To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr and Mrs Anthony R Cook

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill due to the low offer to purchase our property which is subject to compulsory purchase.

2. The petitioners are a married couple in their late 60's and reside at the property, 3 Hodgetts Lane, Burton Green, Kenilworth, CV8 1PH, and have lived at this address for 12 years. The property is a detached bungalow with garden to three sides, access on the forth, the property is of brick construction with tiled roof, it is fully double glazed with full cavity wall and roof insulation, the internal layout includes, off a central hallway, 3 large double bedrooms, family bathroom with shower, linen cupboard, a roof storage space with area of 14.48 M x 7.35 M with a timbered floor area of 14.48 M x 4.26 M and together with roof access ladder, a living/dining room of 7.35 M x 6.2 M and a kitchen dinner of 4.3 M x 3.5 M, off a fully double glazed passageway, a utility room, workshop, garage, the property has connections to all mains services. The bungalow was built for my father in law in 1966 due to my mother in laws ill health, and it was totally refurbished and extensively modernized and extended in 2004, at that time works also included full rewiring, plumbing and full gas central heating system, the property is south facing and has a wooded area and views over open farmland to the rear, which the Bill may "specially and directly affect".

3. a We are specially and directly affected by the Bill as our property is under a compulsory purchase order and the purchase price being offered by HS2 Ltd and their agents is under no circumstance adequate with respect to the properties actual unblighted market value. My wife and I acquired a private appraisal which was carried out by a local agent in November 2013 to obtain an idea of value for our property, the agent returned a figure of £430,000 at that time. In February 2015, prior to submitting the official HS2 FORM of CLAIM we obtained two more appraisals from two local estate agents who work specifically in our area and are fully conversant with the local property market, both agents returned a value of £450,000 and it was stated in both instances that the figures were given with a consideration to the fact that with the forthcoming situation with High Speed Rail this could affect values given. All these figures are available for inspection of documents we hold.

3. b We submitted application forms together with structural building plans to Warwick District Council in March 2015 in order to obtaining through Warwick District Council, two Certificates of Appropriate Alternative Development under the Land Compensation Act 1961 Section 17 as Substituted by Section 63 of the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 which are detailed as an item of specific consideration in HS2's standard Form of Claim, Section 11, Planning. We obtained two certificates, one to convert the existing bungalow with a dormer type roof giving two extra double bedrooms with en-suite, and a large study/office area, the other to demolish the existing property and replace with a five bed roomed dwelling. It has been confirmed to us by Warwick District Council that without the encumbrance of compulsory purchase, these two certificates would qualify as Planning Permission. Certificate numbers ref CAAD/15/0001 and CAAD/15/0002 respectively dated 29/04/2015.

3. c Hinson Parry and Company, who are our agent acting for us in the negotiations with HS2, submitted a value for our property to HS2 in August 2015 of £475,000 to £500,000. In order to value at this figure they have taken into consideration in the first instance, five comparable properties in the local area with established values ranging from £475,000 to £550,000 which were recorded over a period from October 2012 to April 2015. Secondly consideration has been given to the two CAAD's obtained.
3. d HS2 made their initial offer to Hinson Parry to purchase our property 03/08/2015 at a figure of £390,500. Following considerable negotiation by our agent HS2 intimated an offer of £450,000 in late 2015 which we would not consider or accept as we considered it to low. Following further attempted negotiations by our agent with HS2 which they did not respond to following repeated requests by our agent to continue discussions. On 22nd January 2016 some six weeks later our agent was informed by HS2’s agent of a revised and reduced offer down to £430,000 this without any discussion or consultation. We cannot understand or condone this situation as we consider it is not commercially acceptable under any circumstances.

3. e HS2’s latest offer to purchase our property at £430,000 is financially and unacceptably far below the true unblighted value. This offer will not allow us to duplicate that which we now own in this area with the facilities we presently have and we consider that the offer arrived at has been arrived at incorrectly. We therefore wish to summarize our method of arriving at our decision to petition the House of Lords select committee. We had a private appraisal in November 2013 valued at £430,000, that being some 28 months ago. Two further appraisals requested February 2015 both at £450,000, these two values were submitted to us without consideration of the two CAAD’s obtained. Following the acquisition of two CAAD’s, the submission of the valuation to HS2 by our official agent Hinson Parry in August 2015 of £475,000 to £500.00 did consider the CAAD’s, plus it has been some eight months since this matter was put into action and since that time property prices have increased considerably, we therefore consider any increases should be equated into the present true unblighted property price.

4. We humbly request the committee take into consideration the information we have put before them, together with the fact that property prices have increased in the 8 month period that this matter has been in operation and instruct HS2 Ltd to give a realistic full market value for our property which we now consider to be in excess of £500,000.

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that we, or someone representing us in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

The petitioners remain hopeful that the Select Committee will consider a true and realistic value for our property that will allow us to obtain a future home and replacement property comparable to that we now own and in which we live.

Signatures

Mr Anthony R Cook

Mrs Carol Cook

Date 23/03/2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  
PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF PATRICIA & TIMOTHY TAYLOR  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioners are Patricia & Timothy Taylor. We own the freehold of Hammonds Hall Farm & Thistledown Barn, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LT.  

Both properties are held under one title and sit within 10 acres. We converted an agricultural building in 2001 (Thistledown Barn) which is let out on an AST which provides your Petitioners with essential income.  

The Promoters require nearly 40% of your Petitioners property for the construction of the Scheme and have confirmed that they are to acquire us ‘as if by CPO’. This commitment was read out by Tim Mould on 2nd November 2015 to the HS2 House of Commons Select Committee in a joint statement agreed between your Petitioners and the Promoter.  

Your Petitioners will be specially and directly affected, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners live in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which will be directly and adversely affected. Your Petitioners rights, interests and property are materially and injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

i) Chilterns AONB: Your Petitioners are concerned that the Chilterns AONB will be irrevocably damaged.  

ii) AP4: Your Petitioners are concerned that AP4 makes provision for a haul road across our land.  

This will cause increased pollutants, noise, dust etc during construction, together with the increased permanent land take for our property.  

With AP4 included as part of the Scheme you Petitioners will experience even greater material detriment to their property and wellbeing.  

iii) Haul Road Alongside Leather Lane: Your Petitioners are very concerned about a possible haul road which may run alongside Leather Lane.
In the HS2 House of Commons Select Committee final report the Promoter and the County Council were requested by the Committee to find a workable solution which might involve relocating a haul road from near the north tunnel portal further north to near Leather Lane.

The suggestion is that the haul road will be built by the County Council but that it will be funded by the Promoter.

If the County Council & the Promoter agree that this arrangement is workable, it will technically fall outside of the remit of the Scheme.

It will, therefore, bypass the need for the Promoter to give your Petitioners the opportunity to object as it will not be an 'Additional Provision' under the Scheme.

Your Petitioners are very concerned about the possible impact this arrangement will have on their rights and interests due to the increased material adverse impact such a haul road running down alongside Leather Lane to the A413 would have on their property.

Your Petitioners request, therefore, that if such an arrangement is agreed between the County Council (or any Body acting on its behalf) and the Promoter, that the Promoter gives your Petitioners a legally binding written undertaking that their rights will be fully protected and compensated for as if the haul road had been constructed by the Promoter under the Scheme.

Your Petitioners further request that the legally binding written undertaking should also state that if the haul road is deemed to have an increased adverse material impact on the value of your Petitioners property the Promoter will not seek to reduce the level of compensation payable to your Petitioners by claiming that the haul road impact is not related to the Scheme and that your Petitioners should seek compensation for its impact separately from the County Council.

iv) **Punitive Term - Unresolved Issue from HS2 House of Commons Select Committee:** At the House of Commons Select Committee on 2nd November 2015, HS2 made a commitment in the form of a Joint Statement read out in Parliament by Tim Mould QC to acquire your Petitioners property as if by CPO and the Promoter also stated that agreement on Heads of Terms could be achieved by 18th December 2015.

This deadline was missed, and your Petitioners appeared before the HS2 House of Commons Select Committee again on 20th January 2016. Your Petitioners were told that if matters were not resolved, and we felt we had not been treated fairly we could return to the Committee before it folded.

Unfortunately, your Petitioners were unable to return before the Committee folded and we are very dissatisfied with the Promoter seeking to impose an unfair, punitive term into the agreement to acquire our property.
Furthermore, over the last six months negotiations with the Promoter have not proceeded in an acceptable timeframe and, in particular, have not been conducted by HS2's Agent – Steven McLaughlin of Carter Jonas, in an acceptable manner.

Whilst the Promoter has clearly made a written commitment in Parliament that your Petitioners are to be acquired ‘as if by CPO’ the DfT has persisted in attempting to pick and choose which parts of the compensation code it wishes to apply.

The code does not work that way, and they have no legal right to do this when we are being acquired ‘as if by CPO’.

Being acquired ‘as if by CPO’ gives us rights set out in statute entitling us to full and fair compensation. This was confirmed to us by Tim Mould QC outside the House of Commons Select Committee room on 20th January 2016, where he confirmed to us that there would be ‘no punitive terms’.

Despite this a punitive term, requiring us to have a deduction equivalent to six months rental income from Thistledown Barn made from our final compensation, was re-introduced by the DfT to our Heads of Terms in February,

The DfT’s attempt to penalise us by reducing our compensation demonstrates their tick box mentality and inability to do the right thing. How can it be full and fair compensation if we are effectively charged for losing our home?

The compensation code states that we should be put back in the same position, not left worse off.

To resolve this outstanding issue the DfT needs to confirm in writing to your Petitioners that it does not require a deduction from your Petitioners compensation of a sum equivalent to six months rental income on Thistledown Barn.

v) Unintended Tax Liabilities – Outstanding issue from House of Commons: As a consequence of the Promoter acquiring your Petitioners property there may be unforeseen tax liabilities which arise as a direct result of the Scheme.

The NFU raised concerns about unintended tax liabilities for landowners as a result of the Scheme when petitioning the HS2 House of Commons Select Committee and the Committee referred this matter to HMRC.

However, as far as your Petitioner is aware, this matter appears to remain unresolved with no formal response from HMRC yet forthcoming.

This Bill should not be passed without specifically setting out that your
Petitioners should not have to suffer any unintended consequences of any additional or premature tax liability (either current or future) incurred as a direct result of the Scheme, or arising from the actions or omissions of the Promoter or any of the Promoters employees or Agents.

In the event that HMRC is unable or unwilling to grant an exception, or create a special circumstances rule, or defer liability for a period whereby liability would have normally fallen due for payment by your Petitioners, then the Promoter should be legally obliged to pay any such tax liability triggered by the Scheme (together with any associated costs) direct to HMRC on behalf of your Petitioners.

The only remedy for all of your Petitioners objections is a fully bored tunnel throughout the whole of the Chilterns AONB

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Patricia Taylor

Timothy Taylor

Date: 24TH MARCH 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF C. Rupert R. Sweeting

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-3, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is a resident of Chetwode and lives at Chetwode Manor, Chetwode, Buckingham, MK18 488 ("your petitioner's property"). The proposed route for HS2 runs through the middle of Chetwode. Your petitioner's property is accessed by roads that will be used during construction. Your petitioner uses the The Green and School End daily when commuting to and from work and to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. The Green is scheduled to be diverted during construction. School End and the School End Overbridge are scheduled to be diverted and to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner also regularly uses the footpaths through Chetwode that will be diverted under the scheme. Your petitioner is likely to suffer inconvenience from the closure and diversion of roads and footpaths, and from the additional and diverted traffic on the routes that remain open.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Your petitioner favours a cut and cover ("Green") tunnel banked and landscaped over the top, starting to the south of the village of Chetwode and continuing through the high ground past Manthorne Farm, the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode village and School End to avoid the many injurious effects in the parish of Chetwode.

As part of the family that farm Chetwode Manor Farm, a "cut and cover tunnel" will help movement of agricultural machinery – the proposed HS2 line divides the farm in two making for a less economic unit.

The residents of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their local MP, the Church of England, Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council in petitioning for such a change to the construction of the scheme, and would respectfully point out that a tunnel on the alignment proposed by the Promoter would relieve many of the injuries to residents of Chetwode, the Conservation Area, the Grade I listed Church and the local environment identified in the Environmental Statement. Accordingly, your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the railway will be placed in a cut and cover tunnel to minimise the local environmental impact, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and
The proposed railway will pose a major severance issue for wildlife due to the long stretch of cutting, but also due to the security fencing that will be installed along most of the planned route. The Chetwode cut and cover Tunnel proposed by your petitioner would provide some relief to this by allowing the migration of local resident species.

Chetwode is a very tranquil parish. High noise levels from the operation of HS2 are predicted for a high percentage of residential properties in Chetwode after the mitigation currently proposed by the Promoter. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the noise impacts. Chetwode is predicted to experience in-combination effects of significant visual and noise effects which, it is stated in the Environmental Statement, would have a major adverse effect. Current proposed mitigation of earthworks and noise barriers along just one side of the track is not sufficient. The Promoter should undertake further mitigation in the form of a cut and cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top. A cut and cover tunnel would be consistent with numerous Government statements of intent to minimize impact on communities and the environment.

The Environmental Statement predicts that the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Nicholas in Chetwode will have its setting permanently changed by the movement of trains and the associated increase in noise. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the impacts to the Church and its setting. Without more effective mitigation for both the Church and its officers, a substantial endowment will be needed to safeguard the future of this internationally important Church.

Your petitioner is concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on the single track country lanes currently proposed as a construction route. These lanes are not suitable for HGVs and are popular with dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There are no passing places and it is unsafe to take large amounts of construction traffic past the homes at School End where children live and play. Your petitioner regularly uses these roads and therefore will be directly affected by these issues. Your petitioner requests that School End is not used by HGVs at any time in order to decrease the negative impacts of construction. Your petitioners suggest that an alternative temporary construction route for HGVs is created along the trace of HS2. During construction, the nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the roads in Chetwode parish, and after construction, the roads must be returned to their original size and character (no road widening, curb stones or urbanization of this rural parish), and all damage must be repaired by the nominated undertaker.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed new Overbridges carrying public roads over HS2 at The Green and School End, which will be clearly visible from rights of way and residential properties in Chetwode, and which introduce new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Plus the noise of the trains could be a hazard for people riding or leading horses across the proposed Overbridges, due to the high sound level and its rapid onset. Your petitioner requests that, in order to minimise the impact of the proposal, the design of the scheme should be produced with meaningful consultation with the local community, to fit in with the surrounding environment and character of the area, using materials that mirror local buildings and materials. Additional screening must also be put in place and this must be maintained to a high standard.

Your petitioner has set out in the preceding paragraphs just some of the harms that
would befall residents, land owners, businesses, visitors, and the environment were the scheme to be constructed as proposed currently by the Promoter. These harms would be alleviated by constructing the entire section as a cut-and-cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top to prevent the requirement of lowering the route.

There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

C. Rupert R. Sweeting

04/04/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  
PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  
THE PETITION OF Eveline Carn  
Declares that:  
1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  
2. Your petitioner  
The petitioner is the owner of 4 Park Village East NW1 7PX which is situated along the HS2 route close to Euston station.  
3. Your petitioner’s concerns  
Park Village East is a quiet, one way, 20 mph residential street. From next year 24/7 construction will be taking place within a few metres of our property. Constant night time and weekend working at high decibel levels is anticipated. This will go on for years – possibly beyond 2033 by which time I will be 75.  
The street will be closed for at least five years meaning we will be unable to access our house by car. It’s unclear how emergency services will gain access and our insurers have indicated that they may be unwilling to provide cover.  
I am asking to be rehoused during the peak period of construction and to be eligible for the express purchase scheme as are people in other areas who are equally [or in many cases, less] affected.  
I recognise that the HS2 project is considered to serve a greater public good but the principle of fairness dictates that those who benefit should compensate the losers.  
I would also like to draw their Lordships attention to the Need to Sell scheme which in theory provides an escape route for people who need to move and are unable to sell their houses. The reality is different.  
We have had our house on the market since January 2015. We have applied twice under the NTS in the first case citing the need to raise funds for retirement and in the second relocation due to work.  
Our first application under the NTS was rejected on the basis that we had not demonstrated to their satisfaction that we could not afford to maintain the house.  
Our second application cited an offer my husband received of a job in the US. This was rejected on the basis that the “decision maker was not satisfied that an individual’s acceptance of a job offer, even internationally, is dependent on the sale of their property”.
In the light of the scale of the construction and the length of time it will take I would like you to consider what are reasonable requests.

4. The prayer

Eveline Carn therefore asks the House of Lords that she, or someone representing her in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Eveline Carn

2nd April 2016.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-2016  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London to West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION of Anthony Robert Massingham  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner asserts possession of intellectual property shared with Mr Dobble and Roll A Parliamentary Agent as a consequence of a Notice of Objection to the petitioner's locus standi to the City of London Corporation (Open Spaces) Bill  

3. For the avoidance of doubt, the petitioner and the promoters of the City of London Corporation (Open Spaces) Bill relies upon Mr Secretary McLoughlin in which requiring the Court of Referees sitting for the locus standi before the private bill office of the House of Commons be heard simultaneously with the Court of Referees of the private bill office of the House of Commons be heard simultaneously with the alternative high speed rail between Camden Town - North Pole - Northolt junction - Dapped Bridge - Bathwell - Birmingham Airport and beyond
4. The Heathrow Express depot required to be relocated from Old Oak Common for the Elizabeth Line depot be located between Heathrow Terminals 5 and the M25.

5. The petitioners envisages HS2 Ltd route being safeguarded awaiting real passengers and freight flows.

6. The petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that he or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petition remains etc.

ANTHONY ROBERT MASSINGHAM

24th March 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Ronald Drackford

Declares that:

1. The petitioner* is* specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioner currently lives at 3 Witchell, Wendover which is 300m from the proposed line. He has lived there since December 2011. Before that he lived at Dunsmore Edge, London Road which is 350m from the proposed HS2 line. Both his previous residence and his current residence is specially and directly impacted by the proposed bill

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

   In his current residence your petitioner is concerned that the visual blight caused by the 6m high noise barriers on top of an embankment will be a huge visual intrusion to both Wendover and the AONB.

   Your petitioner is concerned that with the construction workforce moving into the area the strain on the local health centre will be extreme. Given your petitioner’s ill health and chronic illness this is a major concern.

   In addition with the forecast levels of HGV’s on the road particularly between Wendover and Stoke Mandeville Hospital – the local A&E department, your petitioner who has had to use these services in the past feels at heightened risk.

   Your petitioner moved from his previous residence which is located outside Wendover to be close to facilities, to have a manageable house given his chronic condition (COPD) and to be able to use a mobility scooter. His property was blighted by the announcement of HS2. The failure of his two applications to the HS2 Exceptional Hardship scheme because his condition was not life threatening but chronically disabling along with the gratuitous advice to move downstairs. Your petitioner consequently due to the failure of HS2 had to deeply discount his house in order to sell to address his property Your petitioner is concerned about the following areas:

   - The promoters have ignored the Commons select committee support of his petition
   - The exception process to handle petitioners who had had to sell their house was not properly communicated
- That the Secretary of State for Transport was the final arbiter in this exception process was essentially conflicted
- The Secretary of State for Transport relied on the flawed results of the Exceptional Hardship Scheme which rejected the petitioner twice and has subsequently been scraped as it was not fit for purpose
- HS2 Ltd have recognised the properties in the area are blighted by purchasing neighbouring properties along the London Road.

**Mitigation**

Your petitioner would like justice and compensation for the discount he had to take on the property to sell it as a direct result of the HS2 Project.

Your petitioner would like a fully bored tunnel through the whole of the AONB bored one way from the south.

Your petitioner would like the promoter to properly fund the Wendover health centre during the construction period.

Your petitioner would like an air ambulance funded for this air during construction if there are to be any significant traffic issues.

4. **The prayer**

The petitioner* therefore asks the House of Lords that he*, or someone representing him* in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner* remains, etc.

Signed by  

Name  

[add the date here]
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Brian Thompson  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner currently lives at Ivy Cottage Halton. While your petitioner’s residence is over 2km away from the proposed HS2 route he is directly impacted on a number of fronts. Specifically all facilities and services used by residents of Halton are mostly located in Wendover, such as health centre, dentist, shops, travel facilities. Any deterioration to these services during construction will have a direct impact on the petitioner. In addition roads such as the A413 are used on a daily basis and traffic delays due to HS2 will impact the petitioner directly. Most directly he is impacted by the risk to Wendover Arm Canal drying up being caused by HS2 which is only 100m from his residence.  

Indirectly the visual blight around Wendover of an Israeli Gaza height wall of 6m will be very obvious, as will the impact on the Chiltern AONB.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

Your petitioner is concerned that with the construction workforce moving into the area will place a strain on the local health centre which will be severe.  

In addition with the forecast levels of HS2 HGV’s on the roads particularly between Wendover and Stoke Mandeville Hospital – the local A&E department, your petitioner is concerned that these traffic delays will cause loss of life and put a risk on people living in the area.  

The hydrogeology of the aquifers which feed the Wendover Arm Canal and Weston Turville SSSI site will be put at risk of drying up by the proposed works by HS2. Your petitioner fears that the Kildare project in Ireland which also ignored/underplayed the hydrogeological risks until into design phase resulted in project delays and overspends and this will happen with the HS2 project. Of concerns that the water quality required in the SSSI site will require any piped water to have a settlement pond to allow fines to clear. This is not in the current plans. The concern is that although HS2 Ltd have offered an assurance to the Environmental Agency by the time the true nature and size of the problem are identified there will be pressure by the promoter/treasury/contractors to shortcut the process and not carry out proper mitigation.
Your petitioner is concerned that the visual blight caused by the 6m high noise barriers on top of an embankment will be a huge visual intrusion to both Wendover and the AONB.

Your petitioner is concerned that HS2 Ltd. are proposing to change two 50m standard pylons for two 63m high pylons. Your petitioner does not understand why when the noise barriers proposed by HS2 Ltd drew from 4m to 6m an increase of 2m the pylons had to grow 13m!

Your petitioner is concerned that the local communities in the area do not get any benefit from the HS2 project. They, like everyone else in England will be paying for this through their taxes. However they are paying twice over with construction disruption, operational intrusion and localise property blight.

**Mitigation**

Your petitioner would like a fully bored tunnel such as T3i through the whole of the AONB bored one way from the south. This would solve the visual blight, the pylon issues, hydrogeology problems and construction impacts.

Your petitioner believes the hydrogeological issues and risks are mitigated by a bored tunnel which goes under the aquifer. If this is not possible then your petitioner would like HS2 ltd/DfT to provide a legal undertaking that proper mitigation for the supply of water and quality of water to the Wendover Arm canal and Weston Turville SSSI site will be undertaken.

If the tunnel is not possible your petitioner believes the national grid electricity lines should be buried where they are being moved. At a minimum the line should be buried between the two standard pylons rather than having an even higher beacon to HS2 of 63m.

Your petitioner would like the local health centre to be properly funded with adequate staff and doctors to provide a similar level of service before the HS2 project.

Your petitioner would like an air ambulance funded for this area during construction if there are to be any significant traffic issues between Halton, Wendover and Stoke Mandeville A&E- High Wycombe(in heart cases).

Your petitioner believes a properly funded community fund for each CFA area which is administered by the local communities and is easily accessible to them is needed. The fund needs to be seen to local rather than administered by bureaucrats along way from the line and angst who does not understand the impact this project is having.
4. *The prayer*

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he*, or someone representing him* in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Signed by ______________________________

Name       Brian Thompson
Date:      

To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Edward McMahon  
Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. The Petitioner resides and runs his business from Horsley Brook Farm, Lichfield, Staffs which consists of 169 acres. The sole use of Horsley Brook Farm is for the training of racehorses. HS2 have safeguarded 40% of Horsley Brook Farm. Due to the scale and nature of land take together with close proximity to the line, this will render the property unusable for the existing business which has been acknowledged by HS2.

3. As at the date of this petition HS2 are reluctant to proceed with the purchase of the land which has been safeguarded, despite a blight notice being served and accepted. HS2 have delayed the purchase of the land identified for ecological mitigation due to the indecision on whether the ground is required or not. This indecision could lead to an untimely delay of up to 18 months. As the land is separated from the main body of the farm by the railway the petitioner will have no use for the land. In order for the petitioner to move forward with future plans he therefore asks that the land identified for ecological mitigation is either purchased by HS2 or released from being safeguarded in the Bill in order that the petitioner can sell the ground to a third party.

On the land the petitioner wishes to retain there is excessive planting, which HS2 has acknowledged is for the purpose of screening for the benefit of the landowner. This layout and scale of planting has a disproportionate effect on the remaining land. This section of the proposed line is in a deep cutting so will not be visible. The petitioner therefore asks for the excessive additional planting to be removed from the scheme and hedgerow planting to be continued on from neighbouring land.
HS2 has suggested that these issues can be dealt with within the ‘farmers pack’ which are due to be distributed sometime this year. The petitioner has however no knowledge of how the farmers pack operates and whether they can help these issues to be achieved or agreed. As some other planting has already been removed from his property there is no reason why an assurance cannot be made immediately.

The petitioners business has suffered a decline during the last 18 months due to the ever nearing HS2 build. This decline cannot be sustained for much longer. Business compensation negotiations with HS2 have commenced, however exceedingly slow and laborious. Business and personal plans have already had to be either postponed or abandoned entirely over the last 6 years, so he asks that the negotiations are swiftly concluded so as not to cause any more financial hardship and uncertainty for the petitioner.

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains etc.

Edward McMahon
Dated: 30th March 2016.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Drs Catherine and Rupert Oliver

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner Drs Catherine and Rupert Oliver, 21 Manor Park Road N2 0SN

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

THE HUMBLE PETITION of Catherine and Rupert Oliver

SHEWETH as follows:-

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced and is now pending in your honourable House intituled “A Bill to make provision for a railway between Euston in London and a junction with the West Coast Main Line at Handsacre in Staffordshire, with a spur from Old Oak Common in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham to a junction with the Channel Tunnel Rail Link at York Way in the London Borough of Islington and a spur from Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes.”

2. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLaughlin, supported by The Prime Minister, The Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, Secretary Theresa May, Secretary Vince Cable, Secretary Iain Duncan Smith, Secretary Eric Pickles, Secretary Owen Paterson, Secretary Edward Davey, and Mr Robert Goodwill.
3. Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway mentioned in paragraph 1 above. They include provision for the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, the compulsory acquisition of land and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. They include clauses which would disapply and modify various enactments relating to special categories of land including burial grounds, consecrated land, commons and open spaces, and other matters, including overhead lines, water, building regulations and party walls, street works and the use of lorries.

4. Clauses 37 to 42 of the Bill deal with the regulatory regime for the railway.

5. Clauses 43 to 65 of the Bill set out a number of miscellaneous and general provisions, including provision for the appointment of a nominated undertaker (“the Nominated Undertaker”) to exercise the powers under the Bill, transfer schemes, provisions relating to statutory undertakers and the Crown, provision about the compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration, reinstatement works and provision about further high speed railway works. Provision is also made about the application of Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.

6. The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill (“the Authorised Works”) are specified in clauses 1 and 2 of and Schedule 1 to the Bill. They consist of scheduled works, which are described in Schedule 1 to the Bill and other works, which are described in clause 2 of the Bill and also in Additional Provision 3.

7. Your Petitioner is Dr Catherine Oliver, a general practitioner with two very young children. She and her husband, Rupert, were until September 2015 the owners of the Basement Flat, 98 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8HX.

8. Your Petitioner, who wished to move to larger accommodation, put her flat on the market at £650,000 in April 2014. This price reflected their awareness that the flat’s value was likely to have been depressed by HS2’s scheme. Despite many viewings, only one offer was received. Feedback from estate agents confirmed that knowledge of HS2’s scheme put off all prospective buyers of the flat. The one offer received, from Tilly Black at £660,000, fell through after HS2’s plans had come to the attention of the buyer.
9. Your Petitioner, having taken her flat off the market in November, put it back on the market in January 2015. Again, there were many viewings but no offers, except one at the clearly blighted price of £620,000, by Mr Seebohm and Ms Skilakos, on 8 April; subsequently raised to £635,000.

10. Your Petitioner therefore applied to the Government’s Need to Sell Scheme on 17 February 2015. She was expecting a second baby, due in April, and was suffering from severe depression. The Olivers were keen to move as soon as possible to a house in East Finchley. On 24 April the Department for Transport accepted the Olivers’ application. In May two independent assessors, Capita and Carter Jonas, put an unblighted value of £680,000 on the flat. The Olivers accepted the DfT’s offer at this price and informed Mr Seebohm and Ms Skilakos that the flat was no longer for sale. They instructed solicitors to expedite the sale to HS2.

11. Despite the urgency of the Olivers’ need to move, the Department for Transport was extremely slow in progressing the purchase of the flat. The DfT only made a formal offer for the flat on 20 May and even this required confirmation by a DfT ‘Decision Maker’ on 8 July.

12. In the meantime, on 30 June, the Olivers had received a renewed but lower offer of £645,000 from Tilly Black, who had viewed the flat the previous autumn. This offer was at a blighted price, but for the Olivers represented a fall-back position for if the DfT failed to complete its purchase.

13. HS2 having been informed of her offer, by Tilly Black, withdrew its own offer to buy the flat on 25 August. The flat was subsequently sold to Tilly Black for £645,000.

14. A letter from Simon Kirby of HS2, dated 24 September 2015, stated:

the requirement that all reasonable efforts should have been made to sell a property and that, despite those efforts, no offers have been received within 15% of its realistic un-blighted asking price, helps to demonstrate any effect of HS2. We would not expect applicants to accept the blighted value of the property (i.e., the amount that the property is worth following the HS2 announcement).
15. Your Petitioner submits that this statement is self-contradictory. There was and is clearly a blight on property in Gloucester Avenue, but it is less than the 15% cited by HS2. If, as HS2’s letter states, “We do not expect applicants to accept the blighted value of the property”, any offer substantially less than the value independently assessed is a blighted price. It is unreasonable and unjust that your Petitioners should have been forced to accept a blighted price.

16. Your Petitioner asks you to compensate them for their undeserved loss of £35,000.

17. Your Petitioner draws your Honourable House’s attention to the defects of and restrictions imposed by the Need to Sell Scheme, which fails to provide appropriate mitigation for the clear property blight caused by HS2’s scheme in Camden. Although they themselves initially qualified under the Need to Sell Scheme, on medical grounds, your Petitioner see no reason why all property blight in Camden should not be recognised by HS2 and fully compensated.

YOUR PETITIONER THEREFORE HUMBLY PRAYS your Honourable House that the Bill may not be allowed to pass into law as it now stands and that they may be heard by their Counsel, Agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against such of the clauses and provisions of the Bill as affect the property, rights and interests of your Petitioner and in support of such other clauses and provisions as may be necessary or expedient for their protection, or that such other relief may be given to your Petitioner in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioner will ever pray, &c

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.
AND the petitioner* remains, etc.

Your Signature

Your name in capital letters

The date
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Neil and Lindsey Graham

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-3, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is a resident of Chetwode and lives at Old School House, School End, Chetwode, MK18 4LA (“your petitioner’s property”). The proposed route for HS2 runs through the middle of Chetwode. Your petitioner’s property is accessed by roads that will be used during construction. Your petitioner uses The Green and School End daily when commuting to and from work and to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. The Green is scheduled to be diverted during construction. School End and the School End Overbridge are scheduled to be diverted and to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner also regularly uses the footpaths through Chetwode that will be diverted under the scheme. Your petitioner is likely to suffer severe inconvenience from the closure and diversion of roads and footpaths, and from the additional and diverted traffic on the routes that remain open.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioner favours a cut and cover (“Green”) tunnel banked and landscaped over the top, starting to the south of the village of Chetwode and continuing through the high ground past Manthorne Farm, the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode village and School End to avoid the many injurious effects in the parish of Chetwode.

The residents of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their local MP, the Church of England, Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council in petitioning for such a change to the construction of the scheme, and would respectfully point out that a tunnel on the alignment proposed by the Promoter would relieve many of the injuries to residents of Chetwode, the Conservation Area, the Grade I listed Church and the local environment identified in the Environmental Statement. Accordingly, your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the railway will be placed in a cut and cover tunnel to minimise the local environmental impact, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and Sections will be amended accordingly.

The proposed railway will pose a major severance issue for wildlife due to the long stretch of cutting, but also due to the security fencing that will be installed along most of
the planned route. The Chetwode cut and cover Tunnel proposed by your petitioner would provide some relief to this by allowing the migration of local resident species.

Chetwode is a very tranquil parish. High noise levels from the operation of HS2 are predicted for a high percentage of residential properties in Chetwode even after the mitigation currently proposed by the Promoter. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the noise impacts. Chetwode is predicted to experience in-combination effects of significant visual and noise effects which, it is stated in the Environmental Statement, would have a major adverse effect. Current proposed mitigation of earthworks and noise barriers along just one side of the track is not sufficient. The Promoter should undertake further mitigation in the form of a cut and cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top. A cut and cover tunnel would be consistent with numerous Government statements of intent to minimize impact on communities and the environment.

The Environmental Statement predicts that the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Nicholas in Chetwode will have its setting permanently changed by the movement of trains and the associated increase in noise. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the impacts to the Church and its setting. Without more effective mitigation for both the Church and its officers, a substantial endowment will be needed to safeguard the future of this internationally important Church.

Your petitioner is concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on the single track country lanes currently proposed as a construction route. These lanes are not suitable for HGVs and are popular with dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There are no passing places and it is very unsafe to take large amounts of construction traffic past the homes at School End where children live and play. Your petitioner regularly uses these roads and therefore will be directly affected by these issues. Your petitioner requests that School End is not used by HGVs at any time in order to decrease the negative impacts of construction. Your petitioners suggest that an alternative temporary construction route for HGVs is created along the trace of HS2. During construction, the nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the roads in Chetwode parish, and after construction, the roads must be returned to their original size and character (no road widening, curb stones or urbanization of this rural parish), and all damage must be repaired by the nominated undertaker.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed new Overbridges carrying public roads over HS2 at The Green and School End, which will be clearly visible from rights of way and residential properties in Chetwode, and which introduce new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Plus the noise of the trains could be a hazard for people riding or leading horses across the proposed Overbridges, due to the high sound level and its rapid onset. Your petitioner requests that, in order to minimise the impact of the proposal, the design of the scheme should be produced with meaningful consultation with the local community, to fit in with the surrounding environment and character of the area, using materials that mirror local buildings and materials. Additional screening must also be put in place and this must be maintained to a high standard.

Your petitioner has set out in the preceding paragraphs just some of the harms that would befall residents, land owners, businesses, visitors, and the environment were the scheme to be constructed as proposed currently by the Promoter. These harms would be alleviated by constructing the entire section as a cut-and-cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top to prevent the requirement of lowering the route.
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Neil and Lindsey Graham

31/03/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr and Mrs R Edwards

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioners are Mr Robert Edwards and Mrs Patricia Edwards of 3/3a Furzen Hill Cottages, Cubbington Heath, Royal Leamington Spa, Warwickshire CV32 6QZ

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

   Our petition is due to our dwelling and Falconry business which are necessarily next to each other, being terminally affected by the HS2 line running approx 170 metres from our properties, and directly through the flying land opposite our property which HS2 Ltd have already conceded, form a licence or lease from the farmer for over 16 years, and the land directly behind our falconry business is being used as a major materials stockpile, i.e. an earth storage dump for all the earth dug out for cuttings for miles around. This disturbed soil contains dormant viral aspergillosis spores, which when disturbed, become active, and when airborne, will kill birds of prey within weeks or months of contact. We are also an "islanded Property" surrounded completely by HS2 Ltd’s Safeguarded zone.

   We petition to be purchased outright with compensation on all aspects of our claim!

4. The prayer

   The petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Mr. R. Edwards  Mrs. P. Edwards
4/04/16  4/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr. and Mrs. Peter Garner

Declares that:
1. The petitioners ('Your Petitioners') are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioners are Peter and Pamela Mary Garner of Hawthorn Farm The Lee Great Missenden Bucks. HP16 9NA, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners live in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioners, are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioners' concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioners as residents of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioners contend that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioners are also seriously concerned about the disruptions to our household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioners need to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. We have grandchildren who we look after daily during the week and need to get to on a regular basis at regular times. Your petitioners further regard this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioners request that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioners accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioners request that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented.
a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be
reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioners further request that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioners request that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of
controlled and that air quality is maintained

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that your petitioners, or someone representing your petitioners in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Peter Garner

Pamela Mary Garner

3/4/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF SUSAN MARY JEPSON

Declares that:
1. The petitioner ('Your Petitioner') is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner is Susan Mary Jepson, resident at 5 Martindell Cottages, Ballinger Road, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9LA, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, of the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T31 proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at
Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wildlife access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred.
in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of
dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

Your petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Anthony Michael Jepson - Agent

Dated 5th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF ROBERT JONES-OWEN, HENRY GARDNER, BERYL UPTON,  
P CORCORAN, E WALSH, M WALSH, B WALSH, M WALSH, C LEE, T RAHMAN,  
S JONES-OWEN, H MELLOR, P MILES, E MILES, P WILLIAMS, P WILLIAMS,  
J HATTON, J FOWKE, S M ILOTT, E E ILOTT, P LEE, R H LEE, R KEEPING, P PLATONOS,  
A IWANCFUK, J PLATONOS, D M ASHWORTH, P J ASHWORTH, A BATTEN,  
B A HAMILTON, R HAMILTON, B J MALHERBE, R J MALHERBE, J DONOVAN,  
D DONOVAN, S H HENRY, J A HENRY, M K YORE, G P YORE, K JEFFS, A FOWKE,  
C J HATTON, E LYGO, M SILK, D HONERON, M PARFORD, A PARFORD, M EMERY,  
R EMERY, D BAKER, G BAKER, G HODT, B HODT, J C MELLOR, S IRVING, A BAILEY, P  
BAILEY, T DELL, J DELL, C MILLER, J MILLER, M A DUNN, M DUNN,  
P WELLS, S W WELLS, J ALONSO, E SPELLER, S SIMKINS, I SIMKINS  

 Declares that:  

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.  

2. Your petitioners are the owners of residential properties located in Hoylake Crescent, Pynchester Close and Bushey Road in the London Borough of Hillingdon.  

3. Your Petitioners allege that they are specially and directly affected by the Bill and their property, rights and interests would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in their present form and they accordingly object to the Bill for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

4. As residents of Ickenham your petitioners have identified several specific significant concerns which are set out below. This list is by no means exhaustive, and due to the inadequacy and inaccuracies of plans proposed by HS2, it is inevitable that the construction of HS2 will disrupt the lives of your petitioners in ways which are not yet known.  

5. Your petitioners respectfully submit that the proposal to carry the railway overground through the area between Ruislip and the M25 will give rise to many community, health, business and environmental impacts. In your petitioners’ respectful submission the cumulative effects of all these adverse impacts requires that a bored tunnel should be constructed instead of an overland route across Ickenham and the Colne Valley.
6. The following paragraphs set out in more details your petitioners' justification for a tunnel and they also explain the remedies that your petitioners seek as a minimum in respect of the matters that are covered, should your honourable House not find in favour of a tunnel.

Specific Concerns

Noise and visual impact

7. Your petitioners understand from the Environmental Statement that there will be significant adverse noise impacts as a direct result of the overground high speed railway in Ickenham and during the construction of the works. Your petitioners in Hoylake Crescent, Pynchester Close and Bushey Road will suffer adverse effects from construction works and the construction site for a period of ten years. Your petitioners will be forced to endure up to 10 years of continuous noise, air pollution, light pollution, sleep deprivation, and in addition, for many living in closer proximity to the line, ground vibration during construction, if, as currently proposed, the construction work takes place 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Your petitioners would therefore request your honourable House to require the nominated undertaker to limit work to the hours of 8.30am - 5 pm, Monday to Friday in order for residents to be given some respite from construction being carried out over so many years, to expect otherwise is unjust and unreasonable.

8. If the high speed railway line becomes operational, your petitioners will be subject to noise from the operation of trains travelling at high speed in both directions. The noise will consist of vibration to the track ahead of the trains, air displacement ahead and behind the trains, from the motors and from the overhead cables. This noise would be continuous if, as planned, trains are running at 18 per hour in each direction, 36 trains an hour in total. In addition the visual impact especially as the track starts to rise onto a viaduct would be intrusive on what is at present an open aspect.

9. Your petitioners wish to ensure that the nominated undertaker should provide a detailed site specific noise mitigation plan along with the provision of appropriate and adequate compensation measures, especially for those petitioners living within 1,000m from the high speed railway line.

10. The nominated undertaker should mitigate the impacts upon petitioners' homes through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, dust dampening, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.

Compensation

11. Your petitioners contend that Hoylake Crescent, Pynchester Close and Bushey Road are especially adversely affected by the proposed high speed railway line due to the large number of homes sited so close to the line and construction works and therefore your petitioners would request your honourable House to require that the zones proposed for compensation must be expanded to include more homes in each zone, and compensation package values increased.
Communication between HS2 and members of the public

12. Your petitioners are concerned that HS2 Ltd has not previously answered our questions despite giving assurances to us that they would respond. We would like to request that an independent counsel be appointed specifically to deal with problems which arise when there is a breakdown in communications between members of the public and HS2 Ltd.

Mitigation

13. Given all the concerns and issues arising from the plans to build the line overland your petitioners believe that there should be a detailed, independent cost comparison of the extension of the tunnel to beyond the M25 versus the total costs of overland construction through Ickenham and the Colne Valley. These costs should be fully inclusive of the cost of the land, the proposed cost of moving the Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre, any haul roads, all compensation packages, the cost to the local economy, the long-term costs of maintaining ecological mitigation sites, any necessary mitigation measures.
The prayer

The petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that they, or someone representing
them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an
opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the
Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Robert Jones-Owen

Henry Gardner

Beryl Upton 01.04.2016 [and signed by 66 other petitioners]
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill


Declarations:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.
2. Your petitioners are residents and own properties in Ickenham Close and Ickenham Road at West Ruislip in the London Borough of Hillingdon, Middlesex which the Bill will specially and directly affect.
3. Your petitioners allege that their property, rights and interests in would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in their present form and they accordingly object to the Bill for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

YOUR PETITIONER’S CONCERNS

General Concern

4. Your petitioners have identified several specific significant concerns which are set out below. This list is by no means exhaustive, and due to the inadequacy and inaccuracies of the information provided by HS2, it is inevitable that that the construction of HS2 will disrupt the lives of your petitioners in ways which are not yet known.
Construction Traffic

5 Your petitioners are gravely concerned about the inadequacy of measures proposed to mitigate the effects of construction traffic at the parts of West Ruislip affected by it. The siting of a construction site in West Ruislip for many years with other construction sites in nearby Ickenham and Harefield will cause significant disruption and congestion to Ruislip and Ickenham suburban roads by HGV traffic. These roads are already heavily congested by local traffic and through traffic from commuters across north west London. Ickenham Road is already heavily congested during many hours of the day, especially morning and evening peak times and Saturday mornings.

6 The promoter's plans still show 300 HGV movements per day in and out of this construction site. Your petitioners are concerned that they will be adversely affected in travelling to and from their jobs, taking children to schools and undertaking their normal daily lives.

Air Pollution

7 Your petitioners are concerned that the latest Bill provisions recognise that the HS2 traffic on Ickenham High Road will cause air pollution to exceed minimum EU standards, endangering the health of local residents and road users. Scientific research shows that diesel pollutants – particulates and NO2 / NOx – cause long term harm to health.

Noise

8 Your petitioners understand from the Environmental Statement that there will be significant adverse noise impacts as a direct result of the construction of the works. Your petitioners will suffer adverse effects from construction traffic noise for a period of up to ten years.

Road Safety

9 West Ruislip station is used by many thousands of persons per day and is the main cycle route through the area. It is a highly congested area of commuter traffic, pedestrians and cyclists. Your petitioners are seriously concerned that the addition of HS2 HGV construction traffic on the local roads will further jeopardise the safety of all road users.
Local Transport Services

10  Your petitioners are concerned that the proposals for HS2 will cause significant disruption to existing bus, rail and underground services. The extensive construction works and railhead required at West Ruislip are a particular cause for concern as the TFL Central Line and Chiltern railway are used by your petitioners to travel to their places of education, work and recreation.

Emergency Services

11  Your petitioners are concerned that the emergency services will be unable to provide timely support to their families and property due to road congestion during the construction period.

Vibration

12  Your petitioners are concerned about the effects of vibration arising from the construction of the high speed railway and associated development including heavy construction traffic.

Utilities

13  Your petitioners are concerned about the proposed utility works at West Ruislip and the immense disruption to the local area they would be expected to cause over many months.

Summary of concerns

14  Your Petitioners are deeply concerned about this congestion, pollution, the noise, and the additional safety risks to people in the area. HS2 has failed to address any of these concerns that were raised by the House Of Commons Select Committee.
MITIGATION REQUESTS

15 Your petitioners request the following mitigation measures

Tunnel Extensions

16 In your petitioners respectful submission the cumulative effects of all these adverse impacts requires that a bored tunnel should be constructed instead of an overland route across Ickenham and the Colne Valley.

17 Should your honourable house not find in favour of a tunnel across Ickenham and the Colne Valley your petitioners request that the tunnel as a minimum is extended to beyond Breakspear Road South, Ickenham thereby avoiding significant adverse noise impacts from an overground railway to many hundreds of households in Ickenham and avoiding the siting of a construction site for the tunnel portal in a residential area with high levels of traffic congestion. The feasibility of such a tunnel extension has already been analysed by HS2 Ltd.

Other Mitigation

18 The following paragraphs explain the remedies that your petitioners seek as a minimum in respect of the matters that are covered, should your honourable House not find in favour of the tunnel being extended.

19 Your petitioners request that the nominated undertaker utilise the existing rail network for the transport of all materials and spoil to and from the construction sites.

20 Your petitioners request that HS2 HGV traffic should only use internal haul roads and not have access to the local residential roads. These internal haul roads should have direct connection to the trunk road network be used. This would remove many of the problems highlighted above.

21 Your petitioners also request that there should be binding mitigation measures on the nominated undertaker including effective noise mitigation and monitoring system in place before commencement and during construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development together with the provision of adequate compensation measures.

22 Your petitioners request your honourable House to require that the nominated undertaker will at all times during the construction works maintain adequate access through West Ruislip for emergency services.
Your petitioners request guarantees from the nominated undertaker that your petitioners' transport services will not be disrupted during construction works.

Compensation

Your petitioners submit that the compensation provisions in relation to property that is not compulsory acquired and other matters are not sufficient to compensate your petitioners adequately for the loss and damage they may incur as a result of construction of the high speed railway and associated development. Many households will be affected by blight from construction sites and construction traffic for up to 10 years and in some cases permanently and will be unable to sell their properties at unblighted prices. The current zonal compensation scheme means that house situated together and suffering the same recognised level of blight will receive different treatment.

Your petitioners request your honourable House to amend the Bill to ensure your petitioners outside the safeguarded area who are injuriously affected and adversely affected by loss of value to their properties should be entitled to claim compensation.

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Philip Taylor

Freda Noonan-Taylor

[and signed by 14 other petitioners]
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr. John Naylor-Smith

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your Petitioner
The petitioner is a resident of Amersham and consumer of water that is drawn from the Misbourne Valley, (as supplied by Affinity water to 140,000 customers).

3. My concern is that: Our water will almost certainly be contaminated, because:

   (1). The Misbourne Valley (in the lower Chiltern area) is a chalk valley that is therefore pervious to liquids (only a few such chalk valleys exist).

   (2). The water supply by Affinity Water to local households is from the underground lakes that are constantly filled by the rainwater permeating the Misbourne Valley chalk soils.

   (3). The chemicals that are used to lubricate the tunnelling machine and to stabilise the ground in front of the machine will permeate down, helped by rain fall, and contaminate the drinking water.

   (4). The material extracted by the tunnelling will be stored on land that is above the Colne Valley for a two year period whilst any liquids seep out into the soil below and thus into the water of the River Colne. Note – The River Misbourne flows into the River Colne thus doubling the danger to the water that is supplied to one third of the Householders of London.

   (5). Affinity Water have sought an indemnity from HS2 against costs arising from providing alternative water supplies.

   (6) What did HS2 say :-
A Director of HS2 Ltd said to the House of Commons Committee in October 2014 “If the grouting did penetrate the chalk, it would not be a poisonous activity, but you would get discoloration in the water extracted for drinking purposes”.
I will not drink that water and along with others would be claiming compensation. If this is London plus our area, this could be over two million persons claiming say £1,000 each or total compensation of £2,000,000,000.

(7). But this statement is much more serious because :-
The above statement was made before any tests had been undertaken by HS2.
The report undertaken since and published last November has now concluded in three separate sections that :-
Par 10 “with the exception of the Mid-Chiltern Chalk groundwater body .... There are no likely adverse effects on water resources” ie. Our water is in danger.

Par19 “There are major adverse risks in relation to hazardous waste landfill capacity”.

Par 20 “Three water bodies remain at amber risk = adverse widespread or prolonged potential effect of water supplies”. Our water company, Affinity Water, is one.

**Conclusion.** The route of HS2 **MUST NOT BE ALONG THE MISBOURNE VALLEY.**

4. The Prayer.
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House of Lords, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

**AND the petitioner remains, etc.**

John Naylor-Smith (FCA retired)

Dated this 2\textsuperscript{nd} day of April 2016.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF DAVID CRANE, SUSAN CRANE, RICHARD HOWARD, KRIS WICKA,  
ALLAN EDWARDS, DAVID THORPE, CATHERINE SILWAL, GILLIAN EATWELL AND JOHN  
SMITH  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.  

2. Your petitioners are the owners of residential properties located in Rectory Way,  
Eleanor Grove, Charlton Close, Broadacre Close, The Mallows, Boniface Road and  
Ashbury Drive as part of what is known, commonly, as the Rectory Way Estate in  
the London Borough of Hillingdon.  

3. Your Petitioners allege that they are specially and directly affected by the Bill and  
their property, rights and interests, could be injuriously and prejudicially affected  
by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in their present form and they  
accordingly object to the Bill for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter  
appearing.  

4. As residents of Ickenham your petitioners have identified several specific significant  
concerns which are set out below. This list is by no means exhaustive, and due to  
the inadequacy and inaccuracies of plans proposed by HS2, it is inevitable that the  
construction of HS2 will disrupt the lives of your petitioners in ways which are not  
yet known.  

5. Your petitioners respectfully submit that the proposal to carry the railway  
overground through the area between Ruislip and the M25 will give rise to many  
community, health, business and environmental impacts. In your petitioners’  
respectful submission the cumulative effects of all these adverse impacts requires  
that a bored tunnel should be constructed instead of an overland route across  
Ickenham and the Colne Valley.  

6. The following paragraphs set out in more details your petitioners’ justification for a  
tunnel and they also explain the remedies that your petitioners seek as a minimum  
in respect of the matters that are covered, should your honourable House not find  
in favour of a tunnel.
Specific Concerns

Transport to Hospitals, work, business and timely arrival of emergency services.

7. The only access to the Rectory Way Estate is via Swakeleys Road, a dual carriageway used routinely by commuters to Uxbridge, the A40/M40, M25 and the south of Hillingdon. In the opposite direction it is a main artery to Ruislip and the north of the Borough. Swakeleys Road has been classified, by HS2 Ltd as a construction route. This a particular concern as it is often impacted, severely, by roadworks and frequent accidents on the main artery into London. Swakeleys roundabout cannot cope with current levels of traffic.

Your petitioners already suffer detrimental travel times to hospitals, work, businesses, et cetera, owing to the highly congested, roads particularly around Ickenham at peak times. Local bus route timetables are often unworkable during peak periods. Many residents of the aforementioned Rectory Way Estate are elderly, infirm, frail and vulnerable, requiring regular visits to our three local hospitals and their G.P. surgeries. They fear that the addition of so many more HGVs on our local road network will impact them dangerously. HS2 Ltd.'s current haul road suggestion will only make matters worse if it accesses the A40 at Swakeleys Roundabout. Traffic signaling there will not limit traffic volumes or flows. Your petitioners seek, from your honourable House, mitigation measures such as those outlined in paragraph 8.

Air quality and pollution

8. A number of the more healthy, youthful and energetic, residents of the Rectory Way Estate use bicycles on a regular basis both for exercise and to avoid traffic congestion. They already find that cycling locally can be a dangerous activity with the current, high volume of HGVs on our roads. Despite the best assurances of HS2 Ltd to require contractors to use Euro 6 HGVs to counter the effects of NO2 and other noxious gases, it has completely failed to respond to questions regarding the emission of sooty particulates. As is now well documented, such sooty particulate emissions from diesel engines constitute a serious health hazard to pedestrians and especially cyclists. The entire VW debacle has highlighted this particular, chronic, pollution problem, and your petitioners seek, from your honourable House mitigation measures to prevent any addition to these and other noxious emissions, by removing the need to run any HS2 Ltd vehicles on our local road network. The use of well designed, carefully placed, haul roads could be a part answer especially if rail were to be used to bring in, and take out, the overwhelming majority of materials, spoil and concrete linings required for the construction project.

Noise

9. Your petitioners understand from the Environmental Statement that there will be significant adverse noise impacts as a direct result of the overground high speed railway in Ickenham and during the construction of the works. Your petitioners in Rectory Way, Eleanor Grove, Charlton Close, Broadacre Close, Boniface Road, The Mallows and Ashbury Drive will suffer adverse effects from construction works and the construction site for a period of ten years. Your petitioners will be forced to endure up to 10 years of continuous noise, and air pollution. Your petitioners would therefore request your honourable House to require the nominated undertaker to
limit work to the hours of 8.30am – 5 pm, Monday to Friday in order for residents to be given some respite from construction being carried out over so many years, to expect otherwise is unjust and unreasonable.

10. Your petitioners wish to ensure that the nominated undertaker should provide a detailed site specific noise mitigation plan along with the provision of appropriate and adequate compensation measures, especially for those petitioners living within 1,000m from the high speed railway line.

11. The nominated undertaker should mitigate the impacts upon petitioners’ homes through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, dust dampening, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.

**Communication between HS2 and members of the public**

12. Your petitioners are concerned that HS2 Ltd has not previously answered our questions despite giving assurances to us that it would respond. We would like to request that an independent counsel be appointed specifically to deal with problems which arise when there is a breakdown in communications between members of the public and HS2 Ltd.

**Mitigation**

13. Given all the concerns and issues arising from the plans to build the line overland your petitioners believe that there should be a detailed, independent cost comparison of the extension of the tunnel to beyond the M25 versus the total costs of overland construction through Ickenham and the Colne Valley. These costs should be fully inclusive of the cost of the land, the proposed cost of moving the Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre, any haul roads, all compensation packages, the cost to the local economy, the long-term costs of maintaining ecological mitigation sites, any necessary mitigation measures

**The prayer**

The petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that they, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

David Crane

Signature

Susan Crane

Signature

[signed by 7 other petitioners]
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON

Declares that:

1. Your Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clause 4(1) of the Bill insofar as it would allow property comprised of a car park and surrounding grassland situated at Gloucester Slips, Outer Circle, Regent’s Park, London NW1 ("the car park") to be used by HS2 for construction and as a lorry holding area.

