise barriers (used to compensate for the sound of high speed trains) – see page 14’.</p> <p>The structures comprising Key Design Elements are defined in Information Paper D1. The criteria for selection were discussed with and the list of KDEs settled through the Phase 1 Planning Forum.</p>
<p>Warwick District Council</p>	<p>We note that certain structures along the route have been identified as being particularly significant. We agree with this approach but within this District there is only one structure designated a Key Design Element which is the Tunnel at Burton Green. There has already been much useful discussion with local people about this feature, its design and its construction. We believe that there are several other structures in the District such as the viaducts over the River Avon and over the River Leam and the diversion works at the Crackley Gap which are equally sensitive and worthy of special consideration. We know that some additional Key Design Elements in this District have been suggested and rejected. We question the system for determining them which is far from transparent.</p>	
<p>Engagement and materials</p>		
<p>Chiltern & South Bucks District Council</p>	<p>Page 12 Piers – “The shape is decided based on the structural role of the pier, such as the amount of weight it will carry” – not sure what this means, will the structures not be carrying the same trains and people?</p> <p>Lineside Noise barriers – would this be better if a link was provided to the commitments made to Parliament?</p>	<p>The engagement information has been produced and edited so that it can be picked up and read by members of the public who have had little or no previous interaction with HS2 and is not intended to replace the more technical Planning Forum Notes. For example, we have explained that the dimensions of a pier are very much determined by its design loads, but in non-technical terms: ‘Their proportions must be designed</p>

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>Earlier drafts of PFNs on CDEs were more specific. Unsure whether the circulated booklet has been simplified just for consultation with detail retained for final document, or whether the wording in this booklet will be the final outcome. If the latter, then we ask for the reinstatement of the following as based on previous drafts.</p>	<p>to deal with the weight they support'. We have simplified descriptions of the context of the railway so that engagement can focus on the form of the Common Design Elements, not on how specific structures are designed – the Schedule 17 process will cover this. We have not provided electronic links to further information within the document as a key part of the success of this engagement depended on using paper questionnaires that people picked up at HS2 engagement events, completed and posted to the independent engagement survey company.</p>
<p>Highways England</p>	<p>Although the approach of recognising some distinctive sections of the line (rural, urban, transport corridor) is commendable, these characterisations appear to be based on adjacent broad land uses rather than landscape character which is clearly more nuanced. There appears to be only limited opportunities for common design elements to respond to local landscape character in a meaningful way.</p>	<p>The engagement material produced was not intended to detail which areas of each authority are considered to fall within different landscape categories. The aim has been to show that the CDE design can respond to different contexts.</p>
<p>Warwick District Council</p>	<p>We find the division into urban, rural and transport corridor somewhat blunt although we appreciate the need for reflecting different issues and challenges. We find the Figure 13 on page 18 of the booklet quite useless as it cannot be interpreted with any degree of accuracy to see which areas in this District are considered in which category even when enlarged. Searching the website where indicated we have found nothing of any benefit whatsoever.</p>	
<p>Solihull MBC</p>	<p>Page 5 of the consultation document states that HS2 will “talk to people about how they design Key Design Elements”. SMBC would seek assurance that the evolution of KDE designs, which include that for Balsall Common and River Blythe Viaducts, will be developed with full collaboration between HS2, the LPA and relevant stakeholders as part of the Schedule 17 process. CDE components may not be satisfactory for KDE structures. SMBC would expect all physical elements of HS2 to be designed to the</p>	<p>The design of Key Design Elements is being developed by HS2 with relevant stakeholders and Local Planning Authorities. We confirm that HS2’s design policy applies to all HS2 infrastructure.</p> <p>The engagement material did seek to explain the terms CDE and KDE. Page 5 of the engagement booklet states: ‘Key Design elements are structures that are particularly significant and / or in particularly sensitive places. You can find a list of them in Table 1 of HS2 Information</p>

