

APPENDIX Q: OPTIONS FOR DEALING WITH HS2 SAFEGUARDING

Option A – do nothing

For	Against
Avoids need to identify another site (or sites) now.	If at a later date it is decided to retain the route which results in at least one of the three sites no longer being developable, then there would be shortfall in provision.
	In view of cut-off date of December 2026 for submitting the Local Plan for Examination there may not be time to identify a replacement site.
	Potential risk to plan, although unlikely to result in an unsound plan, but would require a modification and hence delay to adoption.

Option B – identify reserve site(s)

For	Against
Provides some certainty in the event that a site (or sites) is required.	Whichever site (or sites) are identified as reserve sites will generate objections and result in uncertainty for residents.
Represents positive planning.	Raises expectation of site promoter(s). Even if the route of HS2 is abandoned this may be an issue at a later date if the site promoter seeks planning permission and argue that the principal of development has already been accepted.

Option C – include a new enabling policy which sets out how the council would seek to address any shortfall in housing provision in the event that HS2 results in the sterilisation of one or more sites

For	Against
Would avoid the need to identify a site (or sites) now	Provides less certainty than option B (but more than option A).
Addresses the ‘how realistic is it that sites will need to be protected?’ issue	Too open as to which site(s) would be required