2. Your petitioner

2.1. Your Petitioner is the Zoological Society of London ("ZSL") of Regent’s Park, London NW1. ZSL is an international scientific, conservation and educational charity (registered charity number 208728) founded in 1826 by Royal Charter whose mission is to promote and achieve the worldwide conservation of animals and their habitats. Its mission is realised through science and research, active conservation projects in more than fifty countries and educational, conservation and animal care and breeding activities at its two zoos, ZSL London Zoo ("the Zoo") and ZSL Whipsnade Zoo.

2.2. ZSL occupies the car park under a licence granted by the Royal Parks on 27th July 1990, for the benefit of the Zoo and ZSL’s wider charitable activities.

2.3. The Bill, as originally drafted, envisaged approximately a third of the car park being acquired by the Promoter (equivalent to approximately 80 parking spaces). ZSL were assured by the Promoter at that time that alternative parking spaces would be provided for the duration of the construction works, possibly in the green areas surrounding the car park. Since such time, the Promoter provided in the AP3 for the use of the whole of the car park including the green areas surrounding the car park to be acquired permanently by virtue of article 4(1) of the Bill for the purpose of the “provision of worksite and access for construction”. Your Petitioner understands that the predominant use will be as a lorry holding area, for as long as sixteen years.

2.4. At the House of Commons Select Committee hearing on 16th December 2015, Counsel for HS2 stated that the compulsory land take at the car park would be limited. Written Assurances were subsequently provided to ZSL by HS2 on 29th January 2016, however these were qualified by a number of unexpected conditions and in any event do not address ZSL’s concerns as set out below.
3. Your petitioner's concerns

3.1 Your Petitioner is directly and specially affected by the Bill and by its amendment by Additional Provision 3 (September 2015) as follows.

(a) The construction and operation of the lorry holding area would be likely to cause significant harm to the significant and vulnerable population of hedgehogs resident in the car park, which is of particular concern to ZSL as an animal conservation organisation.

(b) HS2’s use of the car park would prevent access by school children, disabled visitors, families and other visitors to the Zoo, restricting your Petitioner’s ability to foster public interest in animal conservation;

(c) The removal of car parking facilities would have a seriously detrimental impact on your Petitioner’s income and viability to continue operations, given that the income from visitors to the Zoo provides essential funding ZSL’s charitable activities.

(d) The car park is used as an important source of foodstuffs for priority animals at the Zoo.

Further particulars of your Petitioner’s concerns are set out below.

4. Impact on hedgehog population

4.1. Your Petitioner is extremely concerned about the detrimental impact that the proposed development would have on the population of hedgehogs resident in the car park.

4.2. Hedgehogs are a UK Priority Species for conservation and are partially protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). There is strong evidence that the population of hedgehogs in the UK is in serious decline.

4.3. Studies have been conducted by The Royal Parks Foundation in both 2014 and 2015 to assess how many hedgehogs live in Regent’s Park, which areas they forage in and rely on for nesting and how isolated the hedgehog population is. These studies have confirmed that the car park area is a favoured location and one of only three ‘hotspots’ for hedgehogs in the area. They use the whole of the car park for foraging and their nests are located throughout the car park site. Young hedgehogs were found in the surveys, confirming that the population is breeding. As the population is low, the hedgehogs self-select the best habitats, indicating further that the car park is an important habitat for the hedgehogs. In September 2014, forty one hedgehogs were found to be resident in Regent’s Park, of which eleven were resident in the car park.
Only twenty five hedgehogs were found to be resident in Regent’s Park in September 2015, highlighting that this is a population vulnerable to local extinction. Monitoring will continue for a further three to five years to confirm population trends and to identify risk factors which are currently unknown.

4.4. Regent’s Park is the only central London Royal Park to have retained a resident hedgehog population. This is a very significant find and the hedgehog population in the car park area is thought to constitute 27% of the hedgehogs within central London.

4.5. The vegetation around the car park is managed by ZSL with regard to the hedgehogs, as conservation land with a relaxed maintenance and mowing regime. It is considered that ZSL’s current use of the car park does not pose a threat to the population of the hedgehogs and indeed the hedgehogs in this area have thrived alongside ZSL’s use. Your Petitioner considers that, should the Promoter acquire the car park land and change its use to a construction worksite and HGV holding area, this would have a serious and detrimental impact on the population of hedgehogs for a number of reasons, including the destruction of habitat, increased noise, the use of lights and disturbance caused by vehicles and humans on the site including during evenings, early mornings and at night-time. As indicated above, the population is extremely vulnerable and as such, ZSL considers that its conservation should be of paramount importance.

4.6. HS2 stated by email to ZSL on 18th March 2016 that they do not believe that the lorry holding area would have an impact on the hedgehog population. Your Petitioner does not understand how HS2 can have this view despite all evidence to the contrary, namely that potential risk factors and the potential impact of disturbance of the population are unknown.

4.7. Nonetheless, HS2 have stated that they intend to provide proposals for mitigating the impact of their use of the car park on the hedgehog population. A meeting is to be arranged with HS2 for these mitigation proposals to be discussed by ZSL, hedgehog experts who conducted the surveys, Royal Parks and the Crown Estates Paving Commission. It is the opinion of ZSL that the use of the car park by the Promoter would likely lead to the decline or even extinction of the hedgehog population and that mitigation proposals that would seek to allow the use of the car park by the Promoter would not be likely to be effective in protecting the hedgehog population. This is because of the overwhelming uncertainty as to risk factors affecting the hedgehog population. It is not considered that relocation of the hedgehogs could be achieved in a viable way and any use of the site by HS2, for construction or as a lorry holding area, would involve serious risk to the resident population.

4.8. In light of the above, your Petitioner does not consider that that car park could be used by the Promoter in any such way that would enable the hedgehog population to survive. As such, an alternative area should be considered by the Promoter for its worksite and lorry holding area. In light of the evidence regarding the hedgehogs, ZSL has asked HS2 to undertake an investigation and analysis of other potential locations for the lorry holding area, whether on-road or off-road, instead of the car park at Gloucester Slips. However, HS2 has stated that its initial evaluations (undertaken before the hedgehog
evidence came to light) are satisfactory and that it will not reassess alternative locations for the lorry holding area.

5. **Impact on car parking provision and visitors**

5.1. The car park is used by ZSL to provide not only a much needed facility for visiting families and other visitors to the Zoo, but also important coach parking for schools and other groups and visitors, mostly with children. It also provides parking for disabled visitors as well as key members of staff. The car park is situated within a short distance of the main entrance to the Zoo to provide a safe access for disabled users and young children in school groups.

5.2. The resulting loss of its only car parking facilities would have a considerable impact on ZSL’s operation of the Zoo. This would prevent a large number of people from visiting the Zoo. It would have a particular impact on vulnerable visitors, including disabled visitors and children, especially those visiting with schools and families with young children.

5.3. In addition to the children who visit with their parents, over 120,000 school children visit the Zoo each year. These students use various forms of transport, however, the Early Years Foundation Stage (3-5 years old), the Key Stage 1 (5-7 years old) and learners with special educational needs (SEND), rely on being able to travel to the Zoo by coach. Many teachers find the safety and security issues of taking these groups on public transport far too daunting, and therefore without access to coaches these children simply could not come to the Zoo.

5.4. The 120,000 school children that visit the Zoo participate in activities and events with inspiring educators, developing valuable skills and exploring important concepts including evolution, biodiversity, climate change and conservation in unique learning environments. Their understanding is enriched and enhanced by resources from the natural world that are simply not available at school and by being introduced to conservation in a real world context.

5.5. To lose its coach parking facilities would mean that ZSL would likely lose this section of its education audience. Not only does this greatly affect the Zoo’s accessibility for learners who need extra support, but to also lose the younger age groups would mean denying them an informative and exciting out of class trip in a formative time in their development. This age is a key period to foster engagement in science and conservation and the opportunity to develop emotional connections with a wide variety of animals.

5.6. If the Promoter was to take control of the car park this would result in a significant number of children who would be unable to take part in these inspirational activities due to the inability to travel to the Zoo. A loss of car parking, particularly for school visitors, for up to 16 years could result in a whole generation of school children missing out on the educational benefits provided by visiting the Zoo.
5.7. Furthermore, the car park provides valuable parking for many of its key staff members, such as zoo keepers, facility managers and security staff, many of whom live outside London or work unsocial hours and therefore must commute by car to work at the Zoo and rely on the car parking facilities.

5.8. Your Petitioner understands that HS2 Ltd is exploring the feasibility of developing an on street parking option on the Outer Circle for coaches and cars which might minimise the area of replacement parking to be provided in the area around the existing car park. Your Petitioner believes that this option, which still involves use of the car park as a lorry holding area, will not satisfy the grave concerns regarding the potential destruction of the hedgehog population.

5.9. Furthermore, it is understood that the HS2 construction period may coincide with implementation of Cycle Superhighway 11 proposals and the four year redevelopment of Camden Tube Station. This may further exacerbate the problem of access to the Zoo and may mean that visitors wishing to visit by means of coach or car find it harder to do so.

6. Impact on ZSL’s income

6.1. As outlined above, the inability to use its parking facilities will likely result in a considerable reduction in visitors from certain groups. This will necessarily have a detrimental impact on your Petitioner’s income.

6.2. Income lost from the inability to use the car park does not only result from the loss of car parking charges, but could also result from—

(a) lost ticket sales to those visitors;
(b) lost gift aid donations from those visitors;
(c) the resulting lost gift aid from HMRC;
(d) lost catering and retail sales to those visitors;
(e) adverse impact on membership retention and the number of membership subscriptions;
(f) reduced numbers of private hire bookings for events and hospitality; and
(g) loss of key staff who must commute to work at the Zoo by car owing to working necessarily unsociable hours which would adversely impact ZSL’s ability to undertake income generating activities (also incurring recruitment and continuity costs and potential loss of specialist expertise).
6.3. Initial calculations suggest that the lost income over 16 years would amount to a multi-million pound figure. This would have a severe impact on ZSL’s financial viability to carry out its mission and objectives and mean that important and valuable conservation, education and scientific research is unfunded. It could also have an adverse impact on the number of staff ZSL is able to employ at the Zoo.

7. Food source for Zoo animals

7.1. Your Petitioner notes that the car park is also a source for weekly harvesting of important fresh coppiced trees (‘browse’) as foodstuffs for animals at the Zoo throughout the growing season, from May to November. The harvested browse is provided upon the direction of ZSL’s Nutrition and Research Officer to a range of conservation priority species such as giraffes, gorillas, okapis and colobuses and several other animals such as lemurs, kangaroos, reindeer and Galapagos tortoises.

8. Your Petitioner’s requests

8.1. For the reasons outlined above, your Petitioner considers that the Promoter should be required not to acquire the car park site either temporarily or permanently. The severe potential impacts on the hedgehog population resident in the car park as well as the detrimental impacts on ZSL’s operation and mission are too great to overcome and are not justified.

8.2. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that the Promoter should be required to acquire an alternative site for its lorry holding area that is less sensitive and valuable in terms of environmental value and amenity value, which will not deleteriously impact upon the hedgehog population or have such detrimental impacts on ZSL’s operation and mission.

8.3. Notwithstanding the above, should the Promoter retain the power to acquire the car park in any event, although this would not be acceptable to your Petitioner, it is requested that—

(a) the Bill should be amended so that the Promoter should not be able to acquire this land permanently. Permanent acquisition is disproportionate for the proposed use for which access is only required temporarily during the period of construction;

(b) environmental mitigation measures should be provided for the protection of the hedgehog population and ZSL should be consulted upon, approve and monitor any mitigation strategy at the cost of HS2;

(c) appropriate alternative parking facilities, in an equally convenient and accessible location, should be provided for visitors to the Zoo; and

(d) full compensation should be provided to ZSL for its lost revenue and any other losses associated with its inability to use the car park facilities.
For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law insofar as it allows the Promoter to use the car park.

9. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that it, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill. AND the petitioner remains, etc.

[SIGNED BY RALPH ARMOND,
DIRECTOR GENERAL,
ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON]
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Anthony and Elisabeth Harris

Declares that:

1. Your petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners are the owners of the freehold property at 34, Lappetts Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 ORA which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located 500 meters from the South Heath portal as outlined under deposited plans Vol 2.1 Replacement sheet 2.25.

Your Petitioners live in part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) which the Bill may specially and directly affect and your Petitioners are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

1. Your Petitioners will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioners request that the presently proposed fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the Chilterns AONB, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioners and will reduce the impact on the AONB.

2. Your Petitioners further request that in assessing the alternatives of adopting the full tunnel proposals instead of the Promoter’s current proposals for the AONB section of the line, the Promoter is instructed to commission and publish a fully independent cost analysis of such alternatives and to undertake and publish a full cost benefit analysis of the environmental impacts for such AONB section.

3. The adverse effects of the Bill with which your Petitioners are concerned and to which it objects are primarily caused by and associated with the works proposed from the South Heath portal, empowered by Clauses 1 and 2 and Schedules 1 and 2 of the Bill
and associated powers in the Bill (including the power of compulsory purchase). These include works 2/14 to 2/20 in Schedule 1 and are detailed primarily on Deposited Plans, Vol.2.1, Plan Replacement Sheets 2-24 to 2-28.

4. In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB, which is the primary alteration to the Bill your Petitioners seek, your Petitioners request that the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended to Leather Lane, as it will address, most but not all, of your Petitioners concerns.

5. The fall back alternative to these solutions is numerous individual mitigations of the adverse impacts, all of which will cost time and money (over and above the mitigation presently proposed by the Promoter). Your Petitioners expand on the individual adverse impacts that concern it and to which it objects, and the (additional) mitigation that would be required for each, if its fully bored tunnel proposals are rejected, below.

6. **Traffic Congestion:** The disruption over eight years of access to and from Great Missenden for your petitioners travelling to the shops, medical appointments and to the station arising from the major adverse effect that will occur with the large amount of construction traffic at the Link Road (A4128) and Frith Hill roundabouts. This major adverse effect will continue for your petitioners who needs to travel along the A413 to and from Wendover and Stoke Mandeville Hospital and Aylesbury. Your Petitioners are also concerned that avoidance of the congestion at the Link Road Roundabout will lead to rat-runs through Great Missenden and the hilltop villages especially along Kings Lane with its associated safety hazard.

   **Remedies:**
   1. An effective Traffic Management Plan to be approved by Bucks County Council with all costs of monitoring and enforcement to be borne by HS2 Ltd.
   2. Reduce the amount of spoil that requires to be transported through the use of retained cuttings or a bored tunnel extension or reduce the road transportation of spoil by taking it all along the trace.
   3. HS2 to work with Bucks County Council to facilitate traffic flow at the congestion points and consider slip roads, road widening etc.

7. **Construction Haul Road:** Your Petitioners are particularly concerned about the impact of construction traffic using the haul road from the South Heath portal onto the A413 at the Link Road roundabout, such as damage from HGVs (270 HGVs a day at the peak), noise and dust from vehicle cleaning operations and the high risk to users of the Skate Park, Tennis Courts and children’s play area adjacent to the roundabout and children going to the Great Missenden Combined Church of England school nearby.

   **Remedies:**
   1. The construction haul
   2. The construction haul road should be relocated further north, distant from the larger settlements of Great Missenden and Prestwood, and beyond the Mobwell junction hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts. It would also lessen the impact and visual blight of the haul road on parishioners, visitors and businesses in Great Missenden. Traffic signals can be

---

1 HS2 Ltd had given Bucks CC in January 2016 an assurance that it would relocate this haul road but the conditions placed upon the County Council to achieve this were unrealistic.
implemented on the junction with the A413 to control the flow of construction traffic.

3. The amount of spoil requiring transport by road can be reduced by moving more spoil down the trace.

8. **Maintenance Access Road:** The permanent maintenance and access road - Work No 2/18C from the South Heath portal joins Frith Hill (SHL) at a bend on a narrow part of the road. This leads to your petitioners having concerns about road safety especially as the footway and road is used for walking and cycling to Great Missenden. Safety could be further exacerbated by temporary contractors using it to access the portal during construction. Furthermore there is concern for the safety of children at the Great Missenden Church of England Combined School using their Forest School Outdoor Learning Centre and their playing fields as they are adjacent to the Frith Hill roundabout.

**Remedies:**

1. Construction traffic should not use the maintenance access road off Frith Hill during construction.
2. Any temporary construction contractors should not park their white vans at the South Heath portal but at the main construction compound at Wendover and be bussed onto the site.
3. If the construction haul road is relocated as mentioned above, it could be retained so that access to Frith Hill (SHL) will no longer be required.

9. **Noise and Dust:** Your petitioners are concerned that there will be construction noise and dust (and operational noise) as a result of the deep, wide cuttings at the South Heath portal and the cuttings beyond towards Wendover. The dust and noise will be at its worst during the eight year construction period but thereafter some mitigation of the dust will be provided when plantings have matured but not the noise.

**Remedies:**

1. Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to be monitored and enforced by Bucks County Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd
2. A tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB, or at minimum to Leather Lane will obviate the need for deep, wide cuttings in the South Heath and Potter Row area.
3. Other remedies would be retained sides for the cutting and higher trackside noise barriers with barriers on the east side (as well as west) of the line towards Leather Lane.

10. **Dysfunctional Housing market:** Your Petitioner is 800 meters from the trains exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel and are the finding their house prices blighted. They are concerned that they are unable to sell in what has become a dysfunctional housing market. They feel that they are trapped for 10 or more years and find the ‘Need to Sell scheme’ (NTS) complex, slow and does not ensure unblighted house prices.

**Remedies:**
1. A further Chiltern tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns to the edge of the AONB or at least as far as Leather Lane would largely stabilize the dysfunctional market.

2. A compensation scheme that provides full current un-blighted house value to all residents when they wish to sell... A Right to Sell Scheme. The scheme is to be administered by a body independent of HS2 Ltd, with a right to appeal. The NTS scheme needs to be made less complex, faster, more accessible, less onerous to prove qualification, friendly to the elderly and with more stringent rules to ensure reasonable un-blighted valuations.

11. **Operational Noise:** Your petitioners are close enough to the surface line to suffer operational noise at night close to the peak WHO target LOAEL of 60dBmax (23.00 - 24.00 and 06.30 to 07.30)

Remedies:
1. Your petitioners feel that not exceeding the peak LOAEL level of 60dBmax should be a mandatory requirement and not just an aim as outlined in Information Paper E20. Anticipated noise levels should be independently verified and based on evidence of the efficacy of alternative noise reduction methods.

2. Reasonably practicable measures to dissipate the noise should include having retained sides, or steeper slopes to the portal cutting and beyond; deeper cuttings; reducing the train speed; lengthening the porous portal; higher more absorbent noise barriers adjacent to the line to protect Potter Row; noise barriers both sides of the line and to the south of the portal to protect South Heath and Frith Hill properties and those using footpaths GMI/12 & 13.

12. **Health and Wellbeing:** Your Petitioners are concerned that their Health & Wellbeing has been adversely affected, and continue to be, since the announcement of HS2 in 2010. The undeniable result of HS2 is worry, anxiety and stress and, in some cases, clinical depression requiring medical treatment. A further worry is that emergency response times will deteriorate further during construction when ailments such as respiratory disorders will be at their maximum.

Remedies:
1. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern over high levels of dust and pollution, with independent monitoring and powers to halt construction until preventative measures are implemented and verified.

2. The provision of an air ambulance service is requested to complement emergency medical services which are already struggling.

13. **Chilterns AONB:** The proposed line is above ground from the South Heath portal of the Chiltern tunnel for 9 kms to the edge of the Chilterns AONB just north of Wendover. It is in a cutting for approximately 3 kms and will be visible at the highest point of the line in the vicinity of Liberty Lane, notwithstanding the sight of the security fences and catenary masts above the cuttings which will be a major permanent eyesore along the length of Potter Row.

The proposed line from Liberty Lane descends to Wendover and crosses two large unsightly viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean in the Chilterns AONB before reaching a green tunnel running alongside Wendover.
Construction will last up to 8 years with a peak period of more than 3.5 years. HGV traffic, noise and dust will render the rural lanes and footpaths less attractive to all visitors to this area of the AONB whether they are ardent walkers/hikers, currently popular with those groups taking the Duke of Edinburgh Award, or cyclists as it is Route 57 on the National Cycle Network or just families coming for a day-out from London to enjoy the countryside.

Remedies (apart from a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB):

1. The AONB review body must ensure that the viaducts and embankments with enclosures to reduced noise are made as visually pleasing as possible. The design of the new permanent buildings erected by HS2 Ltd to be in-keeping with the surrounding area.

2. The vertical alignment of the track between the South Heath portal and Wendover should be lowered further, if it is not to be placed in a tunnel, to reduce the intrusion of the viaducts; to conceal catenary masts and gantries and reduce the height above the general ground surface of accommodation footbridges. The contractor should not be empowered to raise the line at all on the AONB section.

3. The need for spoil dumps should be minimised either by tunnelling or moving the spoil down the trace or by rail. This particularly applies to the spoil dump planned for Hunts Green farm and those by the construction compounds.

4. The Rights of Way are not to be closed for any length of time and any diversion not to be parallel to the track; furthermore diversions should be over green bridges and not accommodation bridges.

5. All overhead power lines adjacent to the route be buried.

6. Alternatives to Balancing Ponds be considered, and they should be made ecologically and visually attractive, in-keeping with AONB.

14. **Code of Construction Practice**: The Code is a draft; it is not specific about timing of works, or monitoring by the Local Authority and is subject to a sub contract with the nominated undertaker.

Remedies:

1. Daily movements of HGVs to be restricted to between 09.30 and 15.30 hrs and prohibited from using rural lanes.

2. Construction activities should be subject to strict noise limits and light emission limits from night security lighting (there is no street lighting near the construction compounds) and activities restricted to times that are unlikely to affect the sleep patterns of children and the elderly. Furthermore, the Local Authority should be funded to enforce monitoring and policing of the noise and light emission limits and activities, and work should stop if the limits are exceeded.

3. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern and for road users to report damage, also for an independent HS2 adjudicator to review issues, monitor progress with enforcement orders and facilitate claims.

16 **Primary Mitigation**

Accordingly, your Petitioners object to the associated works and the clauses in the Bill that empower the works involved, and humbly requests your honourable House
to modify the Bill, and/or require undertakings of the Promoter, to remove these adverse effects, primarily through a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least to Leather Lane.

17 Secondary Mitigation
In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that your Petitioners seek, your Petitioners request that the haul road from the South Heath portal to the Link Road roundabout be moved along the A413 beyond the Mobwell junction, as it will help to lessen the impact of the construction traffic on the Great Missenden Area.

18 Other Matters
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners, their rights, interests and property, and for which no adequate provision is made to protect them.

Conclusion
19 Your Petitioners support the petitions for a longer fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that extends throughout the Chilterns AONB. Such tunnel extension is being petitioned by the local County, District and Parish Councils and the Chiltern Conservation Board and in the alternative a shorter extension to Leather Lane. If your honourable House alters the Bill to provide for such an extended tunnel most of your Petitioners' objections would be removed (your Petitioners' objection to unsuitable ancillary structures and to the present proposals for compensation would remain – albeit far fewer residents would be affected).

20 In the alternative to extending the fully bored Chiltern tunnel, your Petitioners seek a significant secondary mitigation by relocating the haul road at the South Heath portal.

21 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully request that unless the Bill is amended as proposed above or suitable undertakings obtained from the Promoter, the Bill, along with accompanying Schedules, so far affecting your Petitioners and your Petitioners' area, along with the wider AONB, be not allowed to pass into law.

22 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners rights, interests, property and your petitioners' area and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.

4. The prayer
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the petitioner, or someone representing the petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Thomas Michael Johnstone – Agent

Dated 5 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Christine Ann Kalveks

Declares that:  
1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Christine Ann Kalveks, resident at The Manor House, The Lee, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9NA, whom the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to her household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for commuting to London and journeys to all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your petitioner was born in Amersham and has lived in the Chilterns all her life. During her teenage years, together with her friends from Amersham, she would regularly spend weekends in the tranquillity of The Lee and the surrounding areas. Your petitioner finds it devastating to think that peace and quiet, even in an AONB, will not be available to today's teenagers.

On a practical level, your petitioner needs to be able to visit her elderly, disabled mother in Amersham frequently and quickly and is very concerned that this will not be possible during the long construction period.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.
3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That there should be an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:–

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same
with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

CHRISTINE ANN KALVEK

5 APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Rudolph John Kalveks

Declares that:
1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Rudolph John Kalveks, resident at The Manor House, The Lee,  
Buckinghamshire, HP16 9NA, whom the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during  
construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that  
part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which the Bill will specially  
and directly affect.

Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for  
reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and  
injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed  
Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on  
embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under  
Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further  
protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape  
Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for commuting to London and journeys to all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your petitioner notes that the area around The Lee is much used by cyclists and is concerned that the closure and dislocation of the narrow lanes crossing the Misbourne Valley by the proposed HS2 route and its construction will effectively ruin this public amenity.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above,
then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spolli Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed
and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Richard Knights

April 5, 2016.
To the House of Lords Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Balsall and Berkswell Residents Against Inappropriate Development

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioner is an association of the residents living in the Metropolitan Borough of Solihull in the Parish of Berkswell to the south and east of Balsall Common, particularly but not limited to the areas surrounding Old Waste Lane, Kelsey Lane, Meeting House Lane, Waste Lane, Hob Lane and Windmill Lane. The association was established in November 2011 to make collective representations to Solihull Borough Council and Balsall and Berkswell Parish Councils and other Governmental bodies whose decisions impact upon the Green Belt in our area. In this Petition the association represents the interests of residents of an area that HS2 Ltd call "Beechwood" in their Environmental Statement. The area comprises Waste Lane, Old Waste Lane and that part of Hodgett's Lane which adjoins Waste Lane. The proposed line cuts this area in two.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

The residents of Old Waste Lane are concerned that their residential lane will be used as a parking area by HGV and other road traffic associated with the construction of the proposed rail line. We are seeking a clear and unambiguous assurance from the HS2 Ltd that they will take all reasonable steps to ensure that no traffic associated with the construction of the line will enter Old Waste Lane.

Residents of the area that HS2 Ltd call “Beechwood” are concerned that noise levels will be at unacceptable levels and seek additional noise mitigation measures.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the Petitioner, or someone representing the Petitioner, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Andrew Burrow
Agent
1st April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

The Petition of Ronwen and Roy Emerson

Declare that:

1) The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2) Your Petitioners are Mr and Mrs R. Emerson, of 80 Darwin Court, Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 7BQ.

Your Petitioners are residents of Darwin Court in Gloucester Avenue, London, NW1, which comprises five blocks of 104 private flats in Camden, all of which the Bill will directly and specifically affect.

Darwin Court is a member of the Gloucester Avenue Association (GAA) and your petitioners fully endorse the GAA petition as well as the Darwin Court Residents and Lessees’ petition.

The House of Commons Select Committee’s overall solution for Camden, that we should rely on HS2’s assurances to Camden Council (as yet unknown), is a completely inadequate safeguard of our interests.

3) Your Petitioners’ Concerns

DARWIN COURT

Your Petitioners are deeply concerned about the impact of construction under Darwin Court to its residents and leaseholders.

Your Petitioners are convinced that the experience of those seeking to sell flats in Darwin Court (Darwin Court Petition, page 4, ‘Blight’) is proof that construction plans expressed in the Bill and Environment Statement have already caused blight in properties above the Promoter’s tunnels.

Your Petitioners believe that a similar, if less severe, blight has already affected the rest of Gloucester Avenue, of which the five blocks of Darwin Court are an important and integral part.
Your Petitioners believe that it is unjust that no compensation is on offer for the obvious damage threatened to the lives and property of the residents and leaseholders of Darwin Court.

Your Petitioners believe that compensation should be available to the residents and leaseholders of Darwin Court. They emphasise the need for leaseholders to be eligible for compensation, not just the freeholder.

Your Petitioners are concerned at the Promoter’s plan to use the private garden of Darwin Court as a construction site. They note that the uncompensated appropriation for construction purposes of much used and valued recreational space is typical of the Promoter’s approach to solving its construction needs.

Your Petitioners are concerned about the threat to the thirteen trees with preservation orders in the grounds of Darwin Court made by the Promoter’s plans.

**Your Petitioners therefore pray your honourable House as follows:**

Your Petitioners pray you to look favourably upon the petition of the Darwin Court Residents’ and Leaseholders’ Association.

Your Petitioners ask you to provide protection and compensation for the residents and leaseholders of Darwin Court.

Your Petitioners ask you to recognise that the case of Darwin Court is clear proof of the blight caused by the Bill to properties above the Promoter’s tunnels.

Your Petitioners ask you to extend this recognition of blight to property above the Promoter’s tunnels to the rest of Gloucester Avenue and to all properties above the Promoter’s tunnels in Camden.

Your Petitioners ask you to ensure that the trees with preservation orders in the grounds of Darwin Court are fully protected during construction.

**COMPENSATION**

Realistic and fair compensation should be given to all households situated both directly above and to the sides of tunnels during the construction period and also for a specified period following completion.

Residents affected by land grab and blight during the build should also be compensated fairly. Compensation should be given if there is any damage or subsidence caused by HS2 during and for a specified period after completion.

If residents have to move out while the tunnelling takes place, or our road becomes impassable from heavy traffic or blocked by construction works and works to sewers, etc., we should be compensated for temporary loss of our homes.
We should be compensated for any damage caused to the underground garages and the cars in those garages from leaking pipes as a result of vibrations during the construction period and for a reasonable time afterwards.

There should be proper compensation for all of the issues outlined already, in particular the blight to property prices. Uncertainty as to the effects of the works and the running of the railway in the future have made property 60m above the railway blighted in the same way as those beside it. The same rules therefore should apply.

Turning the Private Garden into a construction site, even if temporary, should also attract compensation, as well as a guarantee that the garden and its trees, shrubs, furniture, lawn and plants, as well as its gateposts, fences and walls, will be returned to your petitioners in at least as good a state as they were before HS2 took it, and preferably better.

Your Petitioners also request that the Promoter be required to prepare at its expense a schedule of condition for our five blocks adjacent to or affected by any works the Promoter may find it necessary to carry out to the utilities, and that this schedule shall, where appropriate, extend to such characteristic features of the Conservation Area as the street railings and entrance steps.

Camden's environment should be protected, and the health of its residents should be treated as a priority. All efforts should be made to make air quality a vital issue.

Your Petitioners pray your honourable House to ensure measures providing full and fair compensation for all losses caused by the construction of HS2 in Camden, whether direct or indirect. This should include compensation for loss of housing, decline in housing values and business losses.

Your Petitioners request that you widen the compensation zone in Camden to match that outside London.

Your petitioners request that proper compensation should be paid for the inconvenience and additional costs of a decade of disruption; and that adequate compensation should be paid if trains, once they are running in tunnels either beneath Darwin Court, or next to Darwin Court, cause damage or misery from noise, vibration or subsidence. Your petitioners respectfully point out that even if compensation were offered, it would be to the freeholder and not to ourselves. Since the freeholder would not be subject to any disruption or blight, we would request that compensation should also be paid to residents.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clauses 1 - 36 so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
YOUR PETITIONERS THEREFORE HUMBLY PRAY your Honourable House that the Bill may not be allowed to pass into law as it now stands and that they may be heard by their Counsel, Agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against such of the clauses and provisions of the Bill as affect the property, rights and interests of your Petitioners and in support of such other clauses and provisions as may be necessary or expedient for their protection, or that such other relief may be given to your Petitioners in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AIR QUALITY

Your Petitioners are concerned that construction will lead to a significant increase in the major air pollutants Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) and Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5) in Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill Village and across Camden.

There is now a scientific and medical consensus linking air pollution to serious health problems, including asthma, cancer and heart disease. NO2, in particular, is recognised as a major killer. A study by King’s College London, commissioned by the Greater London Authority and Transport for London, has put the number of premature, unnecessary deaths from air pollution in London at 9500 a year. Besides these deaths, there are significant adverse effects on the health of the general population exposed to these pollutants, with the young and the elderly at particular risk.

The UK’s persistent breach of European legal levels of pollution, most notably in London, led to the Supreme Court ruling in April 2015 requiring the government to come up with a clean-up plan by the end of 2015. There is an obvious parallel to the situation before the Clean Air Acts of the 1950s, introduced to reduce the many deaths caused by coal-fire pollution.

Pollutant levels on major roads in Camden, measured in 2010, were well in excess of the legal limits imposed by Directive 2008/50/EC. These levels are unlikely to have decreased since then. The UK is already in breach of this directive and, in terms of its current compliance to this directive, rates twenty-eighth out of the twenty-eight members of the EU.

Your Petitioners fear construction will impact air quality in Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village from:

Construction traffic on Adelaide Road, Albany Street, Bayham Street, Camden High Street, Chalk Farm Road, Delancey Street, England’s Lane, Gloucester Avenue, Haverstock Hill, Jamestown Road, Oval Road, Parkway, Primrose Hill Road, Prince Albert Road and Regent’s Park Road.

Traffic congestion due to road closures and additional construction traffic.

Your Petitioners point out that the Promoter has carried out no air-quality testing itself, relying instead on extrapolation from air-quality readings made by the
London Borough of Camden. This method is inadequate, both in general and in many specific instances, to bear the very great weight and reliance put upon it by the Promoter.

To prevent damage to the health and lives of your Petitioners, your Petitioners pray your honourable House to ensure measures are put in place to protect them.

Your Petitioners request that before construction there should be an air quality baseline monitoring study benchmarked against the Air Standards Regulations 2010 and a copy of this report should be made public. Your Petitioners submit that thresholds for air quality and an air quality mitigation plan should be produced for the London Borough of Camden, to apply both before and during the construction and the operation of HS2.

Your Petitioners request that the London Borough of Camden be provided with powers to monitor air quality in accordance with binding mitigation plans and, in the event that air quality thresholds are breached, your Petitioners submit that the Bill should be amended to enable the London Borough of Camden to require the cessation of construction activities until such point as air quality thresholds are complied with.

Your Petitioners request that, in order to limit any increase in air pollution levels, the number of HGV journeys during construction should be reduced by the removal of all spoil by rail and the provision of material by rail rather than road.

Your Petitioners request that that vehicles used in construction should meet the latest European emission standard.

Your Petitioners request that you ensure, so as to avoid additional air pollution, construction does not lead to traffic congestion in Gloucester Avenue, in Primrose Hill Village or in Camden as a whole.

Your Petitioners consider that the Promoter’s plan to bring in and send out most of its HGV vehicles via the Euston Road is unacceptable, as this is bound to lead to a substantial increase of NO2 on what is already one of the most polluted roads in England and Europe.

TUNNELS.

The Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State and the nominated Undertaker to tunnel underneath our blocks. In Darwin Court, noise travels vertically right through all five floors. Residents are used to some noise from the present railway which runs along and next to the blocks, but they are severely affected when any drilling takes place in any of the flats.

Any works that do take place are confined to normal working hours, whereas tunnel and rail construction will continue night and day seven days a week.
A proper study is needed of the long-term effects caused when the tunnelling is completed and the trains are running, on the damage caused by subsidence, noise, vibration on old pipes and the possible damage or even destruction of the buildings themselves.

According to the LGiU (1) ground-borne noise can be a serious problem, depending on geology and building construction; longer trains are worse than short trains; some vibration may be more apparent 40m and 80m away than at 20m.

Your Petitioners respectfully point out the very great extent of existing railway land to the north and east of Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill.

Your petitioners request that the Promoter's tunnels should run beneath existing railway land rather than beneath your Petitioners' homes.

Your petitioners also beg that tunnelling and rail construction should NOT take place twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, as proposed, but should only be allowed during normal construction working hours.

Nor should construction work take place during Bank Holidays, such as Christmas and the New Year, but that your petitioners should be entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes, especially at night.

EUSTON STATION

Your Petitioners are deeply concerned at the provisions of Clause 47 of the Bill. This will allow the Government to purchase land compulsorily where it thinks that HS2 creates "an opportunity for regeneration or development" on any land. The clause states that the Government may acquire land compulsorily if it "considers that the construction or operation of phase one of High Speed 2 gives rise to the opportunity for regeneration or development of any land". This clause, without defined time or space limits, is the assertion of a new general power unprecedented in the history of infrastructure projects.

Your Petitioners fear that Clause 47 is a Trojan horse for the benefit of developers at your Petitioners' expense and that of the residents of Camden.

Your Petitioners draw to your honourable House's attention the impact which any future decisions about Euston Station will have on Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village.

Your Petitioners stress the importance to them that your honourable House ensures that whatever station is built at Euston, whether that proposed in Additional Provision 3 or another, should, as part of its design, allow an alignment in the section of the line near Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village to run centrally under railway land.

Your Petitioners strongly support the building of a double-deck station at Euston so as to maintain or reduce the footprint of the existing station.
Your petitioners endorse the following passage of Section 15 of London Borough of Camden's petition to your honourable House on this Bill:

Your Petitioners are prepared to consider other solutions for the Station and, in order for adequate time to be given for proper consideration, your Petitioners request that consideration is given to the suggestion later in this Petition for a temporary terminus at Old Oak Common. In coming forward with revised proposals, the Promoters must consider properly a range of designs which could be contained within the Station's footprint, such as the option known as "Double Decked Down II", as well as designs which could contain the approach to Euston Station within the boundaries of the existing Camden cuttings and tracks ... 

Your Petitioners respectfully request your honourable House as follows:

1) Your Petitioners request that the powers granted under Clause 47 be removed from the Bill.

2) Your Petitioners ask you to ensure that the interests of Darwin Court, Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village are taken fully into account in examining and approving any new plans for Euston Station and the alignment of the tunnels.

3) Your Petitioners ask you to look favourably on a design for Euston Station which causes the least damage to the area around the station and to Camden as a whole.

4) Your Petitioners ask you to look favourably on a double-deck solution for Euston Station, whether Double-Decked Down 2 or a similar plan.

OLD OAK COMMON

Your Petitioners are concerned that the generation of the new plans for Euston Station and the areas around it, following the abandonment of Option 8, will be driven by time pressure rather than by the need for careful consideration of all the available options highlighted in responses to the Environmental Statement.

Your Petitioners pray your honourable House to provide a temporary terminus for the scheme at Old Oak Common, to allow the best scheme for Euston Station and the area around it to be drawn up without inappropriate time pressure. A short deadline, resulting from the abandonment of Option 8 and the Promoter's unexpected need to provide an alternative solution, is not appropriate for making a complicated decision which will have an enormous impact on the lives of the residents of Camden, including those of your Petitioners.
Given the huge degree of doubt about the numbers of passengers using HS2, your Petitioners suggest that it would be prudent to run services initially to Old Oak Common to establish whether or not there is a need for a high-speed extension of the line to Euston.

TRAFFIC DISRUPTION AND CONGESTION

Your petitioners fear the effect that traffic disruption and congestion will have on our health, caused by construction lorries and road closures. Those who cannot walk far will suffer from not being able to get access to their cars and if they can, too many roads may be blocked for them to be able to get to the shops.

Many older people need or prefer to travel by bus rather than underground. It may become impossible to get anywhere near Darwin Court when the buses are on diversion for up to a year at a time.

If no other solution can be found, then your petitioners request that road transport be limited to daylight hours and avoiding peak traffic times, i.e. between the hours of 9.30 am and 4.30 pm Monday to Friday.

There will be an added risk to cyclists on routes used by the lorries taking away the spoil. Cyclists and lorries do not mix well. Neither of the two phases takes into account the simultaneous private development planned to go over the new station nor the housing to be destroyed and rebuilt around the station, which will require many more HGVs.

ECOLOGY

Your Petitioners deplore the damage the Promoter’s plans threaten to green spaces in Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill and Camden. These spaces include Euston Gardens, St James’s Gardens, Regent’s Park, Darwin Court garden and the Adelaide Road Nature Reserve, to all of which long-term or permanent damage will result.

Your Petitioners regard the Promoter’s plan to commandeer the Zoo Car Park, as a holding area for its HGV vehicles, as being diametrically opposed to the purpose and value of one of the great green spaces of London, from which trade vehicles have always been excluded. They also regard the threat that this entails to the hedgehog population as a symbol of the Promoter’s disregard for the need to preserve viable habitats. The Promoter’s plan to take over Darwin Court garden will destroy the largest green area in Gloucester Avenue itself.
Your Petitioners are deeply opposed to the use of the green bank of Adelaide Road as the site of one of the Promoter’s vent shafts. The Promoter’s works in Adelaide Road threaten the Adelaide Road Nature Reserve and the nearby Private Nature Reserve. These areas, taken together, are an important and rare green corridor near to the centre of London. Your Petitioners point out that there is no need for the Promoter’s vent shaft to be built at this site, as a far better alternative site is available at Juniper Crescent, where no ecological damage would be done in its construction.

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that he and she in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain etc.

................................. .................................
Signed by Roy Emerson       Signed by Ronwen Emerson

Date ..............................................
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF Simon and Claire Marinker

Declares that:

1. The Petitioner's are specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1 to 36, together with Schedules 1-26 set out the Bill's objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway. They include provision for the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, the compulsory acquisition of land and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. They include clauses which would disapply and modify various enactments relating to special categories of land including burial grounds, consecrated land, commons and open spaces, and other matters, including overhead lines, water, building regulations and party walls, street works and the use of lorries.

The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill (“the Authorised Works”) as specified in clauses 1 and 2 of and Schedule 1 to the Bill. They consist of scheduled works, which are described in Schedule 1 to the Bill and other works, which and described in clause 2 of the Bill.

2. The Petitioner's are Simon and Claire Marinker. They are married and have lived in “The Old School House, Radstone, Northamptonshire” since August 2006. They own the freehold. The property is located on the edge of Radstone, a small quiet Hamlet of 18 houses and a 12th century Grade 1 listed Church, enjoying peace, tranquility and beautiful views over open countryside. Radstone is a rural village and is protected by the designation of “open countryside” under local planning laws.

3. The Petitioner's are specially and directly affected by the Bill because of the close proximity of the proposed rail line (c.350m) and construction area (c.175m) to their property and the complete unfairness of the Promoter’s property compensation packages and in particular the Need To Sell Scheme.

The Petitioner's have applied for the Need To Sell Scheme on two separate occasions and have been rejected both times. The Petitioner's application was based on the close proximity of the construction site to their property, detailing significant excavation, demolition, disruption and building works and the subsequent negative impact this would create for them. The Petitioner's gave a very clear and detailed rationale for their “need to sell”.

The Need To Sell Panel did confirm that the impact of construction for the Petitioner's property could be significant.

However the Panel claimed that the Petitioner's did not demonstrate they had a compelling reason to sell or would be placed under an unreasonable burden if they were unable to do so. The Panel gave no clear reason as to why they had come to this conclusion, a decision the Petitioner's find quite incredulous based on the information they supplied for their application.

The Petitioner's Need To Sell application also had the full support of their local MP.

The House of Commons Select Committee's "First Special Report 2015/16 “published on 17/12/15 stated, when referencing the "Need To Sell Scheme", that they were looking to...."see some shift in the Promoter's position....” regarding rural locations affected by construction. This does not appear to be the case in this instance.

The Petitioner's feel their freedom to move house has been removed as a result of HS2, unless, of course, they are prepared to lose a substantial amount of money against the true market value of their property.

As a result, the Petitioner's lives, their plans and aspirations have been halted because of HS2. This compromises their human rights and is not just, or fair.

The Petitioner's respectfully request that the House of Lords Select Committee now instruct the Promoter (HS2 Ltd) to use their discretion and purchase the Petitioner’s property under the Need To Sell or alternative Scheme and to formally amend the Scheme to take into account construction disruption in rural locations.

The Petitioner’s therefore asks the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill:

AND the Petitioner's remains, etc.

Simon Marinker
4th April 2016

Claire Marinker
4th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Mr and Mrs C Holland  

Declares that:  

The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Schedule 25 – Noise.  

The petitioners are husband and wife, aged 71 and 69, respectively, owners since 2004 of a property known as “The Manor House” in the very tranquil parish of Lower Boddington in the district of South Northamptonshire. The house was constructed in stone around 1640, it is Grade II listed.  

The Bill and “Section 7 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990” places your petitioners in an impossible and unfair situation.  

We have read the Promoters Response Document to Petition No 759: Boddington Parish Council to the House of Commons Select Committee of December 2014 in the belief that the noise mitigation engineering designs by HS2 Ltd; would assuage our concerns. We have also read the Environmental Statement Volume 5 (November 2013) CFA15. We feel there are omissions in these documents. These cause us concern.  

The promoter states that the methodology used for assessing potential noise impacts is reviewed by a body called the Acoustic Review Group (ARG). We have read the minutes that are available on the internet of the meetings between HS2 Ltd and ARG from the first meeting (22nd June 2012) until the 14th meeting (26th February 2014).  

We have read that the promotor accepts that our village of Lower Boddington is indeed classed as exceptionally quiet, as stated in the ES (CFA15) paragraph 1.2.6.  

The petitioner’s property is built on an elevated position and at the closest point is only 700 metres from the proposed railway which sits in the valley floor below. The line is raised on a viaduct and embankments and is in the open for approximately 4Km through the
village. There are no natural or current manmade obstructions to prevent any noise from the railway reaching our house. The front of the property faces south and one side faces west. The railway line approaches from the south and passes to the west of the property then heads north. The property and the grounds are therefore potentially subject to noise nuisance from three sides, both during the daytime and at night time because in addition to the normal daytime railway noise, we may suffer from intrusive night time noise as HS2 Ltd; very late into the design, included maintenance sidings to the northwest.

It is unknown at this stage if HS2 Ltd; has engineered into the design sufficient mitigation. We are particularly worried about the fact that HS2 Ltd; appear not to have included any means or plans to monitor noise levels during the operation of the railway. Mitigation works can only be proven if they are monitored. We have found these statements in meeting #3, 13th Dec 2012, between ARG and HS2 Ltd;

Minute 2.1 – No HS1 post commitment to monitor impacts. --- HS2. To be decided if monitoring of impacts post operation will be included.

Minute 2.3 – “HS1 may be nervous about mapping noise annoyance” “HS2 Ltd; acknowledged that absence of complaints is not the full picture”.

At this time, the Promoter is asking all affected persons to take their word on trust. Waiting for complaints rather than actively monitoring for a nuisance is not acceptable for a project of this magnitude. If that is the case, and should the engineering works of HS2 Ltd; fail to mitigate noise sufficiently, there will be a nuisance. From the meeting minutes referred to above, this will only be known to HS2 Ltd; if people complain. If HS2 Ltd; fails to act, your Petitioner will suffer a noise nuisance and would wish to take action to protect their current quality of life.

We are very concerned about our future enjoyment, health and wellbeing due to the peak noise of passing trains and possible noise from the railway and especially sleep disturbance at night. The property and its grounds which we enjoy are situated in a very tranquil area. We do not have or need any sound reducing garden walls or exterior windows such as double glazing. In warmer weather, like many people we sleep with our bedroom window ajar and are very happy and lucky to hear owls as we go to sleep and birdsong when we awake. The buildings, grounds and the immediate external area surrounding the house are an important part of the property. High speed railway noise nuisance would curtail our use and eventually cause a loss of this asset.

We have received correspondence from the Conservation Officer for our district who has written that any work the owner considers necessary to mitigate the effects of HS2 will be judged on the significance of the building only, HS2 is not a consideration. Your petitioners may find themselves in an impossible situation. We may be prevented in carrying out some or all of the mitigation work on our home and grounds that we deem
necessary to retain our quality of life. Any part or all of the proposed work may be rejected by the Conservation Officer because they consider them inappropriate for the building according to legislation. Railway noise may make our home uninhabitable. If it can't be made habitable, it may be lost.

Your petitioners consider this to be discriminatory because Schedule 17 of the HS2 Bill allows the Promoter to demolish, alter and extend many Listed Buildings. Listed buildings lose protection in the HS2 Bill. If a listed building can be demolished, altered or extended for the benefit of HS2, then we, who own a listed building, are geographically close and directly affected by HS2, should be allowed to carry out mitigation work that we feel is essential but the Conservation Officer cannot approve.

When the railway is operational and if we suffer a noise nuisance that HS2 Ltd: is under no obligation to stop, it would be difficult and very time consuming for your Petitioners to request a change in the planning legislation, which may not be forthcoming. Therefore your Petitioners respectfully ask The Committee, that this amendment be made at the same time as the HS2 Bill is approved.

We would like the Bill to be amended such that:-

HS2 Ltd; gives an undertaking:

a) That it will ensure that both the average and the peak noise levels from the railway will not be greater than the very low level currently enjoyed in the parish of Lower Boddington both during normal operation in the daytime and during maintenance operations at night.

b) That it will continuously monitor noise levels, both the mean average and peak levels when the railway is operational and in maintenance and take urgent action should the noise be greater than asked for in a) above.

Or, if the Promotor will not undertake both a) and b) above, in all probability, we believe that a noise nuisance will occur and therefore your Petitioners respectfully request the following:

c) An amendment is made to Section 7 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to allow the petitioners (or subsequent owners) to carry out mitigation works against railway noise that the owner considers a nuisance, without hindrance or prosecution from local Heritage Conservation Officers.

Or allow the petitioners (or subsequent owners) to have their property removed from the Heritage Register.
Or, include your Petitioners property to the Listed Buildings shown in Table 1: Schedule 17 of the Bill, so they are afforded rights to have mitigation works against a nuisance.

d) That HS2 Ltd; will compensate the petitioners (or subsequent owners) for any mitigation costs and any professional fees incurred.

With respect to the Committee, the petitioners trust that they will help them to resolve this problem that has been thrust upon them through no fault of their own. We have no need or wish to modify our home and truly hope that HS2 will not change that. Your Petitioners just need to be prepared.

The petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

\[signed\ by\ Mr\ &\ Mrs\ C.\ Holland\]
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Susan Thornhill

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-3, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.

2. The petitioner is a resident of Chetwode and lives at The Watergate, Newton Purcell, Buckingham. MK18 4BA. The proposed route for HS2 runs through the middle of Chetwode. Your petitioner’s property is accessed by roads that will be used during construction. Your petitioner uses the The Green and School End daily when commuting to and from work and to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. The Green is scheduled to be diverted during construction. School End and the School End Overbridge are scheduled to be diverted and to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner also regularly uses the footpaths through Chetwode that will be diverted under the scheme. Your petitioner is likely to suffer inconvenience from the closure and diversion of roads and footpaths, and from the additional and diverted traffic on the routes that remain open.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioner favours a cut and cover (“Green”) tunnel banked and landscaped over the top, starting to the south of the village of Chetwode and continuing through the high ground past Manthorne Farm, the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode village and School End to avoid the many injurious effects in the parish of Chetwode.

The residents of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their local MP, the Church of England, Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council in petitioning for such a change to the construction of the scheme, and would respectfully point out that a tunnel on the alignment proposed by the Promoter would relieve many of the injuries to residents of Chetwode, the Conservation Area, the Grade I listed Church and the local environment identified in the Environmental Statement. Accordingly, your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the railway will be placed in a cut and cover tunnel to minimise the local environmental impact, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and Sections will be amended accordingly.

The proposed railway will pose a major severance issue for wildlife due to the long stretch of cutting, but also due to the security fencing that will be installed along most of
the planned route. The Chetwode cut and cover Tunnel proposed by your petitioner would provide some relief to this by allowing the migration of local resident species.

Chetwode is a very tranquil parish. High noise levels from the operation of HS2 are predicted for a high percentage of residential properties in Chetwode after the mitigation currently proposed by the Promoter. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the noise impacts. Chetwode is predicted to experience in-combination effects of significant visual and noise effects which, it is stated in the Environmental Statement, would have a major adverse effect. Current proposed mitigation of earthworks and noise barriers along just one side of the track is not sufficient. The Promoter should undertake further mitigation in the form of a cut and cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top. A cut and cover tunnel would be consistent with numerous Government statements of intent to minimize impact on communities and the environment.

The Environmental Statement predicts that the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Nicholas in Chetwode will have its setting permanently changed by the movement of trains and the associated increase in noise. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the impacts to the Church and its setting. Without more effective mitigation for both the Church and its officers, a substantial endowment will be needed to safeguard the future of this internationally important Church.

Your petitioner is concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on the single track country lanes currently proposed as a construction route. These lanes are not suitable for HGVs and are popular with dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There are no passing places and it is unsafe to take large amounts of construction traffic past the homes at School End where children live and play. Your petitioner regularly uses these roads and therefore will be directly affected by these issues. Your petitioner requests that School End is not used by HGVs at any time in order to decrease the negative impacts of construction. Your petitioners suggest that an alternative temporary construction route for HGVs is created along the trace of HS2. During construction, the nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the roads in Chetwode parish, and after construction, the roads must be returned to their original size and character (no road widening, curb stones or urbanization of this rural parish), and all damage must be repaired by the nominated undertaker.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed new Overbridges carrying public roads over HS2 at The Green and School End, which will be clearly visible from rights of way and residential properties in Chetwode, and which introduce new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Plus the noise of the trains could be a hazard for people riding or leading horses across the proposed Overbridges, due to the high sound level and its rapid onset. Your petitioner requests that, in order to minimise the impact of the proposal, the design of the scheme should be produced with meaningful consultation with the local community, to fit in with the surrounding environment and character of the area, using materials that mirror local buildings and materials. Additional screening must also be put in place and this must be maintained to a high standard.

Your petitioner has set out in the preceding paragraphs just some of the harms that would befall residents, land owners, businesses, visitors, and the environment were the scheme to be constructed as proposed currently by the Promoter. These harms would be alleviated by constructing the entire section as a cut-and-cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top to prevent the requirement of lowering the route.
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Susan Thornhill
06/04/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF HENRY THORNHILL  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-3, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.  

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner is a resident of Chetwode and lives at THE WATERGATE, NEWTON PURCELL, BUCKINGHAM, MK18 4BA ("your petitioner’s property"). The proposed route for HS2 runs through the middle of Chetwode. Your petitioner's property is accessed by roads that will be used during construction. Your petitioner uses the The Green and School End daily when commuting to and from work and to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. The Green is scheduled to be diverted during construction. School End and the School End Overbridge are scheduled to be diverted and to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner also regularly uses the footpaths through Chetwode that will be diverted under the scheme. Your petitioner is likely to suffer inconvenience from the closure and diversion of roads and footpaths, and from the additional and diverted traffic on the routes that remain open.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

Your petitioner favours a cut and cover ("Green") tunnel banked and landscaped over the top, starting to the south of the village of Chetwode and continuing through the high ground past Manthorne Farm, the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode village and School End to avoid the many injurious effects in the parish of Chetwode.  

The residents of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their local MP, the Church of England, Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council in petitioning for such a change to the construction of the scheme, and would respectfully point out that a tunnel on the alignment proposed by the Promoter would relieve many of the injuries to residents of Chetwode, the Conservation Area, the Grade I listed Church and the local environment identified in the Environmental Statement. Accordingly, your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the railway will be placed in a cut and cover tunnel to minimise the local environmental impact, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and Sections will be amended accordingly.  