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>ethos and commitments set out within HS2's design policy, regardless of their status as CDE, KDE, or otherwise. The consultation document does not clearly distinguish between Key Design Elements (KDE) and CDE. It is noted that some KDE structures, like viaducts, may include CDE designs.</p>	<p>Paper D1: Design policy....' This follows page 4 that is entitled 'What is a Common Design Element?' and includes the text: 'three different Common Design Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Parapets (part of bridges and viaducts) – see page 9. b. Piers (another part of bridges and viaducts) – see page 11. c. Lineside noise barriers (used to compensate for the sound of high speed trains) – see page 14'.
<p>Warwick District Council</p>	<p>We note that certain structures along the route have been identified as being particularly significant. We agree with this approach but within this District there is only one structure designated a Key Design Element which is the Tunnel at Burton Green. There has already been much useful discussion with local people about this feature, its design and its construction. We believe that there are several other structures in the District such as the viaducts over the River Avon and over the River Leam and the diversion works at the Crackley Gap which are equally sensitive and worthy of special consideration. We know that some additional Key Design Elements in this District have been suggested and rejected. We question the system for determining them which is far from transparent.</p>	<p>The structures comprising Key Design Elements are defined in Information Paper D1. The criteria for selection were discussed with and the list of KDEs settled through the Phase 1 Planning Forum.</p>
<p>National Trust</p>	<p>We note and welcome that local authorities have been consulted, including at the Planning Forum. However, with Planning Forum minutes being published up to four months after the meeting it has been very difficult for the public to stay up to date on discussions. We encourage HS2, perhaps using the Planning Forum, to collate lessons/feedback from local authorities and</p>	<p>HS2 has been actively working with the Phase One Planning Forum since 2018 in developing the Common Design Elements. Three Working Groups have focused on different aspects of the designs which have been adapted in response to this collaboration. HS2's relationship with Local Authorities is led by the same team for both phases of the project and so the improvement and feedback loop is a live process. Engagement material was shared with Local Authorities at the Planning</p>

Statutory Body response	Issues raised	HS2 response
	<p>others about the process of both developing and using the CDEs which can be applied to future phases of HS2.</p>	<p>Forum meeting on 26 September 2019 and engagement proceeded in January 2020 on agreement from the Planning Forum.</p>
<p>Solihull MBC</p>	<p>SMBC is disappointed that HS2 have conducted public consultation on the Common Design Elements (CDE) document without previously sharing the document with the Qualifying Authorities along the HS2 route, of which SMBC is one</p>	
<p>Warwick District Council</p>	<p>We are astounded that only after ten years of the project the important aspect of aesthetic and practical design has been subject to public scrutiny and comment. We are aware that there has been earlier engagement with officers of local planning authorities and that some limited improvements have been made but with hindsight earlier engagement might have been beneficial. For these ten years we have been subjected to artists' impressions and videos purporting to show what the scheme might look like. Our concern is that the original good intentions of a high level of design standards and of low impact on the environment have been compromised by understandable cost considerations.</p>	



Responses: Public

Individual responses were analysed against each issue in each of the three settings (urban, rural and transport corridor).

The most important ranking of the three issues across all settings was Issue 2: Ways of discouraging vandalism and graffiti, including fencing, security measures and an arts and culture strategy to create a sense of ownership (average of 59%).

For the purposes of this engagement summary we have focused on the issues ranked the most important in each of the three settings.

We have allocated the responses to the following four thematic areas to help build a better picture of the key areas of community concern and opportunity:

1. Design of structures and materials
2. Landscape
3. Community
4. Safety and security

The summary of responses is presented in the tables below. The tables also include a response from HS2 Ltd.

Issue 1: The appearance of the structures, including opportunities to add patterns and textures to create a sense of local identity

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Design of structures and materials	Ugly concrete, difficult to improve appearance negative impact on landscape	43	5	4	<p>Common Design Elements (CDEs) are high quality design responses which embody the HS2 Design Vision and give the railway a route-wide identity and efficiency benefits during construction and through future maintenance over the next 120 years. The HS2 Design Vision is focused on a holistic contextual approach – big-picture thinking as to what is appropriate in every setting. CDEs form the consistent ingredients which, when combined with other elements, are an appropriate response to local identity in each specific setting. The use of CDEs makes the HS2 structures recognisable, but the CDE guidelines are sufficiently flexible to allow each structure to respond positively to its setting, be that open countryside or an urban context. Whilst providing a common thread, the CDEs do not dictate the form or proportions of a structure, which must satisfy the technical requirements of the railway and contribute to the ‘placemaking’ opportunity of the location. The selection of materials, surface finishes and design detailing has been carefully considered to allow the design of structures which are appropriate to the rural, peri-urban and urban character areas along the route that spans numerous landscape and townscape character areas.</p> <p>The CDE guidelines for parapets allow for some limited variation to respond to local conditions whilst giving HS2’s viaducts and bridges a consistent appearance.</p> <p>The guidelines for piers describe a ‘family’ of pier types, setting out a framework within which there is flexibility to vary the pier design in response to structural requirements and context.</p> <p>The design of the Lineside Noise Barriers is still underway, and we are considering how the design of these structures can satisfy the technical requirements and deliver a contextual response. When the noise barriers design is more developed we will issue an addendum to this report describing how this has been achieved.</p>
	Colour/paint the structures	27	11	3	
	Incorporate local materials including bricks textured surfaces & claddings to break up concrete	26	9	3	
	Appropriate structures	-	5	-	

