



HS2 London to the West Midlands Appraisal of Sustainability Erratum

The following are corrections to the document *HS2 London to the West Midlands Appraisal of Sustainability – Non Technical Summary*

Paragraph	
11.1.2, p27-28	<p>“...In terms of waste generated by the scheme, mostly during its construction, almost two million cubic metres of spoil would arise from tunnel excavation...”</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>“...In terms of waste generated by the scheme, mostly during its construction, almost three million cubic metres of spoil would arise from tunnel excavation...”</p>

The following are corrections to the document *HS2 London to the West Midlands Appraisal of Sustainability – Main Report Volume 1*

Paragraph	
8.10.18, p100	<p>“Where the line would come out of tunnel in Camden, it would connect to the existing North London Line for a small section of track between Camden and Kings Cross St Pancras station. It is assumed that three HS2 trains per day in each direction would run on this connection. The current service pattern for the section of track above ground is approximately 108 trains per day in each direction. The addition of three HS2 trains per day would have a negligible effect on daytime noise exposure LAeq,18hr from this section of line, and consequently no noise impacts are predicted.”</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>“Where the line would come out of tunnel in Camden, it would connect to the existing North London Line for a small section of track between Camden and Kings Cross St Pancras station. It is assumed that three HS2 trains per hour in each direction would run on this connection. The current service pattern for the section of track above ground is approximately 108 trains per day in each direction; this includes a number of freight trains. The addition of three HS2 trains per hour is not likely to have a significant effect on daytime noise exposure LAeq,18hr from this section of line, consequently no additional dwellings are expected to fall within the noise appraisal criteria.”</p>
8.18.1, p121	<p>“An estimated total of 1.8 million cubic metres of spoil would potentially be generated by tunnelling. This assumes that a balance is otherwise achieved on surface sections between cuttings and embankments”</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>“An estimated total of 2.9 million cubic metres of spoil would potentially be generated by tunnelling. This assumes that a balance is otherwise achieved on surface sections between cuttings and embankments”</p>
Figure 27, p85	<p>The figure shows the alignment between Amersham and Little Missenden as ‘At Grade’.</p>

cont.



	Should be shown as: 'Cutting'
--	--------------------------------------

The following are corrections to the document *HS2 London to the West Midlands Appraisal of Sustainability – Main Report Volume 2*. All corrections in the table below relate to *Section 9a The Present Value Benefits (PVB) for daytime operational-related residential noise*.

Paragraph	
p20, "Overall"	"Proposed Route with indicative additional mitigation: £41million... Proposed Route without additional mitigation: £220million" Should be replaced with: "Proposed Route with indicative additional mitigation: -£41million... Proposed Route without additional mitigation: -£220million "
p20, "Old Oak Common to West Ruislip"	"£8 million..." Should be replaced with: " -£8 million... "
p20, "West Ruislip to Aylesbury"	"£11.5 million..." Should be replaced with: " -£11.5 million... "
p20, "Aylesbury to Brackley (A421 crossing)"	"£3.5 million..." Should be replaced with: " -£3.5 million... "
p20, "Brackley (A421 crossing) to Kenilworth/ Coventry gap"	"£3 million..." Should be replaced with: " -£3 million... "
p20, "Kenilworth/ Coventry gap to Berkswell rail station"	"£1 million..." Should be replaced with: " -£1 million... "
p20, "Birmingham spur"	"£13 million..." Should be replaced with: " -£13 million... "
p20, "Middleton to West Coast Mainline (Lichfield)"	"£1.5 million..." Should be replaced with: " -£1.5 million... "



The following are corrections to the document *HS2 London to the West Midlands Appraisal of Sustainability – Main Report Volume 2*. All corrections in the table below relate to *Section 17a Prevent and Minimise waste production – Volumes of inert and non-hazardous waste spoil potentially requiring off-line disposal as a result of option*.