The proposed railway will pose a major severance issue for wildlife due to the long stretch of cutting, but also due to the security fencing that will be installed along most of
the planned route. The Chetwode cut and cover Tunnel proposed by your petitioner
would provide some relief to this by allowing the migration of local resident species.

Chetwode is a very tranquil parish. High noise levels from the operation of HS2 are
predicted for a high percentage of residential properties in Chetwode after the mitigation
currently proposed by the Promoter. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should,
at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation
against the noise impacts. Chetwode is predicted to experience in-combination effects
of significant visual and noise effects which, it is stated in the Environmental Statement,
would have a major adverse effect. Current proposed mitigation of earthworks and
noise barriers along just one side of the track is not sufficient. The Promoter should
undertake further mitigation in the form of a cut and cover tunnel, banked and
landscaped over the top. A cut and cover tunnel would be consistent with numerous
Government statements of intent to minimize impact on communities and the
environment.

The Environmental Statement predicts that the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St
Nicholas in Chetwode will have its setting permanently changed by the movement of
trains and the associated increase in noise. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker
should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective
mitigation against the impacts to the Church and its setting. Without more effective
mitigation for both the Church and its officers, a substantial endowment will be needed
to safeguard the future of this internationally important Church.

Your petitioner is concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on the
single track country lanes currently proposed as a construction route. These lanes are
not suitable for HGVs and are popular with dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There
are no passing places and it is unsafe to take large amounts of construction traffic past
the homes at School End where children live and play. Your petitioner regularly uses
these roads and therefore will be directly affected by these issues. Your petitioner
requests that School End is not used by HGVs at any time in order to decrease the
negative impacts of construction. Your petitioners suggest that an alternative temporary
construction route for HGVs is created along the trace of HS2. During construction, the
nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the roads in Chetwode parish, and
after construction, the roads must be returned to their original size and character (no
road widening, curb stones or urbanization of this rural parish), and all damage must be
repaired by the nominated undertaker.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed
new Overbridges carrying public roads over HS2 at The Green and School End, which
will be clearly visible from rights of way and residential properties in Chetwode, and
which introduce new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Plus the noise of the
trains could be a hazard for people riding or leading horses across the proposed
Overbridges, due to the high sound level and its rapid onset. Your petitioner requests
that, in order to minimise the impact of the proposal, the design of the scheme should be
produced with meaningful consultation with the local community, to fit in with the
surrounding environment and character of the area, using materials that mirror local
buildings and materials. Additional screening must also be put in place and this must be
maintained to a high standard.

Your petitioner has set out in the preceding paragraphs just some of the harms that
would befall residents, land owners, businesses, visitors, and the environment were the
scheme to be constructed as proposed currently by the Promoter. These harms would
be alleviated by constructing the entire section as a cut-and-cover tunnel, banked and
landscaped over the top to prevent the requirement of lowering the route.
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

HENRY THORNHILL

06/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF LITTLE MISSENDEN PARISH COUNCIL

Declares that:

1. The petitioners’ parishioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioner is Little Missenden Parish Council and the custodian of an area of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty straddling the Misbourne Valley. Your petitioner’s area is bisected by the proposed HS2 route contained within the Bill (see Deposited Plans, Vol. 2.1, sheets 2-21, 2-22, and 2-24, see also Deposited Sections, Vol.5, sheets 5-10, 5-11, 5-12, 5-49 and 5-50).

3. Little Missenden is a mainly rural Parish of four wards with a total of 5,426 parishioners on the electoral roll, split between the villages of Holmer Green (3,455), Little Kingshill 910, Hyde Heath 837 and Little Missenden 224 (numbers accurate as at October 2013).

4. There are no large employers within the Parish, so employment is in small scale service companies, farms, but mainly by commuting to larger centres outside the Parish. There are a number of small shops in Holmer Green and a community shop in Hyde Heath. The nearest large shopping centres are Aylesbury and High Wycombe.

5. The Parish contains one secondary school, four primary schools and two junior schools. There are three Anglican churches, two Baptist churches and one Methodist church. There is one doctor’s surgery in the Parish, in Holmer Green. The nearest A&E is at Stoke Mandeville, 12 miles from the Parish along the A413.

6. Apart from Holmer Green, the Parish is poorly served by public transport and is reliant on the car for access to work, shopping, schools, medical facilities and school buses to Amersham, Chesham and High Wycombe. The nearest train services for leisure and commuting journeys are accessed at Great Missenden, High Wycombe and Amersham.

7. Your petitioner’s concerns

   Your Petitioner’s parishioners and your Petitioner’s area face a range of adverse impacts from HS2, both of a permanent or long term nature and also associated with the drawn-out construction works that will be required. The
impacts may be divided, for ease of reference only, between the permanent/long term impacts and the construction impacts, and include:

Permanent/long term impacts:

i. The impact on the AONB;

ii. The impact on public rights of way;

iii. The impact of the proposed Little Missenden vent shaft.

Construction impacts:

iv. The impact of construction vehicles on traffic flows;

v. The impact on pedestrian and cycle safety;

vi. The impact on chalk streams;

vii. Impacts from timing of works;

viii. The impact on the emergency services;

Most of these impacts could be wholly avoided by an extension of the Chiltern Tunnel as presently proposed in the Bill throughout the whole of the AONB. Our Petition addresses the impacts, and the mitigation required, below.

8 Your Petitioner is also concerned that despite the adverse impacts to its parishioners and its area, the Bill as currently drafted denies the Parish the one tangible benefit that might flow from HS2; access to HS2, as the Bill would close the existing railway line into Paddington that would otherwise connect to the proposed interchange at Old Oak Common. This is important not only for your Petitioner's parishioners and your Petitioner's area but the whole of South Buckinghamshire

9 Permanent/Long Term impacts

The impact on the AONB

Your Petitioner considers the current design for HS2 is unacceptable due to the damage it will cause to the Chilterns AONB, through both the construction impacts of noise, dust, road congestion, etc. and the operational impacts of a high speed rail line in the quiet recreational environment of the AONB.

10 The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty was designated in 1965 and covers 833 square kilometres. It is one of the finest landscapes in England and Wales. The importance of caring for these special places is enshrined in legislation including the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Section 85 of that Act includes the following general duty on public bodies:

"In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority (including a Minister of the Crown) shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty."
11 There is a considerable body of national and local planning policy which specifically aims to conserve and enhance Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This means there are tight controls on any form of development, small or large.

12 To reinforce these national aspirations for the Chilterns AONB, in 2004 Parliament established the Chilterns Conservation Board. The Secretary of State appoints eight members directly to the Board to represent the national interest.

13 The Chilterns AONB is one of the most popular areas in Europe for walking, cycling and horse riding. There are over 50 million visits made annually for the purposes of enjoying quiet recreation (information taken from Report by Tourism South East).

14 Your Petitioner respectfully requests that your honourable House should pay special attention to the proposals in the Bill so far as they affect the AONB in order to determine whether due regard has been paid to this highly sensitive area and whether the proposed railway is appropriately designed in light of its adverse impact on the area, its residents, businesses and visitors. The National Planning Policy Framework, has clauses which explicitly state that permission for major infrastructure should be deemed to be refused in areas of protected landscape such as the Chilterns AONB, unless exceptional circumstances can be established.

15 The roads in the AONB have few pavements and little or no street lighting. In essence the natural beauty has been maintained for centuries with as little manmade intrusion as possible. The planning laws and regulations have been designed with the principle of conserve and enhance this historic landscape. We therefore ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation of best endeavours to avoid developing urban features such as roundabouts and lighting in the AONB and as far as they are capable adopt the same duty to conserve and enhance.

16 Your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended at clause 1 and Schedule 1 (and elsewhere as necessary) to provide for the provision of an extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the whole of the AONB, as this is the only way that this damage can be reduced and in your Petitioner’s opinion would alleviate the detrimental impact that the proposed railway will otherwise have on the AONB.

17 The impact on Public Rights of Way

Your Petitioner’s parishioners, and tourists to your Petitioner’s area, are regular users of public rights of way ("PRoW") around the Misbourne Valley. Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of works authorised by the Bill on PRoW in the area. Your petitioner appreciates the changes made to the bill that have removed the impact on most footpaths in the Parish, but footpath LMI/40 will still be severely affected and our parishioners use the footpaths in neighbouring parishes which will be directly affected by the implementation of HS2.
18 The impact of the Little Missenden Vent Shaft

Your Petitioner is concerned about the design of Little Missenden Vent Shaft, which is noted in the Deposited Plans (see Vol.2.1, sheet 2-21) and Sections (see Vol.5, sheet 5-10) and the Environmental Statement (see ES Vol2, CFA 9, para.7.3.2. This structure will be clearly visible from footpath LMI/40 which runs through the site and the South Bucks Way and footpaths LMI/26, LMI/13 and LMI/40 on the opposite side of the Misbourne Valley, all used by your Petitioners' parishioners and visitors to the area. This will have a significant negative impact on the landscape, and ruin the aesthetics of the local environment within the AONB. Your petitioner has noted the assurances on the provision of the Chiltern AONB Panel and the minimising of the effect on trees on the site. However, your petitioner is concerned that the discussions in the AONB Panel will not reach local level.

19 The access to the Little Missenden Vent Shaft site is currently proposed to be directly from the A413, which will require significant dangerous traffic movements across a high speed section of the A413. Your petitioner and others have put forward a proposal for access from Weedon Hill which would be much safer but despite a site meeting, no assurance has been received on this request.

20 Your petitioner requests information and consultation from HS2 Ltd on the Little Missenden Vent Shaft as regards expected sound and noise issues associated with the shaft during construction and operation as to date no information has been identified within the ES.

21 In order to minimise the impact of the proposal, your Petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker be required to consult meaningfully prior to construction, with your Petitioner and other local residents on the detailed drawings and plans for the Vent Shaft housing and the associated external equipment and access roads. Further that the Vent Shaft be designed to fit in with the surrounding environment, and be maintained to a high standard. Visual screening must add, not detract from the AONB and this must also be maintained to a high standard. Your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended accordingly, whether by amendments to Schedule 1, clause 19 and Schedule 16 or otherwise.

22 Construction Impacts

The impact of construction vehicles on traffic flows

Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of construction vehicles using the A413 and B485 at up to 260 HGVs per day for five and a half years as detailed in the Environmental Statement. Your Petitioner's parishioners use these roads for access to work, railway stations at Great Missenden and Amersham, hospitals and schools as well as shopping and leisure journeys. A high portion of children in the area over the age of eleven are transported to and from school by bus. HS2 traffic along with commuters avoiding the HS2 traffic via the network of local lanes will make these journeys more onerous and dangerous. Construction vehicles using these roads will affect
your Petitioner’s parishioners directly due to increased delays in their daily journeys.

23 Your Petitioner is also concerned about the likelihood of construction and other traffic being diverted on to other roads within the Parish, due to this increased traffic level causing holdups due to the sheer volume of traffic and blockages due to accidents. These roads are Village Road and Taylors Lane, Little Missenden, Hyde Heath Road through Hyde Heath village, Windsor Lane and Watchet Lane, Little Kingshill, and Watchet Lane, Beech Tree Road, Sheepcote Dell Road, Penfold Lane, New Pond Road, Earl Howe Road and the A404 through Holmer Green.

24 Your Petitioner requests that the optimal solution of the extension of the Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB is adopted.

25 If a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB is not adopted your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended to ensure that construction vehicles, including HS2 construction workers transport be excluded from Village Road and Taylors Lane, Little Missenden, Hyde Heath Road through Hyde Heath village, Deep Mill Lane, Windsor Lane and Watchet Lane, Little Kingshill, and Watchet Lane, Beech Tree Road, Sheepcote Dell Road, Penfold Lane, New Pond Road, Earl Howe Road and the A404 through Holmer Green at all times due to the unsuitability of these roads. Your Petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker accesses the worksites along the trace as the preferred option during construction and that a clause is added to the Bill requiring the nominated undertaker to use rail access as the preferred means of transport, by constructing the route from the railheads already identified in the Environmental Statement.

26 The impact on Pedestrian and Cycling safety

Your Petitioner is concerned about the danger that the planned construction traffic will pose to cyclists and pedestrians along the A413 between Amersham and Great Missenden, and Great Missenden and Wendover. The B485 Chesham Road and Hyde Heath Road are recognised cycle routes. The experience from Crossrail shows construction traffic working to deadlines and cyclists are a lethal cocktail. Your petitioner has reviewed the assurance on standards for “cycle friendly” vehicles and considers it insufficient.

27 Your Petitioner requests that the optimal solution of the extension of the Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB is adopted.

28 If a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB is not adopted, your Petitioner requests that provision of separated facilities for these road users is provided along the A413 including a pedestrian tunnel through the Chiltern Railway embankment at Deep Mill. This also will bring a long term safety benefit to these users of the A413.

29 The impact on Chalk Streams

Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of construction works on chalk streams in the area, specifically those associated with the River Misbourne and Shardeloes Lake local wildlife site (“LWS”). Chalk streams are globally rare habitats and therefore special measures should be put in
place to protect them. A number of your Petitioner’s parishioners live adjacent to the River Misbourne and Shardeloes Lakes LWS and others visit them to enjoy the unique habitats and ecology in this area.

30 Your Petitioner requests that surveys are carried out to establish the current ecological value in these habitats, and surveying continues during construction and operation. If surveying demonstrates any adverse impacts during construction, construction in this area must stop until the cause is identified and negative impacts rectified. Any adverse impacts during operation must be addressed immediately. Surveys should be undertaken independently and at the expense of the Nominated Undertaker, and the survey method should be agreed with relevant stakeholders.

31 Impacts from the Timing of Works

Your Petitioner objects to the working hours set out in the draft Code of Construction Practice. Your Petitioner’s parishioners live near the Little Missenden Vent Shaft site and the A413 and therefore will be directly affected by construction works and traffic for the seven years of construction.

32 Your Petitioner requests that working hours in the early morning and evening and weekend at the Chesham Road and Little Missenden Vent shaft sites and at other sites accessed via the A413 and B485 Chesham Road are curtailed. No work should be undertaken on these sites outside the core construction hours defined in the Draft Code of Construction Practise.

33 The impact on Ancient Woodland of bore holes

Your petitioner understands that a number of bore holes will be used to examine the geology of the area through which the HS2 route will pass including within the ancient woodland at Mantles Wood. Whilst the technical report identifies an area of 40sq.m for each borehole site it does not mention access roads and we are concerned that the overall effect on Mantles Wood could be significant.

34 Your petitioner requests that the sites of any boreholes and their associated access are selected so as to ensure no mature trees are affected.

35 The impact on the Emergency Services

Your Petitioner is concerned regarding the need for increased police service provision during the construction phase due to the likely rise in crime rate due the introduction of an itinerant workforce into local communities and the additional costs which will fall upon your Petitioner’s parishioners as a result.

Similarly, the construction is likely to place additional strain on local health services.

36 Your petitioner requests that the Bill be amended to include a requirement on the Nominated Undertaker to pay the Thames Valley Police Force and local health providers for the cost of the increased resources needed.
The impact on Electricity Supplies

The villages of Hyde Heath, Little Missenden and Little Kingshill are supplied with electricity via overhead cables. The area suffers regular outages.

Anticipating that the Little Missenden Vent shaft and other sites will place a further strain on the local supply, particularly during the construction period, your petitioner requests that local services be upgraded before work commences at each work site.

Bill's failure to provide your Petitioner's parishioners with railway benefit

Denial of South Buckinghamshire access to HS2 and Crossrail

Your Petitioner is concerned by the powers given the Secretary of State by Clause 40 of the Bill, which allows the permanent closure of railway services without consultation, combined with the proposed Schedule 1 Work No. 1/42 in the London Borough of Ealing.

The Wycombe Single Line presently provides direct access from South Buckinghamshire to Paddington, and could be used to provide direct access from South Buckinghamshire to the proposed new Station at Old Oak Common, thus to HS2 and also Crossrail. The loss of this direct access from the Chiltern Line to the proposed new station at Old Oak Common will prevent your Petitioner's parishioners having direct access to HS2 and Crossrail at Old Oak Common with the loss of the significant potential benefit in reduced journey times.

Your Petitioner has noted the assurances given to Buckinghamshire County Council and Chiltern Railways on further study by the Secretary of State regarding the restoration of the Wycombe Single line after HS2 works are completed. We would request that Clause 40 be amended to remove Paragraph 1 b. to prevent permanent discontinuance of rail services and on completion of the construction works space be reserved to enable the Wycombe Single Line to be restored.

Reservation in the event of additional provisions/points missed within Bill/Deposited Plans/Sections, ES etc.

The points made above are in relation to the Bill as published for 3rd Reading and are without prejudice to the Petitioner's right to petition further and separately in relation to any additional provisions introduced to that Bill in future.

Further, your Petitioner has had great difficulty understanding the Bill, including its Schedules, alongside the Deposited Plans and Sections and the ES. Your Petitioner is concerned that it may have missed a material point that it would wish to address the Select Committee on. The points made above are without prejudice to any such further points.

Conclusion

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that unless the Bill is amended as proposed above it should not be allowed to pass into law.
45 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner's parishioners, their rights, interests and property, and your Petitioner's area, and for which no adequate provision is made to protect them.

46 Your Petitioner supports the petitions for an extension to the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that extends throughout the AONB.

47 The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that we or someone representing us in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Signature of petitioner:

Name of petitioner: ELIZABETH HOWARD

7th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Martin Wilson Baxter

Declares that:
1. Your Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner Martin Baxter of Southside, Kings Ash, Great Missenden, HP16 9NP, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the current intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

Your petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes. Within ear shot of my home on Chesham Lane HS2 will run on a high embankment across the valley below. I have no confidence that proposed noise reducing measures are sufficient and the frequency of trains will result in noise pollution in what is a tranquil rural area. It is this quality of life, coupled with the magnificent views across the Misbourne Valley, that will be destroyed. The tranquillity and views are what leads to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas. This morning 20 young people wearing back packs passed through, as scores do most weeks of the year, together with walkers who appreciate the countryside. I strongly support this use of the AONB for recreation and quiet reflection. The routes are selected for young people, many of whom are from urban and multicultural communities, because the area provides an experience of solitude and personal challenge, and yet they do not
have to travel far from their homes in towns and cities to benefit from it. Without an extended tunnel HS2 will destroy this experience for future generations together with the inevitable severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of this rural community.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line. The dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner is in his 70th year and selected the location because of the clean air (confirmed by the prolific growth on lichens on trees) and tranquillity, and HS2 Ltd has not given any undertaking that the period of construction, which could be ten years, will not profoundly increase the level of air and noise pollution. During and after the construction, HS2 will permanently reduce the ability of me as a resident, as well as numerous visitors, to enjoy the benefits of this area of natural beauty.

Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line. He needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden, Wendover and Aylesbury, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area. The A413 is a busy route for commuters and services, and already at peak times traffic uses local lanes to avoid the A413. It is inevitable that the servicing of HS2 construction will increase traffic on the A413 resulting in overuse of rural roads, which already suffer because the road surface was not constructed to sustain heavy traffic. An extended tunnel serviced from the open end north of Wendover, where the roads are built for heavy traffic, will significantly reduce the damaging impact of rural roads in the AONB adjacent to the A413.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3l proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DFT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.
3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there are established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wildlife access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.
g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.
h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.
i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.
j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power
lines are reinstated underground.

I. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure, such as road repair and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

p. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

q. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.

Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be amended to enforce the following measures:

d. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413.

e. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08:00 and 09:00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

f. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes.

g. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and...
prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area, during construction.

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

MARTIN W BAXTER

[each petitioner (or his Agent) MUST sign (or seal) the petition here]

Print the name of the person signing below each signature

[add the date here] 5 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF: Dr Simon Charles William Hook, Mrs Judith Patricia Hook, Mr Neil Ames, Ms Margaret Lorimer, Mr Howard Andemahr, Mr Clive Nicholls, Mrs Shirley Nicholls, Mr Christopher Reynolds, Mrs Rebecca Reynolds, Mr Marcus Beckford, Mrs Josephine Beckford, Mr Charles Walker, Mrs Suzanne Walker, Mr Derek Pitts, Mrs Jane Pitts, Mr Frederick McCurry, Mrs Amanda McCurry, Miss Siobhan McCurry, Mr Rohit Mannan, Mrs Bhavna Mannan, Mr Kurt Kuen, Mrs Barbara Kuen, Mr Neil Binns and Mrs Louise Binns

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill, with particular reference to construction works in Buckinghamshire.

2. Your petitioners' concerns

Property blight. The petitioners' properties have suffered blight for 6 years to date and there is no evidence that AP4 provisions have removed that blight. The ability to sell is significantly reduced and carries the prospect of a large financial loss. The petitioners have requested assurance that the Need to Sell scheme is applicable to their property. Chief Executive HS2 Simon Kirby, in his letter of 7th December 2015 to Mrs Cheryl Gillan MP imposed a time restriction on NTS and this is invidious.

Remedy: The petitioners asked that in view of historic and continued sever blight that their property be eligible for the Need to Sell scheme without any constraints.

Traffic, impact on access (duration.) The petitioners are very concerned about the impact of construction traffic on the B485 and A413 in access in and out of South Heath. In particular, with reference to travel to/from work (incl. rail station) and school.
Remedy: A fully developed and approved Traffic Management Plan. To date HS2 Ltd has not shared a TMP with BCC despite repeated requests. Therefore the petitioners have no assurance that traffic on A413 will flow reasonably; this is vital for access to/from South Heath for the petitioners. All costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd.

Construction noise, dust. Construction will run for 8 years with a 1 year gap at the tunnel portal (2017-2023) and 6 years for the vent shaft construction (2019-2023). The petitioners are very concerned about construction noise, dust and other air borne pollution on South Heath residents.

Remedy: Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB. Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to be monitored and enforced by Bucks County Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd.

Temporary construction road. The petitioners note that the new temporary access road from the Chilterns tunnel north portal exits at the Link road roundabout and hence have major concerns that this will add to traffic congestion already on the A413 which HS2 accepts is a major adverse effect. In addition the removal of spoil from the trace via this temporary construction route will exacerbate traffic delays on the A413.

Remedy: Re-route the access road along the line to the north (possibly close to Leather Lane) hence reducing traffic congestion at the A413 Link road roundabout. HS2 have agreed in principle with BCC that this will be considered but appear to have imposed a number of constraints that make it difficult if not impossible to achieve. HS2 should be obliged to fully facilitate this solution and cover all costs. Move all spoil along the trace and not on the A413.

Permanent access road to Frith Hill (SHL). The petitioners note the provision of a permanent access road onto Frith Hill at a bend on narrow part of the roads. As this will be required for safety and evacuation as well as maintenance the use of Frith Hill as a route to Stoke Mandeville Hospital A & E is illogical. The petitioners are concerned that route will be used for fit out and cause considerable local traffic problems and represent a safety hazard to school children and pedestrians.

Remedy: HS2 to undertake that this access road is not used for construction and/or fit out.

Operational noise. There are 43 properties above 65db peak noise and 84% lie behind the portal hence affecting the petitioners. The petitioners have no confidence that HS2 Ltd has taken sufficient measures to ensure that they will not suffer excessive frequent peak noise from the portal area. Noise from the Chesham Road vent shaft and autotransformer is likely to be intrusive and no independent data is available for residents to be assured that noise suppression will be effective.

Remedy: Provide independently verified factually based evidence of peak noise reduction for the proposed scheme. Undertake to implement the most effective alternative. Undertake to provide additional remedial noise suppression if the barriers fail to comply with WHO standards once HS2 is operational. Provide sound suppression to the South side of the trace. Ensure that noise from the vent shaft and autotransformer meets the required standard.
**Health & wellbeing.** The petitioners have been adversely affected since the announcement of HS2 in 2010. Life has changed as a result. The undeniable result of HS2 is worry, anxiety and stress and, in some cases, clinical depression requiring medical treatment and it would be hard to find anybody in the roads represented who has not been detrimentally affected in some way. Major concerns include the effect of the associated noise of HS2 pre and post construction, adverse health effects during construction due to dust and airborne pollutants, especially worrying for those already diagnosed with respiratory disorders. The effects of HS2 on outdoor leisure activities and the enjoyment of open spaces; water pollution during construction; emergency service response times that are particularly important for the young and old lead to the inability of many residents to adjust to the consequences of house blight.

**Remedy:** Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB. High-level dust and pollution suppression during construction with independent monitoring and powers to halt construction until preventative measures are implemented and verified.

**AONB—8.8km still unprotected.** The petitioners value the Chilterns AONB for its beauty as well as a recreational facility that once lost can never be replaced. Additionally, the AONB is used extensively by visitors (especially from London) and loss of these will impact on the local economy. The current above ground construction from the South Heath, north tunnel portal (Bury Farm, South Heath) northward through the AONB will destroy the last 8.8km not protected by a deep bored tunnel. Additionally footpaths have been re-aligned and cross the line rendering some of them unusable.

**Remedy:** Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB.

**Primary Mitigation**

The petitioners assert that the above adverse effects can be removed by extending the existing tunnel from South Heath (Bury Farm) throughout the AONB. Such a tunnel should be based on the T3i proposal.

If a tunnel is not granted then the petitioners request that the tunnel be extended to Leather Lane (as proposed by REPA) as this will address, most of the above concerns.

4. **The prayer**

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Dr S C W Hook
Mrs J P Hook
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05 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Helen Rosemary Jones  

Declares that:  
1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Helen Rosemary Jones, resident of Southside, Kings Ash, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire HP16 9NP. Your Petitioner co-habits this property with the freehold owner. The property is 750 metres (approximately) from the proposed HS2 line, at which point, the line is not in a tunnel. Currently, the property enjoys a peaceful and tranquil location. It will be directly and specifically affected during construction and operation of HS2. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.  

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB, is concerned about the detrimental effects of the current plan on this area AONB. The value of this natural resource is not only to Your Petitioner but also to fellow residents and a large number of people of south east England (including London). At present, this AONB is an asset for all these people. It meets the need for a wide range of leisure, recreational and sporting activities without the need for people to travel further afield. Significantly, Your Petitioner sees many young people using the footpath that runs alongside our home who are undertaking their Duke of Edinburgh Award. The visual and noise impact on this landscape will greatly lessen our mutual desire and ability to undertake these activities.  

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on
embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquility of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to her household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner also relies on reliable transport by car and bus and rail to get to work.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above,
then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed...
and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

o. That there should be established an Independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaken be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be amended to enforce the following measures:

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB and particularly along the A413.

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15.00 and 15.30 during school term.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes.

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the tracts directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the
railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.

(i) Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

(g) That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

(h) That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

(i) That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area, during construction.

(j) A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Helen Rosemary Jones
05/04/2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Peter Maxwell Jones

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill, specifically
   the lack of a longer tunnel in the north-west of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding
   Natural Beauty (AONB).

2. Your petitioner is resident at 20 The Warren, Chartridge, Chesham, Buckinghamshire HP5 2RY,
   which is adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In addition to his own
   personal considerations, your petitioner is a parish councillor in the parish of Chartridge which
   is adjacent to the works proposed for HS2 at Hyde Heath, and the elected Chiltern District
   Councillor for Chartridge, Ballinger and South Heath. Many of the residents whom he has been
   elected to represent will thus be directly and specially affected during the construction and
   fitting out phases of HS2, particularly all those in South Heath. His electors in Potter Row will
   be adversely affected in addition by the operation of the railway. Specifically he is chairman of
   the Ballinger Road Residents Association (South Heath).

3. Your petitioner's concerns

The adverse effects of the Bill with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which he objects
are primarily caused by and associated with the works proposed from the South Heath portal,
empowered by Clauses 1 and 2 and Schedules 1 and 2 of the Bill and associated powers in the
Bill (including the power of compulsory purchase). These include works 2/14 to 2/20 in Schedule
1 and are detailed primarily on Deposited Plans, Vol.2.1, Plan Replacement Sheets 2-24 to 2-28

Your petitioner notes the extension of the bored Chilterns Tunnel (Alternative Provision P4) to
a portal near Bury Farm, South Heath. In your petitioner's opinion, this does not go far enough.
The specific concerns of your petitioner are:

   i) there will be a negative effect on the footpath network in this area of the Chilterns
      AONB. This will be of significant personal detriment to your petitioner who is a
      keen rambler and dog-walker. This would be alleviated by a longer tunnel.

   ii) the 'Haul Road' to the A413 from the northern portal of the Chilterns Tunnel needs
      to be moved, as HS2 Ltd has suggested, in order to prevent excess traffic congestion
      and possible safety concerns. Your petitioner makes many journeys each week along
      the A413 road between Great Missenden and Wendover.

   iii) there will be a negative effect on the lives of residents and visitors to Potter Row,
      including your petitioner. Lengthening the tunnel would significantly reduce the
      disruption to the lives of people in Potter Row.

   iv) your petitioner notes that the tourist economy of the Chilterns AONB will be
      adversely affected by the construction and operation of the railway, leading to
      reduced turnover for local businesses (some of whom are suppliers or customers of
      your petitioner) and thus a loss of tax revenue to HM Government. This too would
      be reduced by extending the length of bored tunnel.
v) your petitioner is a company director of a firm in the printing industry, thus the buoyancy of the (local and national) economy is of considerable importance to him. He considers that the benefits of a longer tunnel underneath the Chilterns AONB outweigh the extra costs of construction.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Peter Maxwell Jones
7 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Wendover Parish Council and Halton Parish Council

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by “the whole Bill

2. Your petitioners

   1. Your Petitioners are Wendover Parish Council and Halton Parish Council within the County of Buckinghamshire, situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“the AONB”). Your Petitioners are responsible for Wendover and Halton Parishes. The Parishes are both within Community Forum Area 10 of the Promoter’s Environmental Statement (“the ES”).

   2. The Parishes are enclosed by the Chilterns and green belt countryside. The Parish is primarily made up of the town of Wendover, which has a good range of shops, services, facilities and employment sites. Wendover abuts Halton Parish including the Wendover Woods (Forestry Commission, Chilterns AONB and partly Ancient Woodland), and an RAF base at Halton. On the north side of the town is the Weston Turville Reservoir and Wendover Arm of the Grand Union Canal.

   Wendover lies at the foot of the Chiltern escarpment extending through the Wendover Gap to the Dip slope. To the south of Wendover, the landscape is characterised by steep sided and open valley, cutting through the chalk scarp and emphasised by woodland cover on the upper valley slopes. The Wendover foothills, to the north, west and east is an area of transition between the flat landscapes of Aylesbury Vale and the Chiltern Escarpment – lower chalk merging into Gault clay. As a significant gateway, providing access to the beech woods and dry valleys of the Chilterns from the Vale of Aylesbury, Wendover is an established tourist venue to the extent that your Petitioner provides and funds a Tourist and Community Information Office in the Wendover Clock Tower.

   3. Your Petitioners have responsibilities for a community of around 9,600 residents, businesses and land in the area that will be directly and specially affected by the Bill with approximately 4 miles of the proposed route running within the Wendover Parish Boundary.

   The proposed line follows a similar route to the existing Chiltern Railways Line and A413. At the point the proposed line comes closest to the ‘built footprint’ of Wendover town to the west, it is proposed to enter a ‘green tunnel’ (a cutting
covered over) of 1.28km. Much of the tunnel will be above the existing ground level and will cross Ellesborough Road, one of the main roads out of the village. A number of houses on Ellesborough Road will be compulsory purchased for demolition with plans for the road to then be re-instated over the green tunnel once it is completed. As the line comes south of the village it is further proposed that it will run along a 12m high viaduct as it passes over the A413 and Chiltern Railways Line. The line then runs on a high embankment to the south eastern boundary of the Parish.

The land proposed to be purchased by compulsion within the Parish is listed within Schedule 5 to the Bill, at pp.195-197.

4. The rights, interests and property of those the Petitioner has responsibility for, along with their quality of life as a whole and your Petitioner’s area, are injuriously affected by the Bill and receive no benefit from it.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Operational Concerns

☐ Noise – the peak noise levels will be unacceptably high in St Mary’s Churchyard; in the playing fields of Wendover Campus School will effectively make them unusable for the type of children using the school and around the northern end of the town.

☐ Noise – the noise modelling predictions are not as certain as stated by HS2 Ltd. We have been informed by an acoustician that they could vary by +/- 5 dB. Given the closeness of residential properties to the line this could result in noise levels causing serious health risks including incremental deaths due to myocardial Infarction

☐ Visual Blight and Noise – will have an adverse effect on tourists coming to Wendover

☐ The combination of noise and visual blight will cause property blight leading to a permanent reduction in house values and

☐ Hydrogeology – the proposal does not address the significant risk of the proposed green tunnel and cutting on the water flows to both the Wendover Arm Canal which feeds water into the Grand Union Canal at its highest point, and the Weston Turville SSSI site

☐ Hydrogeology – the proposed solution of pumping and pipework ignores the need to maintain the water quality as well as flow into the Weston Turville reservoir SSSI site. A settlement pond would be required to ensure there are no suspended ‘fines’ in the water. This requirement is not covered in the existing proposal

☐ Visual Blight – the 6m high noise barriers on top of a high embankment will be highly visible and extremely intrusive, there are no barriers of this height anywhere in the U.K. and these will have a huge impact on the Chiltern AONB and its reputation.
The Smalldean and Wendover Dean viaducts linked by a 1.5 kilometre embankment some 14 metres above existing ground level are hugely visually intrusive adversely changing the environment in the Chilterns AONB.

The noise of the trains going through the AONB will destroy the relative tranquility of the countryside in the area of Wendover and its environs.

These noise barriers will attract graffiti with no provision to maintain their condition which could well be an expensive ongoing financial commitment.

Agricultural economy impacts – permanent loss of land will result in a reduction of jobs in the rural economy.

Pylons – the proposal to change 2 existing national grid pylons of 50m height for ones of 63m height due to an increase in the noise barrier height of 2m will result in the eyesore being visible from further away.

There is no compensation for the community having HS2 thrust upon them – the current proposed community and business funds are totally inadequate.

Given the prevailing wind direction and the proximity of the line to the town there is concern that particles from the high speed train and rails will cause a health risk to people living in Wendover.

Impact on the community of having a number of houses along the Ellesborough road demolished to enable the green tunnel to be built. In addition Road Barn farm will be demolished.

Dust, pollution and poor air quality from the portals and shafts:

Light pollution, particularly from the proposed maintenance loop and sparking from the catenary especially during wet weather.

**Mitigation of Operational Concerns**

A fully bored tunnel through the Chilterns AONB will mitigate all of the above issues along the lines previously proposed T3i option.

If this option is independently found to be unacceptably expensive then a Wendover only tunnel would also help mitigate the worst effects on the town, provided a fully costed price comparison is produced by either a tendering contractor or an Independent Engineering Consultancy.
If a bored tunnel is not granted then your petitioner believes that the green tunnel should be extended to the north by 500m and to the south to the small dean viaduct and an enclosure put on the viaduct.

If the above mitigation is not granted then we believe the 6m high noise barriers should be hidden behind an earth slope or terracing.

The two high pylons would not be needed if there was a bored tunnel. If that is not granted then the electricity supply should be buried where ever it is being moved to avoid having higher pylons and to compensate for the adverse visual and environmental impact of HS2.

The noise concerns could be addressed by having a legally enforceable noise limit. Set at the levels quoted by HS2 Ltd in AP5 with a +5dB added for security of readings.

The proper level of compensation should be paid to St Mary's to ensure the building is correctly insulated to enable it to continue to be used as a concert venue and a further amount to compensate them for the lost revenue that will result from the churchyard becoming unusable/unattractive for wedding.

The promoter should relocate the Wendover Campus School so that they have playing fields they can use to meet the national curriculum.

The promoters make funding available to clean up graffiti.

The promoter should provide a larger community fund to compensate the community which derives no benefit from HS2. These funds should be easily accessible to those people impacted along the line.

**Construction impacts concerns**

- Diversion of highways and general disruption to the local economy and the community
- Light pollution from construction sites
- HGV Damage to highway surfaces and additional road noise
- Disruption of traffic and substantial delays along all local roads, caused by around 300 HGVs per day, especially the A413, the B4009 and the A41.
- Concerned that response times from the emergency services will be severely impacted due to the roads being clogged by HS2 construction vehicles. People will die unnecessarily if a solution is not found. A dedicated Air Ambulance should be provided by the Promotor.
- A serious strain on local community services such as the Wendover Health Centre and the police, caused by an influx of construction workers. In addition an increase in
respiratory illnesses due to construction dust, and mental health issues due to stress of living in a building site.

- Dust caused by chalk and soil from construction and excavation, leading to the exacerbation of respiratory problems suffered by Local Residents. On storage chalk dries out, creating dust, the effect of which will be made worse by the prevailing south-west wind, which blows directly onto Wendover.

- Substantial damage to this part of the Chilterns AONB with its exceptional natural beauty and legally protected landscape, for example by the visual intrusion of the construction works.

- Disruption to power supplies caused by the need to move the electricity pylons near the line.

- Disruption to public footpaths and bridleways, which many Local Residents and tourists use on a regular basis. These include The Ridgeway, which is one of only fifteen National Trails in England and Wales, and the Chiltern Way, the Icknield Way, the South Bucks Way, the Aylesbury Ring and the Chiltern Link.

- Noise from machines digging the green tunnel, moving spoil, constructing embankments and viaducts and traffic connected with that, leading to the inability to concentrate during the day, and inability to sleep at night. In particular the projected night-time noise will be substantially above the World Health Organisation guidelines.

- Light over the construction area causing light pollution. Many Local Residents live in an area where there is little artificial lighting so this incursion of light would be very noticeable.

- The effect on the value of property situated not just near the line but often at many hundreds of metres away from it, which have already suffered blight for over four years, and will continue to do so throughout construction and after.

- The effect on trade and commerce in Wendover, in particular the adverse effect on tourism, as evidenced by the construction of the Wendover bypass in 1997/8 which caused serious financial damage to many businesses, which in turn affects the social cohesion of the community.

Mitigation of Construction Impacts

- A fully bored tunnel bored one way from the south of the AONB to north of Wendover would alleviate most of these concerns.

- The use of a railhead to bring materials in and take spoil away would alleviate the pressure on the roads.

- A properly funded and easily accessible fund for all businesses impacted by HS2 during the construction phase.

- Legally enforceable assurances that the promoter or their agents will adhere to the limits stated in the ES. Ensuring the Code of Construction Practice is made enforceable in law, with monitoring by Local Authorities paid for by the
Promoter/the Nominated Undertaker. Further that a local independent ombudsman is appointed to oversee the conformance of the Promoter or their agents during the construction period. This would cover such areas as:
- working hours
- noise levels
- light pollution
- dust and particle control
- traffic levels

☐ That there is a clear system of arbitration and recourse for aggrieved residents and businesses.
☐ Proper compensation is paid to property owners whose house value has been blighted.
☐ Additional funding is provided by the Promoter for the emergency services and Wendover Health Centre who will have to cover the HS2 workforce and health related issues with the construction process. The additional cost should not be carried by local taxpayers.

☐ If the ambulance service is impeded by the Promoters lorries during construction then the Promoter should fund an air ambulance until such times as traffic delays have abated.

☐ Implementation of a Dust Management Plan (DMP) (which may include measures to control other emissions), approved by the Local Authority. Plan the site layout so that machinery and dust causing activities are located as far away from the population as possible. Use intelligent screening where possible. Erect solid screens or barriers around the site boundary to reduce ‘wind whipping’.
  - Use fine water spray to dampen dust. Water to be applied at rates so that runoff does not occur. Imperative that if runoff does happen, that it does not enter the aquifer - this would be particularly damaging in the case of chalk runoff.

☐ All HS2 traffic including related vehicle traffic movements are banned from the centre of the town and Upper Icknield Way.
4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that they, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Signatories

Signature
Name: Cllr Robert Duggan
Position: Chairman of Wendover Parish Council

Signature
Name: [Signature]
Position: Clerk of Wendover Parish Council

Signature
Name: Cllr Brian Thompson
Position: Chairman of Halton Parish Council

Signature
Name: Fiona Lippmann
Position: Clerk of Halton Parish Council

5 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF David Jenkins and Jill Grainger  

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioners

   The petitioners are resident at 36 B Mornington Terrace, and have been since 2002. Your Petitioners' property is a ground floor 2 bedroom flat that directly faces the proposed route of the HS2 line and is located within direct unobstructed eye line of a major construction site. Your Petitioners' property is also on a residential road that will be used by construction traffic during the construction of the Scheme. Furthermore, Your Petitioners' property is located approximately 50 meters from both the proposed Mornington Street Overbridge Satellite Compound and the proposed Mornington Terrace Sidings Satellite Compound, and is roughly equidistant from the proposed demolition and reconstruction of Mornington Street Bridge, the reconstruction of the Park Village East parapet wall and the construction of the Euston Tunnel portal, all of which locations are in clear, direct and unobstructed view of the property. Your Petitioners' have both worked locally for as long as they have lived in the property, one as a teacher in Somers Town and the other as a teacher in King's Cross, and will continue to do so till retirement. Your Petitioners' daughter plans to live in the property next year while she undertakes her qualifying year working as a teacher. Your Petitioners have always viewed this property as their long-term family home where they would live permanently and indefinitely into retirement. Being 59 and 61 years old respectively, your petitioners now face entering retirement during the period of HS2 construction and maximum disruption.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

   Your Petitioners and their interests are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

   The Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker to do construction works that are estimated to take 16 years to complete (estimated completion 2033) and will include lorry movements, the creation of dust and noise, poor air quality, and 24 hour working.
Health Impact

Your Petitioners are greatly concerned by the impact of the proposed construction on the health of themselves and their daughter. Your Petitioners' property is directly adjacent to the main construction site, where 24 hour working is proposed, two proposed satellite compounds are located and also lies on a residential road that will be used by construction traffic. Your petitioners believe that their health will be injuriously affected by the consequent depletion in air quality, the associated increase in harmful dust particles, the increase in NO2 emissions caused by the traffic of construction lorries, and the restricted access to fresh, unpolluted air caused by the inability, due to construction noise and dirt to open windows to the front of the property. Your Petitioners maintain that the proposed construction will: pose serious risks to their immediate health and ability to be effective workers; and significantly affect their long-term health and longevity during their retirement period (which falls within the HS2 construction period).

Noise and Disturbance

Your petitioners believe that the proposed construction and associated lorry traffic, particularly during 24 hour working, will result in a level of noise and disturbance that will make normal family, social and work life intolerable. Continual noise and vibration without any prospect of respite will inevitably lead to severe sleep deprivation. This will be particularly detrimental to the patience and alertness required in their daily work as teachers of vulnerable children and young people. Normal socializing, including inviting guests over for meals, will also become impossible, due to the increased levels of noise and dirt and restricted access to the property. Your petitioners are both teachers who regularly spend in excess of ten hours per week working at home, preparing classes and marking work, and this is often far exceeded in non-term time. Working at home will be seriously diminished by the impact of continual noise and disturbance.

Light Pollution

Your petitioners believe that light pollution caused by 24 hour construction work, and the associated use of electric arc lights in direct line of sight of their property, will create an intolerable intrusion into their home environment during the hours of darkness. Your petitioners believe that the associated light pollution will damage their sleep patterns and, consequently, their effectiveness as workers.

Loss of Amenity

Your petitioners believe that the loss of amenity caused by the proposed construction will have a damaging impact on their quality of life and their ability to undertake their daily activities safely and without major inconvenience. The positioning of Mornington Street Overbridge Satellite Compound on the corner of Mornington Terrace, and the demolition of Mornington Street Bridge, along with the continual stream of heavy vehicle construction traffic in front of your petitioners’ property, and the removal of existing parking spaces along the length of the street, will all contribute to creating a more hazardous environment for your petitioners, who cycle and walk to work every day. Your petitioners’
currently unobstructed and unspoiled views over to Park Village East will be seriously impacted, especially if the street’s trees are cut down to ease access for HGV construction vehicles. Access to Regents Park will be seriously impacted during the period of the demolition of Mornington Street Bridge.

**Damage to Property and Impact on Market Value**

Your petitioners are greatly concerned by the likelihood of physical damage to their property, which could be caused by the close proximity and massive extent of the proposed construction work and the 16 year proposed timescale over which it would continue. Vibrations caused by the huge increase in HGV construction traffic, as well as the construction work itself, could cause subsidence and structural damage to the property. Construction blight on the scale expected over 16 years is likely to have a dramatic negative effect on the market value of the property (if your petitioners should be forced to sell as a result of the unbearable effects of the construction on their health and general wellbeing).

Your Petitioners object to the powers that are proposed to be provided by the Bill to the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker and respectfully submit that the Bill should be amended or undertakings should be required so that HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must review the construction strategy for the project and its related works by considering their cumulative impacts on communities. And they need to suggest necessary changes from the results of that review before works design and construction strategies have been finalised or construction contractors employed.

The time proposed for the construction of HS2 and its impact on your petitioners' property and its immediate vicinity (specifically, Mornington Street bridge works, Park Village East retaining wall works, Tunnel portal works, other core activities through to 2033) is up to 16 years. Your petitioners consider that the threat to their health and the effects on their living conditions for this length of time are unacceptable.

In light of the foregoing and connected reasons, your petitioners respectfully submit that the following conditions should be introduced to mitigate the worst impacts of the proposed construction programme and timetable.

Firstly, your petitioners humbly submit that all waste, spoil and building materials and equipment connected with the construction programme should be transported to and/or from the sites by rail and not by road. Such a move would greatly mitigate the threat to your petitioners' health by protecting the air quality, reducing the dust and NO2 levels, and reducing noise, vibration and traffic congestion from your petitioners' residential street.

Secondly, your petitioners humbly submit that all construction work on the building programme should be restricted to core daytime working hours, and there should be no 24 hour working permitted at any time. This would greatly mitigate the damaging impact of nighttime noise and light pollution and the likely attendant sleep deprivation caused to your petitioners.
Thirdly, your petitioners humbly submit that the number of construction site satellite compounds (including Mornington Street Overbridge Satellite Compound) should be reduced considerably to a number that would cause the minimum disruption to daily life over the period of the construction timetable. This would have the effect of partially reducing the loss of amenity and visual impact on your petitioners’ immediate vicinity.

Fourthly, your petitioners humbly submit that there should be an independent structural survey of the condition of their property, and a valuation, prior to the commencement of HS2 works. There should be follow up surveys of the property at key points during the HS2 works. In the event that construction has adversely affected the sound structures of their property and/or the value of the property HS2 should be required to pay financial compensation for the full market cost of structural repair and/or the difference between the now blighted value and the unblighted of the property.

Your petitioners humbly submit that if these four conditions are met then it would help to satisfactorily mitigate the damaging impact of the 16 years of proposed construction on your petitioners’ health, general wellbeing and property.

In the event that these four conditions are not met, your petitioners would be forced to move in the interests of their health and general wellbeing, despite never previously having had any intention to do so. Your petitioners would, therefore, humbly submit that financial compensation be provided to allow the petitioners to sell their current property at the full unblighted market value (by guaranteeing to make up any difference in price between the unblighted and blighted final sale value), thereby enabling them to purchase an alternative property at a similar price in an alternative location. In addition, to ensure that no undue financial penalty is experienced, your petitioners humbly suggest that a compensation package (to cover the costs of conveyancing, estate agency fees, home removal expenses and stamp duty) be also offered to your petitioners.

There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

David Jenkins
06.04.2016

Jill Grainger
06.04.2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Sally Kindberg

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. The petitioner is Sally Kindberg of the Basement Flat, 126A Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8JA

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

SHEWETH as follows:-

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced and is now pending in your honourable House entitled “A Bill to make provision for a railway between Euston in London and a junction with the West Coast Main Line at Handsacre in Staffordshire, with a spur from Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes.”

2. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLoughlin

3. Your Petitioner and her rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill including the additions in AP3.
4. Your Petitioner SALLY KINDBERG of the Basement Flat, 126A Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8JA owns and lives in property above the proposed route for HS2 tunnels. Your Petitioner owns a share of the freehold of 126. Your Petitioner has lived here since 1977, her daughter grew up here and attended the local schools. Your Petitioner lives on a very low income and her basement property, now under threat from blight, is the Petitioner’s only financial asset.

5. Your Petitioner’s basement property, in a quiet residential street, will not be demolished as a result of the Bill, but is located directly above the proposed route of tunnels, and will be affected by noise and vibration within the tunnels.

6. Dust and noise from said construction works will affect not only your Petitioner but children in local schools in areas which already have high pollution levels ie in nearby Camden and Euston.

7. Your Petitioner is not assured of the safety of tunnels running underneath her basement property, which is within a terrace of 1880s houses. Any structural damage to the house at 126 Gloucester Avenue will be deemed the responsibility of HS2. Meetings with HS2 representatives in the past, wrongly called ‘consultations’, have not reassured your Petitioner that engineers have carried out adequate assessments, rather HS2 has produced irrelevant photographs, glossy brochures, huge amounts of incomprehensible text, and misleading information eg that the HS2 TBMs (tunnel boring machines) are the same size as those of Crossrail (HS2 TBMS will be bigger), and inconsistent information about the depth of the proposed tunnels underneath her property.

8. Uncertainty about HS2’s plans are causing everyone in Camden a great deal of stress and anxiety.

9. Your Petitioner fears that dust, noise and stress caused by proposed HS2 work will be detrimental to her health as well as to many others in similar situations.

10. Your Petitioner fears that lorries involved in construction work will cause safety concerns to the many children in the area en route to their schools.
11. Your petitioner requests that the tunnels be moved east away from her flat and realigned under the railway land to the rear of her property, or indeed that the existing wasteful plans for HS2 be scrapped.

12. My concerns have not been addressed by either HS2 or the House of Commons.

13. I am subject to injustice.

14. The House of Commons Select Committee’s overall solution for Camden, that Camden residents should rely on HS2’s assurances to Camden Council (as yet unknown) is a completely inadequate safeguard of our interests.

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

And the Petitioner remains etc.

SIGNED

SALLY KINDBERG  6th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF DAVID GOLDSTEIN  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by “The Whole Bill”.  

2. Your petitioner  

   The petitioner is an owner of property; 10 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX which the Bill may "specially and directly affect".  

3. Your petitioner's concerns  

   The proposed storage and lorry compound is a few meters directly opposite my front door where I have lived quietly in my Crown Estate Grade II listed villa for the last 25 years. Having reached the age of 75 I now work from home running a property investment company.  

   My concerns are the noise, disturbance and access issues to my road will make my office and living conditions unbearable. In addition my medical records will support the damaging effects from any pollution that will result from the works all along my road where the rail line runs parallel within meters of my home about half a mile from Euston station.  

   It is my contention that the only option for me is to move and that HS2 should implement for me and my neighbours the EXPRESS PURCHASE SCHEME.  

   As a property man of some 50 years' experience I consider that there is no downside to my proposal of purchasing our very unique and historic Crown Estate head leases on Park Village East. HS2 would end up with a prime property portfolio of considerable investment value and growth potential to derive significant profits after the period of works to ensue.  

4. The prayer  

   The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.  


AND the petitioner remains, etc.

David Goldstein
05/04/2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF South Northants Action Group

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

Your petitioner

2. The petitioner is the South Northants Action Group (SNAG). Its members reside in Whitfield, Brackley, Radstone, Greatworth, Thorpe Mandeville, Culworth, Edgcote, Chipping Warden, Aston-le-Walls, Lower and Upper Boddington. The proposed route of High Speed Two (HS2) will pass through (or be adjacent to) all these parishes and cover a distance of 13 miles in this county.

3. SNAG has interacted with HS2 Ltd through Community Forum meetings, bilateral meetings, and Local Access Forum meetings in South Northamptonshire and also through the petitioning process in the House of Commons. SNAG has set out to represent the interests of those people affected by HS2 in South Northamptonshire. The parishes listed above have more than 16,000 residents.

Your petitioner’s concerns

4. The people living in South Northamptonshire are and will be specially and directly affected in the following ways:

Businesses

5. This part of Northamptonshire contains many farms, and HS2 will run through numerous fields. The remaining areas of some of these fields will in a number of cases be unsuitable for future use due to their small size. Some farms, which have been in the same family for several generations, may no longer be economically viable due to the loss of a significant area of land to be taken by HS2 Ltd. Farmers are also concerned by the capital gains tax implications of selling parts of their land to HS2 Ltd. Despite requests made to the HS2 Select Committee (House of Commons), no action has been taken to either ease this financial burden or for HS2 to lease part of the land rather than buying it.

6. Other businesses have been forced to move or close. Some leases are now being let for much shorter periods. Collectively HS2 will have a negative effect on local employment.
Road disruption and construction issues

7. The A43 (a major trunk road), A361 and 12 minor roads will have either temporary traffic lights or temporary or permanent road closures. Collectively the temporary disruptions will span approximately six years. The permanent closure of the Culworth Road east of Chipping Warden is particularly unwelcome as the replacement route will be at least one mile longer and divert traffic via a dangerous junction on the A361. The temporary traffic lights and road closures will inconvenience both residents and businesses.

8. There will be an additional two thousand HGV two way trips per average day in South Northamptonshire as a result of work for HS2 Ltd. Disruption will be spread over a six year period. On the already busy A43 trunk road, this will represent a 40% increase in HGV traffic compared to the 1800 two way trips per day made currently. During peak months this will become an 80% increase compared to normal HGV traffic movements. The A43 around Brackley (and further south) will struggle to cope, particularly at its many roundabouts, and this congestion will affect both local residents and long distance travellers. On minor roads HGVs will have difficulties when they encounter other traffic due to the roads frequently being narrow.

9. Silverstone race circuit creates significant additional traffic flows on the A43 which are not entirely confined to weekends. If the proposed Rail Central strategic rail freight interchange is built south of Northampton, this will add HGVs to the existing traffic on the A43. HS2 construction works and Rail Central will compound the adverse effects on traffic using the A43.

10. The HGVs used for HS2 construction will often leave mud on the road and will add to the pollution caused by diesel engines. They will also cause premature damage to road surfaces and structure such as bridges. The construction works will create dust, light and noise pollution for six to seven years.

11. Fourteen construction compounds will be built in South Northamptonshire, two of them being “Main” compounds. They will generate their own daily traffic movements in addition to those for HGVs. The siting of these compounds and various permanent structures such as autotransformers has on occasions been unsympathetic. In certain cases requests to move these structures even if only to the other side of the HS2 line have been disregarded.

During operation

12. During Phase one, it is planned that there will be 20 trains per hour, i.e. one train every three minutes. During Phase Two, it is planned there will be 36 trains per hour, i.e. one train every two minutes approximately (total in both directions).

13. These trains will make much more noise than existing trains as they will be travelling at up to 225 mph when the predominant noise will be generated by aerodynamic effects. In addition the trains will make a distinct noise boom as they exit the Greatworth and Chipping Warden tunnels. According HS2 Ltd supplied
data, Community Forum Area 15 (Brackley to Lower Boddington) will suffer both greater increases in noise and higher absolute values of noise generated by HS2 than almost any other rural community forum area. This is most unwelcome as many areas in South Northamptonshire through which HS2 will pass are currently extremely tranquil, as MPs from the HS2 Select Committee (House of Commons) witnessed on their visit to this area on 27th October 2014.