				<p>The CDE approach aims to deliver a coherent and integrated response to the design criteria, including operational maintenance and durability, for this significant infrastructure project.</p> <p>Regarding the use of concrete, HS2 is aligned to the tradition of other, and historic, major rail building projects which were designed and built to operate using the best methods and materials available at the time. Accordingly, it has been determined that the CDE concrete structures – all of which form part of the permanent railway – should be self-finished, as paint or other applied coatings are insufficiently durable and would generate unwarranted maintenance costs over the lifetime of the Project. Patterned or textured concrete can be used in certain instances to enhance the appearance; where this is appropriate proposals will be developed in consultation with the local planning authority. We chose not to include the use of non-structural local materials within the CDE guidelines, to promote visual consistency and structural efficiency. This does not prevent their use elsewhere, for instance in the landscape finishes, where local materials can support the contextual response.</p> <p>Finally, it should be borne in mind that the use of CDEs is not mandated, and there may be locations which call for a different design response to that provided by the CDE guidelines. In such cases appropriate designs will be developed in consultation with the local planning authority.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Issue 1: The appearance of the structures, including opportunities to add patterns and textures to create a sense of local identity

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Landscape	Blending into the landscape, compatible with AONB, blend with local structures and themes/history/geology	55	21	13	<p>HS2 will impact on the landscapes through which it passes, and it is essential that the design of the railway structures and of the landscape reinstatement are considered together to ensure that the new environments we create work together holistically. Designs will be developed that consider local character and species compositions alongside the appearance of the railway and associated structures and respond to the landscape and visual effects identified in the HS2 Environmental Statement. This will include landscape earthworks and associated planting of trees and shrubs that will mitigate views of structures as well as deliver a series of rich habitats.</p> <p>The railway structures themselves should respond to and, as far as possible, contribute to their settings, and the CDE guidelines have been developed with a view to inclusion of the CDEs into holistically considered designs. Post-construction application of vegetation to the CDE structures would raise management and maintenance issues about access. In addition, there are potential risks with climber wires/support structures offering climbing aids to trespass on the operational railway. Similarly, living walls are not considered appropriate as CDEs - which are by definition part of the permanent railway structure - but this does not prevent their use within the landscape schemes where appropriate.</p> <p>The landscape and ecology strategy along the route is to encourage the development of better-connected nature-rich areas, which do not cause a hazard of killing protected species such as bats and badgers. Habitat corridors are being developed which divert wildlife towards areas away from the live railway or, where essential, to provide safe crossing points where the risk of collision is reduced.</p> <p>The HS2 Green Corridor Initiative is being developed to enable opportunities for public connectivity along the route to be improved by enhanced footpaths and cycleways that connect to the existing public rights of way network.</p>
	Plant the structure and living walls and green landscaping	28	3	4	
	Prioritise wildlife & habitat creation	10	4	3	

Issue 1: The appearance of the structures, including opportunities to add patterns and textures to create a sense of local identity

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Community	Local interest & history	9	-	-	<p>There is a Community Engagement strategy and an Arts and Culture strategy for each area along the route. These strategies define opportunities for developing interaction with the local communities which may also include contributions from local schools, artists and other community focused groups. It is through the development of these initiatives that such opportunities will be delivered.</p> <p>Opportunities for community involvement or the involvement of local artists may, within the CDE guidelines, influence the design of the CDEs within each area, or they may be delivered in other ways. This will be decided on an area by area basis.</p>
	Employ local artists in urban areas	5	4	-	
	Mustn't distract from other transport users	-	-	5	
	Local people should choose final designs	-	3		

Issue 1: The appearance of the structures, including opportunities to add patterns and textures to create a sense of local identity

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Safety and security					<p>Safety and security measures are an essential component for the safe operation of the railway for all concerned. Security measures such as fencing, and access restrictions will form part of an integrated approach, including landscape design and other measures. We will aim to deliver the minimum number of fences or barriers necessary for the safe operation of the railway. Where appropriate, noise barriers can form the secure enclosure to the railway, thereby reducing the requirement for an additional security fence.</p>

Issue 2: Ways of discouraging vandalism and graffiti, including fencing, security measures and an arts and culture strategy to create a sense of ownership