Paragraph	
17a, p34, "Overall"	<p>"Waste spoil generated = 1.83Mm³"</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>"Waste spoil generated = 2.93Mm³"</p>
17a, p34, "Tunnel from Euston to Old Oak Common"	<p>"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.75Mm³. Tunnel is twin bore, with an assumed diameter of 8.5m."</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.79Mm³. Tunnel is twin bore, with a diameter of 8.25m."</p>
17a, p34, "Connection to HS1"	<p>"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.37Mm³. Tunnel is single bore, with an assumed diameter of 8.5m."</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.35Mm³. Tunnel is single bore, with a diameter of 8.25m."</p>
17a, p34, "Old Oak Common to West Ruislip"	<p>"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.27Mm³. Tunnel is twin bore, with an assumed diameter of 8.5m."</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.09Mm³. Tunnel is twin bore, with a diameter of 8.25m."</p>
17a, p34, "West Ruislip to Aylesbury"	<p>"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.68Mm³. Tunnel is single bore, with an assumed diameter of 8.5m."</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>"There are two separate tunnel sections in this area, with a total combined volume of waste spoil generated = 1.51Mm³. The first tunnel is 9600m long, is twin bore, with an diameter of 9.7m. The second tunnel is 1260m long, is a single elliptical bore with a height of 16m and width of 10.8m.</p>
17a, p34, "Brackley (A421 crossing) to Kenilworth/Coventry gap"	<p>"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.11Mm³. Tunnel is single bore, with an assumed diameter of 8.5m."</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.20Mm³. Tunnel is twin bore, with a diameter of 11.2m."</p>



17a, p34, "Kenilworth/ Coventry gap to Berkswell rail station"	"Volume of waste spoil generated = 0.02Mm ³ . Tunnel is single bore, with an assumed diameter of 8.5m." Should be replaced with: " Negligible (no tunnels). "
---	---

The following are corrections to the document *HS2 London to the West Midlands Appraisal of Sustainability – Main Report Volume 2*.

Paragraph	
Maps 1-49 and Noise Maps 0-6, p37-133	"This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office." Should be replaced with: "This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office"
Maps 3,18,19,20,21 and 47, P 39, 56,57,58,59 and 87	"Princess Risborough" Should be replaced with: " Princes Risborough" These maps will be reissued separately
Maps 2,10,11,12,13 p3, 48-51	The alignment representing the HS1 connection as shown is incorrect. These maps will be reissued separately.
Maps 14-21, P52-59	The Heathrow Spur turnout 2 as shown is facing the wrong direction; it should be for trains going between Euston and Heathrow. These maps will be reissued separately.

The following are corrections to the document *HS2 London to the West Midlands Appraisal of Sustainability – Appendix 3 – Socio-economic Report*

Paragraph	
5.4.7, p53	"Northampton currently has three trains to London in the morning peak hour, and two trains to Birmingham International and Birmingham New Street. With HS2, there would be an additional path (non-stop) to London, and Birmingham International would still have two trains in the peak hour. However there would only be one train in the peak hour that serves Birmingham New Street, with a faster journey time and fewer stops. Should be replaced with: "Northampton currently has three trains to London in the morning peak hour, and two trains to Birmingham International and Birmingham New Street. With HS2, there would be an additional path (non-stop) to London, while both Birmingham International and Birmingham New Street would still have two trains in the peak hour. "
5.4.8, p53	"A reduced service to New Street may not be attractive for housing growth,



	<p>although there would remain two trains per hour to Birmingham International which may support the commercial developments in the vicinity of the NEC described above.”</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>“The additional path to London may be attractive for housing growth, and the continuation of the two trains per hour to Birmingham International may support the commercial developments in the vicinity of the NEC described above.”</p>
--	---

The following are corrections to the document *HS2 London to the West Midlands Appraisal of Sustainability – Appendix 5 – AoS Technical Reports*

Paragraph	
7.3.3, p52	<p>“The current service pattern for the section of track above ground is approximately 108 trains in each direction. The addition of three HS2 trains per day would have a negligible effect on daytime noise exposure LAeq,18hr from this section of line, and consequently no noise or vibration impacts are predicted using the aforementioned criteria.”</p> <p>Should be replaced with:</p> <p>“The current service pattern for the section of track above ground is approximately 108 trains in each direction; this includes a number of freight trains. The addition of three HS2 trains per hour is not likely to have a significant effect on daytime noise exposure LAeq,18hr from this section of line, and consequently no additional dwellings are expected to fall within the noise appraisal criteria.”</p>