14. There will also be possible damaging effects caused by the ground vibrations generated by these trains.

Environment

15. The proposed route of HS2 will cross more than 20 footpaths in South Northamptonshire, with a particularly high concentration of footpath crossings between Radstone and Greatworth. These footpaths will in some cases be diverted. Regardless of diversions, they will be all become much less pleasant places for walking due to the noise of the HS2 trains.

16. The route of HS2 will cut through Halse Copse an ancient woodland. It will cross a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) at the Helmdon disused railway which is used by the wood white butterfly. Near Radstone there is a risk of bats flying into HS2 trains. A Grade II listed farmhouse at Lower Thorpe will be destroyed to make way for the HS2 viaduct. The 12th century church at Radstone (Grade I listed) is threatened by HS2 as its foundations are thought to be very shallow. The route of HS2 will pass over the site of the Battle of Edgcote, a registered battlefield site.

17. The HS2 route will visually scar this largely unspoilt rural countryside with cuttings, bridges, tall viaducts, embankments and ugly overhead gantries. The visual blight will be even worse near Lower Boddington where a maintenance loop will be built; the site will be 1.2 km long and 130 metres wide (including cutting).

Property

18. Some homeowners in this area have already lost tens or hundreds of thousands of pounds when selling their property as a result of the blight caused by HS2. Many people have found the experience of applying for the Exceptional Hardship Scheme or Need to Sell Scheme extremely stressful and frustrating. Those applicants who have been turned down are even more frustrated, as there is no opportunity to appeal. A subsequent application is necessary to pursue the matter, which may be turned down for a different reason. There have been issues with HS2’s valuers not being familiar with local market conditions. Others who want to downsize or get away from the noise are simply trapped in their homes as no one wants to buy them. This has affected homes that are up to one mile from the line.

19. There are currently five homes in Lower Thorpe. Four have been bought by HS2 Ltd and the fifth should have been. Two of the houses will be demolished. This community has been destroyed before HS2 has even been built.
South Northants Action Group issues

20. The petitioner has several petitioning issues.

Train speed

21. HS2 trains will create a great deal of noise in what is largely a tranquil area at present. Requests have been made to lower the line, create earth bunds, erect noise barriers and use other means to reduce the noise intrusion of these trains. Very little positive response has been made to these requests.

22. However there is much easier and cheaper way to lower the noise generated by HS2 trains; lower their top speed. The petitioner proposes that the top speed should be lowered to 175 mph.

23. This will also help address the serious Rayleigh wave issue which could otherwise result in trains being derailed when travelling at 225 mph or above.

24. As side benefits, the trains would be cheaper to build and run, would place lower demands on the nation’s electricity generation (and make a substantial improvement in energy efficiency) and increase capacity on the HS2 route as trains could run closer together.

HGV movements

25. The petitioner has already noted the considerable number of planned HGV movements created as a result of HS2 construction work in South Northamptonshire. There has been mention that some of these HGV movements may be transferred from public roads to a haul route between Chipping Warden and Greatworth or Turweston. However despite several local people asking for clarification of revised HGV movements, a definitive position has not been provided.

26. The petitioner seeks clear, consistent and up to date data on planned HGV movements from HS2 Ltd. The petitioner needs to be able to see that such vehicle movements have been optimised and that their use of public roads has been minimised.

27. The petitioner requests that vehicles used exclusively on HS2 haul routes must be compliant with existing legislation for noise and pollution regulations as per the requirements on public roads.

Euston station changes

28. A number of people living in South Northamptonshire regularly travel to London on the West Coast Main Line. The changes planned for Euston station include reducing the number of approach tracks from 6 to 5, reducing the number of classic rail platforms from 18 to 11 or 13 and reducing the size of the concourse.
area near the main entrance to the station.

29. The petitioner is concerned the reduction in approach tracks will cause serious delays at peak times, and will constrict further increases in train paths at peak times which will be needed to accommodate expanding passenger demand on services currently run by London Midland and London Overground. It appears that the Euston development is focussed on the anticipated needs of HS2 passengers at the expense of classic rail passengers.

30. HS2 will very significantly increase the number of passengers wanting to use the Underground at Euston. This can be addressed by the building of Crossrail 2. However the petitioner believes that it is essential that the latter is completed before HS2 Phase two becomes operational.

31. In the opinion of the petitioner, it is a major shortcoming that the HS2 development, the classic rail station rebuild and the Crossrail 2 requirements are not being planned in one integrated Euston station development.

32. In particular the petitioner seeks the necessary changes to allow six approach tracks to be provided on the entrance/exit to Euston station for classic trains. The petitioner also seeks to ensure that peak level classic rail services are maintained during construction periods and have the opportunity to be increased subsequently. Other changes need to be considered to address the reduced number of classic rail platforms and reduced concourse area.

Overhead gantries

33. The overhead gantries being erected on the Great Western line and on overground sections of Crossrail are extremely ugly. They have more metal in them than necessary which greatly increases their visual intrusion. They have generated uproar in the area of Goring.

34. The petitioner is concerned that very similar designs of gantries are likely to be adopted for HS2. Likewise these would create far more of an eyesore than is required. Alternatives, which create less visual intrusion, are possible and a competition was run to provide aesthetically pleasing overhead gantries suitable for HS2.

35. The petitioner seeks the adoption of overhead gantries for HS2 which are aesthetically attractive, and requests that the HS2 Independent Design Panel should advise on a suitable design.

Capital gains tax for farmers

36. Farmers whose land is purchased by HS2 Ltd may find themselves unable to invest the proceeds of their sale in additional land within the three year rollover period. Therefore they will be subject to capital gains tax without any subsequent relief. House of Commons HS2 Select Committee MPs recognised this issue both
during their visit to Northamptonshire and in their final report.

37. However it appears that their recommendations on this matter have not yet been delivered. The petitioner seeks an extended rollover period as sought by the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee to ease the burden on farmers whose land will be purchased by HS2 Ltd.

**Air monitoring**

38. The petitioner requests that smart monitoring be installed to measure sound, noise and pollution before, during construction and once trains are running. The information should be made publicly available. Thresholds should be set which if breached will lead to construction work being stopped until the issue is resolved satisfactorily.

**Code of Construction Practice**

39. The existing Code of Construction Practice should be tightened as it has too many caveats and loopholes at present, particularly with regard to working hours.

40. The petitioner requests that there be an independent adjudicator appointed, funded by HS2 Ltd, who is there to quickly resolve issues which occur during construction, e.g. non compliance with the Code of Construction Practice.

**Total Cost**

41. The official cost of HS2 omits a number of elements. The Major Projects Authority identified 8 missing cost elements on 2012. This petitioner has identified a further 12 cost elements which have been omitted from the official cost of HS2. When these costs are included the total is between two and three times the existing official amount.

42. The petitioner seeks the involvement of the National Audit Office to review all the cost elements for HS2 and report back well before HS2's Royal Assent stage.
The prayer

43. The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Andrew Bodman
Roll B Agent
South Northants Action Group

8th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
SESSION 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Richard Timothy Brown and Valerie Brown  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1 to 36 which set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway. They include provision for compulsory acquisition, the extinction and exclusion of rights over land, the temporary possession and use of land, planning permission and deregulation in connection with, inter alia, heritage and environmental matters. Clauses 37 to 52 deal with railway matters, nominated and statutory undertakers, regeneration and reinstatement and further high speed rail works. Clauses 53 to 65 contain miscellaneous and general provisions.  

2. Your Petitioners  

The petitioners are resident at 32 Witchell, Wendover, Bucks, HP22 6EG and are the footpath representatives for the Chiltern Society covering the Parish of Wendover. The Bill will specially and directly affect these footpaths.  

3. Your Petitioners’ Concerns  

Objection is taken to both the construction and operation of certain of the scheduled works proposed to be undertaken in and near Wendover. These works consist mainly of the Small Dean viaduct and an embankment and 6metre high sound barriers between the northern end of the Small Dean viaduct and the southern end of the Wendover green tunnel. They include ancillary works such as satellite compounds, auto-transformer stations, balancing ponds and portal buildings.  

Your Petitioner’s main objective is to have the line lowered into a fully-bored tunnel as it passes through the whole of the Chiltern's Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty  

Problems caused to footpaths by the construction and operation of HS2  

a) According to Chiltern Society figures, The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty receives more than 55,000,000 visitors per year and a substantial number visit Wendover, to walk, cycle and enjoy the beauty and tranquillity of the area.
b) The proposed HS2 route will adversely affect many Public Rights of Way (PROWs) and bridleways.

c) In the parish of Wendover alone, fourteen (14) footpaths will be severed or severely affected by HS2, including the internationally significant Ridgeway Long Distance Footpath, the Chiltern Way, the Icknield Way and the Aylesbury Ring.

d) The footpaths severed or severely impacted are:- W6 (Aylesbury Ring), W11, W13a (Aylesbury Ring), W14, W33, W36 (Chiltern Way), W37, W38, W39, W40, W46 (The Ridgeway), W53, W55 and W57. Wendover High Street is also part of the Ridgeway.

e) Enjoyment of PROWs will be adversely affected by damage to the landscape. This damage includes the unsightly 6metre high sound barriers on top of embankments.

f) The loss of PROWs and damage to the environment and subsequent reduction in the number of visitors will impact very seriously on businesses in Wendover, where shops, pubs and restaurants currently benefit from the expenditure of visitors.

Footpaths - the solution

g) Your Petitioners propose that part of the scheduled works be replaced by a fully-bored tunnel from through the whole of the Chiltern's AONB

h) This would avoid the problems set out in paragraphs a) to f)

Mitigation of the present proposal

i) However, if the proposal for a fully-bored tunnel is rejected your Petitioner proposes the following mitigation:-

j) That the proposed green tunnel be replaced by a fully-bored, short tunnel replacing the viaduct and noise barriers to protect Wendover, as proposed by other petitioners.

k) Where it is necessary to close or temporarily obstruct PROWs during construction of HS2:

   a. the alternative route must not to be unpleasant to use

   b. the closure time must not exceed four weeks

   c. the paths must be fully reinstated as soon as possible.

   d. procedures must be in place to report and correct any breach of agreements with regards to footpaths
1) Your Petitioner’s reiterate that their main objective is to persuade your Honourable House to lower the line into a fully-bored tunnel as it passes through the whole of the Chiltern’s AONB.

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Signed

Richard Timothy Brown

Valerie Brown

7th April, 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF The Southam Area Action Group – Petition 2

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

2.1 The petitioner is the Southam Area Action Group (SAAG). Southam is a Warwickshire town with a population of six and a half thousand people. The planned route of HS2 passes on the southern edge of the industrial estate linked to the town. Southam Area Action Group has done and continues to do its best to represent the interests of the local people in this area with respect to the issues caused by HS2. SAAG members have attended all the HS2 meetings in its area over the last 6 years in order to represent the local population.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

3.1 The 10,000 people from this town and the adjacent area will be specially and directly affected in the following ways:

During construction

3.2 The A423, A425, B4451 and other roads will have traffic light controlled road works for at least 4 to 5 years which will severely disrupt traffic flow. There will be an additional 140 HGV two-way traffic movements per day on average for 4 to 5 years. These will disrupt existing traffic flows, damage the road surfaces prematurely and leave behind large amounts of mud and dust. They will also cause additional traffic pollution.

3.3 The construction works will create dust, light and noise pollution for up to six years. The tunnelling works risks causing massive damage to businesses, buildings and a cemetery. It will also impact the 184 acre Long Itchington ancient woodland necessitating a line of trees to be cut down, even though this is simply for test borings. It is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The unsympathetic location of construction compounds, autotransformers and holding ponds is already causing distress to local landowners.

During operation

3.4 During Phase One it is planned that there will be 20 trains passing per hour, i.e. one train every three minutes. During Phase Two it is planned that there will be 36 trains passing per hour, i.e. one train every two minutes approximately.

3.5 These trains will make much more noise than existing trains as they will be travelling
at up to 225 mph, when aerodynamic effects will generate the predominant noise. In addition the trains will make a distinct noise boom as they exit the Long Itchington Wood tunnel at both ends. There are also possible damaging effects caused by the ground vibrations generated by these trains.

Business and environment
3.6 The plans for HS2 are already having an adverse effect on business. The businesses on the Kineton Road industrial estate can no longer expand south westwards because the land is safeguarded for HS2. This is a key employment area for this town. Some businesses will either move elsewhere or else close. Business leases which were held for ten years are now being renewed for just one year at a time. The Codemaster business site with over 400 jobs could be moved elsewhere. These changes are devastating for local employment prospects. The Dallas Burston polo ground will cease operation as the noise of the trains will upset the horses when the trains exit the tunnel.

3.7 Many farmers’ fields will be bisected by the HS2 route often causing the remaining areas to be less suitable for future use. Some footpaths will be bisected or diverted. Those that are simply close to HS2 will no longer be pleasant places to walk due to the noise of HS2 trains. The HS2 route will visually scar this largely unspoiled rural countryside with deep cuttings, bridges, embankments, vent shafts and ugly overhead gantries.

Property
3.8 Some homeowners in this area have already lost tens or hundreds of thousands of pounds when selling their property as a result of the blight caused by HS2. Some people in this area have publically considered suicide as a result of the anticipated effects of HS2 on their property and way of life. Many people have found the experience of applying for the Exceptional Hardship Scheme or Need to Sell Scheme extremely stressful and frustrating. HS2 issues are the most common reason for people writing to their local Member of Parliament, Jeremy Wright QC.

True Cost of HS2
3.9 The petitioner is most concerned that the cost of High Speed Two has been significantly understated. The petitioner is of the opinion that this project will cost between two and three times the official amount currently stated. This situation has come about as a number of costs have been omitted.

3.10 It should also be noted that the last detailed breakdown of costings for HS2 was published in 2013, although the headline number was revised in November 2015, to reflect 2015 prices.

3.11 The Major Projects Authority in their report of June 2012 identified eight costs that had been omitted. The most significant of those omissions was inflation.

3.12 The petitioner believes that there are other costs that have been omitted or miscalculated, which are outlined below. The Petitioner petitioned on this subject in the House of Commons during March 2015.

Construction costs
3.13 The construction cost for the Phase Two element of the HS2 route appears to be significantly understated in relation to the cost per mile of the Phase One route and the cost per mile of HS1. This should be considered now as if Parliament decides to proceed with Phase One, then there is a strong likelihood that Phase Two will follow. While the
official benefit cost ratio for the whole project is extremely poor, it is even worse for Phase One alone.

3.14 HS2 Ltd have indicated that the number of rail passengers wanting to use the Underground at Euston station will approximately quadruple between 2012 and 2041. Yet they have made no provision for additional capacity on London Underground trains. It has been widely acknowledged that the only way to provide suitable capacity is to build Crossrail 2 before HS2 Phase Two opens. Therefore a contribution needs to be made by HS2 towards the £32.6 bn cost of Crossrail 2.

3.15 Under the Barnett Formula several billion pounds will be provided to Scotland and Northern Ireland as a result of HS2. This has not been included within the HS2 budget, but should be.

3.16 When the fleet of HS2 trains are running, they will draw approximately 1000MW from the national grid. As the UK lacks spare electrical generating capacity, it will be necessary to provide additional generating capacity simply to enable these powerful trains to run. The petitioner is of the view that such a cost needs to be included within the HS2 budget.

3.17 There is no separate research and development budget set aside for HS2. Yet it is proposed that HS2 will travel faster than almost any other high speed trains in the world. That in turn creates a number of engineering issues for which solutions need to be found. One recent example, which has been in the media, is the effect of Rayleigh waves in tracks at such speeds. A typical research and development budget for a major project would be 10% of the total cost.

3.18 The cost of the work required at Euston station now excludes the work to rebuild the part of the station used for classic rail. This cost should also be included in the HS2 budget as it was in the similar case for St Pancras station, which was part of HS1 Section Two.

3.19 The overhead line equipment on existing routes to be used by classic compatible trains needs to be made more reliable to match the standards expected on HS2 trains and also to provide greater current drawn by HS2 trains. The length of route involved is approximately 500 miles. The cost of such upgrading work needs to be included within the HS2 budget.

3.20 The Additional Provisions created since the HS2 Hybrid Bill was published need to have these costs added into the overall HS2 budget.

Running costs and interest on debt
3.21 There are no more than two high speed lines in the world which run profitably, and both of those lines were built more than 30 years ago. HS2 will not generate sufficient profit to pay off its running costs and pay down its debt at the same time. Therefore interest charges will be payable on the outstanding debt for most if not all of its design life. This is another cost that needs to be included within the total budget for HS2 in the opinion of this petitioner.

3.22 Security will be critical on such a high speed line. There will be ongoing costs associated with maintaining suitable security of this line. Similarly there will be track maintenance costs. Both costs need to be added to the HS2 budget.
3.23 There are several additional costs which have been identified but not quantified.

3.24 The HS2 Growth Taskforce scheme, set up by Lord Deighton, is intended to get cities “HS2 Ready”. The funding for individual schemes within this remit will come from Government but should be treated as HS2 costs.

3.25 It was originally planned that the existing station at Crewe would be used. That view has changed and it is now planned that a new station will be built at Crewe. However this new station was not costed at the time of announcement of the HS2 Phase 2a route (November 2015).

3.26 There are approximately half a million homes within 1km of the HS2 route (Phases One and two). Many people living in these houses are going be disturbed by all the construction work while the line is built and subsequently by the noise of the trains once they are running. The majority of people who have applied for the Exceptional Hardship scheme or the Need to Sell scheme have been either turned down or not reached agreement with HS2 Ltd. They either face being stuck in their homes and enduring all the disturbance described above or taking a loss of tens or hundreds of thousands of pounds in the value of their properties. These costs will not appear on the HS2 balance sheet but are occurring as a result of HS2.

3.27 The petitioner would suggest that there might not be sufficient contingency within the HS2 budget. The estimated cost of electrifying the Great Western route is now four times the size of the originally forecast. The cost of electrifying the Midland Mainline is now three times the size of the original forecast.

3.28 Much of the HS2 route has not been surveyed and as far as Phase Two is concerned has not been finalised. It is questionable whether the recent reduction in contingency allowance for Phase Two construction costs can be justified.

3.29 Most of Parliament appears to be unaware of the true cost of HS2. The petitioner proposes that the National Audit Office revisits its current study of HS2 in the light of the findings of this petition. That later report needs to be reviewed closely by the cabinet, all other MPs and the House of Lords prior to royal assent being granted.
4. The prayer

4.1 The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Dr Dan Mitchell
Roll B Agent
Southam Area Action Group
7th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Charlie Clare

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-3, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is a resident of Chetwode and lives at The Old Vicarage, Chetwode, Buckingham, BUCKS, MK18 4JZ ("your petitioner’s property"). The proposed route for HS2 runs through the middle of Chetwode. Your petitioner’s property is accessed by roads that will be used during construction. Your petitioner uses the The Green and School End daily when commuting to and from work and to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. The Green is scheduled to be diverted during construction. School End and the School End Overbridge are scheduled to be diverted and to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner also regularly uses the footpaths through Chetwode that will be diverted under the scheme. Your petitioner is likely to suffer inconvenience from the closure and diversion of roads and footpaths, and from the additional and diverted traffic on the routes that remain open.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Your petitioner favours a cut and cover ("Green") tunnel banked and landscaped over the top, starting to the south of the village of Chetwode and continuing through the high ground past Manthorne Farm, the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode village and School End to avoid the many injurious effects in the parish of Chetwode.

The residents of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their local MP, the Church of England, Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council in petitioning for such a change to the construction of the scheme, and would respectfully point out that a tunnel on the alignment proposed by the Promoter would relieve many of the injuries to residents of Chetwode, the Conservation Area, the Grade I listed Church and the local environment identified in the Environmental Statement. Accordingly, your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the railway will be placed in a cut and cover tunnel to minimise the local environmental impact, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and Sections will be amended accordingly.

The proposed railway will pose a major severance issue for wildlife due to the long stretch of cutting, but also due to the security fencing that will be installed along most of
the planned route. The Chetwode cut and cover Tunnel proposed by your petitioner would provide some relief to this by allowing the migration of local resident species.

Chetwode is a very tranquil parish. High noise levels from the operation of HS2 are predicted for a high percentage of residential properties in Chetwode after the mitigation currently proposed by the Promoter. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the noise impacts. Chetwode is predicted to experience in-combination effects of significant visual and noise effects which, it is stated in the Environmental Statement, would have a major adverse effect. Current proposed mitigation of earthworks and noise barriers along just one side of the track is not sufficient. The Promoter should undertake further mitigation in the form of a cut and cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top. A cut and cover tunnel would be consistent with numerous Government statements of intent to minimize impact on communities and the environment.

The Environmental Statement predicts that the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Nicholas in Chetwode will have its setting permanently changed by the movement of trains and the associated increase in noise. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the impacts to the Church and its setting. Without more effective mitigation for both the Church and its officers, a substantial endowment will be needed to safeguard the future of this internationally important Church.

Your petitioner is concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on the single track country lanes currently proposed as a construction route. These lanes are not suitable for HGVs and are popular with dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There are no passing places and it is unsafe to take large amounts of construction traffic past the homes at School End where children live and play. Your petitioner regularly uses these roads and therefore will be directly affected by these issues. Your petitioner requests that School End is not used by HGVs at any time in order to decrease the negative impacts of construction. Your petitioners suggest that an alternative temporary construction route for HGVs is created along the trace of HS2. During construction, the nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the roads in Chetwode parish, and after construction, the roads must be returned to their original size and character (no road widening, curb stones or urbanization of this rural parish), and all damage must be repaired by the nominated undertaker.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed new Overbridges carrying public roads over HS2 at The Green and School End, which will be clearly visible from rights of way and residential properties in Chetwode, and which introduce new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Plus the noise of the trains could be a hazard for people riding or leading horses across the proposed Overbridges, due to the high sound level and its rapid onset. Your petitioner requests that, in order to minimise the impact of the proposal, the design of the scheme should be produced with meaningful consultation with the local community, to fit in with the surrounding environment and character of the area, using materials that mirror local buildings and materials. Additional screening must also be put in place and this must be maintained to a high standard.

Your petitioner has set out in the preceding paragraphs just some of the harms that would befall residents, land owners, businesses, visitors, and the environment were the scheme to be constructed as proposed currently by the Promoter. These harms would be alleviated by constructing the entire section as a cut-and-cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top to prevent the requirement of lowering the route.
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Each petitioner (or his Agent) **MUST** sign the petition here

Charlie Clare

04/04/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Gordon Robert and Harriet Anna Raitt  

Declares that:  

1. Your petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway. They include provision for the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, the compulsory acquisition of land and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. They include clauses which would disapply and modify various enactments relating to special categories of land including burial grounds, consecrated land, commons and open spaces, and other matters, including overhead lines, water, building regulations and party walls, street works and the use of lorries.  

Clauses 37 to 42 of the Bill deal with the regulatory regime for the railway.  

Clauses 43 to 65 of the Bill set out a number of miscellaneous and general provisions, including provision for the appointment of a nominated undertaker (“the Nominated Undertaker”) to exercise the powers under the Bill, transfer schemes, provisions relating to statutory undertakers and the Crown, provision about the compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration, reinstatement works and provision about further high speed railway works. Provision is also made about the application of Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.  

2. Your petitioner  

Your Petitioners are the freehold owners of 1 Manor Cottages, Banbury Lane, Lower Thorpe, Thorpe Mandeville, Banbury, Oxon. OX17 2HP, and have been since 1985.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

The proposed route of HS2 crosses the Banbury Lane on the Lower Thorpe viaduct, requiring the demolition of two of the five properties in Lower Thorpe, and passes within 90 metres to the north of your Petitioners’ property, which is situated on Banbury Lane. The viaduct will be 7.9 metres high.  

Your Petitioners and their interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

Your Petitioners have taken active steps to work with High Speed 2 Limited and the Government in their development of the proposals, via emails and on-site meetings over the last five years, in an attempt to achieve a satisfactory conclusion regarding a compensation package. However, your Petitioners have to date been unsuccessful because the property lies just outside the Compulsory Purchase Zone. However, as outlined in this petition, your Petitioners have substantial outstanding
concerns with the appraisal work, design and development of the project and the particular powers
now proposed in the Bill and their impact on your Petitioners property.

Your Petitioners are in particular concerned that the proposed railway will render their property
uninhabitable during construction and operation due to loss of community, noise, dust and emission
pollution, and the impacts of construction traffic on highways in and around their property.

Your Petitioners' concerns are explained more fully below and solutions to its concerns identified.
Your Petitioners recognize, however, that other solutions to these concerns may be brought
forward and, insofar as those are to be preferred, it would wish to associate itself with them.

Habitability of your Petitioner's property.

Your Petitioners' residential property has been a family home for over 20 years, and is currently
occupied by a family of four. It is located within the hamlet of Lower Thorpe, which is set in a
tranquil and rural valley between Thorpe Mandeville and Culworth, and will be approximately 90
metres from the Lower Thorpe viaduct. There are five properties in the hamlet of Lower Thorpe,
three of which have already been purchased by High Speed 2 Ltd. Of the five properties, two of
them have been identified for compulsory purchase and demolition. Therefore, your Petitioners'
property will be the only remaining privately owned property in Lower Thorpe. In addition, your
Petitioners' property is in very close proximity to the Lower Thorpe viaduct satellite compound,
and the proposed haul route to be used under the Bill. As a consequence, your Petitioners property
will be subject to intolerable noise/dust/visual impact/vibration/light pollution for two years during
construction, and intolerable noise/visual impact during operation. The community of Lower
Thorpe will be untenable as a result of the proposed railway construction and operation. It has
already been irretrievably broken down as a direct result of the High Speed 2 proposal.

Furthermore, from your Petitioners' property, your Petitioners enjoy views of the surrounding
countryside (which lies within a locally designated Special Landscape Area), and a very peaceful
ambience which will suffer a major adverse effect during the construction phase of two years, and
once the railway authorized by the Bill is operational. This will permanently blight the beautiful rural
character of this hamlet.

Your Petitioners are also concerned that their property is served by a shared Biodisc sewerage
treatment unit, which is situated on an adjacent property (Manor Brook House). The Environmental
Statement has identified an alteration of a watercourse at this location which may affect the system.

Noise

Your Petitioners are concerned that the Environmental Statement deposited with the Bill outlines
that the temporary effects of construction will have a major adverse effect on residential amenity,
including significant noise effects from construction traffic using Banbury Lane and the proposed
haul route, and that the permanent effect is considered to be significant because of the demolition
of two properties in Lower Thorpe. Moreover, the cumulative result of these combined effects are
expected to give rise to a community-wide effect. This will result in a significant detriment to the
quality of life for your Petitioners and their family, and is likely to cause daytime stress, sleep
depression and subsequent health issues. Forecast increases in the sound from the proposed
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railway are likely to cause a major adverse effect on the acoustic character of the area around the dwellings close to the line and open areas as well.

Furthermore, the Environmental Statement outlines that Lower Thorpe is the only residential community which is expected to be subject to significant airborne noise during operation.

Your Petitioners are concerned that the noise levels proposed by High Speed 2 during operation are too high to achieve effective mitigation, and that the noise will be unbearable. Your Petitioners submit that no amount of soundproofing for the house and sound barriers will be sufficient in making the property habitable.

Construction and construction traffic

Your Petitioners are also concerned with respect to the impact of construction on their quality of life and ability to access their property and undertake day to day activities. Despite the proposed haul route, Banbury Lane will still be used to provide access to the Lower Thorpe viaduct satellite compound, and access to the construction of the nearby balancing pond. Banbury Lane is a narrow road which winds through Thorpe Mandeville, much of it with on-street parking and in some sections without a footway. The volume of construction traffic will make pedestrian access from Lower Thorpe to Thorpe Mandeville village dangerous. At its narrowest point, Banbury Lane is only 4.2 metres wide. Along most of the length of Banbury Lane from Thorpe Mandeville, through Lower Thorpe to the proposed satellite compound, there is not sufficient width for a car and an HGV to pass each other, and therefore certainly not enough width to accommodate two HGVs passing each other. The haul route will bring additional HGV movement to the rear of the property.

The closure of Banbury Lane is proposed for a period of approximately two years, and this will result in the loss of pedestrian access to two public footpaths north of the viaduct, and to Culworth village, as well as compromising your Petitioners ability to access their property.

Remedies sought by your Petitioners

Your Petitioners' consider their situation to be unique because of the above conditions, with particular emphasis on the permanent loss of Lower Thorpe as a tenable community. The overall result of the above points is that your Petitioners will be completely isolated as the sole freehold residents in a hamlet where the community has been decimated by the effect of the proposed railway line. Your Petitioners property will be subject to intolerable noise, traffic, dust and inconvenience during construction, and intolerable noise and visual blight during operation.

Your Petitioners therefore seek that High Speed 2 Ltd offer your Petitioners compensation equivalent to the properties which are scheduled for Compulsory Purchase, and that they provide a guarantee that they will not challenge a Blight Notice served by the petitioners on the property.

Your petitioners' MP Andrea Leadsom has supported this solution in a letter of 29th April 2014 which includes the following “It is a ridiculous and unacceptable position Mr and Mrs Raitt find themselves in. It is surely common sense that Mr and Mrs Raitt's property should be compulsorily purchased to prevent it being the only property left in the village (which does not fall into the Compulsory Purchase Zone or has been accepted onto the Exceptional Hardship Scheme). The uncertainty Mr and Mrs Raitt have suffered up until now is completely unacceptable".
Conclusion

There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will jeopardise your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.

4. The prayer

Your petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND your petitioners remain, etc.

Gordon Robert Raitt

Harriet Anna Raitt

April 2, 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF INGRID WILLERSTRÖM

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner has been a leaseholder for the last 13 years of a flat in Mornington Street of which Camden Council is the freeholder.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns:

Your petitioner’s property is directly facing Mornington Terrace, the Mornington Street Bridge and the railroad tracks. Your petitioner is a Swedish citizen but family members have lived in our flat in Camden to study and to work since 2003.

Your petitioner has read with a lot of concern about the proposed HS2 Hybrid Bill. Your petitioner is now together with many other residents in Camden under threat of many years of noise, air pollution, construction sites, traffic and the demolition and reconstruction of walls and bridges.

Your petitioner is especially concerned by the proposals for Mornington Street Bridge and the construction compound outside the building. The Bill will affect the future living conditions as well as the alternatives of letting or selling the property.

After retirement and becoming a widow it has been your petitioner’s dream to live in this flat in London for an interesting life in the multicultural society that is Camden of today. That dream seems far away in the light of the Bill.

The select committee is asked to instruct that HS2 Ltd do the following:

I. Mitigate as far as possible the disturbances for the properties facing the tracks - noise insulation with triple glass windows and dust with ventilation system

II. Regarding traffic – support the solution that has the least impact on residents and environment

III. Evaluate the alternatives and ensure everything is done with minimal disruption & duration for every aspect of HS2 construction

IV. No temporary or permanent loss of public green/open spaces and trees

V. No worsening of air quality from HS2 pollution – improve current levels

VI. Fair urban compensation on a par with rural compensation – in your petitioner’s view everyone entitled to noise insulation should have access to the express purchase scheme, as it is clear from the Environmental Statement that properties like your petitioners remain severely adversely affected even after mitigation, and this will be for the next 20 years – which may be the duration of my active retirement.
VII. Ensure that an independent adjudicator is appointed so residents have somewhere to turn immediately when HS2 Ltd is unfair in implementing property agreements, and enforcements officers for when HS2 Ltd exceeds for instance the agreed noise limits.

VIII. Investigate the role of Old Oak Common in relation to Euston as a temporary terminus and other alternatives which will allow Euston station and tracks to remain within its footprints while keeping excavation and demolition of bridges to a minimum.

IX. Carry out and publicise independent technical and cost-benefit analyses of HS2 in comparison with alternative railway schemes.

X. Old Oak Common costings to be calculated as per Lords request in their Economic committee report.

XI. Timely information from HS2 enabling genuine engagement with the residents affected.

XII. No additional scheme into Euston until local transport has the capacity to cope with the massively increased passenger numbers.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she, or someone representing her in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Name: INGRID WILJERSKROM

Signature: / Signature
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015-16

PETITION against the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

Andrew Michael Band

Declares that:

1. The Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioner is a resident of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Bill would authorise the construction and operation of the railway through and near Wendover. The proposed line would run within 300 metres of Petitioner’s property (6, Bridleways, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6DN) and he will be specially and directly affected by construction and operation of the railway.

Petitioner and his interests are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s Concern

i. Objection is taken to both the construction and operation of certain of the scheduled works proposed. These works consist of a cut and cover type "Green" tunnel and cuttings in the vicinity of Wendover.

ii. Petitioner’s main objective is to persuade your Honourable House of the need to mitigate the detrimental environmental impact of the construction of a cut and cover type tunnel and cuttings, by means of a bored tunnel.

iii. The nature and design of the Wendover "Green" tunnel as proposed will be to excavate the 1280m cut upto 18 m deep and 60 m wide through the existing strata, to construct a concrete box structure and cover this structure with spoil.

iv. The nature of the cut will be to fundamentally affect the hydrogeological capability of the strata that feed five local springs. The springs are dependant upon the water run off from Coombe Hill, which the "Green" tunnel and cuttings will bisect. This will effectively divert the ground water away from the current aquifer spring line.
v. Independent assessments based on a simple ground water model demonstrate a profound impact on these springs which will potentially result in up to 75% flow reduction.

vi. The construction of a tunnel by boring techniques will avoid the need to disturb the surrounding strata such that the impact on the hydrogeology of the surrounding area will be retained. The alternative is for a complex system of tanking, drains, retaining ponds and pumped systems, none of which have been incorporated into the current HS2 design.

vii. The area of Wendover has a number of ecologically important springs that feed Hampden Pond, the Wendover Arm (Grand Union) Canal and Weston Turville SSSI, as well as other important ecological areas in the vicinity of Wendover including Walnut Tree Meadow and the fields to the north of Wendover, the ecology being sensitive to the maintenance of water level, flow and quality.

viii. The Schedule 1 and 2 of the works and the ES, does not consider in detail, (including omission of an initial of groundwater modelling analysis), the impact of construction of the "Green" tunnel on the performance and pollution of the springs in the area, nor the irreparable impacts on the canal and SSSI.

ix. Petitioner maintains that the preservation of the water courses and dependant ecology around Wendover area, including the Weston Turville SSSI and the water supply to the Grand Union canal at Marsworth is of such national importance that appropriate measures of mitigation should be sought to prevent damage to the hydrogeology of the surrounding area and the springs that feed them.

x. Accordingly, irrespective of the other environmental, noise reduction, construction and programme benefits together with reduction on economic and amenity impacts on Wendover itself, that a bored tunnel solution may present, Petitioner calls upon the Honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker as a condition of the Bill to construct a fully bored tunnel solution in lieu of the "Green Tunnel" and cuttings on the grounds of preservation of the area's hydrogeology and dependant ecology.

4. The prayer
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Signatories

Signature

Name: Andrew Michael Band
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Thomas Michael Johnstone  

Declares that:  

1. Your petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  

2. Your petitioner  

Your petitioner is the joint owner of the freehold property at Woodleigh, 12, Lappetts Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0RA, which the Bill may specially and directly affect.  

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location but is located 600 metres from the portal cutting and 850 metres from the train exit/entrance at the portal as outlined under deposited plans Volume 2.1 Replacement sheet 2.25.  

Your petitioner lives in part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) which the Bill may specially and directly affect.  

Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

3. Your petitioner's concerns  

1. Your Petitioner will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner requests that the presently proposed fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the Chilterns AONB, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner and will reduce the impact on the AONB.  

2. Your Petitioner further requests that in assessing the alternatives of adopting the full tunnel proposals instead of the Promoter’s current proposals for the AONB section of the line, the Promoter is instructed to commission and publish a fully independent cost analysis of such alternatives and to undertake and publish a full cost benefit analysis of the environmental impacts for such AONB section.  

3. The adverse effects of the Bill with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects are primarily caused by and associated with the works proposed from the South Heath portal, empowered by Clauses 1 and 2 and Schedules 1 and 2 of the Bill and associated powers in the Bill (including the power of compulsory purchase). These include works 2/14 to 2/20 in Schedule 1 and are detailed primarily on Deposited Plans, Vol.2.1, Plan Replacement Sheets 2-24 to 2-28.
4. In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB, which is the primary alteration to the Bill your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended to Leather Lane, as it will address, most but not all, of your Petitioner’s concerns.

5. The fall back alternative to these solutions is numerous individual mitigations of the adverse impacts, all of which will cost time and money (over and above the mitigation presently proposed by the Promoter). Your Petitioner expands on the individual adverse impacts that concern it and to which it objects, and the (additional) mitigation that would be required for each, if its fully bored tunnel proposals are rejected, below.

6. Traffic Congestion: The disruption over eight years of access to and from Great Missenden for your petitioner travelling to the shops, medical appointments and to the station arising from the major adverse effect that will occur with the large amount of construction traffic at the Link Road (A4128) and Frith Hill roundabouts. This major adverse effect will continue for your petitioner who needs to travel along the A413 to and from Wendover and Stoke Mandeville Hospital and Aylesbury. Your Petitioner is also concerned that avoidance of the congestion at the Link Road Roundabout will lead to rat-runs through Great Missenden and the hilltop villages especially along Kings Lane with its associated safety hazard.

Remedies:
1. An effective Traffic Management Plan to be approved by Bucks County Council with all costs of monitoring and enforcement to be borne by HS2 Ltd.
2. Reduce the amount of spoil that requires to be transported through the use of retained cuttings or a bored tunnel extension or reduce the road transportation of spoil by taking it all along the trace.
3. HS2 to work with Bucks County Council to facilitate traffic flow at the congestion points and consider slip roads, road widening etc.

7. Construction Haul Road: Your Petitioner is particularly concerned about the impact of construction traffic using the haul road from the South Heath portal onto the A413 at the Link Road roundabout, such as damage from HGVs (270 HGVs a day at the peak), noise and dust from vehicle cleaning operations and the high risk to users of the Skate Park, Tennis Courts and children’s play area adjacent to the roundabout and children going to the Great Missenden Combined Church of England school nearby.

Remedies:
1. The construction haul road should be relocated further north, distant from the larger settlements of Great Missenden and Prestwood, and beyond the Mobwell junction hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts. It would also lessen the impact and visual blight of the haul road on parishioners, visitors and businesses in Great Missenden. Traffic signals can be implemented on the junction with the A413 to control the flow of construction traffic.
2. The amount of spoil requiring transport by road can be reduced by moving more spoil down the trace.

8. Maintenance Access Road: The permanent maintenance and access road - Work No 2/18C from the South Heath portal joins Frith Hill (SHL) at a bend on a narrow part of the road. This leads to your petitioner having concerns about road safety especially as the footway and road is used for walking and cycling to Great Missenden. Safety could be further exacerbated by temporary contractors using it to access the portal during

---

1 HS2 Ltd had given Bucks CC in January 2016 an assurance that it would relocate this haul road but the conditions placed upon the County Council to achieve this were unrealistic.
construction. Furthermore there is concern for the safety of children at the Great Missenden Church of England Combined School using their Forest School Outdoor Learning Centre and their playing fields as they are adjacent to the Frith Hill roundabout.

Remedies:
1. Construction traffic should not use the maintenance access road off Frith Hill during construction.
2. Any temporary construction contractors should not park their white vans at the South Heath portal but at the main construction compound at Wendover and be bussed onto the site.
3. If the construction haul road is relocated as mentioned above, it could be retained so that access to Frith Hill (SHL) will no longer be required.

9. **Noise and Dust:** Your petitioner is concerned that there will be construction noise and dust (and operational noise) as a result of the deep, wide cuttings at the South Heath portal and the cuttings beyond towards Wendover. The dust and noise will be at its worst during the eight year construction period but thereafter some mitigation of the dust will be provided when plantings have matured but not the noise.

Remedies:
1. Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to be monitored and enforced by Bucks County Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd.
2. A tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB, or at minimum to Leather Lane will obviate the need for deep, wide cuttings in the South Heath and Potter Row area.
3. Other remedies would be retained sides for the cutting and higher trackside noise barriers with barriers on the east side (as well as west) of the line towards Leather Lane.

10. **Dysfunctional Housing Market:** Your Petitioner is 850 metres from the trains exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel and are the finding their house prices blighted. They are concerned that they are unable to sell in what has become a dysfunctional housing market. They feel that they are trapped for 10 or more years and find the ‘Need to Sell’ scheme (NTS) complex, slow and does not ensure un-blighted house prices.

Remedies:
1. A further Chiltern tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns to the edge of the AONB or at least as far as Leather Lane would largely stabilize the dysfunctional market.
2. A compensation scheme that provides full current un-blighted house value to all residents when they wish to sell.... A Right to Sell Scheme. The scheme is to be administered by a body independent of HS2 Ltd, with a right to appeal. The NTS scheme needs to be made less complex, faster, more accessible, less onerous to prove qualification, friendly to the elderly and with more stringent rules to ensure reasonable un-blighted valuations.

11. **Operational Noise:** Your petitioners are close enough to the surface line to suffer operational noise at night close to the peak WHO target LOAEL of 60dBA max (23.00 – 24.00 and 06.30 to 07.30)

Remedies:
1. Your petitioner feels that not exceeding the peak LOAEL level of 60dBA max should be a mandatory requirement and not just an aim as outlined in Information Paper E20. Anticipated noise levels should be independently verified and based on evidence of the efficacy of alternative noise reduction methods.
2. Reasonably practicable measures to dissipate the noise should include having retained sides, or steeper slopes to the portal cutting and beyond; deeper cuttings; reducing the train speed; lengthening the porous portal; higher more absorbent noise barriers adjacent to the line to protect Potter Row; noise barriers both sides of the line and to the south of the portal to protect South Heath and Frith Hill properties and those using footpaths GMI/12 & 13.

12. **Health and Wellbeing:** Your Petitioner is concerned that their Health & Wellbeing has been adversely affected, and continue to be, since the announcement of HS2 in 2010. The undeniable result of HS2 is worry, anxiety and stress and, in some cases, clinical depression requiring medical treatment. A further worry is that emergency response times will deteriorate further during construction when ailments such as respiratory disorders will be at their maximum.

Remedies:
1. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern over high levels of dust and pollution, with independent monitoring and powers to halt construction until preventative measures are implemented and verified.
2. The provision of an air ambulance service is requested to complement emergency medical services which are already struggling.

13. **Business impact:** Businesses in the area will be specifically affected by a reduction in tourists and in customers footfall, including 12 small businesses in the hilltop villages and approximately 70 businesses in Great Missenden. In addition, delivery vehicles will be delayed by the congestions caused by construction traffic, for example deliveries, often by articulated lorry with a trailer from Europe, to the South Heath Garden Centre.

Tourism plays a significant part in local business, with visitors to the Roald Dahl Museum, local cycling groups using this area as a centre for the Chiltern Cycle way and the Chiltern Hundreds Cycle routes. There are 55 million visits a year to the AONB bringing in £471.6 million of expenditure associated with leisure visits to the Chilterns and sustaining an estimated 12,000 FTE jobs.

Remedy:
1. For businesses which are indirectly or only temporarily affected; compensation for loss of profit, loss of trade and the fees of any professional advisor appointed by the business.
2. A substantial reduction in business rates where applicable.

14. **Chilterns AONB:** The proposed line is above ground from the South Heath portal of the Chiltern tunnel for 9 kms to the edge of the Chilterns AONB just north of Wendover. It is in a cutting for approximately 3 kms and will be visible at the highest point of the line in the vicinity of Liberty Lane, notwithstanding the sight of the security fences and catenary masts above the cuttings which will be a major permanent eyesore along the length of Potter Row.

The proposed line from Liberty Lane descends to Wendover and crosses two large unsightly viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean in the Chilterns AONB before reaching a green tunnel running alongside Wendover.

Construction will last up to 8 years with a peak period of more than 3.5 years. HGV traffic, noise and dust will render the rural lanes and footpaths less attractive to all visitors to this area of the AONB whether they are ardent walkers/hikers, currently popular with those groups taking the Duke of Edinburgh Award, or cyclists as it is Route 57 on the National Cycle Network or just families coming for a day-out from London to enjoy the countryside.
Remedies (apart from a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB):

1. The AONB review body must ensure that the viaducts and embankments with enclosures to reduced noise are made as visually pleasing as possible. The design of the new permanent buildings erected by HS2 Ltd to be in-keeping with the surrounding area.

2. The vertical alignment of the track between the South Heath portal and Wendover should be lowered further, if it is not to be placed in a tunnel, to reduce the intrusion of the viaducts; to conceal catenary masts and gantries and reduce the height above the general ground surface of accommodation footbridges. The contractor should not be empowered to raise the line at all on the AONB section.

3. The need for spoil dumps should be minimised either by tunnelling or moving the spoil down the trace or by rail. This particularly applies to the spoil dump planned for Hunts Green farm and those by the construction compounds.

4. The Rights of Way are not to be closed for any length of time and any diversion not to be parallel to the track; furthermore diversions should be over green bridges and not accommodation bridges.

5. All overhead power lines adjacent to the route be buried.

6. Alternatives to Balancing Ponds be considered, and they should be made ecologically and visually attractive, in-keeping with AONB.

15. Code of Construction Practice: The Code is a draft; it is not specific about timing of works, or monitoring by the Local Authority and is subject to a sub contract with the nominated undertaker.

Remedies:

1. Daily movements of HGVs to be restricted to between 09.30 and 15.30 hrs and prohibited from using rural lanes.

2. Construction activities should be subject to strict noise limits and light emission limits from night security lighting (there is no street lighting near the construction compounds) and activities restricted to times that are unlikely to affect the sleep patterns of children and the elderly. Furthermore, the Local Authority should be funded to enforce monitoring and policing of the noise and light emission limits and activities, and work should stop if the limits are exceeded.

3. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern and for road users to report damage, also for an independent HS2 adjudicator to review issues, monitor progress with enforcement orders and facilitate claims.

16 Primary Mitigation

Accordingly, your Petitioner objects to the associated works and the clauses in the Bill that empower the works involved, and humbly requests your honourable House to modify the Bill, and/or require undertakings of the Promoter, to remove these adverse effects, primarily through a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least to Leather Lane.

17 Secondary Mitigation

In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the haul road from the South Heath portal to the Link Road roundabout be moved along the A413 beyond the Mobwell junction, as it will help to lessen the impact of the construction traffic on the Great Missenden Area.
Other Matters
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now
stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners, their rights, interests and property, and for
which no adequate provision is made to protect them.

Conclusion
Your Petitioner supports the petitions for a longer fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that
extends throughout the Chilterns AONB. Such tunnel extension is being petitioned by
the local County, District and Parish Councils and the Chiltern Conservation Board and
in the alternative a shorter extension to Leather Lane. If your honourable House alters
the Bill to provide for such an extended tunnel most of your Petitioner’s objections would
be removed (your Petitioner’s objection to unsuitable ancillary structures and to the
present proposals for compensation would remain – albeit far fewer residents would be
affected).

In the alternative to extending the fully bored Chiltern tunnel, your Petitioner seeks a
significant secondary mitigation by relocating the haul road at the South Heath portal.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully requests that
unless the Bill is amended as proposed above or suitable undertakings obtained from
the Promoter, the Bill, along with accompanying Schedules, so far affecting your
Petitioner and your Petitioner’s area, along with the wider AONB, be not allowed to pass
into law.

There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now
stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner’s, their rights, interests, property and your
petitioner’s area and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the petitioner, or someone representing
the petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an
opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select
Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Signed

Thomas Michael Johnstone
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF William Broderick Jones

Declares that:
1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is, William Broderick Jones Tabor Grove, Marriots avenue, South Heath, Bucks, HP16 9QN, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere. As a cyclist your petitioner is worried about his safety along the roads to Great Missenden.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to
the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.
g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.
h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.
i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.
j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line
n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons
o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons
p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations
Q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413
b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.
c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden
and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.
4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

.............................................................. 9th April 2016
WILL JONES

(each petitioner (or his Agent) MUST sign (or seal) the petition here)

Print the name of the person signing below each signature (and add “Agent” if appropriate)

[add the date here]
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Alexander Rhys Jones

Declares that:
1. The petitioner ('Your Petitioner') is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Alexander Rhys Jones, resident at Tabor Grove, Marriotts Avenue, South Heath, Great Missenden, Bucks, HP169QN, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquility of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere. As a cyclist, your petitioner will be greatly restricted from passing from South Heath to Great Missenden without potentially putting his life in danger.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts
would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any
adverse impacts are found
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line
n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons
o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons
p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations
q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413
b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08:00 and 09:00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.
c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid
linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

.............................. 9/4/16

ALEXANDER JONES
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Roger Warren

 Declares that:

Your petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

Your petitioner

Your petitioner is 73, was born in Kenilworth, and has lived in the Crackley area for most of his life. He is the freehold owner/occupier of 16 Crackley Crescent, Kenilworth, Warwicks CV8 2FF. The property is adjacent to the construction site proposed under the bill, and less than half a mile from the proposed line.

Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioner is a free-lance writer and editor who is able to work at the property, because it is quiet. But this will not be possible when it is subject to the inevitable noise, dust, and vibration during both construction and operation.

However, your petitioner’s greatest concern is about environmental damage. The proposed line cuts straight through the narrow but much-valued area of Green Belt which separates Kenilworth from Coventry. This is particularly rich in wild life, especially very varied bird-life, which will be lost with the noise from HS2. The only real solution to this environmental problem is to re-route this section of track. If the proposed speed were to be reduced, such re-routing (following, for example, existing transport corridors) would presumably be possible. Failing that, placing the line wholly in a deep tunnel with accompanying landscaping might help.

HS2 proposes to divert Canley/Crackley brook. At present, heavy rain results in the complete flooding of the adjacent fields, but in the last 29 years, the back-up from the flooded fields has not quite reached this property. However, the proposed diversion of the brook to the field behind the property will most certainly have that effect, because of the slope of the land. Perhaps a deep tunnelling for the brook might alleviate the flooding risk. The obvious solution, of course, is to leave the brook, and the Crackley area, as it is, especially since none of the supposed advantages put forward by HS2 Ltd would benefit Kenilworth or the area as a whole.

The Prayer

Your petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-2016

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION of THE SOLIHULL TREE WARDEN GROUP

Declares that

1. Your Petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill, particularly Clauses 1 - 3 (Works), Clauses 20 - 24 (Planning), and Clauses 25 - 36 (Deregulation).

Your Petitioners

2. Your Petitioners are the Solihull Tree Warden Group. The Tree Warden scheme is a national initiative, launched in 1990, and coordinated by the Tree Council. There are now over 8000 voluntary tree wardens nationwide. Your Petitioners are an association of volunteers and nominees of local councils, who care passionately about trees and woodland in our local community, and who are involved in maintaining local woodland, tree planting, and working with local schools. Events and projects are held throughout the year, involving people who live in the local community. Your Petitioners act as the "eyes and ears" of the Borough for all matters concerning trees, with the aim of protecting both rural and urban trees in Solihull for future generations, and are supported by the Tree Council and Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.

3. The Bill would authorise the construction and operation of some 14 kilometres of the proposed railway through the eastern part of the Metropolitan Borough of Solihull. The current plans would cause major long-term harm to trees and the environment all along the route. Many established woodlands, connecting hedgerows, and individual trees would be severely impacted and lost forever by the construction of HS2. Your Petitioners take objection to the part of the works and the provisions of the Bill that are injurious to our communities, as set out in the paragraphs following.

Valuation of trees

4. Your Petitioners contend that in all consultations attended by our representatives, no attempt has been made to introduce, consider, or assess the true cost in loss of amenity to the residents, and visitors to this area, consequent upon the implementation of the Bill. Your Petitioners are familiar with, and apply, two systems to place monetary value on the visual amenity of trees. The Helliwell System, dating from the mid 1960's has been extensively used in court cases, insurance claims and public enquiries to place visual amenity values on individual trees, and to a somewhat lesser extent, in court to place visual amenity values on woodland. The Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT) system, from the London Tree Officers Association, dates back to 1995, and has
also been widely accepted as a marker of true costs to the community at local public enquiries. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that a report will be laid before Parliament stating the full monetary amenity value of trees, area by area, that will be lost due to the proposed railway, and that an objective assessment of the amenity value of trees will be included in each and every cost/benefit analysis of proposals to mitigate the environmental harm of the proposed railway.

Bio-diversity

5. Your Petitions share the concerns of other Environmental bodies about the impact of the works on bio-diversity. The Promoter has claimed there will be no net loss of biodiversity, and has offered to plant more than 2 million new trees. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the HS2 scheme be amended to yield a net increase in bio-diversity, that bio-diversity will be monitored and adjusted on an equitable basis along the whole extent of the scheme, and that progress with the planting of new trees will be monitored and reported annually with regard to the number of viable new trees and the species profile in each location.

Solihull trees and woodlands

6. The southern end of the proposed Pool Wood Embankment would result in the destruction of nearly 5 hectares of natural woodland. It is intended to site a construction roadhead in the wood, construct the 70 metre wide 4-track embankment through it, and convert the surviving area to grassland. Your Petitioners would point out that apart from the ecological value of this wood, it is also used for informal recreational access by the residents of nearby Chelmsley Wood, and that there is a great scarcity of natural green space in the neighbourhood. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the proposed railway will be realigned to the east in order to minimise the loss to Pool Wood, that the railway will be constructed on a viaduct rather than an embankment, and that any loss of woodland area will be replaced with an area of similar size and character using the remnant area to the west of the proposed scheme and contiguous parts of Brickfield Farm.

7. The proposed new station at Middle Bickenhill would occupy a very large area of land, taking in part of the surviving trace of the former Coleshill Railway, the Denbigh Spinney Local Wildlife Site, swamp habitats by the Hollywell Brook, and a series of pools north of Middle Bickenhill Lane. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that naturalised equivalent replacement habitats will be created within the station site as part of the landscaping, that these will be developed to the satisfaction of the local Tree Wardens and the Warwickshire Wildlife Trust, and that they will be protected and maintained in perpetuity.

8. It is noted that the Promoter proposes to acquire permanently some 5% of the area of the Marsh Lane Nature Reserve, to the east of the former Kenilworth Road, now Public Footpath M230A. The Reserve consists of pools, a reed bed, woodland, and grassland, and nearly 200 species of bird have been observed there. It is visited by the West Midlands Bird Club and many other groups and individuals. The potential affect on the visiting bird populations is unknown, but the Promoter has offered to create additional
habitat on adjacent farmland. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the proposed railway will be realigned to the east to minimise the impact on the Reserve, and that any loss of area will be replaced by substitute habitat which will be created promptly and to the full satisfaction of the operators of the Reserve.

9. Your Petitioners object to the potential loss of nearly a hectare of trees, including many well-established mature pine trees, from Sixteen-Acre Wood, where the landscape and the environment would be damaged significantly by the proposed railway. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that trees felled within Sixteen-Acre Wood will be replaced on land not required permanently for the scheme, that substitute woodland will be created in nearby locations to offset the loss of woodland, and that the undertakings sought in paragraphs 28 and 29 will be applied.