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Design of structure and materials	They will inevitably encourage vandalism	22	-	-	<p>Vandalism, graffiti, security and a sense of ownership are all inter-related. We propose to adopt a 'no tolerance' approach to graffiti which has worked well on HS1; any graffiti is promptly removed or painted over (using a paint colour that matches the concrete) and graffiti 'artists' are thereby progressively discouraged.</p> <p>Opportunities for other vandalism will be minimised by Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), which aims to facilitate crime prevention through the design of a building or structure, minimising conditions which support anti-social behaviour.</p>
	Cleanable coatings, textures, angles to discourage	19	-	-	
	Design all elements sympathetic to the local environment and local materials	-	8	3	

Issue 2: Ways of discouraging vandalism and graffiti, including fencing, security measures and an arts and culture strategy to create a sense of ownership

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Landscape	Blend with landscape with natural barriers as invisible less likely to be abused	21	4	-	<p>The design of the landscape around HS2 structures will apply the principles of CPTED, facilitating crime prevention through design. The use of fencing and active security systems is described below, and these can be supplemented by landscape design, including the use of natural barriers where appropriate. This will need to be done in a way that does not create climbing aids and does not unduly increase the maintenance burden.</p>
	Natural fences, vegetation, living gardens & green walls to discourage access and vandalism	17	6	6	
	Fencing and security measures must blend in and respect local character	-	-	5	

Issue 2: Ways of discouraging vandalism and graffiti, including fencing, security measures and an arts and culture strategy to create a sense of ownership

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Community	Designate official graffiti areas/walls to promote local ownership of structures and discourage graffiti	14	8	-	The Community Engagement strategy and Arts and Culture strategy for each area help to promote community involvement and a sense of local ownership. Where the structures and landscapes we create attract strong local support there will be less temptation towards, and less tolerance of, anti-social behaviour. In urban and peri-urban areas, the development of vibrant, attractive places will help to discourage such behaviour.
	Develop strategies, including arts & culture with local communities	6	6	-	
	Local imaginary and street art with local schools	-	4	-	

Issue 2: Ways of discouraging vandalism and graffiti, including fencing, security measures and an arts and culture strategy to create a sense of ownership

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Safety and Security	Fencing and security measures to prevent vandalism are essential	15	-	-	The design of HS2 structures and the spaces around them will apply the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). As stated above, the noise barriers can form the secure enclosure to the railway, reducing the requirement for security fences, providing doing so does not create an attractive canvas for graffiti. As robust, carefully designed components of the infrastructure, CDEs will play their part in the network-wide strategy to minimise vandalism and graffiti
	Graffiti proof finishes & anti climb structures including concerns that plain concrete could encourage graffiti	-	12	2	
	CCTV essential	-	6	-	
	Fencing where only necessary, or no fencing, and not concrete	6	5	-	

Issue 3: Creating safe spaces and/or a sense of place under the viaducts – for example, through lighting, art and culture or community project

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Design of structure and materials	Create environmental open spaces with open walkways	-	-	4	<p>The CDEs provide a common thread which makes HS2's structures recognisable, and the CDE guidelines have been developed with a view to their inclusion into holistically considered designs. They do not dictate the form or proportions of a structure; this will be a response to the context.</p> <p>We will aim to create good quality spaces under bridges and viaducts which make a positive contribution to their surroundings. In urban areas this provides opportunity for generating attractive, active, well connected, vibrant city spaces. In rural or peri-urban areas a more sensitive approach is likely to be appropriate. The careful consideration of how the structure integrates with the landscape is paramount.</p> <p>The piers are the CDE with most impact on the spaces under the viaducts. Piers are the structural supports which hold up the viaducts, and the CDE guidelines describe a 'family' of pier types, allowing considerable flexibility - within the CDE framework - to vary the pier design. This flexibility will support the aims above.</p> <p>It is also possible that feature lighting, art and culture or community projects may enhance the spaces under viaducts. These opportunities will be developed location by location and do not fall into the CDE work.</p>
	Features blend in with rural setting	6	-	-	

Issue 3: Creating safe spaces and/or a sense of place under the viaducts – for example, through lighting, art and culture or community project

Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Landscape	Prioritise wildlife and habitat creation	9	-	-	<p>The design of the railway structures and of the landscape reinstatement must be considered holistically, and this will include consideration of spaces under bridges and viaducts, which have the potential to contribute to placemaking opportunities, habitat creation and wildlife corridors.</p>
	Landscaping, tree planting, grass, living walls	7	3	3	