10. The Promoter proposes to erect the Bradnock Auto-transformer Station within the boundary of Sixteen-Acre Wood. Your Petitioners believe the proposed screening plantings would be discontinuous and too thin to prevent ruination of the landscape. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that trees and shrubs will be planted, in depth, all along the west side of the Bradnock Auto-transformer Station, that there will be further tree planting to integrate Sixteen-Acre Wood with the screening around the Auto-transformer Station, that these plantings will be done early in the construction phase following best practice guidance, and that the Promoter will make enduring agreements to provide on-going care and maintenance.

11. The proposed bisection of Marlowes Wood would be particularly damaging. Many mature trees, including fine examples of sweet chestnuts, would be felled, with a consequential effect on the whole environment. The Wood contains a heronry, and contrary to the Promoter's reports, the nests are less than 150 metres from the proposed railway, and will experience substantial noise disturbance. Your Petitioners are concerned that Marlowes Wood, in particular, its heronry, has not been adequately evaluated in the Environmental Statement. Other species adversely affected will include bats, newts, butterflies, many other invertebrates, badgers, foxes, deer, and unusual birds such as barn owls and woodcock. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that there will be no disturbance whatsoever to the heronry until a substitute equivalent habitat has been established in a nearby location and that all necessary measures have been taken to protect the substitute habitat from disturbance, and that a habitat protection plan agreed with your Petitioners will be in place prior to any works being carried out.

12. Sections of Marlowes Wood are understood to meet the criteria for registration as Ancient Woodland, but are not yet listed as such. Because of the length of time it takes to develop the ecosystem and soil of ancient woodland, any damage to it would be irreparable. Your Petitioners do not accept the need or merit for designating the whole of Marlowes Wood for "woodland enhancement". Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the ancient part of Marlowes Wood will be given the highest standard of physical protection against intrusion and damage, that nearby adjacent areas will be planted to create a habitat that might develop over time into something with a similar ambience and environment to that which has been lost, that this planting
will be done early in the construction phase following best practice guidance, that the Promoter will make enduring agreements to provide on-going care and maintenance, and that the loss of nesting habitats for birds and bats will be offset by placing suitable nesting boxes in the new trees.

13. The Promoter has withdrawn the proposal for the offset planting that was planned between Marlowes and the A452, but to enhance Marlowes Wood itself. However, your Petitioners do not consider this to be equitable, since Marlowes Wood is already planted. The areas that are being left unplanted appear to have little utility, so your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the original planting scheme be carried out.

14. The proposed railway will cut through the Park Lane Spinney, which follows the trace of the Berkswell Park Pale. Oak trees and archaeological deposits will be lost. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that intrusion into the Park Pale and Spinney will be minimised, and that following construction of the scheme, the Spinney will be replanted with matching species to leave the minimum possible gap in the trees.

15. Your Petitioners are concerned by the Promoter's proposal to locate the Park Lane Cutting Main Compound, a large area of Temporary Workers' Accommodation, and several material stockpiles, on land adjacent to Park Lane and the Kenilworth Road. This would result in the loss of or damage to individual trees and hedgerows, by felling, impact, pollution, hydrological change, and compaction of the ground. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the Park Lane Cutting Main Compound will be relocated and divided into smaller units to reduce the damage to the environment.

16. Your Petitioners note that the Promoter intends to retain a roundabout at the junction of Park Lane and the A452 Kenilworth Road, which had been designated for removal once construction of the scheme was complete. The Promoter concedes that this will increase vehicle traffic on Park Lane, and have a moderate adverse significant effect due to traffic-related severance for non-motorised users. Principally, this will affect walkers on the Heart of England Way, Public Footpath M214. However, there is a concern that the traffic impact is under-estimated, in that the route will become attractive, in both directions, to longer-distance commuters going toward Coventry.

17. The Promoter does not identify any beneficial effects from the retention of the roundabout. Construction of the roundabout would endanger mature native oak trees, one of which is the oldest in Berkswell, north of the roundabout. There will be a considerable loss of visual amenity due to the roundabout itself, a balancing pond and maintenance access, lighting columns and light pollution, and signage. The roundabout will have an adverse effect on air pollution, carbon emissions, and road safety, since the great majority of vehicles on the A452 will have to negotiate the roundabout to no benefit. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that there will be a comprehensive re-evaluation of the highway changes in the Park Lane/ Lavender Hall Lane area to meet the needs of both the construction and operation phases of HS2, and that the proposed roundabout, Work No. 3/5B, will either not be constructed or will be removed after construction with full reinstatement of the landscape.
18. There is considerable concern that the temporary use of the Kenilworth Greenway by construction traffic during the construction phase could lead to the unnecessary felling of trees along the Greenway. Many of these date from the Nineteenth Century. Because of the length of time taken for trees to reach maturity, there would be significant loss of landscape amenity if trees are felled or damaged. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that a construction haul route will be provided along the side of the Kenilworth Greenway to avoid the felling of mature trees and damage to the fragile structures, that the felling of mature trees along the Kenilworth Greenway will only take place if essential for the passage of equipment, that the root systems of all the Greenway trees will be effectively protected throughout the construction operations, that damaged or felled trees will be replaced early in the construction phase following best practice guidance, and that the Promoter will make enduring agreements to provide on-going care and maintenance of replacement trees.

19. It is understood that the Burton Green Auto-transformer Feeder Station is an essential part of the proposed railway scheme, yet the Promoter has given no details other than the allocation of a site between Hodgetts Lane, the proposed railway, Work No. 2/146, and the existing electrical substation. The field is currently edged with woodland, through which runs Public Footpath M187. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the woodland to the east and south of the site will be safeguarded during the construction phase, that additional trees and shrubs will be planted, in depth, around the Burton Green Auto-transformer Feeder Station, that these plantings will be done early in the construction phase following best practice guidance, and that the Promoter will make enduring agreements to provide on-going care and maintenance.

20. There is concern that the temporary route of the Kenilworth Greenway, Work No. 2/183B, would run for 90 metres alongside Big Poors Wood, which is now considered Ancient Woodland and of high value. With the disruption of normal recreational walking routes by the widespread construction activity, there would be an increased risk of incursion into the wood, and possible damage, during the construction period. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that Big Poors Wood will be securely fenced and properly protected from incursion, that the nominated undertaker will monitor the security of the fencing and make repairs as needed, and that any complaints of intrusion will be investigated promptly.

21. The scheme proposed by the Promoter would cause considerable damage to Little Poors Wood, which is recognised as potential Ancient Woodland and rated of High Value. Its existence on the tithe map of 1841 is noted, as is the area of ridge and furrow earthworks. A section of the wood with established oaks and other trees, plus ground cover and woodland soil profiles, would be destroyed, to permit construction of the Burton Green Tunnel. The reinstated Kenilworth Greenway, Work No. 2/182, intrudes into the Wood and prevents improved screening measures. There is also a very significant risk of inadvertent damage during construction. There is an intention that the area would be replanted, but your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that Work No. 2/182 will be moved away from Little Poors Wood, that the part of Little Poors Wood to be destroyed will be kept to the minimum, that a dense
foliage screen will be established to preserve the setting of the Wood from visual intrusion of the Scheme, that the rest of the wood will be securely fenced and properly protected throughout the construction period, that the topsoil from the wood will be conserved and used during reinstatement, that the wood will be replanted with species equivalent to those lost following best practice guidance, that the Promoter will make enduring agreements to provide on-going care and maintenance of replacement trees, and that there will be rigorous local oversight and enforcement of protection measures for the Wood during the construction phase.

Tunnelling

22. The route of the proposed railway appears to your Petitioners to have been chosen without balancing the harm to the environment against other objectives. Your Petitioners believe that the damages set out in the foregoing paragraphs could be greatly reduced by the increased use of tunnelling. Your Petitioners seek a revision to the plans for the proposed railway, with the route constructed in tunnel from Burton Green northwards to beyond Sixteen-Acre Wood, and with the northern portal of the tunnel located and designed to minimise the environmental impact.

Construction phase

23. Your Petitioners believe that the proposals in the Code of Construction Practice for enforcement of measures to protect agriculture, ecology, and the natural environment, during the construction of the scheme, are inadequate. Example issues in this category are the handling of reusable spoil, topsoil storage, compaction, weed propagation, dust and contamination in an agricultural context, disturbance of livestock, trees, hedges, root systems, habitats, fauna, flora, pollution, spillage, drainage, and de-watering. Your Petitioners seek amendments to the provisions of the Bill and to the Code of Construction Practice that would empower local parish and town councils to employ jointly an Ecological Officer, for the duration of the works, with the power to suspend works, should agreed control measures be breached, and until more rigorous measures have been put in place, and your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that all costs arising from the employment of such an Ecological Officer will be met by the nominated undertaker.

24. It is noted that the protection of trees during construction works requires specialist knowledge. Your Petitioners assert that inadequate measures are specified in the Code of Construction Practice, and so seek amendments to the Code of Construction Practice that would require the nominated undertaker and its contractors to work through a community engagement process and to respond to advice from the Local Authority Tree Officers and your Petitioners, the local Tree Wardens.

25. Your Petitioners would draw attention to the substantial risk to the environment from spillages of oil, fuel, hydraulic fluids, other materials from vehicles, machinery, and fixed installations, and to the harm that would be caused by contaminated run-off into the water system and by residues left on land that is returned to agriculture. Your Petitioners seek amendments to the Code of Construction Practice that would require the application of strict control measures to the latest standards.
26. The propagation of weeds by the movement of vehicles and the failure to control seed formation would cause inconvenience and loss to agricultural business and residential gardeners. Your Petitioners seek amendments to the provisions of the Bill and to the Code of Construction Practice that would require the nominated undertaker to provide training to contractors and sub-contractors, to carry out inspections, to destroy identified weeds, to grant access to work sites for those with a legitimate concern, and to ensure this topic is properly considered in a community engagement process.

27. Your Petitioners consider that the significant lengths of embankments and deep cuttings in the proposed Works will have a serious impact on drainage and ground water, with implications on residential, commercial, and agricultural land use. As an example, the recent overbridge at Tile Hill station is believed to have contributed to the increased flooding in the area of Duggins Lane, Berkswell. The geology in our area includes surface layers of limited permeability with more porous sub-strata, so that subsurface flows have a material effect on the depth of water in surface watercourses. Dewatering or changes to permeability could increase seasonal flow fluctuations. The Promoter has not set out a procedure for reviewing hydrological issues during the groundworks. Your Petitioners seek amendments to the provisions of the Bill and to the Code of Construction Practice that would require the on-site identification of the exposed strata and hydraulic modelling to determine appropriate mitigation, and that would require the Promoter to establish a committee to review hydrological findings on a monthly basis and ensure corrective actions are carried out.

Restoration after construction

28. Your Petitioners note that a wide range of measures for ecological compensation has been offered by the Promoter, but there is a lack of firm action plans and clear standards. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the implementation and monitoring of bio-system replacement will be done to a high uniform standard throughout the proposed scheme, that the Promoter will follow the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and seek to improve the natural environment, that there will be compliance with the European Environmental Impact Assessment criteria, the UK Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management standards, and British Standard BS 8545 "Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape", and that the creation of alternative habitats and translocation of species will be commenced as soon as reasonably practicable.

29. Trees are critical features in the landscape and need long-term planning and care due to their slow growth rate. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that where tree planting is to be used as an offset, a replacement ratio of 5-for-1 will be used in order to ensure satisfactory replacement, and that advice from the relevant parish and town councils and local interest groups on species and locations will be heeded.

30. It is noted that the proposed Works will entail damage or removal of hedgerows throughout our area, with serious implications for the complete ecosystem. The hedgerows provide a vital interconnection function, and give shelter to numerous species of fauna and flora. Many hedgerows were established by the Enclosure Act of
1802 and contain mature oak trees from that period. Your Petitioners note the intention to plant substitute lengths of hedging, but seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the replacement hedges will be planted and nurtured to maturity in appropriate interconnecting locations, using species that are similar to those displaced, and that the overall scheme of planting will provide a quantity and quality of habitats equivalent to those that have been lost.

31. Given the long-term nature of ecological effects, it would appear there would be considerable difficulty in knowing whether the mitigation and offset arrangements advanced by the Promoter have produced the desired results. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that a long-term ecological monitoring programme will be established, and that the monitoring programme will be open to full involvement by the local Tree Wardens, Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council, the local parish and town councils, and other relevant special-interest groups.

32. It is expected that long-term ecological monitoring would identify the need for restorative or corrective measures to bring the environmental outcomes closer to that which was intended and authorised. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that future operators of the proposed railway will be obliged by contract to provide funding for, and to take, restorative ecological measures, when adverse affects appear to be developing.
33. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended and undertakings given as proposed above, the provisions of the Bill, so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

34. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, (including their human rights) interests and property and for which no provision is made to protect your Petitioners and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

The Prayer

Your Petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the Petitioners remain, etc.

Herbert Donald Hitchcock (Chairman - Solihull Tree Warden Group)

Carol Henrick (Secretary- Solihull Tree Warden Group)

Ian Mills (Treasurer - Solihull Tree Warden Group)

Dated: 04/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF THE LEE OLD CHURCH TRUST (Registered Charity No 286870)

Declares that:
1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

2.1 Your Petitioner is The Lee Old Church Trust (Registered Charity No 286870). The Old Church is located 900m from the proposed line and the impact of HS2 will impinge on the character and environment of the Old Church and its surroundings within the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“AONB”).

2.2 The Lee Old Church is of the 13th century early English Gothic period and it origins can be traced back to 1146. There are a number of rare features of significant historical and architectural interest including Rare 13th Century Glass showing the Crucifixion and the figures of St Mary and St John and Wall Paintings dating back to the 14th century. With the building of a new church in 1867, the Lee Old Church became a school. Gradually its condition deteriorated until the roof became in need of retiling in the early 1970s. Over the next 10 years members of local community obtained permission from the Church of England to take over responsibility for the upkeep of the church whilst it remained a consecrated building. In September 1982, The Lee Old Church Trust was established and funds raised for the restoration of the building. Today, The Old Church is used for church services, Sunday School meetings, Quiet Days, Recitals, Talks and summertime Cream Teas. The Lee Old Church has a widespread reputation as a place of tranquillity which make it a favoured location for quiets days and a place for quiet reflection and contemplation.

2.3 A building as old as The Lee Old Church can be susceptible to a variety of changes in its local environment and if HS2 created vibration this could cause damage, particularly to the windows.

2.4 The majority of people who use The Lee Old Church are residents covered the areas included as CFAs 9 and 10 in Vol 2 of the HS2 Phase one Environmental Statement issued by the Department for Transport (‘DfT”) and HS2 Ltd, although some come from further afield including Thame & Beaconsfield. All these people will be in affected by HS2, during construction and after completion by its operation.
2.5 The Lee Old Church Trust considers The Lee Old Church building and its members, users and visitors ("members") for the activities stated above will be adversely affected by HS2 whether such members arrive by foot, bicycle or car. This will decrease the income of The Lee Old Church Trust and its ability to maintain the ancient building.

2.6 The Lee Old Church Trust was established in order to restore and maintain The Lee Old Church as a place of tranquillity which make it a favoured location for quiets days and a place for quiet reflection and contemplation. It sits in the AONB which will itself be specially and directly affected by HS2. The Chiltern AONB is a unique national asset often referred to as the lungs of London and visited by the people of London and beyond over 50 million times a year. Accordingly, The Lee Old Church Trust supports actions to conserve, protect and improve the physical and natural environment of the AONB.

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line.

Your Petitioner is located in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect

Your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1 Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioner is located within the AONB and is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.
Your petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2 Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

   a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

   b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

   c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

   d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wildlife access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.
q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

- Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413
- Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms
- Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
- Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
- That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained
- Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
- That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
- That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response
- That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Mrs E. Ford
Treasurer, The Lee Old Church Trust

April 6th 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE JOINT PETITION OF CASSANDRA HONG, JANET DUA, ZHAN YUN LIM, ANNETTE NIX, JENNIFER HEYDARI AND FARIBORZ HEYDARI

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners are residents of 5 Fellows Road, NW3 3LR and Andrews House, Fellows Road, London NW3 3LU. The Petitioners are residents of Fellows Road and every aspect of their daily existence at their properties — living, sleeping, working, shopping, going to the library at Swiss Cottage, using the Adelaide Nature Reserve, Primrose Hill, Regent’s Park and Hampstead Heath for leisure — will be specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed construction of HS2.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioners’ properties lie extremely close to the Adelaide Road vent shaft, where there will be a major construction compound for HS2. The road on which their properties are located joins Adelaide Road, one of the roads adjacent to the HS2 line and to be used for major construction traffic and works. Their properties are close enough to the tunnelling for HS2 that it is expected to suffer some settlement from the works.

Their properties lie on a road in an area for which the Environmental Impact Statement acknowledges a ‘major adverse effect’ (p. 140) of access to all the roads. The road on which their properties are located lies within a zone that will be surrounded on all sides by the routes which will be used by construction vehicles and diverted traffic (Adelaide Road, Haverstock Hill, England’s Lane, Primrose Hill Road), estimated by HS2 Ltd to involve 100 HGVs per day.

Your Petitioners’ properties lie within the area shown in the Environmental Impact Statement to be within the zone of visibility, and an area which will be affected by noise, dirt, dust, air and light pollution, vibrations, traffic congestion, construction traffic, road closures and traffic rerouting, cranes, hoardings and other elements of urban blight from the construction of HS2.

Your Petitioners’ properties lie on a road designated to undergo works for a sewer due to HS2, for which the hybrid bill would allow access from the ground level. Their property lies immediately outside the 60 metre band and is thus not eligible for compensation as the Bill is presently drafted.

Your Petitioners are regular users of roads in which, according to the Environmental Statement, ‘changes in traffic flows will affect non-motorised users, making it more difficult to cross the road’ (p. 143): Adelaide Road, Regent’s Park Road, Haverstock Hill, England’s Lane, Primrose Hill Road, Fellows Road, Winchester Road, Chalk Farm Road,
Bridge Approach, Gloucester Avenue, Prince Albert Road and Avenue Road.

The petitioners will often be at home day and night throughout the period of the construction both of the vent shaft and of the works at Euston, an area which is impossible for them to avoid on the route that they traverse daily for their daily routines.

Accordingly, your Petitioners request (1) that the route of HS2 terminates at Old Oak Common rather than at Euston, in order that it can better be linked with the rest of the rail network and that the London Borough of Camden be spared from devastation.

In the absence of that remedy, your Petitioners request (2) that the proposal known as Euston Express or some similar proposal be adopted, so that the last part of the train journey into Euston be completed at normal speeds and on the existing tracks, as is the standard practice with high-speed trains in other countries.

In the absence of that remedy, your Petitioners request (3) that the Adelaide Road vent shaft be moved to Juniper Crescent, where it will be further away from densely populated areas, including social housing, and will not destroy the Adelaide Road Nature Reserve or disrupt the ‘green corridor, (4) that the spoil from the construction of the vent shaft be removed by rail by 70% rather than by road, and (5) that the dust, noise, and air pollution from the works be kept within the legal limits, which the air of London already exceeds.

Your Petitioners finally request (6) that, should their situation turn out to be so intolerable that they wish to move, but face severe financial loss because of the surrounding blight from the construction of HS2, from damage to their property caused by the construction, or a from combination of the two, they be afforded fair and equitable compensation for the financial loss, damage to their quality of life and for the distress that they will have suffered.

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Cassandra Hong Janet Dua Zhan Yun Lim Annette Nix

Jennifer Heydari Fariborz Heydari

4th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF SARAH LOIS PRICE

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. Your petitioner is a Professor of Chemistry at UCL, who has lived in the same flat that she owns in Mornington Crescent for over 25 years. The flat is on the lorry route through Mornington Crescent, designated as adversely affected, and very close to the properties that HS2 have recognised as needing noise insulation. Her property is a listed building and having the original sash windows at front and rear, is poorly insulated against noise and dust as well as draughts.

   Your petitioner will have to move during the construction of HS2, hopefully on retirement in about five years time, but possibly earlier if she develops greater mobility problems. The only toilet is in the basement bathroom, down steep stairs and the property cannot be adapted as suitable for the elderly. The purchaser will need to renew the damp course in the basement, and refurbish the bathroom and kitchen.

   Your petitioner walks into the laboratory daily over the construction route and relies on public transport and taxis for all travel.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns are

   The lorry traffic and building works will lead to excessive noise and dust affecting her ability to live, work and sleep in her home. The construction work will also affect her ability to sell the property when she has to move. The lorry traffic will make it very difficult to have contractors do major work on renovating the property from an inability to park and deliver materials.

   Your petitioner asks for Old Oak Common to be considered as an alternative terminus.

   If construction goes ahead at Euston, your petitioner requests for the lorry traffic to be kept to an absolute minimum, with transport of the building materials and spoil to be done by rail, to have the least impact on our living conditions.
Your petitioner also requests that there should be an independent adjudicator, so she has somewhere to turn to when she needs to sell or if the noise, vibration and dust experienced means that her property warrants insulation. There should be an approved independent agent able to determine whether properties in the disputed areas are being affected and organise the installation of suitable insulation very quickly even in listed buildings, with minimal bureaucracy for the resident and owners.

Your petitioner is concerned that there will be considerable traffic congestion in the area, particularly when the Hampstead Road bridge is closed or restricted. This will mean that public transport will be slower and so not have the required capacity and that walking or cycling in the area will be very unpleasant and unhealthy.

Your petitioner therefore asks that there should be minimal disruption and duration for every aspect of HS2 construction that affects local transport and traffic flow. There should be no worsening of air pollution during HS2 construction, including all traffic, not just the HS2 lorries and construction.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she, or someone representing her in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Name: Sarah Lois Price ........................ Signature...........................
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Great Missenden Parish Council
Declares that:

1. Your Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your Petitioner

2.1 The Petitioner is Great Missenden Parish Council within the County of Buckinghamshire and situated entirely within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“the AONB”).

2.2 Your Petitioner has responsibilities for residents and land in the area that will be directly and specially affected by the Bill as the proposed line crosses to the north east of the parish. Your Petitioner represents the hilltop villages of Ballinger, Potter Row and South Heath, with 1,200 residents in 477 homes, and also approximately 9,000 residents in 3,600 homes in Great Missenden, Prestwood and Heath End who will be affected by works as outlined in Clauses 1 & 2, Schedules 1 & 2 and associated provisions within the Bill.

2.3 Your Petitioner’s parishioners and area will be directly, specially and injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, to which your Petitioner accordingly objects for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns and objections to the Bill and requested mitigation

3.1 Your Petitioner’s parishioners and your Petitioner’s area will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner requests that the presently proposed fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the Chilterns AONB, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DIT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils, and action groups within the local area forums and is supported by them. Proposals based on a tunnel bored from each end or a tunnel bored from one end (T-BOW) would both be acceptable. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner’s parishioners and will reduce the impact on the AONB.

3.2 Your Petitioner further requests that in assessing the alternatives of adopting the full tunnel proposals instead of the Promoter’s current proposals for the AONB section of the line, the Promoter is instructed to commission and publish a fully independent cost analysis of such alternatives and to undertake and publish a full cost benefit analysis of the environmental impacts for such AONB section.

3.3 The adverse effects of the Bill with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects are primarily caused by and associated with the works proposed within the Parish i.e. South Heath portal, empowered by Clauses 1 and 2 and Schedules 1 and 2 of
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the Bill and associated powers in the Bill (including the power of compulsory purchase). These include works 2/14 to 2/20 in Schedule 1 and are detailed primarily on Deposited Plans, Vol.2.1, Plan Replacement Sheets 2-24 to 2-28.

3.4 In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB, which is the primary alteration to the Bill your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended to Leather Lane, as it will address, most but not all, of your Petitioner’s concerns.

3.5 The fall back alternative to these solutions is numerous individual mitigations of the adverse impacts, all of which will cost time and money (over and above the mitigation presently proposed by the Promoter). Your Petitioner expands on the individual adverse impacts that concern it and to which it objects, and the (additional) mitigation that would be required for each, if its deep bored tunnel proposals are rejected, below.

3.6 Impact on the communities and amenities within the Parish

3.6.1 The predicted construction period in the South Heath, Potter Row area is up to eight years. Your Petitioner considers that effects on residents’ living conditions for this length of time are unacceptable, especially for more vulnerable groups. The Promoter (HS2 Ltd) itself acknowledges that, even with its already proposed mitigation, traffic will suffer significant increases in delays and congestion at junctions on the A413 with rat-runs throughout Great Missenden, Prestwood and the Hilltop villages. The Promoter describes these effects as “temporary”, but they will go on for years. Hence unrestricted access to and from the hilltop villages especially South Heath is vital for its residents to fulfil their basic daily needs including getting to work, taking children to school, accessing shops, the library, post office, getting to/from appointments especially medical ones, going to/being visited by friends and family etc. Similarly, HS2 Ltd acknowledges that, even with its already proposed mitigation, construction will give rise to a range of noise impacts to your Petitioner’s community. These impacts, and others, will shatter the area’s present tranquillity.

3.6.2 Residents’ health and well-being is already being adversely affected as a result of anxiety caused by the anticipated effects of the construction, in particular the social isolation it will cause and also the loss of quality of life and tranquillity (see the Health Impact Assessment report, section 5.11.4 & 5), and the property blight that has affected their homes since 2010. The property blight will only worsen during the 8 year construction period and beyond as parishioners’ homes have lost value, leaving them trapped, unable to sell to move on with their lives. There are over 265 homes in the parish alone that are within 1km of the line which is not in a bored tunnel, and the Promoter’s present proposals for compensation are nowhere near adequate for all those who are suffering and will suffer blight.

3.6.3 Beyond construction, the impact on the small communities of South Heath and Potter Row is substantial and adverse, involving the demolition of Mulberry Park Hill with five associated outbuildings and two pylon structures. Properties in South Heath and Potter Row will be exposed to excessive noise and vibration as the train runs through the open sections of the AONB.

3.6.4 The individual items with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects under this head, along with the (additional) mitigation required (primarily if your Petitioner’s preferred tunnel solution is not adopted) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on the communities and amenities within the Parish</th>
<th>Matters with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects</th>
<th>Mitigation sought (primarily if the further Chiltern Tunnel extension is not adopted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 2

The Lords GMPC HS2 petition
- The disruption over eight years of access to and from Great Missenden, Prestwood and the hilltop villages for parishioners travelling to school, work and to the station arising from the major adverse effect that will occur at the Link Road (A4128) and Frith Hill roundabouts on the A413. This adverse effect will continue for those parishioners travelling along the A413 to and from Wendover and Stoke Mandeville Hospital and will lead to rat-runs through Great Missenden, Prestwood and the hilltop villages and delays to emergency services, especially from the Fire Station.

- The impact of noise and dust during construction of the South Heath portal and cuttings to the north especially for parishioners in South Heath and Potter Row.

- The new haul road from the Chilterns tunnel north portal at South Heath joins the A413 at the Link road roundabout, thereby adding to significant traffic congestion already at this junction. In addition to the visual blight arising from the location along GMI/13, your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of dust and other airborne pollutants from any vehicle cleaning operations arising from construction traffic on the haul road. Your Petitioner is particularly concerned over the large number of HGVs (270 per day at the peak) traversing the slope of the haul road, for children using the parish council’s skate park, tennis courts and children’s playground adjacent to the Link Road roundabout and for those attending the Great Missenden Church of England Combined School nearby.

- The permanent maintenance and access road Work No 2/18C from the portal joins Frith Hill (SHL) at a bend on a narrow part of the road. This leads to concerns about road safety especially as the footway and road is used by school children walking and cycling to Great Missenden. Safety could be further exacerbated by temporary contractors using it to access the portal during construction. Furthermore there is concern for the safety of children at the Great Missenden Church of England Combined School nearby.

1. An effective Traffic Management Plan to be approved by Buckinghamshire County Council with all costs of monitoring and enforcement to be borne by HS2 Ltd.

2. The daily movements of HGVs to be restricted to between 09.30 and 15.30.

3. Reduce the amount of spoil that requires to be transported through the use of retained cuttings/steeper sides or a bored tunnel extension or reduce the road transportation of spoil by taking it all along the trace or by rail.

4. Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to be monitored and enforced by Buckinghamshire County Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd.

5. The construction haul road should be relocated further north, distant from the larger settlements of Great Missenden and Prestwood, and beyond the Mobwell junction hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts. It would also lessen the impact and visual blight of the haul road on parishioners, visitors and businesses in Great Missenden. Traffic signals can be implemented on the junction with the A413 to control the flow of construction traffic.

6. Construction traffic to and from the South Heath portal should not use the maintenance access road off Frith Hill during construction. This road is not suitable for heavy construction traffic and were it to be used this would add further congestion at the roundabout with the A413 and create further concerns for the children enjoying the school’s facilities adjacent to the Frith Hill roundabout.

7. The Information Paper E20 outlines the measures that will be put in place to mitigate the effects of noise so as not to exceed LOAELs. Your
England Combined School using their Forest School Outdoor Learning Centre and their playing fields as they are adjacent to the Frith Hill roundabout

- Over 150 homes in the parish are close enough to the surface line to suffer operational noise at night above the peak WHO target LOAEL of 60 dBmax. The Bill offers insufficient mitigation to some of the South Heath and Potter Row communities. Parishioners living near the Chesham Road Vent Shaft are also concerned about any noise from the Vent Shaft and Auto-transformer Station

- Over 300 parishioners within 1km of the South Heath portal are finding their house prices blighted by their proximity to the South Heath portal. They are concerned that they are unable to sell in what has become a dysfunctional housing market. Parishioners feel that they are trapped for 10 or more years and find the 'Need to Sell scheme' (NTS) complex, slow and does not ensure unblighted prices.

- Parishioners in hilltop villages are concerned that their Health & Wellbeing have been adversely affected, and continue to be, since the announcement of HS2 in 2010. The undeniable result of HS2 is worry, anxiety and stress and, in some cases, clinical depression requiring medical treatment. A further worry is that emergency response times will deteriorate further during construction when ailments such as respiratory disorders will be at their maximum.

- Your Petitioner is concerned with the impact on tourism and employment on the 9km of the Chilterns AONB still unprotected by deep bore tunnelling and the associated visual blight such as two pylons near the portal will be replaced by one or more obstructive taller pylons; the design of vent shaft buildings; the design of the porous tunnel portal; the impact of the Wendover Dean viaduct etc. The additional construction traffic will result in major adverse effects on walkers, and cyclists

Petitioner feels that not exceeding the peak LOAEL level of 60dBmax should be a mandatory requirement.
Anticipated noise levels should be independently verified, and based on evidence of noise reduction for the alternatives offered.
Reasonably practicable measures to dissipate the noise should include having retained sides to the portal cutting and beyond; deeper cuttings; reducing the train speed; lengthening the porous portal; higher more absorbent noise barriers adjacent to the line to protect Potter Row; noise barriers both sides of the line and to the south of the portal to protect South Heath and Frith Hill properties and those using footpaths.

8. A tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns to the edge of the AONB or at least as far as Leather Lane would largely stabilize the dysfunctional market. A compensation scheme that provides full current un-blighted house values to all residents when they wish to sell... A Right to Sell Scheme. The scheme is to be administered by a body independent of HS2 ltd, with a right to appeal. The NTS scheme needs to be made less complex, faster, more accessible, less onerous to prove qualification and with more stringent rules to ensure reasonable un-blighted valuations by using local valuers. This will help to reduce stress for those who worry about the value of their largest asset.

9. A tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB would mitigate the effects on Health and Wellbeing. High-level dust and pollution suppression during construction with independent monitoring and powers to halt construction until preventative measures are implemented and verified.

10. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for parishioners to raise any issues of concern such as in 9. and for road users to report damage, also for an independent adjudicator to review issues, monitor progress with enforcement orders and facilitate claims.

11. The provision of an air ambulance service is requested to complement emergency medical services which are already struggling.

12. Full mitigation would be provided by a tunnel

\[2\text{ 23.00 to 24.00 and 06.30 to 07.30 hrs}\]
between the B485 Frith Hill and Rocky Lane and is likely to deter further visitors and local cycling clubs.

- Your Petitioner is concerned that during construction, noise and dust (and operational noise), together with light pollution from security lighting at construction compound sites will significantly adversely affect adjacent properties along Potter Row to Hammonds Hall Farm and Hunts Green Farm and on Woodlands Park residential home in terms of its viability.

- Land is to be taken from the irreplaceable Grims Ditch scheduled monument, and the bridges over the line will be higher and be more prominent

- Your Petitioner notes that footpath GMI/2 is diverted to run along the outer edge of the landscape planting instead of the inner edge, however the footpath is still only 40m from the line and the noise level will be unacceptable

- Businesses in the parish will be specifically affected by a reduction in tourists and in customers footfall, including 12 small businesses in the hilltop villages and approximately 70 businesses in Great Missenden.

- The impact of delivery vehicles will conflict with construction traffic, for example deliveries, often by articulated lorry with a trailer from Europe, to the South Heath Garden Centre along Kings Lane

13. A tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB or at minimum to Leather Lane will obviate the need for deep wide cuttings. Other remedies would be retained sides for the cutting, steeper sides and higher trackside noise barriers with barriers on the east side (as well as west) towards Leather Lane.

14. Landscaping will be required to mask the sight of vent shaft buildings and mitigate any noise. Two properties Meadow Leigh and Annie Baileys are unacceptably close the Chesham Vent shaft and Auto-Transformer and should be bought by HS2.

15. Extend the landscaping to locate the diverted GMI/2 footpath further away from the line and position the footpath at an angle to the line rather than parallel to it.

16. For businesses which are indirectly or only temporarily affected; compensation for loss of profit, loss of trade and the fees of any professional advisor appointed by the business and furthermore a substantial reduction in business rates.

17. The £30m community fund for the whole of phase one of HS2 is derisory and should be at least £200m with the Great Missenden Parish Council to be consulted to determine projects in the parish.

3.7 Impact on the Chilterns AONB

3.7.1 The proposed line is above ground from the South Heath Portal of the Chiltern tunnel for 9 kms to the edge of the Chilterns AONB just north of Wendover. It is in a cutting towards the northern edge of the parish for approximately 3 kms but it will be visible at the highest point of the line in the vicinity of Liberty Lane, notwithstanding the sight of the security fences and catenary masts above the cuttings which, together with light pollution from the arcing of the pantographs, will be a major permanent eyesore along the length of Potter Row.

3.7.2 The proposed line from Liberty Lane descends to Wendover and crosses two large unsightly viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean in the Chilterns AONB before reaching a green tunnel running alongside Wendover.
3.7.3 Loss of farm land in the parish, namely a total of 31 hectares during construction of which 27 hectares will be permanently lost (SES3 & AP4ES, Vol2 CFA9, pp.34-36).

3.7.4 Construction will last up to 8 years with a peak period of more than 3.5 years. HGV traffic, noise and dust will render the rural lanes and footpaths less attractive to all visitors to this area of the AONB whether they are ardent walkers/hikers, currently popular with those groups taking the Duke of Edinburgh Award, or cyclists as it is Route 57 on the National Cycle Network or just families coming for a day-out from London to enjoy the countryside.

3.7.5 Tourism plays a significant part in local business, with visitors to the Roald Dahl Museum, local cycling groups using this area as a centre for the Chiltern Cycle way and the Chiltern Hundreds Cycle routes. There are 55 million visits a year to the AONB bringing in £471.6 million of expenditure associated with leisure visits to the Chilterns and sustaining an estimated 12,000 FTE jobs.

3.7.6 The attraction to tourists of this part of the Chilterns AONB will be lost forever.

3.7.7 The individual items with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects under this head, along with the (additional) mitigation required (if your Petitioner’s preferred tunnel solution is not adopted) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on the Chilterns AONB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matters with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visual intrusion of two large viaducts in the Chilterns AONB namely The Wendover Dean 500 metres long and up to 18 metres high to the track or 26 metres to the catenary masts and the Small Dean viaduct 500 metres long up to 13 metres high to the track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visual intrusion and light pollution across the Misbourne Valley up to 2 km away arising from the sight of the catenary towers and arcing from the pantographs (Upper Hollis 1.6km: Angling Spring Farm 2.2km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The effect on/loss of irreplaceable ancient woodland at Jenkins Wood and Jones Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The effect on heritage assets grouped near the South Heath portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The disruption to, and temporary closure of fourteen Rights of Way in the AONB, of which two in the parish will be diverted (GMI/2 and 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The sight of taller overhead power line pylons which are adjacent to the proposed route and two near Bury Farm to be relocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The ecological and visual impact of unsightly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
balancing ponds within the AONB

- The creation of security fences, transformers and portal buildings which permanently disfigure the landscape and are not in-keeping with the AONB

- The impact of construction works on chalk streams, specifically those associated with the River Misbourne. Chalk streams are globally rare habitats and therefore special measures should be put in place to protect them. The River Misbourne is used for watering livestock in the parish

- Rural lanes in the AONB need to be protected for example construction traffic on Rocky Lane should be transferred to a new separate haul road running from the trace to the A413 bridges.

6 Trees be planted along the southern side of Potter Row to ensure effective screening in keeping with the surrounding environment

7 All overhead power lines adjacent to the route be buried

8 Alternatives to Balancing Ponds be considered, and they should be made ecologically and visually attractive, in-keeping with AONB.

9 Comprehensive surveys are carried out to confirm the current ecological value in chalk stream habitats, and that surveying continues during construction and operation and for ten years thereafter. If surveying demonstrates any adverse impacts during construction, then construction in this area must stop until the cause is identified and negative impacts rectified.

4 Clauses 4 and 47

4.1 In addition to the above, your Petitioner is concerned by the powers to acquire land and rights in land by compulsion contained in Clause 4 of the Bill and elsewhere, and believes that the powers sought go beyond what is required to achieve implementation of HS2. In addition, the powers under Clause 47 to acquire land for regeneration and other purposes are unprecedented, unnecessary and only serve to create additional blight.

4.2 Your Petitioner humbly asks your honourable House to alter the Bill and/or seek undertakings such that no greater amount of land/rights in or over land will be acquired than is reasonably required for the construction and operation of the railway works authorised by the Bill. Your Petitioner requests that the Bill and the Deposited Plans be amended to exclude land that is not required, or that the Secretary of State and/or the Promoter HS2 Ltd be required to enter into legally binding agreements with land owners stating that land that is not required will not be compulsorily acquired. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that Clause 47 be removed from the Bill.

5 Primary Mitigation

Accordingly, your Petitioner objects to the associated works and the clauses in the Bill that empower the works involved, and humbly requests your honourable House to modify the Bill, and/or require undertakings of the Promoter, to remove these adverse effects, primarily through a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least to Leather Lane.

6 Secondary Mitigation

In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the haul road from the South Heath portal to the Link Road roundabout be moved along the A413 beyond the Mobwell junction, as it will help to lessen the impact of the construction traffic on the Great Missenden Area.

7 Conclusion

7.1 Your Petitioner supports the petitions for a longer fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that extends throughout the Chilterns AONB. Such tunnel extension is being supported by the local County, District and Parish Councils and the Chiltern Conservation Board and in the alternative a shorter extension to Leather Lane. If your honourable House alters the Bill to provide for such an extended tunnel most of your Petitioner’s objections would be removed.
(your Petitioner's objection to unsuitable ancillary structures and to the present proposals for compensation would remain – albeit far fewer of its parishioners would be affected).

7.2 In the alternative to extending the fully bored Chiltern tunnel, your Petitioner seeks a significant secondary mitigation by relocating the haul road at the South Heath portal.

7.3 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully requests that unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, or suitable undertakings obtained from the Promoter, the Bill, along with accompanying Schedules, so far affecting your Petitioner and your Petitioner's area, along with the wider AONB, be not allowed to pass into law.

7.4 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner's parishioners, their rights, interests, property and your Petitioner's area and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.

8 *The prayer*

The Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the Petitioner, or someone representing the Petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

Signatories:

Miss Anne Mitchell  
Clerk to Great Missenden Parish Council  

Mrs Anne Hewett  
Chairman, Great Missenden Parish Council  

12th April 2016  

Date  
2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF The Friends of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill

 Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Clause 4(1) of the Bill to the extent that it would allow the car park and surrounding grassland known as Gloucester Slips, Outer Circle, Regent’s Park to be used by HS2 for construction and as a lorry holding area.

2. Your petitioner

Your petitioners are the Friends of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill. This is an association representing nearly one thousand individuals with a common interest in preserving and enhancing the amenities of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill for the benefit of the public and to protect these amenities from despoliation. The majority of the association’s members live in and around Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill. The association has been in existence for over 20 years.

3. Your Petitioners’ views expressed in the Petition were endorsed by a resolution passed by the Chairman and Committee of the said association on 18th October 2015, and a further resolution passed by the Chairman and Committee on 10 April 2016. At a meeting on 10 April the committee of the Friends of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill authorised their Chairman, Mrs Ianthe McWilliams to present the petition approved by them to the House of Lords.
Your petitioners' concerns

4. Additional Provision 3 (September 2015) would allow the car park and surrounding grassland known as Gloucester Slips, Outer Circle, Regent's Park to be used by HS2 for construction and as a lorry holding area giving rise to concerns as follows:

(a) the requisitioning of land reducing the amenity of Regent’s Park
(b) the use of the land for construction traffic
(c) the damage to a colony of breeding hedgehogs
(d) the likely reduction in access for educational visits to the Zoo
(e) the likely reduction in access to important sources of income for the Royal Parks
(f) the possible consequential increase in parking of commercial coach traffic on the Outer Circle road.

Further particulars of your Petitioners’ concerns are set out below.

5. Your Petitioners object most strongly to the compulsory and permanent acquisition of the whole of the Slips (Zoo) car park and the surrounding green areas by HS2 Ltd for ‘provision of worksite and access for construction’ which your petitioners understand will be mainly for the use of their construction lorries.

6. Your Petitioners consider that the occupation of the Gloucester Slips area of the Park, and its surrounding by high hoardings for 16 years will constitute a serious loss of amenity to the Park.

7. Your Petitioners understand that HS2 Ltd are proposing to have approximately 600 heavy construction lorry movements per day, initially removing (possibly toxic) waste soil, but later importing construction materials. The lorries will be diesel and the levels of pollution could be expected to be very high. It is understood that this could last some 16 years, although the land is to be acquired permanently. Coaches, heavy vehicles and lorries without specific permission and purpose are currently banned from the roads in Regent’s Park to reinforce the special nature of the Royal Parks as a retreat from the overwhelming business of metropolitan London life.

8. At present the access to the Slips (Zoo) car park is via Gloucester Gate and the Outer Circle of Regent’s Park. It is not certain whether HS2 Ltd intend just to use this access, or, as has been understood by the
Petitioners, HS2 Ltd may intend to create a new entry (or exit) in Prince Albert Road, across the pavement (much frequented by school children on their way to the Zoo), removing the railings, some trees, and laying track across the wide grass area to the central metalled area of the car park. At present the car park is the habitat of one of the last urban colonies of hedgehogs (now a threatened species). Whichever access route is intended, the combination of the heavy lorries, lighting, high impermeable fencing and the removal of the grass and trees will almost certainly wipe out this colony.

9. Your Petitioners' further reasons for objecting to the use of the Slips (Zoo) car park by HS2 Ltd’s lorries are:-
   a) The use of Gloucester Gate, already a dangerous intersection, by heavy construction vehicles, would present an intolerable hazard to both pedestrians (including children, the elderly and infirm), cyclists and other road users. Large numbers of families with children and other visitors to the zoo arrive and depart via Camden Town Underground station. The traffic congestion at the intersection between Prince Albert Road, Park Village East, Albany Street and Parkway is already often unacceptable: add to this the proposed 600 lorry movements a day and the consequence can only be gridlock;
   b) Your Petitioners note that no account has been taken of the proposed effect of the installation of TfL’s Cycle Superhighway 11. The proposed closure of Macclesfield Bridge to motor vehicles for most of the day will create a huge increase in the traffic on Prince Albert Road; which would be further exacerbated by HS2 Ltd’s lorries endeavouring to turn into any proposed new entrance to the Slips (Zoo) car park;
   c) TfL’s traffic modelling for the area affected by Cycle Superhighway 11 projected an increase of over 100% in the traffic using Albany Street and this was with no account being made for HS2 Ltd’s lorries;
   d) Your Petitioners know that the additional pollution from HS2 Ltd’s lorries will be significant and the levels on major roads in Camden are already in excess of EEC regulations (Directive 2008/50/EC);
   e) Your petitioners know that the result of losing the use of the Slips (Zoo) car park will be extremely deleterious to both the Royal Parks and ZSL. In the case of the Royal Parks, the loss of the car park will call into question the possibility of holding the Frieze Art Fair, which is an essential source of income to the Royal Parks, (whose budget has been reduced over recent years by successive governments by more than 60%). In the case of the Zoo, we understand serious loss of income and educational impact can be predicted.
   f) Your petitioners understand that HS2 are considering the feasibility of seeking for coach parking to be allowed along the Outer Circle. This will not satisfy the concerns about the hedgehog population in the car park.
and would lead to a range of further concerns: it would set a very unhelpful 16 year precedent for spoiling the carefully preserved Grade I listed streetscape in the Park landscape, damaging the amenity value of the Park. Coaches are not normally allowed in the Park (except to access the Zoo car park). If displacing car parking spaces, they would also reduce much needed park income. They would cause congestion, contrary to the aim of reducing traffic in the Outer Circle to increase the safety of Park roads for cyclists, who are expected to increase in number if Cycle Superhighway 11 proceeds to encourage them to use the Outer Circle.

10. The 2nd Special Report of the Select Committee said: 'A plan to maximise the amount of waste removal carried by rail will be developed by May 2016. This may alleviate the extent of lorry use of the Zoological Society of London car park facilities, where there is a small but significant population of hedgehogs.' Although your petitioners are aware that HS2 Ltd has been in touch with the Zoo, we understand that no satisfactory solutions have yet been reached. Our concerns have not been addressed by either HS2 Ltd or the House of Commons.

11. Your Petitioners are able to offer few solutions to the very serious problems raised by the proposals embodied in the Hybrid Bill regarding the acquisition of the Slips (Zoo) car park, but placing these in order of preference, we offer the following:-
   
a) That HS2 Ltd should terminate at Old Oak Common where there would be excellent connections via Crossrail and public transport to all London destinations including St. Pancras and HS1;
   
b) Your Petitioners feel that if the redevelopment of Euston should proceed, all soil and construction materials should travel by rail;
   
c) Your Petitioners feel that if HS2 Ltd is unable to deliver on either of the above, that they should employ an alternative site, rather than the Slips (Zoo) car park.

12. Your Petitioners object to the powers that are proposed to be provided to the Secretary of State and Nominated Undertaker of the Bill as proposed to be amended by AP3 and respectfully submit that AP3 or the Bill should be amended or undertakings should be required to be given so that HS2 Ltd, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must review the construction strategy that they claim necessitates the requisitioning of the Slips (Zoo) car park and come forward with necessary changes arising from that review before works packages, design and tendering strategies have been finalised.
The prayer

13. The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain

IANTHE MCWILLIAMS, Chairman of the Friends of Regent's Park and Primrose Hill, (Agent)

11 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Jonathan R. Jones  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.  

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Jonathan R Jones, resident at: Tabor Grove, Marriotts Avenue, South Heath, Great Missenden, HP169QN, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect. Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.  

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention. Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.
Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere. Your petitioner also has great concerns about any increase in traffic on the roundabouts on the A413 Great Missenden by-pass. As a cyclist, these roundabouts are already navigable safely only with extreme care due to the volume and speed of traffic. It is essential to you your petitioner to use these roundabouts to access the Railway Station at Great Missenden. Any further increase in volume may create traffic situations where the joining of the roundabout from Frith Hill may be impossible safely at certain times of day because of the constant through flow.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

   a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged
environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which
designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area. 

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413.

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes.

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet
the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

...........................

9th April 2016

Jonathan Jones

Print the name of the person signing below each signature (and add “Agent” if appropriate)

9th April 2016
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS
Session 2015-16
PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF David Turner and Barbara Turner
Declares that

1 The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2 Your petitioners are pensioners living quiet but upright lives in a 1st floor flat just north of Euston station. We seek measures to make our lives endurable in the eye of the storm that is HS2.

3 In an ideal world your petitioners would successfully argue that this monstrous scheme would not proceed. But we are beyond that—we concede that, by virtue of our age and proximity to Euston we will be tormented for the rest of our lives. This petition sketches our circumstances, describes our future and argues for proper mitigation and compensation for us and all other urban dwellers close to the tracks.

4 Your petitioners both turn 70 this year. For 44 years we have lived on the 1st floor of a tower block (Dalehead) on the Ampthill Square Estate. It is 120mtrs from the end of existing Euston platforms and 110mtrs from the lines going north. It will not be demolished as part of the scheme. It will be 70mtrs from the promoter’s principle construction site and even nearer vast services rerouting works, both on our estate. It is 30mtrs from a point on Hampstead Road due to be raised (as much as 4.8mtrs) to accommodate the enlarged Hampstead Road bridge, and 60mtrs from Granby Terrace bridge—also to be rebuilt.

5 The promoters estimate that service relaying, bridge/road rebuilding, line laying and ancillary works will span 17 years, and the full scheme works will take 33 years—at best. Due to the exigencies of existing train running, most of this works are scheduled for 24 hour working. Even the promoters have described the works as having a long-term, extremely disruptive and impacting on noise levels, air quality, mobility and accessibility.

6 Your petitioners will endure detriment to their entire living environment that will be relentless and extensive. Regarding extent, actuarily, we may expect to live 13-15 years. If so, the scheme will blight all the time we have

7 The promoters have offered various mitigation and intent to up their oft criticised stakeholder consultation. But the nature, extent and influencing factors are such that there is only so much that can be done. We will be living in the slap bang in the middle of the nation’s largest construction project for the rest of our lives.

8 Broadly, mitigation extends to looking at the feasibility of noise insulation, air circulation in individual homes and area monitoring of disturbance across the board as well as some intention to limit unsociable hours working as far as is practicable. In general, your petitioners are prepared to
place their fate in the hands of those better qualified, experienced and positioned to continue to liaise with the promoters.

9 But we argue for a ‘champion’

10 We ask that there is a body of experts resourced to undertake all monitoring and its reporting in the public domain. It should have the powers to censure the promoters when they fail and impose proportionate penalty. It should be our dedicated ombudsman, a conduit whereby the mighty can be humbled when appropriate. All its doings should be transparent and regularly published.

11 Turning to compensation, the promoters say that urban dwellers are well used to disturbance and, as such do not deserve the compensation given to those in rural climes. Your petitioners regard this as a cynically grotesque argument — the complete inversion of what should be — that those already coping with disturbance and having their burden further added should be roundly compensated. The opposite is true here. Perversely, urban dwellers are being more harshly treated than those in the counties. Your petitioners ask that they and other urban dwellers ‘enjoy’ exactly the same compensation as their rural cousins — across the board.

12 Failing that, at the very minimum there should be specific but significant enhancements to the ‘need-to-sell’ scheme as presently envisaged. In order to qualify, applicants must ‘score’ against 5 criteria including health, family and work demands and evidence of attempts to sell. Some regard is supposed to be given to stage of life but statistics to date show that the percentage of those 70+ succeeding is little more than younger applicants.

13 Your petitioners ask that where the extent of their likely disturbance — both degree, range and longevity is such and when this is conflated with age, applicants should automatically qualify for the scheme regardless of anything else. Merely as an illustration, we can be expected to die in a building site. We, and others so positioned should qualify and qualification should be automatic on presentation of birth certificates. The promoters are better placed than anyone to assess the aggregate of disturbance. Should they refuse on grounds of extent there should be an independent appeals process. The percentage of acceptances by age of those applying should be published and the Select Committee should from time to time question the promoters as to the efficacy of the scheme. Any such ‘automatic’ acceptance should be valid throughout the scheme or, of course — death.

14 Finally, our petitioners ask for improvement to the degree of compensation offered to ‘need-to-sell’ acceptances — specifically for automatic (age-related) applicants. As pensioners, or income or capital will not cover moving costs and we are, of course we unable to borrow. Consequently we could be accepted for ‘need-to-sell’ but not be able to afford to. Thus, we ask that all age-related automatic acceptances qualify for the exact same terms as offered to those whose dwelling is required by the promoters. That is - market value, all moving costs (including stamp duty) and a cash sum in lieu of disturbance.

15 In summary, your petitioners ask for reasonable treatment to ensure that the rest of our lives is a little more tolerable that the future presently offered to us by the promoters of this monstrous juggernaut
16 The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords ask that they or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

17 AND the petitioners remain, etc

..........................................................

(DAVID TURNER)

..........................................................

(BARBARA TURNER)

9 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Ruth Anita Fowler

Declarations that:
1. The petitioner ('Your Petitioner') is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Ruth Anita Fowler, resident at The Blacksmith's Cottage, Swan Bottom, The Lee, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire HP16 9NH, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line.

Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to her household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, hospital and GP services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for Stoke Mandeville, Aylesbury, London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Being recently retired, your petitioner anticipates moving to a smaller property at some time during the period of construction of the high speed railway or shortly thereafter. She is concerned that the problems caused by the construction including HGV vehicles, disruption to roads and access and the general problems of noise, dust, dirt, traffic movements and other issues arising during construction will further materially affect interest in properties and cause a property blight in this area which will severely restrict your petitioner’s potential options, as property values in this part of the Chilterns AONB are already falling in relation to those in other areas not so affected. During the period of operation, the noise of high speed trains will continue to depress property prices as the silence, landscape and other associated benefits of the AONB will be forever compromised.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area.
forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

   a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

   b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

   c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

   d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wildlife access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

   e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

   f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

   g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

   h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.

   i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban
drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

r. That should assurances given by the Promoter that your petitioner will not be inconvenienced by noise during construction or operation prove to be incorrect, and your petitioner’s health be adversely affected by such noise, that the Promoter will ensure that remedial action is taken to fully mitigate the impact of such noise.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and,
in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Ruth Anita Fowler

11th April, 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Simon George Denison-Smith

Declares that:

1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioners is Simon Denison-Smith, resident at Pheasant Cottage, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line, in particular the major adverse effect that will occur
at the Link Road and Frith Hill roundabouts, which will exceed their capacity. In addition to
the impact on his daily journey to and from work, as a coach at the Ballinger Waggoners
cricket club, your petitioner believes that the evening coaching and matches, which take place
every weekday evening during the summer, will be severely disrupted. Over 30% of its youth
membership travel from the Great Missenden side of the A413 and 50% of visiting teams.
Your petitioner does not believe that HS2’s conclusions from their calculations for the
increased traffic on the A413 are correct. Your petitioner believes that the amount of work
traffic attempting to access the A413 during the busy rush hour period when he and the club
members are using these routes will be sufficient to delay journeys sufficiently that it will not
be worth many players making the journey. Such disruption will cause significant
inconvenience to your petitioner but for the club has the potential to severely impact member
numbers upon which the club is so dependent and could ultimately threaten the future
existence of the club.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the
presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an
extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that
the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel
proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and
HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively
discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is
supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be
presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the
remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise
required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include
the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above,
then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large
measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your
Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following
mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be
adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed
within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to
seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for
the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of
the line.
c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and
north of Wendover.
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of
way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to
retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly
given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of
Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413
b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.
c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.
4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

____________________  ______________________

Simon Denison-Smith,  
Pheasant Cottage, Ballinger, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LF

10 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-2016  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London to West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION of: CHARLES WILSON ENGINEERS LIMITED  

Declares that:  

1. Your Petitioner is specifically and directly adversely affected by Clauses 4 to 11 and 48 of the Bill and Schedules 5 to 10 which comprise provisions for the compulsory acquisition of land. In particular your Petitioner is affected by Clauses 4, 5 and 6 and Schedule 5 to the Bill which authorise the compulsory acquisition of any land within the Act Limits (Clause 4 (1)), along with land specified for particular purposes in Schedule 5 (Clause 4 (2)), which includes your Petitioner's land. Your Petitioner is also affected by the powers to acquire rights in land (Clause 5) and the provisions in relation to acquisition of part of land (Clause 6).  

2. Your Petitioner is also specifically and directly affected by the rights conferred by Clause 12 and Schedule 15 to extinguish private and other rights over land and Clause 15 and Schedule 16 to allow temporary possession to be taken of land within the Acts limits.  

3. Furthermore your Petitioner is specifically and directly affected by Clause 1 and Schedule 1 (Work No. 3/206), which gives authority for “A realignment of Wolseley Drive commencing at the junction of that road with Bromford Lane and terminating at a point 132 west of its commencement” and Clause 20 which confers a deemed grant of planning permission in respect of these works. Work No. 3/206 is what necessitates the acquisition of your Petitioner’s property and the removal of their access to the highway network via Wolseley Drive. Your Petitioner requires access between the Site and the highway network at all times via Wolseley Drive and is therefore also affected by Clause 3 and Schedule 4. In particular Schedule 4, Part 2, Subsection (3) of the Bill which it is noted currently provides that Wolseley Drive must remain available as highway for public access at all times notwithstanding the works to re-align Wolseley Drive.
Your Petitioner

4. Your Petitioner is Charles Wilson Engineers Limited ("Charles Wilson Engineers") who operate their business from 317 Bromford Lane, Washwood Heath, Birmingham, B8 2SH ("the Site"). The freehold of this land is owned by Gallagher Holdings Limited. The site was purchased on 21st February 2002 for use by Charles Wilson Engineers for their current purposes. Charles Wilson Engineers is a subsidiary of Gallagher Holdings Limited. Charles Wilson Engineers runs a very successful plant hire business from the Site. The Bill specifically and directly affects your Petitioner's use of the Site, in that all of their outside yard areas compromising part of their Site, and also the existing access to the Site, are included within the Act limits (Plots 163 and 164) and are consequentially affected by compulsory acquisition and/or temporary acquisition and related powers.

5. Given that the nature of your Petitioner's business is the hire of heavy plant and machinery predominantly to the construction sector, a large outside yard area is essential to the operation of their business model, given the need to store and move plant around the Site in order to be able to dispatch it to, and receive it back from, their customers. A large outside yard area is also essential in order to allow vehicle movements within the site, to allow delivery vehicles to enter the site in forwards gear, collect plant and machinery and then leave the site in a forwards gear. More than 95% of your Petitioner's business from this depot depends on having a usefully large outside yard area accessed from Wolseley Drive. Only 5% of the business relates to their tool hire/small plant operation from their sales counter accessed via the A4040 Bromford Lane.

6. The Site affected by the Bill is your Petitioner's only premises in Birmingham. The Site serves an area of operation predominantly centred on the Birmingham and West Midlands area, but due to its central location the Site also includes Stoke and Worksop within its catchment area to the north, Lincoln and North East Anglia to the east, Northampton and Milton Keynes, Bicester and Oxford to the south and Gloucester to the south west. Further, due to its central location, it plays a pivotal role within the 'hub and spoke' network of Charles Wilson Engineers, acting as a hub/transit depot for the London, Bristol and Northern (Liverpool, Manchester and Leeds) 'spokes' of the group. At any one time the Site employs between 20 and 25 permanent Charles Wilson Engineers staff, up to 5 casual staff and around 10 drivers and/or labourers operating from this site, thus creating direct employment for around 40 local people.
Your Petitioner's concerns

Re-alignment of Wolseley Drive

7. Clause 1 of the Bill currently authorises works to re-align part of Wolseley Drive at Work No. 3/206 of Schedule 1. The re-alignment of Wolseley Drive appears to be the sole reason for seeking to include your Petitioners land within the limits of the Act. Your Petitioner contends that it is necessary neither to re-align Wolseley Drive nor to acquire any of their land. Your Petitioners highways consultant (Julian Clarke of Transport Planning Associates), advises that the current alignment would allow suitable and appropriate access to the Washwood Heath depot for all potential types of vehicles likely to require such access during both construction and operational stages. In this regard, Wolseley Drive is 7.3 m in width at its narrowest widening to two lanes as it moves from the Charles Wilson Engineers access towards the junction with Bromford Lane. This measurement is consistent with the widths of highways that form part of the primary route network and with our understanding of the width of the proposed realigned Wolseley Drive. Swept path analysis completed by Transport Planning Associates for the full range of vehicle types, including Heavy Goods Vehicles (16.5m), low-loaders (18m) or rigid vehicles, demonstrates that the route is of a suitable width for all vehicle movements to pass without conflict.

8. The new alignment will not enable any traffic movements that are not already possible with the existing alignment. In so far as any justification has been put forward for realignment of Wolseley Drive, it has been piecemeal and without any detailed explanation. At meetings held with the Promoter various possible suggestions for the justification of the need to re-align Wolseley Drive have been postulated including flood issues, tunnel escape routes and the need to provide pedestrian and cycle routes on both sides of the road, amongst others. The various reasons given have varied at the different meetings attended and none of these reasons have been substantiated by any detail, such that the Petitioner does not yet know the case being advanced by the Promoter. Your Petitioner is therefore substantially prejudiced in the face of an ever changing and unsubstantiated picture, to understand the reasons for the re-alignment and the case for the extent of land acquisition proposed. Your Petitioner therefore reserved the right to respond at the Select Committee hearing to any justification now or in the future advanced by the Promoter for the re-alignment of Wolseley Drive and the extent of land take required once established by the Promoter.
Extent of Land Acquisition - permanent and temporary

9. Your Petitioner's first contention is that there is no need for any compulsory acquisition of their land. Since no substantive reason for the need to re-align Wolseley Drive has been provided, the land acquisition consequent on that re-alignment is not justified. Your Petitioner respectfully suggests that the Bill is amended to remove Work No 3/206 and to remove your Petitioner's land, in particular plots 163 and 164, from the limits of the Act and the scope of acquisition from compulsory purchase or temporary possession powers because there is no adequate justification for its inclusion. Compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers are draconian measures which should be fully justified in respect of every parcel of land. In particular there must be a compelling case in the public interest as to why every parcel of land should be acquired despite the detriment to the individual land owner affected and the impact on their human rights. That test is not met here.

10. In the alternative your Petitioner's second contention is that, in the event that a genuine and justifiable need for the Promoter to re-align Wolseley Drive were to be shown a lesser land take than that currently proposed is possible. Firstly, a revised alignment which minimises the land take yet achieves all of the promoters other objectives could be designed. Secondly, it contends that in any event the land acquisition proposal is far more extensive than is necessary, even based on the alignment which the promoter currently seeks to achieve.

11. The proposed land acquisition of Plot 163 and 164 includes all of the Petitioners existing main outside yard area but leaves in situ their main large plant storage premises. The main premises would be left without vehicular or pedestrian access to the highway and no yard. The small plant/tool hire unit accessed via Bromford Land would still have access to the highway but there is no access through to the main large plant storage premises. It would therefore be impossible for your Petitioner to continue to operate from the Site and your Petitioner would either have to relocate or extinguish the business. Efforts to date to identify appropriate relocation properties have not been successful due to the lack of suitable alternative sites for this particular use and the lack of suitable employment land generally. Notwithstanding this your Petitioner continues to make every effort to identify suitable relocation premises to avoid the extinguishment of the business and resultant job losses. Your Petitioner contends that, particularly in light of the scarcity of suitable employment land in the area, it is incumbent on the Promoter to minimise their temporary and permanent land take, where possible.
12. In fact the Promoter itself has acknowledged that, even with their current proposals for realignment of Wolseley Drive, a lesser area of land take would still enable it to provide the realignment which it seeks (which realignment your Petitioner does not accept as being necessary). This reduced area of land take is shown by a hatched red line on the drawing labelled Gallagher Holdings Indicative Minimum Land take provided by the Promoters agents. In light of this concession by the Promoter, your Petitioner disputes that the full proposed land take in Plots 163 and 164 can ever be justified, and contends that a reduced minimum land take necessary for the current re-alignment should be identified by the Promoter.

13. Even the reduced minimum land take currently proposed should be fully justified given that any loss of the Petitioners yard will have a significant and detrimental impact on their ability to operate from the Site may still prevent the Petitioner from continuing to operate their business from the Site. Accordingly, even the reduced land take currently proposed is not acceptable to the Petitioner because either the existing Wolseley Drive is suitable or a revised alignment with a lesser land take is possible. Nonetheless the extent of the indicative minimum land take would likely be preferable to acquisition of the whole (of plots 163 & 164).

14. Your Petitioner has had a number of meetings with the Promoter to discuss re-alignment of Wolseley Drive, extent and nature of land take and access, at your Petitioners request. Despite engaging early, with the first meeting between the parties being on 11th March 2015, very little progress had been made and your Petitioner was left with the impression that they were not being taken seriously. Since 18th March 2016 the HS2 Petitions team have sought to engage with the Petitioner and have now, following a meeting on 1st April, (i) established that access to and from your Petitioners Site and Wolseley Drive can be delivered throughout the construction period and thereafter, (ii) agreed to look at alternative alignments for Wolseley Drive and (iii) agreed to look at minimising the necessary temporary and permanent land acquisition. This is promising although your Petitioner has not been presented with any detailed proposals or any firm undertakings that these matters can be resolved. Your Petitioner has at their own expense hired a team of consultants to provide professional advice on the various issues arising, including a surveyor and highways consultant to help assist in finding solutions to the impact of the Promoters project on your Petitioners interests. Your Petitioner sincerely hopes the Promoter will now continue to
engage with it in a genuine attempt to save the business, jobs and minimise the compensation impact on the public purse. Your Petitioner remains committed to continue discussion with the Promoter and find solutions to address the issues remaining outstanding between the parties.

Continued access to Wolseley Drive

15. On the assumption that either no land is taken or a lesser extent of land is taken your Petitioner asserts that they should be able to maintain continued access via Wolseley Drive, whether or not it is re-aligned. The Bill provides in Schedule 4 (Part 2 ss (3)) that the revised alignment for Wolseley Drive must be provided before the old alignment is stopped up; it is clearly proposed that public access to Wolseley Drive will be maintained throughout. Notwithstanding this to date the promoter has failed to provide firm assurances that this will be offered up both during the construction and operational phases of HS2; thus your Petitioner is again prejudiced because they have no clear understanding as to whether the Promoter will allow them to continue to access their Premises from Wolseley Drive, nor any clear understanding as to what the Promoters reasons for refusing such access would be. Accordingly your Petitioner reserves the right to respond to any issues raised by the Promoter in respect of the issue of maintaining continued access to Wolseley Drive. Your Petitioner also has no clear idea from the Promoter at what stage in the overall programme for the delivery of HS2 the proposed re-alignment of Wolseley Drive would be carried out; at various times the Promoters agents have indicated both that such realignment might take place at the very beginning of the project, and at the very end of it. Very recent negotiations with the Promoter suggest these issues may be capable of being overcome and access can be retained from Wolseley Drive at all times. As yet your Petitioners have no firm undertaking to this effect.

16. Given that the proposed Depot and your Petitioner would, in combination, generate less traffic than existing users of Wolseley Drive, your Petitioner contends there is no reason why use of Wolseley Drive cannot be shared by the Promoter with your Petitioner. The Promoters proposals in respect of the Washwood Heath Depot will actually result in a reduction of traffic movements along Wolseley Drive as compared to existing volumes, even if Charles Wilson Engineers were to continue generating its current level of vehicular
movements. At present, Wolseley Drive serves two significant land parcels in addition to the Charles Wilson Engineers' site; one (Plot 193) is used as a storage/distribution warehouse which was most recently put to use as a parcel mail distribution centre, the other (Plot 199) is currently used as DVSA pound for storage of vehicles. Subject to compulsory acquisition in the form currently provided in the Bill, both of these areas are proposed for acquisition in connection with the delivery of the depot facility and related construction activity. The Promoters Environmental Statement assumes in respect of the construction traffic flows on Wolseley Drive that these uses will cease. The construction traffic proposed to be generated by HS2 when combined with Charles Wilson Engineers continuing to access their premises via Wolseley Drive will comprise less traffic than the current lawful position. Further the Promoters Environmental Statement assumes in its statement of operational traffic flows on Wolseley Drive that these uses will cease as a result of the HS2 scheme. The anticipated operational traffic proposed to be generated by HS2, when combined with that generated by Charles Wilson Engineers continuing to access their premises via Wolseley Drive, will comprise less traffic than is generated by the current lawful position. Thus there is no question as to capacity; Wolseley Drive can accommodate both the traffic generated by Charles Wilson Engineers and that generated by HS2 both during construction and operational phases. Any subsequent land uses proposed to be accessed via Wolseley Drive in future will require planning permission or the equivalent and the traffic implications of such proposals would need to be considered at the appropriate time.

Finally in the eventuality that a re-aligned Wolseley Drive is deemed to be necessary, your Petitioner wishes to secure agreement as to the method and timing of the construction of Works 3/206 of Schedule 1 so that continued access to Wolesley Drive is maintained for the Petitioner at all times during the construction period and thereafter, in order to minimise disruption and the extent of temporary possession of their land in order to secure their continued successful operational use of their own land. Given the retention of public access along Wolseley Drive throughout, your Petitioner contends that this can be provided for.

Access via Bromford Lane

A further matter in dispute between your Petitioner and the Promoter relates to the issue of how access would be gained by the Petitioner to any retained yard area. The Promoter is suggesting that a currently unused access on to the A4040 Bromford Lane should be used in
future. Such suggestion is wholly unworkable, particularly given the fact that Bromford Lane forms part of Birmingham’s strategic highway network.

19. It is correct that there is a historic access on the Petitioners Site which has previously provided access onto Bromford Lane, which is now unused and has long since been boarded up. However, the Petitioner contends that this access is unusable because the access is of an unsuitable size and could not accommodate the swept paths of the type of traffic that need to access and egress the plant hire business at this Site. Any such use would necessitate significant improvement works and the obtaining of relevant highway authority consents, which would be unlikely to be forthcoming due to the interference and obstruction which would be caused to traffic using the strategic highway network.

20. In this regard, Site access onto Bromford Lane would be ‘left in’ and ‘left out’ only, and the significant majority of vehicles requiring access to and from the Site are either HGVs, Low Loaders or Rigid Vehicles. The swept path analysis shows that for these vehicle types to make a left hand turn into the Site, they would need to move over into the right hand lane and then turn left cutting across both lanes. This movement is dangerous generally in terms of the risk of ‘under cutting’ whilst the movement is taking place, and is dangerous especially in terms of risk to cyclists. On exiting the Site to the left there are currently 4 lanes, a left hand lane (to Wolseley Drive), 2 straight on lanes and a right hand lane. The large vehicles identified above would need to cut across 3 lanes of traffic to make the exit manoeuvre and be able to be positioned in the left hand straight ahead lane to move forwards.

21. Further, the access is of an unsuitable width and would need to be significantly redesigned for both arrival and departure movements. Even after redesign of the access the swept paths on entering and exiting the Site would still necessitate crossing multiple lanes of Bromford Lane carriage way in completing the movement. The turning movements explained above are hazardous and would not normally be supported by Highways Authorities due to concerns related to undertaking and the potential further hazard posed to cyclists.

22. Furthermore the exit is hazardous due to the existing traffic volumes on Bromford Lane (A4040), which would create longer wait times to access/exit the Site. Even a redesigned Site access would only accommodate 1 vehicle in or out at any time, so a vehicle seeking to
exit the Site, would then cause queuing on the highway for any vehicles waiting to enter the Site.

23. The access is also hazardous because it is too close to an existing bus stop. The impact upon the existing bus stop is significant and whilst this could conceivably be overcome by relocation, there is no certainty that a suitable location will be available, agreeable to the Highway Authority and bus operator, or deliverable (given the need to obtain further traffic regulation orders not secured via the Bill to deliver its relocation).

24. Quite apart from issues of safety and design, the proposed use of access on to Bromford Lane would have an adverse impact on your Petitioner's business, resulting in increased transport and traffic implications at locations elsewhere, increased inconvenience, cost and unnecessary unsustainable additional mileage. Use of any redesigned access on Bromford Lane would necessitate space being taken from the existing Site compound area (which is already required for operational purposes), and necessitate vehicles undertaking a turning manoeuvre within the Site compound, within what would already be a significantly reduced yard area due to land having been taken on account of the compulsory acquisition. This would have a consequential impact on the ability to store plant and operate the business from the Site.

Conclusion

25. Your Petitioner claims that re-alignment of Wolseley Drive is unnecessary and unjustified and consequentially that any land acquisition of their property is unnecessary and/or that a revised re-alignment with lesser land take impacts can be identified. The Promoters proposals will significantly affect your Petitioner's ability to operate from these premises. Accordingly, in order to prevent harm to (possibly extinguishment of) the Petitioners business, to avoid job losses, and to reduce compensation payments, it is essential that a reduced area of land take, both temporary and permanent, is agreed with the Petitioner. Finally your Petitioner needs to be assured of continuing access from Wolseley Drive, re-aligned or otherwise, and is unaware of any good reason why this cannot be provided.
The Prayer

The Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that they or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which consider this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains etc

By Counsel etc

Signed: [Signature]  (Agent) Agent

Printed: ABIGAIL WALTERS

Dated 11.04.16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-2016  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London to West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION of: GALLAGHER HOLDINGS LIMITED  

Declares that:  

1. Your Petitioner is specifically and directly adversely affected by Clauses 4 to 11 and 48 of the Bill and Schedules 5 to 10 which comprise provisions for the compulsory acquisition of land. In particular your Petitioner is affected by Clauses 4, 5 and 6 and Schedule 5 to the Bill which authorise the compulsory acquisition of any land within the Act Limits (Clause 4 (1)), along with land specified for particular purposes in Schedule 5 (Clause 4 (2)), which includes your Petitioners land. Your Petitioner is also affected by the powers to acquire rights in land (Clause 5) and the provisions in relation to acquisition of part of land (Clause 6).  

2. Your Petitioner is also specifically and directly affected by the rights conferred by Clause 12 and Schedule 15 to extinguish private and other rights over land and Clause 15 and Schedule 16 to allow temporary possession to be taken of land within the Acts limits.  

3. Furthermore your Petitioner is specifically and directly affected by Clause 1 and Schedule 1 (Work No. 3/206), which gives authority for "A realignment of Wolseley Drive commencing at the junction of that road with Bromford Lane and terminating at a point 132 west of its commencement" and Clause 20 which confers a deemed grant of planning permission in respect of these works. Work No. 3/206 is what necessitates the acquisition of your Petitioners property and the removal of their access to the highway network via Wolseley Drive. Your Petitioner is also affected by Clause 3 and Schedule 4 as access between the Site and the highway network via Wolseley Drive is required to be maintained at all times. In particular Schedule 4, Part 2, Subsection (3) of the Bill which it is noted currently provides
that Wolseley Drive must remain available as highway for public access at all times notwithstanding the works to re-align Wolseley Drive.

Your Petitioner

4. Your Petitioner is Gallagher Holdings Limited ("Gallagher Holdings") who own the freehold of 317 Bromford Lane, Washwood Heath, Birmingham, B8 2SH ("the Site"). The Site was purchased on 21st February 2002 by Gallagher Holdings for use by Charles Wilson Engineers Limited ("Charles Wilson Engineers") for their current purposes. Gallagher Holdings holds properties for group companies, together with other investments. In this regard Charles Wilson Engineers is a subsidiary of Gallagher Holdings. Charles Wilson Engineers runs a very successful plant hire business from the Site. The Bill specifically and directly affects Charles Wilson Engineers' use of the Site, in that all of the outside yard areas compromising part of their Site, and also the existing access to the Site, are included within the Act limits (Plots 163 and 164) and are consequentially affected by compulsory acquisition and/or temporary acquisition and related powers.

5. The nature of your Petitioner's business is that of a holding company including holding property for the group companies. Your Petitioner would wish to retain as much of its own land in its own ownership for its own business objectives. These would primarily be to secure the continued occupation of the Site by Charles Wilson Engineers. Notwithstanding this your Petitioner has significant covenant strength and experience of redevelopment of urban sites and in any event wishes to ensure that the Premises within the Site, which themselves are not subject to compulsory acquisition powers, are left with a useable outside yard area and access to the highway network. Current land acquisition proposals take all main outside yard areas but leave in situ their main large plant storage premises. The main premises would be left without vehicular or pedestrian access to the highway and no yard. The smaller plant/hire/sales counter accessed from Bromford Lane would still have access to the highway but there is no access through to the main large plant storage premises on the Site.
Your Petitioner's concerns

Re-alignment of Wolseley Drive

6. Clause 1 of the Bill currently authorises works to re-align part of Wolseley Drive at Work No. 3/206 of Schedule 1. The re-alignment of Wolseley Drive appears to be the sole reason for seeking to include your Petitioners land within the limits of the Act. Your Petitioner contends that it is necessary neither to re-align Wolseley Drive nor to acquire any of their land. Your Petitioners highways consultant (Julian Clarke of Transport Planning Associates), advises that the current alignment would allow suitable and appropriate access to the Washwood Heath depot for all potential types of vehicles likely to require such access during both construction and operational stages. In this regard, Wolseley Drive is 7.3 m in width at its narrowest widening to two lanes as it moves from the Charles Wilson Engineers access towards the junction with Bromford Lane. This measurement is consistent with the widths of highways that form part of the primary route network and with our understanding of the width of the proposed realigned Wolseley Drive. Swept path analysis completed by Transport Planning Associates for the full range of vehicle types, including Heavy Goods Vehicles (16.5m), low-loaders (18m) or rigid vehicles, demonstrates that the route is of a suitable width for all vehicle movements to pass without conflict.

7. The new alignment will not enable any traffic movements that are not already possible with the existing alignment. In so far as any justification has been put forward for realignment of Wolseley Drive, it has been piecemeal and without any detailed explanation. At meetings held with the Promoter various possible suggestions for the justification of the need to re-align Wolseley Drive have been postulated including flood issues, tunnel escape routes and the need to provide pedestrian and cycle routes on both sides of the road, amongst others. The various reasons given have varied at the different meetings attended and none of these reasons have been substantiated by any detail, such that the Petitioner does not yet know the case being advanced by the Promoter. Your Petitioner is therefore substantially prejudiced in the face of an ever changing and unsubstantiated picture, to understand the reasons for the re-alignment and the case for the extent of land acquisition proposed. Your Petitioner therefore reserves the right to respond at the Select Committee hearing to any justification now or in the future advanced by the Promoter for the re-alignment of Wolseley Drive and the extent of land take required once established by the Promoter.
Extent of Land Acquisition - permanent and temporary

8. Your Petitioners first contention is that there is no need for any compulsory acquisition of their land. Since no substantive reason for the need to re-align Wolseley Drive has been provided, the land acquisition consequent on that re-alignment is not justified. Your Petitioner respectfully suggests that the Bill is amended to remove Work No 3/206 and to remove your Petitioners land, in particular plots 163 and 164, from the limits of the Act and the scope of acquisition from compulsory purchase or temporary possession powers because there is no adequate justification for its inclusion. Compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers are draconian measures which should be fully justified in respect of every parcel of land. In particular, there must be a compelling case in the public interest as to why land should be acquired despite the detriment to the land owner affected and the impact on their human rights. That test is not met here. Furthermore no adequate attempts to negotiate with the Petitioner to acquire the Site have been carried out either before or in parallel with the Hybrid Bill process; in this regard all meetings with the HS2 Petitions team were, until recently, at our instigation.

9. In the alternative, in the event that a genuine and justifiable need for the Promoter to re-align Wolseley Drive were to be shown, your Petitioner contends firstly, that a revised alignment which minimises the land take yet achieves all of the promoters other objectives could be designed. Secondly, it contends that in any event the land acquisition proposal is far more extensive than is necessary even based on the alignment which the Promoter currently seeks to achieve.

10. The proposed land acquisition of Plot 163 and 164 includes all of the Petitioners existing yard area, but leaves in situ their main large plant storage premises. Thus the main premises would be left without vehicular or pedestrian access to the highway, and with no yard. The small plant/tool hire unit accessed via Bromford Lane would still have access to the highway but there is no internal access through to the main large plant storage buildings. It would therefore be impossible for Charles Wilson Engineers to continue to operate from the Site, and very unlikely that your Petitioner could attract a new occupier. Your Petitioner contends that particularly in light of the scarcity of suitable employment land in the area it is
incumbent on the Promoter to minimise their temporary and permanent land take where possible.

11. In fact the Promoter itself has acknowledged that, even with the current proposals for realignment of Wolseley Drive, a lesser area of land take, would still enable it to provide the realignment which it seeks (which re-alignment Your Petitioner does not accept as being necessary). This reduced area of land take is shown by a hatched red line on the drawing labelled Gallagher Holdings Indicative Minimum Land take provided by the Promoters agents. In light of this concession by the Promoter, your Petitioner disputes that the full proposed land take in Plots 163 and 164 can ever be justified, and contends that a reduced minimum land take necessary for the current re-alignment should be identified by the Promoter.

12. Even the reduced minimum land take currently proposed should be fully justified given that any loss of the Petitioners yard will have a significant and detrimental impact on their existing occupier’s ability to operate from the Site. Accordingly, even the reduced land take currently proposed is not acceptable to the Petitioner, because either the existing Wolseley Drive is suitable or a revised alignment with a lesser land take is possible. Nonetheless the extent of the indicative minimum land take would likely be preferable to acquisition of the whole (of plots 163 & 164).

13. Your Petitioner has had a number of meetings with the Promoter to discuss re-alignment of Wolseley Drive, extent and nature of land take and access, at your Petitioners request. Despite engaging early, with the first meeting being on 11th March 2015, very little progress had been made and your Petitioner was left with the impression that they were not being taken seriously. Since 18th March 2016 the HS2 Petitions team have sought to engage with the Petitioner and have now, following a meeting on 1st April, (i) established that access to and from your Petitioners Site and Wolseley Drive can be delivered throughout the construction period and thereafter, (ii) agreed to look at alternative alignments to Wolseley Drive and (iii) agreed to look at minimising the necessary temporary and permanent land acquisition. This is promising although your Petitioner has not been presented with any detailed proposals or any firm undertakings that these matters can be resolved. Your Petitioner has, together with Charles Wilson Engineers, at their own expense hired a team of
consultants to provide professional advice on the various issues, including a surveyor and highways consultant to help assist in finding solutions to the impact of the Promoters project on your Petitioners interests. Your Petitioner remains committed to continue discussion with the Promoter and find solutions to address the issues remaining outstanding between the parties.

Continued access to Wolseley Drive

14. On the assumption that either no land is taken or a lesser extent of land is taken, your Petitioner asserts that they should be able to maintain continued access via Wolseley Drive, whether or not it is re-aligned. The Bill provides in Schedule 4 (Part 2 ss (3)) that the revised alignment for Wolseley Drive must be provided before the old alignment is stopped up; it is clearly proposed that public access to Wolseley Drive will be maintained throughout. However, to date the Promoter has failed to provide firm assurances that this will be offered up both during the construction and operational phases of HS2; thus your Petitioner is again prejudiced because they have no clear understanding as to whether the Promoter will allow them to continue to access their Premises from Wolseley Drive nor any clear understanding as to what the Promoters reasons for refusing such access would be. Accordingly your Petitioner reserves the right to respond to any issues raised by the Promoter in respect of the issue of maintaining continued access to Wolseley Drive. Your Petitioner also has no clear idea from the Promoter at what stage in the overall programme for the delivery of HS2 the proposed re-alignment of Wolseley Drive would be carried out, at various times the Promoters agents have indicated both that such re-alignment might take place at the very beginning of the project and at the very end of it. Very recent negotiations suggest that these issues may be capable of being overcome and access can be retained from Wolseley Drive at all times. Your Petitioner does not yet have any firm undertaking to this effect.

15. Given that the proposed Depot and Charles Wilson Engineers would, in combination, generate less traffic than existing users of Wolseley Drive, your Petitioner contends there is no reason why use of Wolseley Drive cannot be shared by the Promoter with the current occupant of the Site, Charles Wilson Engineers. HS2’s proposals in respect of the Washwood Heath Depot will actually result in a reduction of traffic movements along Wolseley Drive as compared to existing volumes, even if Charles Wilson Engineers were to continue generating
its current level of vehicular movements. At present, Wolseley Drive serves two significant land parcels in addition to the Charles Wilson Engineers' site; one (Plot 193) is used as a storage/distribution warehouse which was most recently put to use as a parcel mail distribution centre, the other (Plot 199) is currently used as DVSA pound for storage of vehicles. Subject to compulsory acquisition in the form currently provided in the Bill, both of these areas are proposed for acquisition in connection with the delivery of the depot facility and related construction activity. The Promoters Environmental Statement assumes in respect of the construction traffic flows on Wolseley Drive that these uses will cease. The construction traffic proposed to be generated by HS2 when combined with Charles Wilson Engineers continuing to access their premises via Wolseley Drive will comprise less traffic than the current lawful position. Further the Promoters Environmental Statement assumes in its statement of operational traffic flows on Wolseley Drive that these uses will cease as a result of the HS2 scheme. The anticipated operational traffic proposed to be generated by HS2, when combined with that generated by Charles Wilson Engineers Limited continuing to access their premises via Wolseley Drive, will comprise less traffic than is generated by the current lawful position. Thus there is no question as to capacity; Wolseley Drive can accommodate both the traffic generated by Charles Wilson Engineers and that generated by HS2 both during construction and operational phases. Any subsequent land uses proposed to be accessed via Wolseley Drive in future will require planning permission or the equivalent and the traffic implications of such proposals would need to be considered at the appropriate time.

16. Finally in the eventuality that a re-aligned Wolseley Drive is deemed to be necessary, your Petitioner wishes to secure agreement as to the method and timing of the construction of Works 3/206 of Schedule 1 so that continued access to Wolseley Drive is maintained for the Petitioner and its tenant from Wolseley Drive at all times during the construction period and thereafter in order to minimise disruption and the extent of temporary possession of their land in order to secure their continued use of their own land. Given the retention of public access along Wolseley Drive throughout, Your Petitioner contends that this can be provided for.
Conclusion

17. Your Petitioner claims that re-alignment of Wolseley Drive is unnecessary and unjustified and consequentially that any land acquisition of their property is unnecessary and/or that a revised re-alignment with lesser land take impacts can be identified. The current proposals will significantly affect your Petitioner’s ability to put these premises to meaningful use. It is essential that a reduced area of land take, both temporary and permanent, is agreed with the Petitioner. Finally your Petitioner needs to be assured of continuing access from Wolseley Drive, re-aligned or otherwise, and is unaware of any good reason why this cannot be provided.

The Prayer

The Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that they or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which consider this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains etc

By Counsel etc

Signed: [Signature]

Printed: ABIGAIL WALTERS

Dated 11/04/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Graham Thomas Fowler  

Declares that:  
1. The petitioner ('Your Petitioner') is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Graham Thomas Fowler, resident at The Blacksmith's Cottage, Swan Bottom, The Lee, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire HP16 9NH, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.  

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.  

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquility of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to her household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, hospital and GP services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for Stoke Mandeville, Aylesbury, London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Being recently retired, your petitioner anticipates moving to a smaller property at some time during the period of construction of the high speed railway or shortly thereafter. He is concerned that the problems caused by the construction including HGV vehicles, disruption to roads and access and the general problems of noise, dust, dirt, traffic movements and other issues arising during construction will further materially affect interest in properties and cause a property blight in this area which will severely restrict your petitioner’s potential options, as property values in this part of the Chilterns AONB are already falling in relation to those in other areas not so affected. During the period of operation, the noise of high speed trains will continue to depress property prices as the silence, landscape and other associated benefits of the AONB will be forever compromised.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area.
forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

   a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.
   b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
   c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.
   d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wildlife access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
   e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
   f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.
   g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.
   h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.
   i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban
drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

r. That should assurances given by the Promoter that your petitioner will not be inconvenienced by noise during construction or operation prove to be incorrect, and your petitioner’s health be adversely affected by such noise, that the Promoter will ensure that remedial action is taken to fully mitigate the impact of such noise.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and,
in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413
b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.
c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Graham Thomas Fowler

11th April, 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF MARTIN BERTRAM CHAMBERS AND JANE ALISON CHAMBERS

Declares that:
1. The petitioners (‘Your Petitioners’) are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioners
Your Petitioners are Martin Bertram Chambers and Jane Alison Chambers, resident at Halefield, Hale Lane, Wendover, HP22 6NQ whom the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners live in Wendover adjacent to that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

They and their family have lived in this property for 24 years. They are 67 and 63 years of age respectively. The Bill would authorise the construction and operation of the railway through and near Wendover. The proposed line would run within 560 metres of your Petitioners’ property which is shown on map C252-ETM-EV-MAP-020-000501-P01 of HS2 Ltd’s Environmental Statement.

Your Petitioners are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioners’ concerns
3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioners as residents of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB are concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.
In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two large and intrusive viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

Objection is taken to both the construction and operation of certain of the scheduled works proposed to be undertaken in and near Wendover between Little Missenden and Stoke Mandeville. These works consist mainly of an embankment between Hartley Farm and Road Barn Farm; Small Dean viaduct; and an embankment between the northern end of the Small Dean viaduct and the southern end of the Wendover green tunnel. They include ancillary works such as satellite compounds, auto-transformer stations, balancing ponds and portal buildings. Your Petitioners' principal objection is to the grotesquely unsightly Small Dean viaduct, not least because a totally suitable, economically viable alternative of a fully-bored tunnel has so far been ignored by the Government and the nominated undertaker.

Your Petitioners' main objective is to persuade the House of Lords to lower the line into a fully-bored tunnel from Little Missenden to the end of the AONB to the north of Wendover.

Your Petitioners contend that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes. It will permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your Petitioners are also seriously concerned about the disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust caused by chalk and soil from construction and excavation, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. As storage chalk dries out, creating dust, the effect of which will be made worse by the prevailing south-west wind, which blows directly onto your Petitioners' property Halefield.
Your Petitioners contend that the use of hideous unsightly 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and will fail to provide absolute protection from substantial damage to the local cultural heritage, including the ancient St Mary’s Church, which your Petitioners and their family attend for weekly church services and have done so since moving to Wendover 24 years ago, and which they also visit regularly for concerts and other cultural occasions. With HS2 trains passing at such regular intervals it would be impossible to hear and be heard in the church, resulting in both a loss of amenity for local residents as well as intolerable noise for those attending the church. It is inconceivable that the Government could let the current sound barrier and sound proofing proposals for St Mary’s Church of HS2 proceed which would for practical purposes destroy the life of the church.

Your Petitioners believe that, without a fully bored tunnel, the construction and operation of the proposed line on the surface will cause substantial and permanent irretrievable damage to this part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) with its exceptional natural beauty. It is hard to understand how the Government and the nominated undertaker, HS2 Ltd, could have such crass disregard and lack of care and sympathy for the beautiful natural landscape of the Chiltern Hills as to propose the current surface route for the railway and not choose instead the alternative of a fully-bored tunnel.

Your Petitioners need to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and need to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas.

Your Petitioners request that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed by local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this
proposal would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in
the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies
otherwise required.

Your Petitioners further request that in assessing the alternatives of adopting
the full tunnel proposals and the Promoter’s current proposals for the AONB
section of the line, the Promoter is instructed to commission and publish a
fully independent cost analysis of such alternatives and to undertake and
publish a full cost benefit analysis of the environmental impacts for such
AONB section. It is inconceivable that a proper assessment of the proposal
for a fully bored tunnel can be made by the House of Lords without the
benefit of such detailed analyses.

3.2 Problems caused by the operation of HS2
Your Petitioners aver that the operation of HS2 following the completion of
the proposed scheduled works would have the following permanent effects:

Your Petitioners’ view of the Chiltern Hills in the AONB would be
permanently scarred by the obtrusively high viaduct, embankment and
gantries. The line would be visible from numerous viewpoints in the
locality including their own property. It would be overpowering and
dominant in the landscape and would loom across what is a stunningly
beautiful valley like an obtrusive white scar linking the two sides of the
valley from one ridge to the next. Only a philistine could allow this
quintessential part of Britain’s country heritage to be desecrated in this
stubbornly blinkered way.

Your Petitioners’ view of the Chiltern Hills would also be permanently
damaged by trains up to 400 metres long passing every two minutes. Why
should anyone living within sight and hearing distance of the trains have to
tolerate such thoughtless, inconsiderate development when the reasonable
alternative of a fully-bored tunnel is available?

The noise from these trains would cause an intolerable strain upon your
Petitioners’ life and affect their sleep. The Petitioners’ property is shown on
HS2 Ltd’s Operational Sound Contour Map SV-01-19 as being affected by
the noise from the operation of the trains on the railway. At the distance
from the line where they live the noise would be spread over a longer time
period, and thus be heard for approximately one minute in two. This is in an
area which is at present one of peaceful tranquillity.
The value of your Petitioners’ house has already been adversely affected, and will continue to be so on a permanent basis.

3.3 Your Petitioners further request that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioners request that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the line, and particularly along the A413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors.

4. The prayer

The Petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that your Petitioners, or someone representing your Petitioners in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the Petitioners remain, etc.

..........................................................

MARTIN BERTRAM CHAMBERS

.................................................. ........................

JANE ALISON CHAMBERS

11th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF BRENDA MURRAY

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is a joint owner with her husband Mr Ian Murray of the property
11 Berkswell Hall Berkswell which is set in the historical conservation village of Berkswell. The
building is Grade 2* listed.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

My husband and I purchased the property sixteen years ago because of the quintessential English
rural views and landscaping, including a lake laid out in 19C, together with sheep and varied
wildlife. The property is located approximately 800 metres from the proposed railway line and even
nearer to the proposed large 50 acre construction site plus two satellite sites.

4. The Bill includes powers to carry out construction works which are estimated to take more than
six years to complete, during which time part of the construction compound will be visible from my
property. There will be creation of dust and considerable noise throughout many hours of the day
and week. Once the railway is completed the trains themselves will produce continued noise. All of
which will destroy the peaceful tranquil environment around the property and park landscape. One
solution to mitigate some of the noise and dust directly affecting the property would be to have
double glazing on relevant windows in the property. To do so, permission would have to be
obtained from English Heritage as it is a Grade 2* listed building. While this permission may be
granted, to comply with listed planning permission, the windows would have to be completely
replaced with an exact copy of the existing large paned Victorian sash windows. The cost of so
doing would be too expensive for me. Therefore noise and dust from both the construction
compound site and the trains will not be reduced inside the property. In addition, sitting and walking
in the historic grounds of the property (which contain two of Warwickshire’s oldest specimen
Wellingtonia trees) will be most unpleasant, from the noise and dust viewpoint, ruining the current
special peaceful ambience.

5. Once completed the train will be in a cutting at the nearest point (approximately 800 metres) to
my property. However, about 1000 metres from the property there is a run to the south east of the
property where the line will be on an embankment leading to a viaduct, changing the visual aspect,
in addition to destroying the peaceful environment of my property and treasured piece of English
heritage. Following delivery of a House of Common’s petition HS2 Limited agreed to additional
planting to provide improved visual screening, which will of course take time to grow to a desirable
height, however the noise element will increase purely from the existence of the railway.
6. I am particularly concerned that this special property will, henceforth, be blighted, both during the long construction phase and afterwards once the trains run. I am very concerned that it will not be possible to sell or obtain full market value, most particularly during the long period of construction and the ultimate value of the property will be reduced once the trains run due to the constant noise in this very special, peaceful location. This problem will be exacerbated without double glazing to the property. The property is outside the declared compensation scheme limits.

7. I respectfully submit that the Bill should be amended or undertakings should be required so that HS2 Limited must review the construction strategy for the project and its related works. They need to suggest necessary changes from the results of that review before works design and construction strategies have been finalised or construction contractors employed.

8. Requests have been made for a deep bore tunnel from the south of Burton Green to a point north of Sixteen Acre Wood. Such a tunnel would be far less disruptive both during the construction period and also once operational. It would save the three communities of Berkswell, Balsall Common and Burton Green. While I strongly support this request, it has been dismissed by HS2 Limited as being too expensive even though in their Environmental Statement, Section 2.6.35, they state that a tunnel would "have environmental and community benefits" and "the magnitude of the benefits would increase with tunnel length". Also HS2 Berkswell and Balsall Common Tunnel Report prepared for Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council November 2014 Section 3.3.7 states "There would be reduced impacts on landscape character and reduced visual impacts on residential properties. The loss of heritage assets would be reduced as would be impact on listed buildings." And 3.3.8 'Noise levels at residential properties would be reduced as construction works would be contained underground for the majority of the length of the tunnel. Reduced noise levels, dust and visual impacts would reduce overall amenity impacts on the community.'

9. Given that a deep bore tunnel is what should be provided, I would wish, at the very least to have a cut and cover tunnel at the Park Lane cutting. To do so would address some of the noise issues. Once completed mature tree planting could be carried out at the sides and top of the cover to provide much needed environmental aesthetics, together with a mitigating effect on noise to provide a better quality of life.

10. Why have HS2 Ltd agreed to put a tunnel through the Chilterns and near Lichfield but will not agree to repeated requests for a tunnel through beautiful historic Warwickshire countryside near to a large residential area? According to HS2 Berkswell and Balsall Common Tunnel Report the cost for (Option C) a 6.3km long twin bore tunnel from south of Burton Green to north of Sixteen Acre Wood would be an additional £351 million. Under a cautiously accepted total spend for the project of £55 billion this is near 0.64% of total spend. How can HS2 Limited morally justify this cost differential against the damaging effect for ever on the lives of the people of this area.

11. I request that the construction compounds are moved to an area of less habitation but if HS2 Limited insist on them remaining on the proposed site then I request that during the construction phase restrictions on working hours from the construction compound to be those of daylight hours, not twenty four hours and not on a Sunday. In the Promoter's Response to my original Petition, they state: Page 6.17 Construction Noise 'No evening, weekend or night-time works are proposed in this area.' but page 19.1 'there will be occasions when night-tine, weekend and 24 hour working will be required.' Once the railway is built the construction compound must be rapidly dismantled and returned to a greenfield site for agricultural use without delay and not be designated for any other future use.
12. While I fully concur with the principle of increased rail capacity, by making speed the significant factor in this project no account is taken of effects on local communities including ensuing noise. It should be mandatory for the trains to slow down should national and international guidelines on noise be breached. The same noise guidelines should also be imposed upon the construction phase of the project.

13. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she, or someone representing her in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Brenda Murray

Date:
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Dr Niall Gordon Ramsden and Mrs Rona Mary Ramsden  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioners are owners and occupiers of The Chilterns, Old Risborough Road, Stoke Mandeville, a residential property approximately 85m from the proposed train line which is at an elevated level.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

The petitioners are specially and directly affected by the Bill in the following ways:  

a) The proposed line, coupled with a new dual carriageway being constructed behind the property as a mitigation measure for the main village of Stoke Mandeville, will have a massive negative effect on the house to such an extent that it will not be possible to live in and enjoy the property during construction and/or when the line is in operation.  

b) The current proposal under the Voluntary Purchase Zone is unreasonable and unfair in that, because the property is just outside a 60m compulsory purchase zone, no compensation is offered. Instead only an offer to purchase the property at the unblighted value is made. The nett effect is that the Petitioners will face financial losses in the order of £90,000 due to stamp duty costs, legal fees etc – as well as being offered an unrealistic value (See note c below)  

c) The unblighted value is being determined by valuation specialists from a list dictated by HS2 – none of whom are from the affected area or familiar with local property prices. The undervaluation is in the order of £75,000 making total losses £165,000 and without any compensation for losing one’s home.  

d) The valuation provided by the out-of-area valuation agents is below that considered as being a true value by local agents.  

Points c and d are, it is understood, being addressed by HS2 but this has not been implemented.  

Proper compensation should be offered to those so obviously severely affected taking into account the local effects rather than imposing an arbitrary limit of 60m for compulsory purchase with proper compensation. Local considerations should include elevation of the line, reductions in access routes to property caused by diverted or
blocked roads, effects of other mitigation measures which might benefit some but have a deleterious effect on others.

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

DR NIALL GORDON RAMSDEN          MRS RONA RAMSDEN
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  
PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Stephen and Susan Plowden  
Declares that:  
1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.  
2. Your petitioner  
The petitioners are the joint freehold owners of the house at 69 Albert Street.  
3. Your petitioner’s concerns  
3.1 At present we are occasionally disturbed by noise from the existing railway. This nuisance can be troublesome in summer, when the houses in Mornington Terrace tend to have their windows open, thus reducing our noise barrier. We would expect there to be some increase in this nuisance if HS2 trains come into Euston. That, however, is not a major consideration for us, although it could be for residents of Mornington Terrace and others for whom the terrace does not act as a barrier.  
3.2 We are much more concerned about the nuisances that will occur during the very long construction phase. They are of two kinds. The first is the environmental nuisance of the noise, dust and other air pollution caused by the works themselves and by the lorries taking materials to the site or removing spoil from it. The second is the disruption that local people and visitors would suffer when moving around this area. All modes of transport would be affected, including walking. The closure of bridges and roads will make our ordinary journeys longer. It will also lead to the rerouting of traffic throughout the area and will cause extra congestion. This will exacerbate both the environmental nuisance and the difficulties of local movement.  
3.3 The Camden Cutting Group, to which we belong, will be describing these nuisances in their petition, as will other local groups. There is no need to add to their descriptions here. With respect to the environmental nuisances, our house is more fortunately placed than the dwellings of many other local residents, so we will suffer less than some of our neighbours, but still very significantly. With respect to the difficulties caused to local travel, we would be affected in much the same way as other people in the area, perhaps a bit more than some because of our ages.  
3.4 The great harm that would be done to this area cannot be dealt with by mitigation and compensation, however much the present arrangements were improved. The only satisfactory remedy is for the London terminus of HS2 to be changed from Euston to Old Oak Common.  
3.5 The arguments for Old Oak Common to become the terminus were spelt out in detail by the Pan Camden HS2 Alliance several years ago. But when the Bill was published, some people, including Camden Council, concluded that because a terminus at Euston is regarded as part of the principle of the Bill, the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee would not be able to consider these arguments. I sought the advice of Simon Knight of HS2 Ltd on this point. He told me that provided the case for Old Oak Common was presented in the right way, as a remedy for the various costs and
nuisances that building and operating HS2 between Old Oak Common and Euston would cause, the Committee’s chairman could use his discretion and allow this case to be heard. Fortunately, that is what the chairman did, although unfortunately the Committee then found against it. I hope that the House of Lords HS2 Select Committee will follow its House of Commons counterpart in allowing the arguments for Old Oak Common to be heard. I hope, too, that I can persuade the Committee that they are sound.

3.6 Under the present plan, HS2 trains will stop at Old Oak Common and then continue to the terminus at Euston. If Old Oak Common became the terminus, those HS2 passengers for whom Euston would be the more convenient interchange point would suffer a penalty, in the form of extra travel time, by being obliged to change at Old Oak Common instead. This penalty has to be weighed against the cost savings (using the term “cost” in its widest sense) that would be achieved by not building the line east of Old Oak Common. The resources needed to build this section of the line, and to redevelop Euston to accommodate the extra trains, would be saved, although the extra cost of developing Old Oak Common as a terminus rather than as a stop would partly offset these savings. Shortening the journey for HS2 trains would also bring savings in operating costs, although here too it is possible that some extra cost would be incurred in providing the Underground and Overground connections between Old Oak Common and other parts of London. The huge social and environmental costs of the line between Old Oak Common and Euston that other petitioners will be describing for the Committee would be avoided, although, once again, some relatively small extra costs of this type must be expected at Old Oak Common.

3.7 Unfortunately, HS2 Ltd and the government have never compared the two options in this systematic way. When the Pan Camden HS2 Alliance raised this issue with HS2 Ltd in the autumn of 2012, we were advised that if we wanted to pursue it, we should approach our local MP or the DfT. We therefore prepared a document, which was sent to the relevant Minister, then Simon Burns, in April 2013, setting out in considerable detail what a study comparing Euston and Old Oak Common as the London terminus would involve. The only response was a stonewalling reply from a civil servant. The Economic Affairs Committee of the House of Lords received similar treatment. In its report on HS2 of March 2015, the Committee said, “The Government should estimate the overall reduction of cost to HS2 of terminating the line at Old Oak Common (in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham), including any necessary redesign of the station at Old Oak Common to make this possible, and calculate the effect on the cost benefit analysis”. The Government did not take up or comment on this recommendation. Its response to the Committee’s report does not even mention Old Oak Common.

3.8 Instead of making a proper comparison, HS2 Ltd and the government have relied on the assertion that the travel time penalties rule out the Old Oak Common option. This, for example, is what the Government said in its response of January 2012 to the report of November 2011 of the House of Commons Transport Select Committee:

The Government should reassess whether terminating at either Old Oak Common or another station on the Crossrail network might not be a more effective solution than having Euston as the terminating station (from Paragraph 107)

As published in the consultation documentation, HS2 Ltd considered 27 different station locations in London when developing the proposed route, which included terminus stations at Old Oak Common and other major London stations.
Old Oak Common was dismissed as a terminating station because the majority of passengers using HS2 would want to travel into central London. If Old Oak Common was the terminating London station, passengers would have to change onto another train or mode of transport to continue into central London, creating a time penalty that would reduce the benefits of HS2 and cause inconvenience to the majority of passengers.

3.9 Official witnesses to the Inquiry of the Economic Affairs Committee of the House of Lords took a similar line.

3.10 It is almost certainly untrue that the majority of HS2 passengers going into central London would prefer an interchange at Euston. For those that did, the extra travel time they would experience by having to change at Old Oak Common instead would in most cases be very small. Richard Percival provided detailed calculations to the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee about this, and I expect he will present them again on this occasion. The one point I would like to add is that HS2 Ltd has been extremely remiss in not providing the best base for estimating how the origins and destinations of HS2 passengers would be distributed within London. It should have conducted a survey of passengers on the existing WCML. The cost would have been trivial in relation to the hugely important issues at stake.

3.11 How should the time penalties, whatever they are, be weighed against the cost savings of making Old Oak Common the terminus? Economists would probably say that cost benefit analysis should be used to make a trade-off. Many people would feel uneasy about that idea. Is it really possible to give money values to all these considerations? Can even a large number of individually very small inconveniences be traded off against the huge damage to the lives of a smaller number of people who would lose their homes or face the breakup of their communities, and against losses to the community as a whole of the destruction of features such as St James’s Gardens?

3.12 I am a moderate believer in cost benefit analysis, and in 1969/70, in the context of the Third London Airport Inquiry, undertook one of the earliest studies to put money values on the avoidance of noise nuisance. This work was well received at the time. Nevertheless, my view is that this particular act of weighing up can only be done by judgment. I would also say that even very many individually almost trivial increases in journey time cannot outweigh the very serious social and environmental costs. In my view, it is not even necessary to take account of the large savings in resource costs that moving the terminus to Old Oak Common would bring.

3.13 Fortunately, it is not necessary to resolve this philosophical issue. If cost benefit analysis is to be used, it must be conducted according to the correct rules. That has not been done, and if it were, I do not believe the time penalties would outweigh the cost savings.

3.14 One of the items that would be saved by not taking HS2 into Euston would be the compensation that would have to be paid to the people legally entitled to receive it. It is not clear to me how much compensation it is proposed to pay, and whether this sum has been allowed for in the estimate of costs. It is possible that it has been, although not separately itemised. But even if that has been done, that is not the main point.

3.15 The amounts to be included as compensation in a cost-benefit analysis are far higher than the amounts that the law requires to be paid. All losses, that is to say all adverse effects, have to be allowed for, and the rule is that the amounts to be included to represent these losses should be those that the losers would have to receive in order to feel as well-off with the nuisance and with this compensation as they would feel if the scheme did not go ahead. (For example, “my house would
be noisier, but if I were given enough money to build the extension I have always wanted, I would feel compensated.

The great majority of the nuisances that the Committee will be hearing about from local residents, such as noise from construction lorries etc., are not of a kind for which compensation has to be paid, but should nevertheless be included as costs in the analysis. In addition, I think it is unlikely that many of the people who do have to be paid would be satisfied by the amounts legally required. If people who would lose their homes were satisfied by being paid the market price, they would have sold already. Offering the market price plus 10%, which I understand is what is now envisaged, might satisfy some of them, but I would guess that most people suffering the loss of a home and the breakup of their community would remain dissatisfied.

3.16 This failure to abide by the rules of cost benefit analysis does not affect only the local issue of where to put the London terminus but the whole HS2 proposal. For example, the damage that HS2 would do to the countryside is a loss that would be felt by millions of people, not just those living close to the line, but it does not figure anywhere in the appraisal. It is truly scandalous that the DfT and Treasury economists have allowed such a flagrant breach of the rules of their discipline.

3.17 The House of Commons HS2 Select Committee put forward another argument against having the terminus at Old Oak Common. In paragraph 221 of its report, the Committee said, “To reach central London by changing from an HS2 terminus at Old Oak Common would place undesirably high dependence on a single Underground service: Crossrail”. In fact, Old Oak Common would be connected to the Overground as well as to Crossrail. It is also unclear what risks the Committee had in mind. If it is the risk that Crossrail would become overloaded by adding the HS2 demand to the regional demand, it has been shown that, even on implausibly high estimates of demand, lengthening the trains longer and increasing the frequency of service would enable Crossrail to cope. There are several other ways of dealing with any capacity problems that might arise.

3.18 I hope the House of Lords HS2 Select Committee will feel able to recommend the replacement of Euston by Old Oak Common as the London terminus. If that is too sweeping, then I urge the Committee to order a proper cost benefit analysis. As well as calculating all the resource costs involved, HS2 Ltd would have to undertake at least two new research studies. One, as mentioned in paragraph 3.10 above, would be to conduct a survey of passengers on the West Coast Main Line coming from Birmingham or further north to ascertain their London origins and destinations. The other would be surveys among residents of Camden and the other affected areas of London to find out how much money they would need to be paid to make them feel as well off if obliged to endure all the adverse impacts of HS2, as they would feel if this section of the line were not built.

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that Stephen Plowden, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain.

Stephen Plowden

Susan Plowden

12 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Against – on Merits

To the House of Lords of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

THE HUMBLE PETITION of Sarah Plevin

Declares that:-

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. The Petitioner is Sarah Plevin

Your Petitioner's area is bisected by the proposed HS2 route contained within the Bill (see Deposited Plans, Vol. 2.1, sheets 2-21, 2-22, 2-23 and 2-24, see also Deposited Sections, Vol.5, sheets 5-10, 5-11, 5-12, 5-13, 5-49 and 5-50).