Issue 3: Creating safe spaces and/or a sense of place under the viaducts – for example, through lighting, art and culture or community project					
Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Community	Art, performance spaces and local heritage paintings & involve schools	9	8	-	Well-designed spaces under viaducts and bridges will offer opportunities for community involvement, such as places to gather, playgrounds, community projects, local markets, art or performance spaces, or use of the spaces for local heritage or painting projects. The HS2 Green Corridor Initiative enables opportunities for public connectivity along the route to be improved by enhanced footpaths and cycleways that connect to the existing public rights of way network.
	Use spaces for play parks, public spaces, sports, businesses and places to meet	5	12	-	
	Not appealing places to use & not relevant in rural area	7	4	-	
	Enhance existing and create new footpaths, bridleways, cycle paths	5	3	-	

Issue 3: Creating safe spaces and/or a sense of place under the viaducts – for example, through lighting, art and culture or community project					
Theme	Top sub-issues raised ranked most important across all three settings	Number of responses based on setting			HS2 response
		Rural	Urban	Transport	
Safety and security	Lighting and CCTV for safety and security	19	6	3	CPTED principles are applied as part of a holistic approach which aims to create safe, attractive, usable spaces under the bridges and viaducts.
	Deter crime and rough sleeping	8	6	2	

Engagement headlines

The number of responses across the three issues and settings was fairly consistent, indicating that most people who responded answered all questions in the survey.

Issue 1: The appearance of the structure, including opportunities to add patterns and textures to create a sense of local identity

The design of the structure and materials used generated the most responses across all three settings, with the use of concrete in rural settings raising most concern. Rural setting responses were also highly concerned about using alternative materials to concrete and paint CDEs.

The landscape theme also ranked as most important in the rural setting, with references made to ensuring the CDEs blended into the existing landscape alongside requests to include planting close to the structures and create living walls.

For the community theme, the most popular sub-issue was to ensure local history and interest is considered. Urban and rural setting responses stated that local artists should be employed in CDEs design.

Issue 2: Ways of discouraging vandalism and graffiti, including fencing, security measures and an arts and culture strategy to create a sense of ownership

Ensuring CDEs include natural fences, vegetation, living gardens and green walls to discourage vandalism and graffiti were mentioned in most responses across all three settings relating to structures and materials, with blending into the existing landscape the most popular design theme in rural setting responses.

Within the community theme, the most popular idea across both rural and urban settings was designating official graffiti areas/walls to promote local ownership of structures and discourage graffiti, followed by the development of strategies, including arts and culture, with local communities.

The need for fencing and security measures to prevent vandalism was the most recorded safety issue for rural settings. In urban settings, respondents mentioned graffiti-proof finishes and anti-climb structures, including concerns that plain concrete could encourage graffiti.

Issue 3: Creating safe spaces and/or a sense of place under the viaducts

Security and safety proved the most important theme for the CDEs design to address in Issue 3, with lighting and CCTV featuring most across all 3 settings; particularly in the rural setting.

Community was the second most popular theme, with art, performance spaces and local heritage paintings mentioned, alongside involving schools and using spaces for play parks, public spaces, sports, businesses and places to meet. The latter was more important in an urban setting.

Keeping you informed

We are committed to keeping you informed about work on HS2. This includes ensuring you know what to expect and when to expect it, as well as how we can help.

The independent commissioners

We have an independent Residents' Commissioner whose job it is to make sure we keep to the promises we make in our Residents Charter.

Our independent Construction Commissioner's role is to mediate and monitor the way in which we manage and respond to construction complaints. For more information visit www.hs2.org.uk/in-your-area

Holding us to account

If you are unhappy for any reason, you can make a complaint by contacting our HS2 Helpdesk team. For more information visit www.hs2.org.uk/how-to-complain

Property and compensation

You can find out all about HS2 and properties along the line of route by visiting our website.

You can also find out if you're eligible for compensation. Visit www.hs2.org.uk/in-your-area/

Please contact us if you'd like a free copy of this document in large print, Braille, audio or easy read. You can also contact us for help and information in a different language.

HS2 Ltd is committed to protecting personal information. If you wish to know more about how we use your personal information please see our Privacy Notice (www.gov.uk/government/publications/high-speed-two-ltdprivacy-notice)

Contact us

Our HS2 Helpdesk team are available all day, every day. You can contact them via:

 Freephone
08081 434 434

 Minicom
08081 456 472

 Email
hs2enquiries@hs2.org.uk

Write to

**FREEPOST
HS2 Community Engagement**

Website **www.hs2.org.uk**

To keep up to date with what is happening in your area, visit:

www.hs2inyourarea.co.uk