Your Petitioner

1 Your Petitioner is Sarah Plevin a freehold owner of The Homestead, Brays Lane, Hyde Heath, Bucks HP6 5RU, who will be directly and specially affected, by both the operation and construction of the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) which will be directly and adversely affected.

2 Your petitioner lives in Hyde Heath a community in proximity to the HS2 line, Little Missenden Vent Shaft and the Chiltern Tunnel Portal together with associated construction sites. Your Petitioner will therefore be subject to property blight, construction disruption, loss of amenity and permanent noise and visual intrusion when the HS2 line is operational.

3 Your Petitioner frequently walks the footpaths between the Misbourne valley and the ridge to the West. Your petitioner regularly walks in the ancient woodlands in an around South Heath and the wider AONB. These public rights of way (PROW) will be stripped of their rural nature and tranquillity by HS2 and several will be permanently stopped up, so preventing access to this quiet and unspoilt part of the AONB.

4 Your Petitioner and family will also suffer years of disruption and difficulty from the construction of HS2 due to the HGVs and other associated vehicles using the A413/B485 which your petitioner uses on a regular basis to access the amenities in Great Missenden. Additionally, your petitioner is greatly concerned at the impact and dangers associated with traffic rat running to escape congestion and in doing so intensify use of the rural signal track sunken lanes that service the village - such lanes heavily used by pedestrians and cyclists.
Your Petitioner's rights interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Your Petitioner's Concerns

Your Petitioner is concerned about the long term damage and permanent injury from visual and acoustic impacts in the AONB of the operation of the line between South Heath and Wendover, and its supporting infrastructure and furniture. The destruction of ancient woodlands (that represents 30% of all the losses to ancient woodlands on the line), the loss of farmland and landscape, the embankments and unsightly manmade viaducts across valleys classified by the House of Lords as possessing Natural Beauty to be conserved and enhanced. The permanent stopping up and re-routing of PROW all add up to a severe impact on this area of the Chilterns AONB and set a dangerous precedent for the protection of AONB landscape everywhere.

HS2 crosses the widest part of the AONB and less than 50% is in a bored tunnel. Between South Heath and Wendover, the proposed route is on the surface and includes sections in shallow cuttings, on two viaducts, on embankments and in green tunnels. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 12). The CROW Act explicitly states that "regard should be had to conserve and enhance" and 52% surface route cannot comply with this regard. Furthermore, NPPF states explicitly that Major Infrastructure should be refused in Areas of Natural Beauty unless in the national interest AND there are exceptional circumstances. HS2 Ltd have not provided, made or answered any question with regard to the exceptional circumstances than exist that allows them to breach the explicit rules laid down by NPPF. The AONB is also protected by the European Landscape Convention which HS2 Ltd have not acknowledged despite Ministers confirming they are fully compliant with European Law.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the Promoter of the Bill has ignored the obligations to protect the AONB, and cannot understand how they consider that the proposed surface route of the line for this area meets the requirements to conserve and enhance the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscape. The special qualities of the AONB cause it to be visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas. Your petitioner requests that changes be made to the Bill to ensure the fullest possible protection of the AONB. No other part of the line is within an AONB or has the level of statutory protection afforded to the AONB.

Your Petitioner is gravely concerned that line will create an unacceptable visual impact along the AONB section of the line from South Heath to Wendover. The raised embankments and viaducts plus overhead lines and gantries, together with light pollution and other ancillary structures will constitute a major permanent extremely visible eyesore along this section of the AONB.
Your Petitioner objects to the use of balancing ponds in the Chilterns AONB as they are not natural ponds and would significantly alter the character and visual aspects of this area.

Your Petitioner is concerned about the level of exposure to the noise of operations from the footpaths & lanes in the immediate vicinity of HS2 together with the tunnel portals. Noise would severely impact upon the use and enjoyment of the properties in the area, as well as on the neighbourhood's general amenity. This and the visual obtrusiveness and loss of natural landscape will severely and permanently reduce the attractiveness of the area and thereby damage an important national asset. Even by year 15 of operation, the scheme will be visible from over 20 sq kms of the AONB.

Your petitioner is concerned about the loss of natural habitats for wildlife and habitat severance as the railway constitutes a barrier. There will also be an unacceptable effect on owls and bats who we are informed in the ES will be killed within 1.5km of the line.

Your petitioner is concerned about the property blight effects on the value of her home. Despite being 4km from the new tunnel head and work camp, there is evidence that blight is continuing to affect property in Hyde Heath. Recent evidence is available that property values are depressed by up to 35% in Hyde Heath rendering adverse Loan to Value when re-mortgaging. This means that residents of Hyde Heath are unable to take advantage of the best market loan rates or indeed offered the full market of mortgage lenders. Such restrictions result in inferior market rates and high monthly mortgage costs placing greater strain on family budgets and stress on family life. Your petitioner’s home is now permanently blighted and has been since 2010. The blight impacts on the value of her home and places a restriction on ability to sell. Your petitioner is trapped and this restriction is causing your petitioner and her family and friends great anxiety and stress, and the compensation arrangements are wholly inadequate in addressing the problems.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the impacts of construction. The resultant dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications of the long period of construction will make the Petitioner's life challenging. HS2 Ltd were warned by their advisers that construction of the AONB route would be challenging and your petitioner feels they are negligently ignoring the dangers of building the scheme so remote from a major road such as a Motorway or dual carriageway. HS2 Ltd have deliberately attempted to classify the A413 as a major transport corridor to disguise this negligence and this has compounded the impacts your petitioner will experience. Your Petitioner will continue to need to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line particularly for access to Great Missenden, Wendover and Chesham. This will render longer problematic trips for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail access. Your Petitioner will also continue to need to gain access to the A413, which is on the other side of the proposed HS2 line, for London and all other areas. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow ancient sunken lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area which should be protected in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, and is concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and the effects of construction traffic using the A413.
Your Petitioner is gravely concerned about the inadequacy of measures proposed to mitigate the effects of construction traffic and the intended diversions and road closures throughout the section of the proposed line which is in the AONB, and in the Misbourne Valley in particular and that this will place a further burden on the roads in this community, which are already under pressure. There will be a consequent effect on the businesses of Great Missenden and Chesham who will suffer from loss of custom due to difficulties of access.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaker's on-going accountability is unspecified and that the Code of Construction Practice is inadequate and has no legal status, with no independent means of monitoring and assessing compliance or sanctions for breach.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) proposed by HS2 Ltd are incapable of being fulfilled or capped as the Promoter has not undertaken adequate work to substantiate. The promoter is wholly reliant on the term "reasonably practicable" when referring to the EMRs in that the Bill allows the promoter to deviate from "minimum" requirements on grounds of costs they determine is unreasonable. Therefore, given the promoter has failed to undertake intrusive ground investigation work, they are unable to confirm with accuracy the noise levels that the scheme will generate. Therefore, if the noise levels set out in the EMRs are unachievable due to additional structure and strengthening leading to higher noise levels, the promoter can seek to compensate persons affected if they deem the cost of meeting the EMRs is not reasonably practicable. This is evidence of arbitrary decision-making by the promoter and consequently opens the government and taxpayer up to claims for punitive and exemplary damages, which your petitioner will seek in the event the test of what is reasonably practicable is not removed from the Bill.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the emergency services will be unable to provide timely support due to road congestion, closures and diversions during the construction period.

Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction works on the chalk stream of the River Misbourne and the damage to the quality of drinking water supply.

Your Petitioner is concerned that land which is occupied and utilised by contractors during construction will not be cleared and restored after completion to a satisfactory standard for the AONB or in the worst case that it will simply be abandoned by the contractors.

Your Petitioner is also concerned about errors and omissions in the Environmental Statement and matters which your petitioner understands will be clarified or corrected at a later stage and that these may call for further mitigation or remedies to be considered by the Select Committee.

Your Petitioner wishes to express concern regarding the poor provision of information supplied by the promoter, including in particular errors and omissions in the Environmental Statement with Plan and profile maps remaining unavailable, and furthermore, supplementary information such as the Code of Construction Practice has remained in draft form.
23 Your Petitioner strongly objects to the diversions and closure of public rights of way in the area and the reinstatement of some PROWs by making them run alongside the line rather than by new footbridges and is further concerned that, for this section of the AONB, none of these are to be green bridges despite the intentions of the Promoters to build green bridges elsewhere along the route. Your petitioner asks the promoter to be held to give their regard to conserving and enhancing in keeping with their statutory obligations.

24 Your petitioner records that HS2 Ltd stated in 2012 that the cost of the AONB route would be £3bn cheaper than the M40 motorway route. This assessment was made with intrusive survey knowledge of ground conditions on the M40 route but no such information to inform the costs of the AONB route. In 2012 the budget for the scheme was set at £32bn... it is now £56bn. HS2 Ltd has publicly stated that much of the additional costs are a consequence of tunnelling and mitigation in the AONB route – this raises the question of why this was not considered prior to selecting the AONB route as these are directly costs of protecting the environment they had a duty to conserve? Furthermore, given their original duty to have regard to conserve and enhance extends to less than half the route being in tunnel, we record that HS2 Ltd have stated further tunnelling would be “expensive for the taxpayer”. While your petitioner is sure this would be correct, it is the cost of undertaking construction via the AONB route versus the M40 route and therefore clear and explicit evidence that the original arbitrary decision in 2012 is incorrect. As the 2012 decision was arbitrary without the decision of Parliament, it means as public servants they have misled Parliament and caused disproportionate impact with specific bias to residents suffering as a consequence of their error. Therefore, HS2 Ltd must be compelled to re-evaluate this original decision in light of the new information and in particular to undertake the intrusive ground study work to accurately inform a comparison. Failure to do so would give grounds to person in the AONB suffering acute stress and mental health issues as a consequence of the route, to claim punitive and exemplary damages from the Government for such an erroneous arbitrary decision.

Remedies / Mitigation requested

25 Your petitioner requests that measures be taken and changes be made in the Bill or the Code of Construction Practice or by obtaining binding undertakings from the Promoter to address the various concerns of your Petitioner as listed above.

26 Your Petitioner requests that the AONB be protected from these effects by amending the Bill so the line passes throughout the AONB in a fully bored tunnel, as proposed by the Chiltern District Council\(^1\) or by extending the present Chiltern tunnel proposals by adopting the CRAG T2\(^2\) proposals. The latter is referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted as both feasible and environmentally preferable. Either of these options would substantially remove the adverse effects noted in this petition and the need for the proposed remedies otherwise required.

---


\(^2\) [http://www.thelee.org.uk/HS2%20storage/Proposals%20for%20the%20Chilterns%20Tunnel%20Extension%20Dec%202013.pdf](http://www.thelee.org.uk/HS2%20storage/Proposals%20for%20the%20Chilterns%20Tunnel%20Extension%20Dec%202013.pdf)
Your petitioner requests that, if the proposal for a full tunnel throughout the AONB is rejected, then the Chilterns' bored tunnel should be extended to Leather Lane. The South Heath Chilterns Tunnel Extension\(^3\) (referred to as the REPA tunnel in the ES at Vol 2, 2.6.18 CFA 9) has acknowledged substantial environmental benefits, and for no net cost can preserve a further 4km of the AONB from adverse effects. Importantly, this then

In the absence of extending the Chilterns' tunnel then the following mitigations would be needed to ameliorate the worst of the effects, and your Petitioner requests that provision is made for:

a. prohibiting the use of all existing minor roads in the AONB to be used by maintenance vehicles on grounds of safety and conserving the natural landscape

b. the cuttings adjacent to the South Heath Green Tunnel should be made deeper, and return to the levels originally proposed by the 2011 consultation, with continuous full height (5m) high specification sound barriers (both sides of the line) immediately adjacent to the track to reduce noise, and with bunds to conceal the line and the gantries where appropriate.

c. That the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line

d. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

e. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there are established rights of way, and to make these green bridges, in order to retain trees and shrubs and permit wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB

f. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report, but permanently, in order to help reduce the environmental impact.

g. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible.

h. That compensatory planting commences at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time — with funding for their maintenance in perpetuity. Where this replaces ancient woodland it should adopt the 30:1 ratio supported by the Woodland Trust and not 4:1 as currently proposed

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds and other water management measures, that alternative techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority, and that if necessary waste water is tanked and then removed for sustainable disposal

j. That the pylons are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground, rather than moved and then re-instated on the surface, as proposed. That no pylon nor additional pylons be allowed to be higher or create greater impact than existing. It is a cost of developing the scheme in the AONB if it is expensive to run the electricity underground.

k. That property blight is compensated by extending the HS2 voluntary purchase scheme and amending the "need to sell" scheme so that having sufficient

\(^{3}\)\text{http://www.repahs2.org.uk}
financial resources should not disqualify an applicant who otherwise wishes to move for any reason. Both Hyde Heath and Hyde End should still be recognised as a community suffering blight.

I. Restricting HGV movements to the period 09:30 – 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB. Additionally, prohibiting HGV movements along school routes between 15:00 and 15:30.

m. Prohibiting any widening, straightening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes for construction traffic.

n. That the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised and monitored and that air quality is maintained.

p. Operating a 'Park and Ride' scheme to transport construction workers along the trace, and enforcing this by not providing parking for contractors at the construction compounds.

q. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to its original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

r. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

s. Prohibiting any widening, straightening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes for construction traffic.

t. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

u. A hotline should be set up allowing road users to report any damage to the road, and the highway authority should have access to all reports, to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

v. That in relation to the River Misbourne, full surveys and continued monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts including increased turbidity.

w. The Committee to make the Executive of the Environment Agency explicitly and personally accountable should any increased turbidity occur beyond that which is predicted by HS2 Ltd and therefore approved by the EA.

The on-going lack of information has made it particularly difficult to understand the full impacts of HS2, and therefore not only has commenting on the project been particularly difficult but, when the information is corrected or made available, as appropriate, that any new or revised issues will not have been specifically raised or referred to in your Petitioner's petition. Your petitioner requests therefore that, if such further matters regarding this do arise, your petitioner will be permitted to raise such matters with the Committee.

That the promoters acknowledge the impact blight is creating with regard to remortgaging in the AONB. That in addition to the "need to sell" scheme a remortgaging scheme is put in place by HS2 Ltd. The terms of such a scheme should allow petitioners to take advantage of full un-blighted values of their properties to arrive at the loan to value of their property and using this LTV, the promoter be compelled to advance the best market value loan and interest rate available to the petitioner at the full un-blighted LTV rate. Failure to do so once again opens up the Government to punitive damages from persons unable to remortgage at the best market value rates as a direct consequence of the blight on their property affecting their Loan to Value.
Objection to the detailed route and speed

31 Your Petitioner doubts that the current route that accommodates the proposed inappropriately high speed through the AONB would have been selected had a Strategic Environmental Assessment been conducted, since the obvious difficulties now apparent in constructing a line through this area would have become apparent. A lower speed would allow HS2 to use existing transport corridors and greatly reduce environmental impacts, while adding little to journey times. Dropping the maximum speed from 225 mph to 185 mph adds just 4.5 minutes to the London – Birmingham journey time, according to the draft ES. ‘Future proofing’ the route to allow 250 mph in the future, increases the environmental damage caused by the route.

32 Your Petitioner requests that a lower speed be adopted – such as that of HS1 – and a route be determined and adopted that exploits the greater ability for following existing corridors and avoiding sensitive environments.

33 The list of grievances above is by no means exhaustive and, due to the inadequacy of and omissions and errors in the Environmental Statement prepared by HS2 Ltd in 2013 that the choose to term as a “Final” report, it is inevitable that that the construction of HS2 will disrupt the lives of the residents in the AONB, including those of your Petitioner, in ways which have not yet been realised. A key determinant in the intrusive ground investigation studies that HS2 Ltd have arbitrarily sought to delay to ensure the full impact is withheld from Parliament and your petitioner.

34 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, the relevant clauses so far affecting your Petitioner should not be allowed to pass into law.

35 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner, your Petitioner's friends and neighbours and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she, or someone representing her in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

[Signature of petitioner]
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

Petition against the  

High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF ERIC GUSTAVON  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly affected by the whole Bill  
2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner and his wife have lived at and owned Brackenbury House in Breakspear Road South, Ickenham for the last 39 years. It is a Grade 11 listed building dating back to the 15th century on an Ancient Monument moated site set in ancient farmland with views over open countryside. 
We have spent most of our spare time and income restoring the property which is now in a first class condition. The moat is featured on the front cover of the English Heritage booklet “Moats Ponds and Ornamental lakes in the Historic Environment.” 
The house and garden sit in a triangle of ancient farmland bordered by the Chiltern Railway to the north, Breakspear Road South to the east and south and Harvill Road to the west. This is Green Belt land. HS2 will convert this land into the main construction site for the tunnel into London including the cement factory and the deposition of excavated material both temporary and permanent. 

We will be affected by the construction site in the following ways:  
   a. Noise:  
      Construction traffic. 
      Conveyor belt operating 24/7
b. **Dust:**
Dust from soil movements. Dust from cement Factory.

c. **Air Pollution:**
Deisel fumes (particulate and Nox)
from construction traffic and road haulage.

d. **Water Pollution:**
Much of the surface water from
what will be the construction site drains into the
moat which is rich in pond life. The run off will
increase (due to stripping of topsoil) and be
contaminated with deisel and other products from
the excavated soil.

e. **Flooding:**
Increased run off will cause further
flooding in Breakspear Road South which already
floods at times in heavy rain.

f. **Light Pollution:**
Light pollution from construction site and
conveyor belt security lighting. At present our
nightime outlook is dark.

From the above it is obvious that Brackenbury House is going to be severely
affected both by HS2 and the construction site. The construction site is set to
be in operation for 10 years. Given that my wife and I are 78 and 75 this is
a life sentence. Both the Commons select committee on HS2 and Mr. Mould
QC. for HS2 both stated that we would be severely affected.
PROPOSALS:

Given that this project with its many serious faults and financial implications for the country can not be stopped then the petitioner suggests the following could help to alleviate some of the distress, disruption and financial unfairness that is being caused in a fairly heartless manner.

1. A TUNNEL:

Ickenham with its B-roads is not suitable for the large numbers of lorries (500-1000 a day) This, with the construction planned for 10 years, diversion and closure of footpaths and the permanent move of the outdoor activities centre (HOAC) will permanently change the character of what is a very pleasant community permanently for the worse. With the Heathrow Spur now cancelled there is no reason not to have a tunnel.

2. COMPENSATION:

The level of compensation as published is poor.

To date it appears that the only payment we will receive is £27,000 when the trains are running in 2027. (we could well be dead by then) This figure in no way approaches the permanent drop in value of our property.

There is no compensation for the effects of the 10 year construction site on our quality of life or the severe drop in value of the property, which is our main capital asset. We have had no official notification that we will receive any compensation.

It appears that our only course of action is to apply for 'the need to sell scheme'. To do this we must first put our house on the market for 3 months. The appeal of the property is a handsome, historic house in a rural setting. No one will want to pay anywhere near pre HS2 value for a house which will be totally surrounded by a construction site for 10 years.
We have been told that the government must consider the cost to the taxpayer but is it fair to ask those severely affected to also suffer a major financial loss whilst many people will be making a handsome profit from it?

I would ask the committee for a total review of the compensation available and eligibility to receive it. Mr. Cameron did state early on in the project that "no one should lose financially because of this". At the moment this is not true. They should follow the modern dictum that "The Polluter Pays"

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Eric Gustavson FRCS

8th. April 2016
To The House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITIONER ROGER WILLIAM PERKINS  

Declares that:  

1/ The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by SE24 and AP5 as they affect CF10 where I live.  

2/ The petitioner lives at 52 Hale Road, Wendover, Bucks, HP22 6NF  
The premises was used by HS2 Ltd to carry out sound measurements reference C272-MCL-LP-ACC-020-000940_BM288750_RWPerkins/MWPerkins  
My email address is rogerw.perkins2@gmail.com  
I have lived at this address for 8 years and moved here to enjoy the views and peace and quiet of this area of outstanding natural beauty.  

3/ Your petitioner’s concerns are:  
The beauty and peace of the area will be destroyed if a fully bored tunnel is not utilised to carry the railway passed Wendover.  
The alternative proposed of an extended green tunnel with a 6 Metre high concrete noise barrier is totally unacceptable as it will be a visual eyesore in addition to the horror of the 14 metre high viaduct and embankment proposed. It will change this beautiful area of countryside into a concrete jungle.  
The proposed noise barrier together with the additional hydrogeological work required and the extension to the green tunnel has not been properly costed. A detailed costing and comparison to the exact costing of a bored tunnel is required before a decision can be made as to which scheme is best.  

4/ The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that his agent, Antony Chapman in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this bill.  

And the Petitioner Roger William Perkins remains etc.  

Dated 6th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Against – on Merits

To the House of Lords of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

THE HUMBLE PETITION of Hyde Heath Petitioners

Declares that: -

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. The Petitioners are the group of petitioners who previously petitioned the House of Commons individually but were asked to group by the Select Committee. A list of names is attached (hereafter known as HHP)

3. Your Petitioner’s area is bisected by the proposed HS2 route contained within the Bill (see Deposited Plans, Vol. 2.1, sheets 2-21, 2-22, 2-23 and 2-24, see also Deposited Sections, Vol.5, sheets 5-10, 5-11, 5-12, 5-13, 5-49 and 5-50).

4. We are situated to the north of the A413 on the Chiltern Ridge.

5. There are no large employers within Hyde Heath, so employment is in small scale service companies, farms, but mainly by commuting to larger centres outside the Village.

6. Hyde Heath has a village shop, pre and infant school, 2 churches, village pub, cricket pitch, common and significant leisure opportunities afforded by the many public rights of way and walkways that emanate from the village.

7. The village is poorly served by public transport and is reliant on the car for access to work, shopping, schools, medical facilities and school buses to Amersham, Chesham and High Wycombe. The nearest train services for leisure and commuting journeys are accessed at Great Missenden, High Wycombe and Amersham.

8. Primary access to the village is via 2 single track routes from the A413 together with the main Hyde Heath Road which runs from the B485 Missenden Road to Chesham and Amersham. All of these routes will be disrupted and affected by the HS2 construction traffic.
Your petitioner’s concerns

9. Your Petitioners face a range of adverse impacts from HS2, both of a permanent or long term nature and also associated with the drawn-out construction works that will be required. Current impacts include ongoing property blight which is now affecting re-mortgaging and house purchase together with health issues as a consequence of stress, worry and concerns associated with the uncertainty regarding the project. The impacts once the scheme begins construction and operation may be divided between permanent/long term impacts, and include:

Permanent/long term impacts:
The impact on the AONB;
The impact on Public Rights of Way;
The impact of the proposed Little Missenden Vent Shaft.

Construction impacts:
The impact of construction vehicles on traffic flows;
The impact on pedestrian and cycle safety;
The impact on chalk streams;
Impacts from timing of works;
The impact on the emergency services;
Property Blight

10. Most of these impacts could be wholly avoided by an extension of the Chiltern Tunnel as presently proposed in the Bill throughout the whole of the AONB. Our Petition addresses the impacts, and the mitigation required, below.

11. Your petitioners are also concerned that the Board of HS2 Ltd have operated in an arbitrary fashion to make decisions that have misled Parliament. We are unsure whether this is with the approval of the Department of Transport or without. We contend they may have deliberately misrepresented information to Parliament with regards to the Survey, Safety and cost of the Scheme as proposed to Parliament. We contend they knowingly are aware that such misrepresentation and failure to deliberately undertake urgent survey works recommended by their own Engineers could lead to significant unassessed impacts, increase in environmental impacts, increase in impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, increase in safety issues associated with the scheme and above all an increase in the overall cost to the taxpayer as a result of their negligent actions. Such failure on the part of HS2 Ltd could result in the scheme as proposed being unfit for purpose and unable to deliver the benefits set out to Parliament.
12. Your petitioners are concerned that as a consequence of the failure to undertake actions recommended by their own engineer, HS2 Ltd are proceeding on an arbitrary decision making basis that opens up the Taxpayer and Government to risk of negligent actions which may lead to Criminal Liability. Equally we are concerned that such actions, taken on an arbitrary basis will open up the UK taxpayer to punitive and exemplary damages for additional impacts when the matter itself could have been easily assessed and quantified.

13. Your petitioners are aware that HS2 Ltd have minimised this fact when presenting evidence to the HS2 Select Committee of the lower house. Your petitioner wishes to test this evidence in the upper house following additional information made available to your petitioner that was not available to the petitioner when petitioning the lower house.

14. Furthermore, your petitioners are gravely concerned at information provided that suggests the DFT and HS2 Ltd have misled Parliament on the purpose of the High Speed Scheme. We contend that the primary purpose of the High Speed Line is not for the benefit of passengers, but for the benefit of freight and the rail freight industry which is a highly subsidised industry. We will present evidence that confirms that HS2 Ltd have misled Parliament.

15. In this regard, we will provide evidence of vested interests that have colluded between private business and public office. Such collusion has cross party links. We will provide evidence that a private PLC with significant political influence is the chief beneficiary of the High Speed Rail project. We will provide evidence of parties with conflicts of interests (which have not been declared) together with evidence that the DFT has knowingly employed persons that are also employed by the private PLC to deliver the PLCs prime objective.

16. Finally, we will present evidence that this private PLC has been investigated by the Public Accounts Committee and has been found to be an offshore entity paying “little or no tax” yet appears to be the substantial beneficiary of the outcomes of the scheme.

17. Your Petitioners and their rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Objections in General

18. Your petitioners object on grounds HS2 Ltd presented incorrect, misleading and factually inaccurate evidence to MPs with wilful disregard and specific bias to persons affected such as the residents of Hyde Heath. Such disregard and bias is contrary to their appointment and duties under the High Speed Rail (Preparation)
Act 2013. HS2 Ltd have not adequately answered the scrutiny or adopted the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee, The Treasury Select Committee, The Environmental Audit Committee, the National Audit Office, The Transport Committee and the Major Projects Committee and the Committee of the House of Lords who have considered the economic case for the High Speed Line and determined it is not as yet proven. We ask that the committee call for an investigation in public if Prima Facie evidence can show these committees were ignored by HS2 Ltd and the DFT to the benefit of vested interests and political collusion.

19. Your petitioners record HS2 connects only 13 of the 465 City Journeys consuming a disproportionate share of expenditure relative to the interests of the rest of the UK. Such Cities already have the best rail connections in the UK. Such specific bias in favour of these key Cities is political and is leading to disproportionate impacts on rural places such as Hyde Heath. We ask that any disproportionate impacts created by HS2 Ltd are compensated in full. If HS2 Ltd have not assessed a disproportionate impact which they have been made aware of, we ask they do so before the Bill is allowed to progress beyond the House of Lords. If HS2 Ltd has not or is unwilling to assess or mitigate an impact they have been made aware of, we ask Committee amend the bill to remove statutory protection for HS2 Ltd and allow the normal law of Tort for specific bias, disproportionate impact, wilful disregard and nuisance. In defining this we respectfully accept the principle of the bill has been established but ask that the committee confirm any and all impacts notified to HS2 Ltd via the submissions to the Final Environmental Statement should serve a purpose and form the basis of all notified impacts HS2 Ltd should reasonably have been expected to assess prior to second reading and therefore appropriately mitigate or give reason why they should not. Otherwise they are guilty of wilful disregard and overly relying on statutory protection to allow them to create such disproportionate impact.

20. Your petitioners are against the illegal destruction of the environment and ancient woodland in the Chiltern AONB as we can see no case for any exceptional circumstances for this route. The National Planning Policy Framework was misinterpreted by HS2 Ltd in their 2013 Final Environmental Statement they presented to Parliament and therefore it has misled Parliament as regards duty of MPs. The statutory rules protecting the AONB is provided in Section 11A (2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (National Parks), and Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (AONBs). They state that, “In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty”. HS2 Ltd quote the National Planning Policy Framework as authority to develop stating “major developments should not take place in these designated areas, except in exceptional circumstances”. This quote is incorrect as clause 116 of the NPPF is explicit that planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances **AND** where it can be demonstrated they are in the
public interest. Clause 116 sets tests including establishing the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way. If the cost is not prohibitive and the scheme can be delivered outside the designated area then applying the legal definition of exceptional circumstances, permission should be refused. Your petitioners reserve the right to introduce legal case law that illustrates why the landscape protection statutes cannot be dis-applied without such exceptional circumstances as to do so would be oppressive.

21. Your petitioners record that this evidence was presented to HS2 Select Committee of the Commons. We contend they have made mistakes in interpretation leading to incorrect conclusion and summary. The Select Committee Final report stated that they considered impact of the scheme in relation to the size of the AONB as a whole. We contend no such regard was expected. We contend their regard was to conserve and enhance the whole without exclusion explicit or implied.

22. Furthermore, your petitioners record that the Select Committee used the precedent of the HS1 enabling Act to justify impact to the AONB in Kent by the HS1 Line. We record this as an error of precedent as the HS1 enabling Act pre-dated the CROW Act and therefore this is explicit evidence that both the Lower and Upper house following the HS1 enabling Act sought to re-affirm and provide stronger more explicit and better protection for AONBs and protected landscape. We remind the Committee that following the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework, there are clauses inserted which explicitly state that permission for major infrastructure should be deemed to be refused in areas of protected landscape such as the Chilterns AONB, unless exceptional circumstances can be established.

23. We record that to date HS2 Ltd have established no case for any circumstances that are exceptional that would warrant the development of major infrastructure in the AONB and therefore there is a deemed planning refusal under prevailing legislation. We also state for the record that should the contents of Clause 11 above prove to be accurate and the scheme can no longer fulfil its purpose and deliver the speed as set out in the specification that it presented to Parliament for approval, then the decision taken to route via the AONB on a straighter line (rather than via a motorway corridor for purposes of speed) would serve no purpose and the impact be disproportionate with specific bias.

24. Finally, we record that MPs had a duty to consider and apply the prevailing planning legislation when deciding the broad route of the scheme. We contend they failed in this duty and provide further evidence that MP Hendrick, a member of the select committee of the commons, asked a specific question in the HS2 select Committee. He enquired whether the Commons Select Committee had a duty to consider national planning and whether they were expected to apply it. We record that the Chairman of Ways and Means of the House of Commons has written to our village society to explain that "the committee were addressed on
the relevant planning law regime" to make decisions as regards planning law protecting the AONB. Clearly this has not happened and therefore the Commons Committee was not instructed correctly as clearly if they had been then the MP would not have needed to ask such a question.

25. Your petitioners seek confirmation that the entire House of Commons and House of Lords are bound by prevailing planning legislation including the Acts protecting the AONB and National Planning Framework and in doing so have a duty to consider the prevailing Acts when determining whether the AONB has been given sufficient regard to conserve and enhance it. We contend that only 48% of the route via the AONB has been given due regard and that the Commons did not give sufficient regard to prevailing planning protection for its Landscape Status. We contend that for the HS2 Bill to pass the House of Lords and receive Royal Ascent, it is necessary to apply the full weight of the Acts and prevailing planning legislation explicitly protecting the AONB or otherwise repeal the CROW Act, Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework that together explicitly seeks to protect it.

26. Your petitioners identified specific grievances in our Environmental Statement response due to the inadequacy of the document where only 48% of the route was surveyed at its time of production. We record that HS2 Ltd presented a document they termed as “final” to Parliament. Since then a substantial body of evidence over 18 months has been presented to Parliament's Select Committee establishing a significant body of inaccuracies, failures to survey, incorrect conclusions, false and misleading information and minimised quantification of impacts. We record Arup’s asked HS2 Ltd to undertake ground investigations works ASAP in 2012. We record Arup’s stated in their 2012 report that failure to undertake this survey work could mean “everything could change including location of tunnel head, vent shafts, alignment and line depth”. We respectfully request that the House of Lords agree that the 2013 Environmental Impact Assessment is not a Final Document and with only 48% of the work done, could not have informed Parliament sufficiently at 2nd Reading. We ask that this “Final” document cannot be considered as “Final” and that the Lords instruct a new “Final” Environmental Statement prior to the Bill receiving Royal Ascent and certainly before 3rd Reading in the House of Lords.

27. Your petitioners believe the Hybrid Bill fails to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive 92/2011/EU (EU Directives) as there have been significant material changes post consultation which will lead to cumulative impacts.

28. Your petitioners contend the board of HS2 Ltd did not discharge their duties given to them under the High Speed Rail (Preparation Act) 2013. Statute requires the promoter, as a condition of obtaining statutory immunity from action, should carry out the work and conduct the operation impartially with all reasonable regard and care for the interests of others. The promoter must not cause any unassessed or ignored damage greater than that suffered by members of the
public in general or visit in anyway any evidence of specific bias when producing the Final Environmental Statement Documents. We ask that all statements of specific bias as set out in our response to the Environmental Statement are assessed and we receive confirmation that HS2 Ltd are content they have not behaved with any bias to Hyde Heath.

AONB

29. Your petitioners seek design input with regard to the scheme in the AONB. The Localism Act was set up to give greater control for local people to influence the design of schemes planned in their local area. Major Infrastructure schemes and not excluded and therefore to be compliant with the Localism Act we respectfully request that design committees of local people from organisations such as HHP who are directly and specifically affected, are granted real power to influence the design of the scheme in the AONB.

30. Your petitioners record that HS2 Ltd set out a document promoting the High Speed Line indicating it would offer benefits to locations “all along the route”. We see no evidence of such benefits, however, to make good on this promise it would be a sensible remedy to request HS2 Ltd provide a package of support for rural businesses affected including being placed under a positive obligation to source materials and labour from local run businesses as opposed to national organisations if the tender prices are within 10%. We ask that they provide permanent support for all rural businesses such as farming to ensure there is no specific bias in favour of encouraging employment and growth in the Cities of London, Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds. Any rural housing demolished should be replaced at the full cost of HS2 and made available to local people, meeting essential community needs and on an affordable basis. We request that HS2 be placed under a positive obligation to ensure permanent support is given for any and all rural businesses with an obligation to ensure no net loss of employment now and forever for the duration of the operation of the line.

31. Your petitioners wish to record that the Environmental Statement Design Aim 9 is to optimise the land resource but only “appropriate to development for high speed rail and its infrastructure”. Your petitioners ask that the duty to conserve and enhance the AONB should ensure that its natural resources are not in any way utilised.

32. Your petitioners record the HS2 Sustainability Policy. We note however that HS2 Ltd have placed a provision in the Bill such that their obligation is only to comply “provided this does not add unreasonable cost or delay with the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme”. We ask the AONB be considered separately in this regard as it is afforded statutory protection with a responsibility to conserve and enhance. That responsibility is governed by no test of reasonableness that limits cost and therefore there is no test that limits works in the AONB to “reasonable” endeavours. To ask that when referring to the AONB
the endeavours that by statute must be adopted are “best” and not “reasonable”.

33. We ask that the committee accept the conclusions of the Environmental Audit Committee who agree with this statement.

34. Your petitioners wish to record key features of the AONB are rustic and rural nature. We have few roundabouts which are an urban feature out of keeping with rural roads. We have few pavements and little or no street lighting. In essence the natural beauty has been maintained for centuries with as little manmade intrusion as possible. Our entire planning laws and regulations have been designed with the principle of conserve and enhance this historic landscape. We therefore ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation of best endeavours to avoid developing urban features such as roundabouts and lighting in the AONB and as far as they are capable adopt the same duty to conserve and enhance.

35. Your petitioners ask for evidence that the HS2 scheme in Community Forum Area 9 (henceforth known as CFA9) is “for the most part to be set within a wide valley interrupted by existing development and, as such, is considered to have a relatively low level of tranquillity compared with other more secluded and less developed areas of the AONB”.

36. Your petitioners record the fact major infrastructure works means such works will be visible in many locations and have the potential to give rise to significant temporary effects which cannot be mitigated practicably. We record the statements made in the Environmental Audit Committee that areas with landscape protection, should be mitigated as part of a hierarchy and areas with the highest protection, such as ancient woodland and the AONB must be mitigated to a far higher level than would be “practicable”. The EAC made clear that the word practicable was not applicable with regards to Ancient Woodland and the AONB and therefore should be removed from the Hybrid Bill. We respectfully request that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to use their very best endeavours to mitigate fully any visible temporary effects of construction to conserve and enhance the Ancient Woodland and AONB.

37. Community Impacts

38. Your petitioners wish to petition against the statement of the former HS2 Chief Executive’s assertion that “there will be no impact on Great Missenden because it is a kilometre from the line”. We ask that the study work that quantifies this statement be made available. Great Missenden is a significant retail centre used by persons in Hyde Heath. If this centre is to become materially impacted there will be a corresponding impact upon the residents of Hyde Heath forced to shop
elsewhere with greater travel distances and multiple trips, particularly in the case of parents with Children at the Missenden Schools. We seek remedy that should certain businesses within Great Missenden be put out of business, the multiple trips enduring increased time, cost and inconvenience must be assessed, quantified and provision made to compensate it should the worst case occur.

39. Your petitioners note that the Non-technical summary states the scheme will “bring” benefits both “beneficial and adverse”. Your petitioners seek positive implementation of this statement with a package of benefits to Hyde Heath as promised by the ES. We seek remedy that it is for HS2 Ltd to identify and bring the benefits they have claimed to Parliament. As such, we ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under an obligation to meet with Hyde Heath residents and negotiate a package of benefits to make good on their promises to Parliament. We do not believe it is appropriate to ask HHP to bid for money within a community fund as this is not the statement HS2 Ltd have given to Parliament.

40. Your petitioners respectfully request that any and all work camps and areas with vent shafts and transformers be compelled to generate 15% of all their energy use from renewable sources in keeping with national guidelines on this matter. HS2 Ltd are seeking to deliver an exceptional scheme so your petitioners request that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to fund, develop and deliver true sustainability as a by-product of the scheme. We ask for a simple gesture by agreeing to fund a package of solar panel roof installations on all Village roofs, including the school, village hall and any and all other buildings that could generate the solar for the work camps and/or the vent shafts and in doing so fulfil their sustainable energy commitments, demonstrate true sustainable credentials and provide a true sustainable benefit to the Village compliant with NPPF.

41. Your petitioners note the Law Commission recommended to Parliament to overhaul the laws pertaining to compensation with regards to Major Projects. To date, Parliament has not introduced legislation to protect those suffering from major infrastructure projects and their impossibly long gestation. A sitting Government has no incentive in doing so and therefore this failure to legislate is clearly inequitable and oppressive. We therefore ask committee for a win win scenario where committee agree to issue a property bond as set out by HS2AA. This does not set precedent of compulsory purchase law as it is a specific committee recommendation.

42. If Government refuse to accept the committee’s recommendation, they can challenge the ruling in Court. The distinction being no resident of Hyde Heath would have the financial resources to obtain such relief by going to court and risk costs awarded against them. However, a positive ruling by committee means the residents are insulated as regards costs, damages and legal fees without precedent being established. If it is the will of the Law Lords to accept such legislation, they will find in favour in court to set precedent. If it is not, they will find against.
43. Your petitioners wish a guarantee to be issued which protects the village of Hyde Heath from impacts associated with the Phase 2 scheme. It is the concern of Hyde Heath that Phase 1 of the scheme may be built, but since the arguments for the scheme are largely based around issues of repairing the north/south divide, generating jobs in the north etc, it is evident that this should not come at a disproportionate impact on Hyde Heath. Of specific concern would be passing the Hybrid Bill authorising Phase 1, yet Parliament failing to pass the Bill authorising Phase 2. Such a situation would lead to disproportionate impact on Hyde Heath while failing to achieve the defining reason for building phase 1 of HS2. Therefore, under the circumstances, your petitioners seek amendment to the bill such that the works to build the Phase 1 cannot commence until the Phase 2 Bill has passed into law.

44. Your petitioners ask that the Independent Complaints Commissioner is independent and the complaints process is fully funded with sufficient meaningful powers and resources to investigate complaints and take any and all action necessary to correct any disproportionate impact.

45. Your petitioners ask that if any regular journey undertaken by residents in CFA9 forces diversions that increase mileage, HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to compensate anyone suffering loss as a consequence of the additional journey distance, specifically fuel cost and extra mileage by car. Namely 45p per mile for cars and 20p per mile for bikes as approved by HMRC.

46. Your petitioners request that they be granted permission to raise at committee any point raised by any other community affected along the route if such point is applicable to the residents of Hyde Heath and the remedy granted to the community is such it could alleviate similar impact or suffering of Hyde Heath and in doing so bring benefit and/or sustainability to the village as HS2 Ltd have promised.

47. Construction

48. Your petitioners introduce evidence that the route proving engineer, Arup, gave engineering advice to the Secretary of State and Department for Transport informing them the AONB route was potentially dangerous with cost risks. Hyde Heath members have contacted the Secretary of State, DFT and HS2 Ltd and questioned why this advice has been ignored. The AONB route involves shallow tunnelling in soft ground where ground conditions are completely unknown. The Public Accounts Committee pointed this out to HS2 Ltd, stating that the large contingency is a function of weak cost information. This weak cost information is a product of no intrusive soil studies to inform safety of the route and potential cost risk implications.
49. Arup’s advised the AONB soil is unknown and presents risks. They described almost all the strata as suspect and used words such as “vulnerable to shrinkage and swelling”, “material has low strength and high moisture content”, “contains groundwater and will be troublesome for earthworks slope stability”, “careful handling required”, “slope instability problems”. The Government and HS2 Ltd have wilfully ignored this advice. We are aware that other respected engineers have surveyed the route and reached the same conclusion. We ask for a positive obligation on HS2 Ltd to obtain from the main contractor (and any subsidiary contractors and any and all persons working in a design capacity) a full and unqualified design and construction warranty in favour of the residents of Hyde Heath.

50. Your petitioners request that HS2 Ltd explain why they have ignored evidence presented to them on safety issues associated with sink holes in and around the village of Hyde Heath. Your petitioners seek remedy that HS2 Ltd is asked to provide intrusive soil study that confirms the existence of sink holes in the area and to clarify how they intend to stabilise the surrounding soil from settlement induced by vibration and Rayleigh Wave issues that present significant dangers of opening up sinkholes in the villages and areas surrounding the line.

51. Your petitioners note the route of HS2 was considered by Atkins in their original High Speed Line study in 2004. This report made clear the route should not be an intensely used rail line as it categorically made clear the proposal should be 2 separate lines north to south and should NOT be “a singular core service”. In ignoring these recommendations, all traffic from every city north of Birmingham will filter into a singular core corridor. We will present evidence that it is the intention to hand significant Capacity on the West Coast Line and East Coast Line to rail freight with passenger journeys on HS2 line replacing current East and West Coast Services. Irrespective of the fact this will present a significant security risk, we are concerned the entire distance passenger rail network south of Birmingham will be wholly reliant on the High Speed Line.

52. Your petitioners request information and consultation from HS2 Ltd on The Little Missenden Vent Shaft as regards expected sound and noise issues associated with the shaft. To date despite several requests HS2 Ltd still cannot confirm the expected noise level at the vent shaft.

53. Your petitioners ask for confirmation of whether the Tunnel Boring Machines will be buried or removed from CFA9 and HS2 Ltd is placed under a positive obligation to confirm this during committee with no deviation from their undertaking.

54. Your petitioners ask that HS2 Ltd confirm no field drains will be cut, since they maintain in the ES that no watercourse diversions will occur in CFA9. We ask that they are placed under a positive obligation to maintain field drains and undertake re-instatement or mitigation within the flood risk assessment and we reserve rights to petition if any impact is created.
55. Your petitioners note that 2 national grid pylons (Frith Hill and West of Jenkins Wood) are to be demolished. This is an obvious opportunity to provide an enhancement in the AONB. We request that if there are any buildings or transformer equipment, including oil sinks, required to do so this is consulted upon and any and all safety and pollution hazards are assessed and mitigated to ensure there are no safety risks to the population.

56. Your petitioners propose that the forestry track adjacent to Mantles Green Cottage that is used to access Mantles Wood is not used for piling operations and that access can be taken for all necessary piling works from the A413.

57. Your petitioners ask that the hours of operation and intensity of use within the construction sites are restricted within the tranquil AONB. We ask that the CoCP controls any and all noise not before 8am and not after 8pm. We ask that on Sundays, there should be no working at the North Portal or Missenden Vent Shaft to ensure the sanctity of morning worship is preserved with the various churches in CFA9.

58. Your petitioners note HS2 Ltd makes statement that operational employment and significant growth is created at locations all along the route including stations, train crew facilities and infrastructure maintenance depots. Your petitioners therefore ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to ensure their best endeavours to make this happen within CFA9.

Water

59. Your petitioners question the route of HS2 Ltd in light of the recent and ongoing problem of flooding in the UK. The Water Minister informs us very little assessment has been made as to the impacts the scheme may have as regards flooding. The removal of woodland and ancient woodland in particular removes the attenuation capacity of the Misbourne Valley which will inevitably lead to greater downstream flooding both around Hyde Heath and down the Thames corridor, such loss of attenuation being exacerbated by the substantial water displacement in the aquifer due to tunnelling. Your petitioners request that an independent flood risk assessment with reference to the above points should be prepared and presented to give Parliament assurances prior to the Bill leaving the House of Lords.

60. Your petitioners do not consider the hydrology studies to date to be sufficient to inform the impacts on Hyde Heath with regard to attenuation and flood mitigation systems. We ask that HS2 Ltd produce sufficiently robust documents to inform the design and fix the size, shape and contours of the drainage systems to ensure all impacts are properly assessed and effects are mitigated. We ask that there is no deviation from that shown in the Final Environmental Statement and the plans and routes of the attenuation and flood systems are fixed alongside the parliamentary plans submitted with the Hybrid Bill.
61. Your petitioners comment that removal of mature tree systems will greatly exacerbate run off and lead to greater flood issues. We ask for evidence from HS2 Ltd that they have factored into their run off the loss of attenuation from loss of mature and ancient tree systems together with field drainage losses exacerbated by introducing hard standing/man made generated run off features that result from the design. We ask that HS2 Ltd remain compliant with all rules designed to mitigate run off and in doing so specify porous surfaces as a positive obligation together with best endeavours to ensure this is a core aim of their designs within the AONB.

62. Your petitioners wish to reserve rights to raise further petitions in respect of results and impacts from hydrological and hydro-geological surveys yet to be undertaken by HS2 Ltd. Such surveys will confirm flooding potential, water quality and groundwater conditions, geotechnical investigations to confirm ground and groundwater conditions, contaminated land surveys. We ask that the Local Land Contamination Officer and other officers of the District and County Councils responsible for these matters are consulted with a positive obligation on HS2 Ltd to be fully compliant with local standards and methodology.

63. Your petitioners record where piling takes place in contaminated soil precautions must be taken to prevent soil or groundwater migrating into aquifers as this would be unacceptable to the Water Framework Directive. We ask that an independent body is set up with specific duty to monitor such activity and given wide ranging powers to prevent construction and/or impose significant penalty fines if pollution or turbidity is introduced.

64. Your petitioners ask that no dewatering or grouting takes place during excavation where such dewatering could carry contaminants from the construction process which then transfer to the receptor sites such as the Misbourne River or Shardeloes Lake.

65. Your petitioners are concerned and object to the statement that impacts on groundwater flows and quality will be analysed, and where the assessment predicts that a likely significant adverse effect may occur, a strategy to manage the risk will be agreed with the Environment Agency. We understand impacts on groundwater have been assessed and the effects are significant including pollution of sensitive receptors and potable freshwater supplies. Your petitioners ask that they are not subjected to an “acceptable level of pollution” of potable water supplies or reduction in freshwater supplies which could result in hose pipe bans in this area etc. We ask that HS2 Ltd should be placed under a positive obligation to be fully responsible in mitigating now and forever the permanent impact of their actions with liability of full compensation for impact on local water supplies that renders disproportionate impacts on households in CFA9. We record in relation to Clause 11 of this document that failure to do so raises the prospect of criminal liability and certainly opens the Government up to potential
for punitive and exemplary damages for not assessing a risk they were obligated to fully assess under the HS2 Preparation Act.

66. Your petitioners wish to object strongly that the entire route will be located within a source protection zone (SPZ). HS2 Ltd has an obligation under the Preparation Act to ensure they assess that the route is designed to be optimum and this includes minimal impact and minimal safety risk. Evidence provided by Chiltern District Council and their Chief Engineer Peter Brett Associates regarding their “Green Route” indicates that this tunnel option offers a better operational alignment, passes through better and more consistent ground conditions below the water table, mostly below the deeply weathered zones underlying the dry valleys and zones containing solution features and chalk mines. We therefore ask that the route be changed on grounds of source protection which is a higher priority national interest than HS2 and provides better environmental protection and public safety.

67. Your petitioners note that the TBM will be operated in a closed face mode when tunnelling within water bearing strata and the tunnel lining will be designed to reduce leakage rates to a minimum. We ask that they accept a positive undertaking with very best endeavours to ensure no leaks occur that pollute a natural aquifer controlled by the Water Framework Directive.

68. Your petitioners note that the method of piling will be selected to avoid creating hydraulic pathways such as cracks and cavities between the construction and the natural rock that might establish pathways between the aquifer and shallower surface water and groundwater. We ask that HS2 Ltd accept a positive obligation to use their very best endeavours to select a piling solution that will ensure that the absolute minimum hydraulic pathways are created.

69. Your petitioners ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation and very best endeavours to ensure no migration of turbid groundwater to surface water occurs as evidence of their efforts on mitigating disruption to groundwater as a consequence of construction.

70. Your petitioners ask for evidence that during year one of operation, there will be no impacts on chalk streams within the AONB. Your petitioners contend that failure to supply the study work to confirm this assurance is evidence the necessary study work has not been undertaken and this assurance is misleading Parliament. Furthermore, in keeping with Clause 11 of this petition, failure to supply this information will open up the Government to Punitive and exemplary damages.

71. Your petitioners object to the statement that HS2 Ltd in liaison with the Environment Agency considers all practicable measures to mitigate adverse impacts on surface water bodies and groundwater have been identified. The Environmental Audit Committee requested that HS2 Ltd remove the word practicable and therefore ask that the Environmental Agency be asked to confirm
in writing that “all measures to mitigate adverse impacts on surface bodies and groundwater have been identified”. We request HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation with very best endeavours to comply and that this point be referred to the Environmental Audit Committee for consideration once the EA have responded.

72. Your petitioners note HS2 Ltd have sought to apply the Sequential Test of the NPPF which states: “The aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding”. We respectfully request that HS2 produce the study which confirms the alternative routes have a higher probability of flooding than the AONB route. We ask they provide written statement they have studied all water courses along the route and this route presents the best route with regard to flood plain avoidance and is better in that regard than the CDC/Bucks CC “green” route.

73. Your petitioners note the Exception Test within paragraph 102 of the NPPF. It states that for certain types of development, where the Sequential Test has been applied, for the Exception Test to be passed it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk. A site specific flood risk assessment “must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall”. Your petitioners ask for evidence of the “wider sustainability benefits” to any communities along the intermediate route of the line and therefore ask how HS2 Ltd complies with the exception test.

Traffic and Transport

74. Your petitioners are aware there are cases in Hyde Heath where the HS2 design or construction is affecting the marketability of homes and in doing so affecting the consequent mortgage valuation, despite being almost 4km from the tunnel head and work sites. HS2 Ltd should be compelled to cover the difference in costs or provide mortgage finance so that persons are not placed in an adverse financial position before they can settle any claim for compensation.

75. Your petitioners note the AONB route is one of the furthest routes from a major transport corridor such as a Motorway. We object to the statement the A413 is a major transport corridor and ask the committee to review the dangers posed by this statement. The old narrow roads which connect with the A413 throughout the AONB have high sided verge hedges presenting the most unique and dangerous set of conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. Your petitioners ask for traffic studies to record traffic levels on lanes around Hyde Heath (Keepers Lane, Chalk Lane, Pipers Wood (known as Weedon Hill by HS2 Ltd) which will all be used by traffic when the A413/B485 is congested with traffic avoiding work camps. These lanes will become dangerously overloaded with
severe impacts to those who live adjacent the lanes and increased risks to cyclists and pedestrians in the village. The village has few pavements and no street lighting and our greatest concerns relate to dangers to safety of school children. We ask that the Health and Safety Executive be asked to review the work produced by HS2. This matter cannot be left to the construction stage or CoCP as mitigation is inappropriate as the factors are a direct result of suggesting the A413 is a "major transport corridor".

76. Your petitioners note that HS2 Ltd have not adopted current best practice guidance published by DfT and TfL as regards cyclists following deaths in London as a consequence of Crossrail. We further note there has been no assessment of road cycling in the Chilterns despite it being a nationally recognised location for such activity. Your petitioners ask that current guidance is adopted and HS2 Ltd be asked to undertake Chiltern Wide study of risks to and impacts on road cyclists as a consequence of the construction of the scheme.

77. Your petitioners wish to record that HS2 Ltd have not taken account of accident or safety risks and has avoided commenting on the many accidents on the A413 where traffic joins from Chalk Lane, Keepers Lane or Pipers Wood (Weedon Hill) onto the dual carriageway. We record that HS2 Ltd failed to highlight the fatalities in the prior 2 years to the ES. All fatalities occurred because slow moving vehicles join with fast moving vehicles on this section and HS2 construction will exacerbate this issue. We ask the HSE assess whether there is a specific safety issue as a consequence of the decision to locate the Missenden Vent shaft in this area and the Board of HS2 Ltd accept full responsibility in the event fatalities occur as a consequence of this oversight.

78. Your petitioners state that assessment scope, key assumptions and limitations for the traffic and transport assessments are generic and incorrect and ask that the traffic assessment is reproduced using a rush hour reflecting this location.

79. Your petitioners ask that assessment of any impact on primary and secondary school bus services are included in the ES and HS2 Ltd accept a positive undertaking to make their best endeavours to ensure no delays occur to this vital service.

80. Your petitioners note that HS2 Ltd have adopted ‘Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon’, published by the DFT in 2011 which promotes the greater prioritisation of walking, cycling and public transport for short local journeys, including travel to and from stations. We ask that HS2 Ltd are placed under a positive obligation to use their best endeavours to meet this requirement in the CFA9.
Noise

81. Your petitioners ask that noise fence barriers are designed to be aesthetically in keeping with the natural key features of an AONB and that HS2 Ltd do not specify standard nor off the shelf designs. We ask that design of all permanent visible HS2 features within the AONB should be designed under a positive obligation to deliver their very best endeavours in mitigating the impact via aesthetically pleasing design in keeping with the natural beauty.

82. Your petitioners wish to reserve the right to introduce evidence with regards to the noise impacts, both during construction and operation. We ask that HS2 Ltd provide funding and support for the purchase/hire of sound meters to be placed strategically around locations impacted and over the long term to correctly analyse the existing background noise and subsequent construction noise. Secondly we ask that HS2 Ltd be asked to give a statement to explain how they arrived at their calculations if they have no knowledge of train system or track system. Finally, we ask that HS2 Ltd release the sound analysis and follow up study work on HS1 as regards noise impacts to allow accurate comparison.

83. Your petitioners state that noise levels in this area are likely to drop over the long term as car technology improves but more importantly as the switch to zero emission electric vehicles occurs, such vehicles generating far less noise than conventional cars. Therefore, this area is likely to benefit greatly from a substantial reduction in car noise as a consequence of this emerging technology. We therefore ask that background noise at the horizon year factors in this change in technology and such a change is a continuing benefit to the area that will be denied to us by HS2.

84. Your petitioners ask that HS2 be placed under a positive obligation to ensure there is no night time tunnel work in CFA9.

85. Your petitioners note HS2 Ltd established the baseline noise claiming CF9 is not a “tranquil” location due to noise generated in the background from the A413. No calculation was made to isolate the highest noise contributor to the baseline or filter its changing effects over the course of 24hrs. Therefore, we ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to adopt the same logic and methodology when assessing permanent operational effects on residents. For example, if the highest recorded noise maker over 24hrs is tunnel pressure boom then this is the reading used to assess impact.

Environmental Concerns

86. Your petitioners ask that HS2 Ltd give an undertaking to ensure all displaced ancient woodland soils are fully trans-located to form the basis of the new woodland planting as promised by HS2 Ltd before the 2nd Reading in the Commons. We note that the Environmental Audit Committee made clear that Ancient Woodland cannot be bio-offset and if such an irreplaceable resource is to
be lost then it should be as a very last option and if alternatives exist, regardless of cost, such alternatives must be taken.

87. We wish to record that HS2 Ltd have given the impression they have relocated the tunnel head of the Chilterns North Tunnel from Mantles Wood to West of South Heath, thus savings Mantles Wood. While such a relocation was a welcome decision by the Select Committee, we wish to record that HS2 still intend to destroy large parts of the ancient wood to facilitate borehole studies. We ask that the Committee ascertain if these isolated borehole studies are strictly necessary and whether it is critical work that is necessary to destroy large parts of an ancient wood for 1 borehole?

88. Your petitioners wish to record that insufficient effort has been made by HS2 Ltd to mitigate the wildlife impacts in CFA9. There are significant breeding populations of Barn Owls in this area. There is evidence of nationally important Bats roosting in the area. There are breeding Kites that have been unassessed and there is no methodology for dealing with Hazel Dormouse. There are nationally scarce species of Beetle and Fly present in Mantles Wood associated with decaying ancient Woodlands. There are nationally important and rare species of Wood Barley, Box and rare species of flower including wild pansy and Orchids recorded. There is no methodology provided that sufficiently addresses exactly how HS2 intend to mitigate or translocate these species.

89. We therefore ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to use their best endeavours and draft mitigation documents with methodology on how they will conserve and enhance these species to the satisfaction of the local and national bodies that seek to protect them.

90. Your petitioners raise serious errors in the Bat assessments in CFA9. A young male species classified as of principal importance in England was detected but could not be radio-tagged. We ask that follow up Bat studies are undertaken supervised by Bat Conservation experts to ensure conservation of this rare creature.

91. Your petitioners ask that the Barn Owl Trust recommendation to mitigate death of all Barn Owls 1.5km either side of the line is adopted.

**Hybrid Bill Powers**

92. Your petitioners object to powers sought by the promoter through the Hybrid Bill process as they are too wide ranging. In constructing or maintaining any of the scheduled works, the nominated undertaker should accept an absolute undertaking not to deviate in any way from the Plans and Sections that accompany the hybrid Bill (the Parliamentary Plans). Such powers exceed that which is allowed under European EIA Directive, namely, the Final ES must be “Final” and any deviation or change in the route or any significant change in design or any new structures must be consulted upon as part of a Final ES to
avoid any cumulative impacts. Clause 47 should be removed or amended significantly. It should have time limits and be narrowly drafted and specific to regeneration only and not “any land” as this would apply to greenbelt and AONB land. Specifically, the promoter and all others deriving benefits from this clause should be under a positive obligation to render any profits generated from the purchase and sale of such land back to the communities affected along the line to ensure balance is brought with regard to disproportionate impacts.

93. Your petitioners ask that the hybrid Bill does not dis-apply legislative provisions that preserve human remains and burial grounds are afforded all due dignity, care and respect. We wish to record that under the Burial Act 1857, burial grounds which have been consecrated according to the rites of the Church of England are subject to the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop and ask that HS2 Ltd remain fully compliant with this legislation to avoid religious discrimination.

94. Your petitioners strongly object to HS2 Ltd asking for permission in the Hybrid Bill in IA13-26B to ignore the Railways Acts of 93/05 as regards HS2 commissioning to ensure they delay having to pay out compensation for persons affected during compensation. We respectfully ask that the committee does not allow HS2 Ltd this right.

Closing

95. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners. Your petitioners ask that they should be removed from the bill.

96. Your Petitioners also consider that when a change to the scheme in the Bill is justified on the merits, it is no answer for the Promoters to say that such changes should be resisted because it goes beyond what is provided for in the Bill. It is the Promoters, not those affected, who have chosen what to put in the Bill and, if they have specified or designed incorrectly, they should accept a correction, particularly on safety grounds. In addition, given that the Promoters have already indicated that future changes to the scheme will be necessary, it is clear the Final Environmental Statement is not intended to be “Final” but is a fluid document that is evolving and therefore further changes are anticipated by the promoter before issuing the “final” version.

97. Your Petitioner is concerned that the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) proposed by HS2 Ltd are incapable of being fulfilled or capped as the Promoter has not undertaken adequate work to substantiate. The promoter is wholly reliant on the term “reasonably practicable” when referring to the EMRs in that the Bill allows the promoter to deviate from “minimum” requirements on grounds of costs they determine is unreasonable. Therefore, given the promoter has failed to undertake intrusive ground investigation work, they are unable to confirm with accuracy the noise levels that the scheme will generate. Therefore,
if the noise levels set out in the EM Rs are unachievable due to additional structure and strengthening leading to higher noise levels, the promoter can seek to compensate persons affected if they deem the cost of meeting the EM Rs is not reasonably practicable. This is evidence of arbitrary decision making by the promoter and consequently opens the government and taxpayer up to claims for punitive and exemplary damages which your petitioner will seek in the event the test of what is reasonably practicable is not removed from the Bill.

98. The Committee to make the Executive of the Environment Agency explicitly and personally accountable should any increased turbidity occur beyond that which is predicted by HS2 Ltd and therefore approved by the EA.

99. Your petitioner records that HS2 Ltd stated in 2012 that the cost of the AONB route would be £3bn cheaper than the M40 motorway route. This assessment was made with intrusive survey knowledge of ground conditions on the M40 route but no such information to inform the costs of the AONB route. In 2012 the budget for the scheme was set at £32bn......it is now £56bn. HS2 Ltd has publicly stated that much of the additional costs are a consequence of tunnelling and mitigation in the AONB route. Furthermore, given their original duty to have regard to conserve and enhance extends to less than half the route being in tunnel, we record that HS2 Ltd have stated further tunnelling would be “expensive for the taxpayer”. While your petitioner is sure this would be correct, it is the cost of undertaking construction via the AONB route vrs the M40 route and therefore clear and explicit evidence that the original arbitrary decision in 2012 is incorrect. As the 2012 decision was arbitrary without the decision of Parliament, it means as public servants they have misled Parliament and caused disproportionate impact with specific bias to residents suffering as a consequence of their error. Therefore, HS2 Ltd must be compelled to re-evaluate this original decision in light of the new information and in particular to undertake the intrusive ground study work to accurately inform a comparison. Failure to do so would give grounds to person in the AONB suffering acute stress and mental health issues as a consequence of the route, to claim punitive and exemplary damages from the Government for such an arbitrary decision.

100. That the promoters acknowledge the impact blight is creating with regard to re-mortgaging in the AONB. That in addition to the “need to sell” scheme a re-mortgaging scheme is put in place by HS2 Ltd. The terms of such a scheme should allow petitioners to take advantage of full unblighted values of their properties to arrive at the loan to value of their property and using this LTV, the promoter be compelled to advance the best market value loan and interest available to the petitioner at the full unblighted LTV rate. Failure to do so once again opens up the Government to punitive damages from persons unable to re-mortgage at the best market value rates as a direct consequence of the blight on their property affecting their Loan to Value.
101. Your petitioners consider there are significant failures by the promoter which cumulatively are leading to undue stress, health impact, financial impact, restrictions on human rights, restrictions and impacts on lifestyle which collectively are having impacts on family life. All of these impacts are the result of negligent and deliberate, arbitrary and erroneous decision making by the promoter. It is explicitly clear that this negligence is leading to disproportionate impacts as a consequence of specific bias. Collectively due to failures of the executive board of HS2 Ltd, it is evidently clear they have invited class action to sue the Government for Exemplary and Punitive damages for these impacts.

102. Respectfully, if the Lords do not recognise and remedy these significant issues, it leaves those affected to seek Judicial Review then class action for punitive damages. In both instances your petitioners are left with no option but to seek injunction against the schemes construction until both routes are exhausted. The resulting cost to the taxpayer would be prohibitively expensive not least in the case of the resulting delays to the scheme. This is not a route your petitioner wishes to undertake but if the Lords will not provide restitution for these impacts and address the inequality and unfair nature, what other route is available?

The petitioner* therefore asks the House of Lords that he*, or someone representing him* in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.
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To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Against – on Merits

To the House of Lords of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

THE HUMBLE PETITION of Hyde Heath Village Society

Declares that: -

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. The Petitioners are Hyde Heath Village Society (hereafter known as HHVS)

3. Your Petitioner’s area is bisected by the proposed HS2 route contained within the Bill (see Deposited Plans, Vol. 2.1, sheets 2-21, 2-22, 2-23 and 2-24, see also Deposited Sections, Vol.5, sheets 5-10, 5-11, 5-12, 5-13, 5-49 and 5-50).

4. HHVS is the Village Society for the communities of Hyde Heath and members of Hyde End. We are situated to the north of the A413 on the Chiltern Ridge.

5. There are no large employers within Hyde Heath, so employment is in small scale service companies, farms, but mainly by commuting to larger centres outside the Village.

6. Hyde Heath has a village shop, pre and infant school, 2 churches, village pub, cricket pitch, common and significant leisure opportunities afforded by the many public rights of way and walkways that emanate from the village.

7. The village is poorly served by public transport and is reliant on the car for access to work, shopping, schools, medical facilities and school buses to Amersham, Chesham and High Wycombe. The nearest train services for leisure and commuting journeys are accessed at Great Missenden, High Wycombe and Amersham.

8. Primary access to the village is via 2 single track routes from the A413 together with the main Hyde Heath Road which runs from the B485 Missenden Road to Chesham and Amersham. All of these routes will be disrupted and affected by the HS2 construction traffic.
Your petitioner’s concerns

9. Your Petitioners face a range of adverse impacts from HS2, both of a permanent or long term nature and also associated with the drawn-out construction works that will be required. Current impacts include ongoing property blight which is now affecting re-mortgaging and house purchase together with health issues as a consequence of stress, worry and concerns associated with the uncertainty regarding the project. The impacts once the scheme begins construction and operation may be divided between permanent/long term impacts, and include:

   **Permanent/long term impacts:**
   - The impact on the AONB;
   - The impact on Public Rights of Way;
   - The impact of the proposed Little Missenden Vent Shaft.

   **Construction impacts:**
   - The impact of construction vehicles on traffic flows;
   - The impact on pedestrian and cycle safety;
   - The impact on chalk streams;
   - Impacts from timing of works;
   - The impact on the emergency services;
   - Property Blight

10. Most of these impacts could be wholly avoided by an extension of the Chiltern Tunnel as presently proposed in the Bill throughout the whole of the AONB. Our Petition addresses the impacts, and the mitigation required, below.

11. Your petitioners are also concerned that the Board of HS2 Ltd have operated in an arbitrary fashion to make decisions that have misled Parliament. We are unsure whether this is with the approval of the Department of Transport or without. We contend they may have deliberately misrepresented information to Parliament with regards to the Survey, Safety and cost of the Scheme as proposed to Parliament. We contend they knowingly are aware that such misrepresentation and failure to deliberately undertake urgent survey works recommended by their own Engineers could lead to significant unassessed impacts, increase in environmental impacts, increase in impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, increase in safety issues associated with the scheme and above all an increase in the overall cost to the taxpayer as a result of their negligent actions. Such failure on the part of HS2 Ltd could result in the scheme as proposed being unfit for purpose and unable to deliver the benefits set out to Parliament.
12. Your petitioners are concerned that as a consequence of the failure to undertake actions recommended by their own engineer, HS2 Ltd are proceeding on an arbitrary decision making basis that opens up the Taxpayer and Government to risk of negligent actions which may lead to Criminal Liability. Equally we are concerned that such actions, taken on an arbitrary basis will open up the UK taxpayer to punitive and exemplary damages for additional impacts when the matter itself could have been easily assessed and quantified.

13. Your petitioners are aware that HS2 Ltd have minimised this fact when presenting evidence to the HS2 Select Committee of the lower house. Your petitioner wishes to test this evidence in the upper house following additional information made available to your petitioner that was not available to the petitioner when petitioning the lower house.

14. Furthermore, your petitioners are gravely concerned at information provided that suggests the DFT and HS2 Ltd have misled Parliament on the purpose of the High Speed Scheme. We contend that the primary purpose of the High Speed Line is not for the benefit of passengers, but for the benefit of freight and the rail freight industry which is a highly subsidised industry. We will present evidence that confirms that HS2 Ltd have misled Parliament.

15. In this regard, we will provide evidence of vested interests that have colluded between private business and public office. Such collusion has cross party links. We will provide evidence that a private PLC with significant political influence is the chief beneficiary of the High Speed Rail project. We will provide evidence of parties with conflicts of interests (which have not been declared) together with evidence that the DFT has knowingly employed persons that are also employed by the private PLC to deliver the PLCs prime objective.

16. Finally, we will present evidence that this private PLC has been investigated by the Public Accounts Committee and has been found to be an offshore entity paying “little or no tax” yet appears to be the substantial beneficiary of the outcomes of the scheme.

17. Your Petitioners and their rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Objections in General

18. Your petitioners object on grounds HS2 Ltd presented incorrect, misleading and factually inaccurate evidence to MPs with wilful disregard and specific bias to persons affected such as the residents of Hyde Heath. Such disregard and bias is contrary to their appointment and duties under the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013. HS2 Ltd have not adequately answered the scrutiny or adopted the
recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee, The Treasury Select Committee, The Environmental Audit Committee, the National Audit Office, The Transport Committee and the Major Projects Committee and the Committee of the House of Lords who have considered the economic case for the High Speed Line and determined it is not as yet proven. We ask that the committee call for an investigation in public if Prima Facie evidence can show these committees were ignored by HS2 Ltd and the DFT to the benefit of vested interests and political collusion.

19. Your petitioners record HS2 connects only 13 of the 465 City Journeys consuming a disproportionate share of expenditure relative to the interests of the rest of the UK. Such Cities already have the best rail connections in the UK. Such specific bias in favour of these key Cities is political and is leading to disproportionate impacts on rural places such as Hyde Heath. We ask that any disproportionate impacts created by HS2 Ltd are compensated in full. If HS2 Ltd have not assessed a disproportionate impact which they have been made aware of, we ask they do so before the Bill is allowed to progress beyond the House of Lords. If HS2 Ltd has not or is unwilling to assess or mitigate an impact they have been made aware of, we ask Committee amend the bill to remove statutory protection for HS2 Ltd and allow the normal law of Tort for specific bias, disproportionate impact, wilful disregard and nuisance. In defining this we respectfully accept the principle of the bill has been established but ask that the committee confirm any and all impacts notified to HS2 Ltd via the submissions to the Final Environmental Statement should serve a purpose and form the basis of all notified impacts HS2 Ltd should reasonably have been expected to assess prior to second reading and therefore appropriately mitigate or give reason why they should not. Otherwise they are guilty of wilful disregard and overly relying on statutory protection to allow them to create such disproportionate impact.

20. Your petitioners are against the illegal destruction of the environment and ancient woodland in the Chiltern AONB as we can see no case for any exceptional circumstances for this route. The National Planning Policy Framework was misinterpreted by HS2 Ltd in their 2013 Final Environmental Statement they presented to Parliament and therefore it has misled Parliament as regards duty of MPs. The statutory rules protecting the AONB is provided in Section 11A (2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (National Parks), and Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (AONBs). They state that, “In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty”. HS2 Ltd quote the National Planning Policy Framework as authority to develop stating “major developments should not take place in these designated areas, except in exceptional circumstances”. This quote is incorrect as clause 116 of the NPPF is explicit that planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances \textbf{AND} where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Clause 116 sets tests including establishing the cost of, and scope
for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way. If the cost is not prohibitive and the scheme can be delivered outside the designated area then applying the legal definition of exceptional circumstances, permission should be refused. Your petitioners reserve the right to introduce legal case law that illustrates why the landscape protection statutes cannot be dis-applied without such exceptional circumstances as to do so would be oppressive.

21. Your petitioners record that this evidence was presented to HS2 Select Committee of the Commons. We contend they have made mistakes in interpretation leading to incorrect conclusion and summary. The Select Committee Final report stated that they considered impact of the scheme in relation to the size of the AONB as a whole. We contend no such regard was expected. We contend their regard was to conserve and enhance the whole without exclusion explicit or implied.

22. Furthermore, your petitioners record that the Select Committee used the precedent of the HS1 enabling Act to justify impact to the AONB in Kent by the HS1 Line. We record this as an error of precedent as the HS1 enabling Act pre-dated the CROW Act and therefore this is explicit evidence that both the Lower and Upper house following the HS1 enabling Act sought to re-affirm and provide stronger more explicit and better protection for AONBs and protected landscape. We remind the Committee that following the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework, there are clauses inserted which explicitly state that permission for major infrastructure should be deemed to be refused in areas of protected landscape such as the Chilterns AONB, unless exceptional circumstances can be established.

23. We record that to date HS2 Ltd have established no case for any circumstances that are exceptional that would warrant the development of major infrastructure in the AONB and therefore there is a deemed planning refusal under prevailing legislation. We also state for the record that should the contents of Clause 11 above prove to be accurate and the scheme can no longer fulfil its purpose and deliver the speed as set out in the specification that it presented to Parliament for approval, then the decision taken to route via the AONB on a straighter line (rather than via a motorway corridor for purposes of speed) would serve no purpose and the impact be disproportionate with specific bias.

24. Finally, we record that MPs had a duty to consider and apply the prevailing planning legislation when deciding the broad route of the scheme. We contend they failed in this duty and provide further evidence that MP Hendrick, a member of the select committee of the commons, asked a specific question in the HS2 select Committee. He enquired whether the Commons Select Committee had a duty to consider national planning and whether they were expected to apply it. We record that the Chairman of Ways and Means of the House of Commons has written to HHVS to explain that "the committee were addressed on the relevant planning law regime" to make decisions as regards planning law protecting the
AONB. Clearly this has not happened and therefore the Commons Committee was not instructed correctly as clearly if they had been then the MP would not have needed to ask such a question.

25. Your petitioners seek confirmation that the entire House of Commons and House of Lords are bound by prevailing planning legislation including the Acts protecting the AONB and National Planning Framework and in doing so have a duty to consider the prevailing Acts when determining whether the AONB has been given sufficient regard to conserve and enhance it. We contend that only 48% of the route via the AONB has been given due regard and that the Commons did not give sufficient regard to prevailing planning protection for its Landscape Status. We contend that for the HS2 Bill to pass the House of Lords and receive Royal Ascent, it is necessary to apply the full weight of the Acts and prevailing planning legislation explicitly protecting the AONB or otherwise repeal the CROW Act, Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework that together explicitly seeks to protect it.

26. Your petitioners identified specific grievances in our Environmental Statement response due to the inadequacy of the document where only 48% of the route was surveyed at its time of production. We record that HS2 Ltd presented a document they termed as “final” to Parliament. Since then a substantial body of evidence over 18 months has been presented to Parliaments Select Committee establishing a significant body of inaccuracies, failures to survey, incorrect conclusions, false and misleading information and minimised quantification of impacts. We record Arup’s asked HS2 Ltd to undertake ground investigations works ASAP in 2012. We record Arup’s stated in their 2012 report that failure to undertake this survey work could mean “everything could change including location of tunnel head, vent shafts, alignment and line depth”. We respectfully request that the House of Lords agree that the 2013 Environmental Impact Assessment is not a Final Document and with only 48% of the work done, could not have informed Parliament sufficiently at 2nd Reading. We ask that this “Final” document cannot be considered as “Final” and that the Lords instruct a new “Final” Environmental Statement prior to the Bill receiving Royal Ascent and certainly before 3rd Reading in the House of Lords.

27. Your petitioners believe the Hybrid Bill fails to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive 92/2011/EU (EU Directives) as there have been significant material changes post consultation which will lead to cumulative impacts.

28. Your petitioners contend the board of HS2 Ltd did not discharge their duties given to them under the High Speed Rail (Preparation Act) 2013. Statute requires the promoter, as a condition of obtaining statutory immunity from action, should carry out the work and conduct the operation impartially with all reasonable regard and care for the interests of others. The promoter must not cause any unassessed or ignored damage greater than that suffered by members of the public in general or visit in anyway any evidence of specific bias when producing
the Final Environmental Statement Documents. We ask that all statements of specific bias as set out in our response to the Environmental Statement are assessed and we receive confirmation that HS2 Ltd are content they have not behaved with any bias to Hyde Heath.

AONB

29. Your petitioners seek design input with regard to the scheme in the AONB. The Localism Act was set up to give greater control for local people to influence the design of schemes planned in their local area. Major Infrastructure schemes and not excluded and therefore to be compliant with the Localism Act we respectfully request that design committees of local people from organisations such as HHVS who are directly and specifically affected, are granted real power to influence the design of the scheme in the AONB.

30. Your petitioners record that HS2 Ltd set out a document promoting the High Speed Line indicating it would offer benefits to locations “all along the route”. We see no evidence of such benefits, however, to make good on this promise it would be a sensible remedy to request HS2 Ltd provide a package of support for rural businesses affected including being placed under a positive obligation to source materials and labour from local run businesses as opposed to national organisations if the tender prices are within 10%. We ask that they provide permanent support for all rural businesses such as farming to ensure there is no specific bias in favour of encouraging employment and growth in the Cities of London, Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds. Any rural housing demolished should be replaced at the full cost of HS2 and made available to local people, meeting essential community needs and on an affordable basis. We request that HS2 be placed under a positive obligation to ensure permanent support is given for any and all rural businesses with an obligation to ensure no net loss of employment now and forever for the duration of the operation of the line.

31. Your petitioners wish to record that the Environmental Statement Design Aim 9 is to optimise the land resource but only “appropriate to development for high speed rail and its infrastructure”. Your petitioners ask that the duty to conserve and enhance the AONB should ensure that its natural resources are not in any way utilised.

32. Your petitioners record the HS2 Sustainability Policy. We note however that HS2 Ltd have placed a provision in the Bill such that their obligation is only to comply “provided this does not add unreasonable cost or delay with the construction and operation of the Proposed Scheme”. We ask the AONB be considered separately in this regard as it is afforded statutory protection with a responsibility to conserve and enhance. That responsibility is governed by no test of reasonableness that limits cost and therefore there is no test that limits works in the AONB to “reasonable” endeavours. To ask that when referring to the AONB the endeavours that by statute must be adopted are “best” and not “reasonable”.
33. We ask that the committee accept the conclusions of the Environmental Audit Committee who agree with this statement.

34. Your petitioners wish to record key features of the AONB are rustic and rural nature. We have few roundabouts which are an urban feature out of keeping with rural roads. We have few pavements and little or no street lighting. In essence the natural beauty has been maintained for centuries with as little manmade intrusion as possible. Our entire planning laws and regulations have been designed with the principle of conserve and enhance this historic landscape. We therefore ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation of best endeavours to avoid developing urban features such as roundabouts and lighting in the AONB and as far as they are capable adopt the same duty to conserve and enhance.

35. Your petitioners ask for evidence that the HS2 scheme in Community Forum Area 9 (henceforth known as CFA9) is “for the most part to be set within a wide valley interrupted by existing development and, as such, is considered to have a relatively low level of tranquillity compared with other more secluded and less developed areas of the AONB”.

36. Your petitioners record the fact major infrastructure works means such works will be visible in many locations and have the potential to give rise to significant temporary effects which cannot be mitigated practicably. We record the statements made in the Environmental Audit Committee that areas with landscape protection, should be mitigated as part of a hierarchy and areas with the highest protection, such as ancient woodland and the AONB must be mitigated to a far higher level than would be “practicable”. The EAC made clear that the word practicable was not applicable with regards to Ancient Woodland and the AONB and therefore should be removed from the Hybrid Bill. We respectfully request that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to use their very best endeavours to mitigate fully any visible temporary effects of construction to conserve and enhance the Ancient Woodland and AONB.

37. Community Impacts

38. Your petitioners wish to petition against the statement of the former HS2 Chief Executive’s assertion that “there will be no impact on Great Missenden because it is a kilometre from the line”. We ask that the study work that quantifies this statement be made available. Great Missenden is a significant retail centre used by persons in Hyde Heath. If this centre is to become materially impacted there will be a corresponding impact upon the residents of Hyde Heath forced to shop elsewhere with greater travel distances and multiple trips, particularly in the case of parents with Children at the Missenden Schools. We seek remedy that should
certain businesses within Great Missenden be put out of business, the multiple trips enduring increased time, cost and inconvenience must be assessed, quantified and provision made to compensate it should the worst case occur.

39. Your petitioners note that the Non-technical summary states the scheme will “bring” benefits both “beneficial and adverse”. Your petitioners seek positive implementation of this statement with a package of benefits to Hyde Heath as promised by the ES. We seek remedy that it is for HS2 Ltd to identify and bring the benefits they have claimed to Parliament. As such, we ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under an obligation to meet with Hyde Heath residents and negotiate a package of benefits to make good on their promises to Parliament. We do not believe it is appropriate to ask HHVS to bid for money within a community fund as this is not the statement HS2 Ltd have given to Parliament.

40. Your petitioners respectfully request that any and all work camps and areas with vent shafts and transformers be compelled to generate 15% of all their energy use from renewable sources in keeping with national guidelines on this matter. HS2 Ltd are seeking to deliver an exceptional scheme so your petitioners request that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to fund, develop and deliver true sustainability as a by-product of the scheme. We ask for a simple gesture by agreeing to fund a package of solar panel roof installations on all Village Society roofs, including the school, village hall and any and all other buildings that could generate the solar for the work camps and/or the vent shafts and in doing so fulfil their sustainable energy commitments, demonstrate true sustainable credentials and provide a true sustainable benefit to the Village compliant with NPPF.

41. Your petitioners note the Law Commission recommended to Parliament to overhaul the laws pertaining to compensation with regards to Major Projects. To date, Parliament has not introduced legislation to protect those suffering from major infrastructure projects and their impossibly long gestation. A sitting Government has no incentive in doing so and therefore this failure to legislate is clearly inequitable and oppressive. We therefore ask committee for a win win scenario where committee agree to issue a property bond as set out by HS2AA. This does not set precedent of compulsory purchase law as it is a specific committee recommendation.

42. If Government refuse to accept the committee’s recommendation, they can challenge the ruling in Court. The distinction being no resident of Hyde Heath would have the financial resources to obtain such relief by going to court and risk costs awarded against them. However, a positive ruling by committee means the residents are insulated as regards costs, damages and legal fees without precedent being established. If it is the will of the Law Lords to accept such
legislation, they will find in favour in court to set precedent. If it is not, they will find against.

43. Your petitioners wish a guarantee to be issued which protects the village of Hyde Heath from impacts associated with the Phase 2 scheme. It is the concern of Hyde Heath that Phase 1 of the scheme may be built, but since the arguments for the scheme are largely based around issues of repairing the north/south divide, generating jobs in the north etc, it is evident that this should not come at a disproportionate impact on Hyde Heath. Of specific concern would be passing the Hybrid Bill authorising Phase 1, yet Parliament failing to pass the Bill authorising Phase 2. Such a situation would lead to disproportionate impact on Hyde Heath while failing to achieve the defining reason for building phase 1 of HS2. Therefore, under the circumstances, your petitioners seek amendment to the bill such that the works to build the Phase 1 cannot commence until the Phase 2 Bill has passed into law.

44. Your petitioners ask that the Independent Complaints Commissioner is independent and the complaints process is fully funded with sufficient meaningful powers and resources to investigate complaints and take any and all action necessary to correct any disproportionate impact.

45. Your petitioners ask that if any regular journey undertaken by residents in CFA9 forces diversions that increase mileage, HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to compensate anyone suffering loss as a consequence of the additional journey distance, specifically fuel cost and extra mileage by car. Namely 45p per mile for cars and 20p per mile for bikes as approved by HMRC.

46. Your petitioners request that they be granted permission to raise at committee any point raised by any other community affected along the route if such point is applicable to the residents of Hyde Heath and the remedy granted to the community is such it could alleviate similar impact or suffering of Hyde Heath and in doing so bring benefit and/or sustainability to the village as HS2 Ltd have promised.

47. Construction

48. Your petitioners introduce evidence that the route proving engineer, Arup, gave engineering advice to the Secretary of State and Department for Transport informing them the AONB route was potentially dangerous with cost risks. Hyde Heath members have contacted the Secretary of State, DFT and HS2 Ltd and questioned why this advice has been ignored. The AONB route involves shallow tunnelling in soft ground where ground conditions are completely unknown. The Public Accounts Committee pointed this out to HS2 Ltd, stating that the large contingency is a function of weak cost information. This weak cost information is a product of no intrusive soil studies to inform safety of the route and potential cost risk implications.
49. Arup’s advised the AONB soil is unknown and presents risks. They described almost all the strata as suspect and used words such as “vulnerable to shrinkage and swelling”, “material has low strength and high moisture content”, “contains groundwater and will be troublesome for earthworks slope stability”, “careful handling required”, “slope instability problems”. The Government and HS2 Ltd have wilfully ignored this advice. We are aware that other respected engineers have surveyed the route and reached the same conclusion. We ask for a positive obligation on HS2 Ltd to obtain from the main contractor (and any subsidiary contractors and any and all persons working in a design capacity) a full and unqualified design and construction warranty in favour of the residents of Hyde Heath.

50. Your petitioners request that HS2 Ltd explain why they have ignored evidence presented to them on safety issues associated with sink holes in and around the village of Hyde Heath. Your petitioners seek remedy that HS2 Ltd is asked to provide intrusive soil study that confirms the existence of sink holes in the area and to clarify how they intend to stabilise the surrounding soil from settlement induced by vibration and Rayleigh Wave issues that present significant dangers of opening up sinkholes in the villages and areas surrounding the line.

51. Your petitioners note the route of HS2 was considered by Atkins in their original High Speed Line study in 2004. This report made clear the route should not be an intensely used rail line as it categorically made clear the proposal should be 2 separate lines north to south and should NOT be “a singular core service”. In ignoring these recommendations, all traffic from every city north of Birmingham will filter into a singular core corridor. We will present evidence that it is the intention to hand significant Capacity on the West Coast Line and East Coast Line to rail freight with passenger journeys on HS2 line replacing current East and West Coast Services. Irrespective of the fact this will present a significant security risk, we are concerned the entire distance passenger rail network south of Birmingham will be wholly reliant on the High Speed Line.

52. Your petitioners request information and consultation from HS2 Ltd on The Little Missenden Vent Shaft as regards expected sound and noise issues associated with the shaft. To date despite several requests HS2 Ltd still cannot confirm the expected noise level at the vent shaft.

53. Your petitioners ask for confirmation of whether the Tunnel Boring Machines will be buried or removed from CFA9 and HS2 Ltd is placed under a positive obligation to confirm this during committee with no deviation from their undertaking.

54. Your petitioners ask that HS2 Ltd confirm no field drains will be cut, since they maintain in the ES that no watercourse diversions will occur in CFA9. We ask that
they are placed under a positive obligation to maintain field drains and undertake re-instatement or mitigation within the flood risk assessment and we reserve rights to petition if any impact is created.

55. Your petitioners note that 2 national grid pylons (Frith Hill and West of Jenkins Wood) are to be demolished. This is an obvious opportunity to provide an enhancement in the AONB. We request that if there are any buildings or transformer equipment, including oil sinks, required to do so this is consulted upon and any and all safety and pollution hazards are assessed and mitigated to ensure there are no safety risks to the population.

56. Your petitioners propose that the forestry track adjacent to Mantles Green Cottage that is used to access Mantles Wood is not used for piling operations and that access can be taken for all necessary piling works from the A413.

57. Your petitioners ask that the hours of operation and intensity of use within the construction sites are restricted within the tranquil AONB. We ask that the CoCP controls any and all noise not before 8am and not after 8pm. We ask that on Sundays, there should be no working at the North Portal or Missenden Vent Shaft to ensure the sanctity of morning worship is preserved with the various churches in CFA9.

58. Your petitioners note HS2 Ltd makes statement that operational employment and significant growth is created at locations ALL along the route including stations, train crew facilities and infrastructure maintenance depots. Your petitioners therefore ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to ensure their best endeavours to make this happen within CFA9.

Water

59. Your petitioners question the route of HS2 Ltd in light of the recent and ongoing problem of flooding in the UK. The Water Minister informs us very little assessment has been made as to the impacts the scheme may have as regards flooding. The removal of woodland and ancient woodland in particular removes the attenuation capacity of the Misbourne Valley which will inevitably lead to greater downstream flooding both around Hyde Heath and down the Thames corridor, such loss of attenuation being exacerbated by the substantial water displacement in the aquifer due to tunnelling. Your petitioners request that an independent flood risk assessment with reference to the above points should be prepared and presented to give Parliament assurances prior to the Bill leaving the House of Lords.

60. Your petitioners do not consider the hydrology studies to date to be sufficient to inform the impacts on Hyde Heath with regard to attenuation and flood
mitigation systems. We ask that HS2 Ltd produce sufficiently robust documents to inform the design and fix the size, shape and contours of the drainage systems to ensure all impacts are properly assessed and effects are mitigated. We ask that there is no deviation from that shown in the Final Environmental Statement and the plans and routes of the attenuation and flood systems are fixed alongside the parliamentary plans submitted with the Hybrid Bill.

61. Your petitioners comment that removal of mature tree systems will greatly exacerbate run off and lead to greater flood issues. We ask for evidence from HS2 Ltd that they have factored into their run off the loss of attenuation from loss of mature and ancient tree systems together with field drainage losses exacerbated by introducing hard standing/man made generated run off features that result from the design. We ask that HS2 Ltd remain compliant with all rules designed to mitigate run off and in doing so specify porous surfaces as a positive obligation together with best endeavours to ensure this is a core aim of their designs within the AONB.

62. Your petitioners wish to reserve rights to raise further petitions in respect of results and impacts from hydrological and hydro-geological surveys yet to be undertaken by HS2 Ltd. Such surveys will confirm flooding potential, water quality and groundwater conditions, geotechnical investigations to confirm ground and groundwater conditions, contaminated land surveys. We ask that the Local Land Contamination Officer and other officers of the District and County Councils responsible for these matters are consulted with a positive obligation on HS2 Ltd to be fully compliant with local standards and methodology.

63. Your petitioners record where piling takes place in contaminated soil precautions must be taken to prevent soil or groundwater migrating into aquifers as this would be unacceptable to the Water Framework Directive. We ask that an independent body is set up with specific duty to monitor such activity and given wide ranging powers to prevent construction and/or impose significant penalty fines if pollution or turbidity is introduced.

64. Your petitioners ask that no dewatering or grouting takes place during excavation where such dewatering could carry contaminants from the construction process which then transfer to the receptor sites such as the Misbourne River or Shardeloes Lake.

65. Your petitioners are concerned and object to the statement that impacts on groundwater flows and quality will be analysed, and where the assessment predicts that a likely significant adverse effect may occur, a strategy to manage the risk will be agreed with the Environment Agency. We understand impacts on groundwater have been assessed and the effects are significant including pollution of sensitive receptors and potable freshwater supplies. Your petitioners ask that they are not subjected to an “acceptable level of pollution” of potable
water supplies or reduction in freshwater supplies which could result in hose pipe bans in this area etc. We ask that HS2 Ltd should be placed under a positive obligation to be fully responsible in mitigating now and forever the permanent impact of their actions with liability of full compensation for impact on local water supplies that renders disproportionate impacts on households in CFA9. We record in relation to Clause 11 of this document that failure to do so raises the prospect of criminal liability and certainly opens the Government up to potential for punitive and exemplary damages for not assessing a risk they were obligated to fully assess under the HS2 Preparation Act.

66. Your petitioners wish to object strongly that the entire route will be located within a source protection zone (SPZ). HS2 Ltd has an obligation under the Preparation Act to ensure they assess that the route is designed to be optimum and this includes minimal impact and minimal safety risk. Evidence provided by Chiltern District Council and their Chief Engineer Peter Brett Associates regarding their “Green Route” indicates that this tunnel option offers a better operational alignment, passes through better and more consistent ground conditions below the water table, mostly below the deeply weathered zones underlying the dry valleys and zones containing solution features and chalk mines. We therefore ask that the route be changed on grounds of source protection which is a higher priority national interest than HS2 and provides better environmental protection and public safety.

67. Your petitioners note that the TBM will be operated in a closed face mode when tunnelling within water bearing strata and the tunnel lining will be designed to reduce leakage rates to a minimum. We ask that they accept a positive undertaking with very best endeavours to ensure no leaks occur that pollute a natural aquifer controlled by the Water Framework Directive.

68. Your petitioners note that the method of piling will be selected to avoid creating hydraulic pathways such as cracks and cavities between the construction and the natural rock that might establish pathways between the aquifer and shallower surface water and groundwater. We ask that HS2 Ltd accept a positive obligation to use their very best endeavours to select a piling solution that will ensure that the absolute minimum hydraulic pathways are created.

69. Your petitioners ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation and very best endeavours to ensure no migration of turbid groundwater to surface water occurs as evidence of their efforts on mitigating disruption to groundwater as a consequence of construction.

70. Your petitioners ask for evidence that during year one of operation, there will be no impacts on chalk streams within the AONB. Your petitioners contend that failure to supply the study work to confirm this assurance is evidence the necessary study work has not been undertaken and this assurance is misleading
Parliament. Furthermore, in keeping with Clause 11 of this petition, failure to supply this information will open up the Government to Punitive and exemplary damages.

71. Your petitioners object to the statement that HS2 Ltd in liaison with the Environment Agency considers all practicable measures to mitigate adverse impacts on surface water bodies and groundwater have been identified. The Environmental Audit Committee requested that HS2 Ltd remove the word practicable and therefore ask that the Environmental Agency be asked to confirm in writing that “all measures to mitigate adverse impacts on surface bodies and groundwater have been identified”. We request HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation with very best endeavours to comply and that this point be referred to the Environmental Audit Committee for consideration once the EA have responded.

72. Your petitioners note HS2 Ltd have sought to apply the Sequential Test of the NPPF which states: “The aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding”. We respectfully request that HS2 produce the study which confirms the alternative routes have a higher probability of flooding than the AONB route. We ask they provide written statement they have studied all water courses along the route and this route presents the best route with regard to flood plain avoidance and is better in that regard than the CDC/Bucks CC “green” route.

73. Your petitioners note the Exception Test within paragraph 102 of the NPPF. It states that for certain types of development, where the Sequential Test has been applied, for the Exception Test to be passed it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk. A site specific flood risk assessment “must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall”. Your petitioners ask for evidence of the “wider sustainability benefits” to any communities along the intermediate route of the line and therefore ask how HS2 Ltd complies with the exception test.

Traffic and Transport

74. Your petitioners are aware there are cases in Hyde Heath where the HS2 design or construction is affecting the marketability of homes and in doing so affecting the consequent mortgage valuation, despite being almost 4km from the tunnel head and work sites. HS2 Ltd should be compelled to cover the difference in costs or provide mortgage finance so that persons are not placed in an adverse financial position before they can settle any claim for compensation.
75. Your petitioners note the AONB route is one of the furthest routes from a major transport corridor such as a Motorway. We object to the statement the A413 is a major transport corridor and ask the committee to review the dangers posed by this statement. The old narrow roads which connect with the A413 throughout the AONB have high sided verge hedges presenting the most unique and dangerous set of conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. Your petitioners ask for traffic studies to record traffic levels on lanes around Hyde Heath (Keepers Lane, Chalk Lane, Pipers Wood (known as Weedon Hill by HS2 Ltd) which will all be used by traffic when the A413/B485 is congested with traffic avoiding work camps. These lanes will become dangerously overloaded with severe impacts to those who live adjacent the lanes and increased risks to cyclists and pedestrians in the village. The village has few pavements and no street lighting and our greatest concerns relate to dangers to safety of school children. We ask that the Health and Safety Executive be asked to review the work produced by HS2. This matter cannot be left to the construction stage or CoCP as mitigation is inappropriate as the factors are a direct result of suggesting the A413 is a “major transport corridor”.

76. Your petitioners note that HS2 Ltd have not adopted current best practice guidance published by DfT and TfL as regards cyclists following deaths in London as a consequence of Crossrail. We further note there has been no assessment of road cycling in the Chilterns despite it being a nationally recognised location for such activity. Your petitioners ask that current guidance is adopted and HS2 Ltd be asked to undertake Chiltern Wide study of risks to and impacts on road cyclists as a consequence of the construction of the scheme.

77. Your petitioners wish to record that HS2 Ltd have not taken account of accident or safety risks and has avoided commenting on the many accidents on the A413 where traffic joins from Chalk Lane, Keepers Lane or Pipers Wood (Weedon Hill) onto the dual carriageway. We record that HS2 Ltd failed to highlight the fatalities in the prior 2 years to the ES. All fatalities occurred because slow moving vehicles join with fast moving vehicles on this section and HS2 construction will exacerbate this issue. We ask the HSE assess whether there is a specific safety issue as a consequence of the decision to locate the Missenden Vent shaft in this area and the Board of HS2 Ltd accept full responsibility in the event fatalities occur as a consequence of this oversight.

78. Your petitioners state that assessment scope, key assumptions and limitations for the traffic and transport assessments are generic and incorrect and ask that the traffic assessment is reproduced using a rush hour reflecting this location.

79. Your petitioners ask that assessment of any impact on primary and secondary school bus services are included in the ES and HS2 Ltd accept a positive
undertaking to make their best endeavours to ensure no delays occur to this vital service.

80. Your petitioners note that HS2 Ltd have adopted ‘Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon’, published by the DFT in 2011 which promotes the greater prioritisation of walking, cycling and public transport for short local journeys, including travel to and from stations. We ask that Hs2 Ltd are placed under a positive obligation to use their best endeavours to meet this requirement in the CFA9.

**Noise**

81. Your petitioners ask that noise fence barriers are designed to be aesthetically in keeping with the natural key features of an AONB and that HS2 Ltd do not specify standard nor off the shelf designs. We ask that design of all permanent visible HS2 features within the AONB should be designed under a positive obligation to deliver their very best endeavours in mitigating the impact via aesthetically pleasing design in keeping with the natural beauty.

82. Your petitioners wish to reserve the right to introduce evidence with regards to the noise impacts, both during construction and operation. We ask that Hs2 Ltd provide funding and support for the purchase/hire of sound meters to be placed strategically around locations impacted and over the long term to correctly analyse the existing background noise and subsequent construction noise. Secondly we ask that HS2 Ltd be asked to give a statement to explain how they arrived at their calculations if they have no knowledge of train system or track system. Finally, we ask that HS2 Ltd release the sound analysis and follow up study work on HS1 as regards noise impacts to allow accurate comparison.

83. Your petitioners state that noise levels in this area are likely to drop over the long term as car technology improves but more importantly as the switch to zero emission electric vehicles occurs, such vehicles generating far less noise than conventional cars. Therefore, this area is likely to benefit greatly from a substantial reduction in car noise as a consequence of this emerging technology. We therefore ask that background noise at the horizon year factors in this change in technology and such a change is a continuing benefit to the area that will be denied to us by HS2.

84. Your petitioners ask that HS2 be placed under a positive obligation to ensure there is no night time tunnel work in CFA9.

85. Your petitioners note HS2 Ltd established the baseline noise claiming CF9 is not a “tranquil” location due to noise generated in the background from the A413. No calculation was made to isolate the highest noise contributor to the baseline or filter its changing effects over the course of 24hrs. Therefore, we ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to adopt the same logic and methodology when assessing permanent operational effects on residents. For example, if the
Environmental Concerns

86. Your petitioners ask that HS2 Ltd give an undertaking to ensure all displaced ancient woodland soils are fully trans-located to form the basis of the new woodland planting as promised by HS2 Ltd before the 2nd Reading in the Commons. We note that the Environmental Audit Committee made clear that Ancient Woodland cannot be bio-offset and if such an irreplaceable resource is to be lost then it should be as a very last option and if alternatives exist, regardless of cost, such alternatives must be taken.

87. We wish to record that HS2 Ltd have given the impression they have relocated the tunnel head of the Chilterns North Tunnel from Mantles Wood to West of South Heath, thus savings Mantles Wood. While such a relocation was a welcome decision by the Select Committee, we wish to record that HS2 still intend to destroy large parts of the ancient wood to facilitate borehole studies. We ask that the Committee ascertain if these isolated borehole studies are strictly necessary and whether it is critical work that is necessary to destroy large parts of an ancient wood for 1 borehole?

88. Your petitioners wish to record that insufficient effort has been made by HS2 Ltd to mitigate the wildlife impacts in CFA9. There are significant breeding populations of Barn Owls in this area. There is evidence of nationally important Bats roosting in the area. There are breeding Kites that have been unassessed and there is no methodology for dealing with Hazel Dormouse. There are nationally scarce species of Beetle and Fly present in Mantles Wood associated with decaying ancient Woodlands. There are nationally important and rare species of Wood Barley, Box and rare species of flower including wild pansy and Orchids recorded. There is no methodology provided that sufficiently addresses exactly how HS2 intend to mitigate or translocate these species.

89. We therefore ask that HS2 Ltd be placed under a positive obligation to use their best endeavours and draft mitigation documents with methodology on how they will conserve and enhance these species to the satisfaction of the local and national bodies that seek to protect them.

90. Your petitioners raise serious errors in the Bat assessments in CFA9. A young male species classified as of principal importance in England was detected but could not be radio-tagged. We ask that follow up Bat studies are undertaken supervised by Bat Conservation experts to ensure conservation of this rare creature.

91. Your petitioners ask that the Barn Owl Trust recommendation to mitigate death of all Barn Owls 1.5km either side of the line is adopted.
Hybrid Bill Powers

92. Your petitioners object to powers sought by the promoter through the Hybrid Bill process as they are too wide ranging. In constructing or maintaining any of the scheduled works, the nominated undertaker should accept an absolute undertaking not to deviate in any way from the Plans and Sections that accompany the hybrid Bill (the Parliamentary Plans). Such powers exceed that which is allowed under European EIA Directive, namely, the Final ES must be "Final" and any deviation or change in the route or any significant change in design or any new structures must be consulted upon as part of a Final ES to avoid any cumulative impacts. Clause 47 should be removed or amended significantly. It should have time limits and be narrowly drafted and specific to regeneration only and not "any land" as this would apply to greenbelt and AONB land. Specifically, the promoter and all others deriving benefits from this clause should be under a positive obligation to render any profits generated from the purchase and sale of such land back to the communities affected along the line to ensure balance is brought with regard to disproportionate impacts.

93. Your petitioners ask that the hybrid Bill does not dis-apply legislative provisions that preserve human remains and burial grounds are afforded all due dignity, care and respect. We wish to record that under the Burial Act 1857, burial grounds which have been consecrated according to the rites of the Church of England are subject to the jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop and ask that HS2 Ltd remain fully compliant with this legislation to avoid religious discrimination.

94. Your petitioners strongly object to HS2 Ltd asking for permission in the Hybrid Bill in IA13-26B to ignore the Railways Acts of 93/05 as regards HS2 commissioning to ensure they delay having to pay out compensation for persons affected during compensation. We respectfully ask that the committee does not allow HS2 Ltd this right.

Closing

95. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners. Your petitioners ask that they should be removed from the bill.

96. Your Petitioners also consider that when a change to the scheme in the Bill is justified on the merits, it is no answer for the Promoters to say that such changes should be resisted because it goes beyond what is provided for in the Bill. It is the Promoters, not those affected, who have chosen what to put in the Bill and, if they have specified or designed incorrectly, they should accept a correction, particularly on safety grounds. In addition, given that the Promoters have already indicated that future changes to the scheme will be necessary, it is clear the Final Environmental Statement is not intended to be "Final" but is a fluid document.
that is evolving and therefore further changes are anticipated by the promoter before issuing the “final” version.

97. Your Petitioner is concerned that the Environmental Minimum Requirements (EMRs) proposed by HS2 Ltd are incapable of being fulfilled or capped as the Promoter has not undertaken adequate work to substantiate. The promoter is wholly reliant on the term “reasonably practicable” when referring to the EMRs in that the Bill allows the promoter to deviate from “minimum” requirements on grounds of costs they determine is unreasonable. Therefore, given the promoter has failed to undertake intrusive ground investigation work, they are unable to confirm with accuracy the noise levels that the scheme will generate. Therefore, if the noise levels set out in the EMRs are unachievable due to additional structure and strengthening leading to higher noise levels, the promoter can seek to compensate persons affected if they deem the cost of meeting the EMRs is not reasonably practicable. This is evidence of arbitrary decision making by the promoter and consequently opens the government and taxpayer up to claims for punitive and exemplary damages which your petitioner will seek in the event the test of what is reasonably practicable is not removed from the Bill.

98. The Committee to make the Executive of the Environment Agency explicitly and personally accountable should any increased turbidity occur beyond that which is predicted by HS2 Ltd and therefore approved by the EA.

99. Your petitioner records that HS2 Ltd stated in 2012 that the cost of the AONB route would be £3bn cheaper than the M40 motorway route. This assessment was made with intrusive survey knowledge of ground conditions on the M40 route but no such information to inform the costs of the AONB route. In 2012 the budget for the scheme was set at £32bn......it is now £56bn. HS2 Ltd has publicly stated that much of the additional costs are a consequence of tunnelling and mitigation in the AONB route. Furthermore, given their original duty to have regard to conserve and enhance extends to less than half the route being in tunnel, we record that HS2 Ltd have stated further tunnelling would be “expensive for the taxpayer”. While your petitioner is sure this would be correct, it is the cost of undertaking construction via the AONB route vrs the M40 route and therefore clear and explicit evidence that the original arbitrary decision in 2012 is incorrect. As the 2012 decision was arbitrary without the decision of Parliament, it means as public servants they have misled Parliament and caused disproportionate impact with specific bias to residents suffering as a consequence of their error. Therefore, HS2 Ltd must be compelled to re-evaluate this original decision in light of the new information and in particular to undertake the intrusive ground study work to accurately inform a comparison. Failure to do so would give grounds to person in the AONB suffering acute stress and mental health issues as a consequence of the route, to claim punitive and exemplary damages from the Government for such an arbitrary decision.
100. That the promoters acknowledge the impact blight is creating with regard to re-mortgaging in the AONB. That in addition to the “need to sell” scheme a re-mortgaging scheme is put in place by HS2 Ltd. The terms of such a scheme should allow petitioners to take advantage of full unblighted values of their properties to arrive at the loan to value of their property and using this LTV, the promoter be compelled to advance the best market value loan and interest available to the petitioner at the full unblighted LTV rate. Failure to do so once again opens up the Government to punitive damages from persons unable to re-mortgage at the best market value rates as a direct consequence of the blight on their property affecting their Loan to Value.

101. Your petitioners consider there are significant failures by the promoter which cumulatively are leading to undue stress, health impact, financial impact, restrictions on human rights, restrictions and impacts on lifestyle which collectively are having impacts on family life. All of these impacts are the result of negligent and deliberate, arbitrary and erroneous decision making by the promoter. It is explicitly clear that this negligence is leading to disproportionate impacts as a consequence of specific bias. Collectively due to failures of the executive board of HS2 Ltd, it is evidently clear they have invited class action to sue the Government for Exemplary and Punitive damages for these impacts.

102. Respectfully, if the Lords do not recognise and remedy these significant issues, it leaves those affected to seek Judicial Review then class action for punitive damages. In both instances your petitioners are left with no option but to seek injunction against the schemes construction until both routes are exhausted. The resulting cost to the taxpayer would be prohibitively expensive not least in the case of the resulting delays to the scheme. This is not a route your petitioner wishes to undertake but if the Lords will not provide restitution for these impacts and address the inequality and unfair nature, what other route is available?

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he*, or someone representing him* in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Colin Spence

Declares that:

1. Your petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

   Your petitioner is the joint owner of the freehold property at Fortuna, 36 Lappetts Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0RA, which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

   This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located 550 metres from the portal cutting and 800 metres from the train exit/entrance at the portal as outlined under deposited plans Volume 2.1 Replacement sheet 2.25.

   Your petitioner lives in part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

   Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

   1. Your Petitioner will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner requests that the presently proposed fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the Chilterns AONB, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner and will reduce the impact on the AONB.

   2. Your Petitioner further requests that in assessing the alternatives of adopting the full tunnel proposals instead of the Promoter's current proposals for the AONB section of the line, the Promoter is instructed to commission and publish a fully independent cost analysis of such alternatives and to undertake and publish a full cost benefit analysis of the environmental impacts for such AONB section.

   3. The adverse effects of the Bill with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects are primarily caused by and associated with the works proposed from the
South Heath portal, empowered by Clauses 1 and 2 and Schedules 1 and 2 of the Bill and associated powers in the Bill (including the power of compulsory purchase). These include works 2/14 to 2/20 in Schedule 1 and are detailed primarily on Deposited Plans, Vol.2.1, Plan Replacement Sheets 2-24 to 2-28

4. In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB, which is the primary alteration to the Bill your Petitioner your requests that the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended to Leather address, most but not all, of your Petitioner’s concerns.

5. The fall back alternative to these solutions is numerous individual mitigations of the adverse impacts, all of which will cost time and money (over and above the mitigation presently proposed by the Promoter). Your Petitioner expands on the individual adverse impacts that concern it and to which it objects, and the (additional) mitigation that would be required for each, if its fully bored tunnel proposals are rejected, below.

6. Traffic Congestion: The disruption over eight years of access to and from Great Missenden for your petitioner travelling to the shops,, medical appointments and to the station arising from the major adverse effect that will occur with the large amount of construction traffic at the Link Road (A4128) and Frith Hill roundabouts. This major adverse effect will continue for your petitioner who needs to travel along the A413 to and from Wendover and Stoke Mandeville Hospital and Aylesbury. Your Petitioner is also concerned that avoidance of the congestion at the Link Road Roundabout will lead to rat-runs through Great Missenden and the hilltop villages especially along Kings Lane with its associated safety hazard.

Remedies:
1. An effective Traffic Management Plan to be approved by Bucks County Council with all costs of monitoring and enforcement to be borne by HS2 Ltd.
2. Reduce the amount of spoil that requires to be transported through the use of retained cuttings or a bored tunnel extension or reduce the road transportation of spoil by taking it all along the trace.
3. HS2 to work with Bucks County Council to facilitate traffic flow at the congestion points and consider slip roads, road widening etc.

7. Construction Haul Road: Your Petitioner is particularly concerned about the impact of construction traffic using the haul road from the South Heath portal onto the A413 at the Link Road roundabout, such as damage from HGVs (270 HGVs a day at the peak), noise and dust from vehicle cleaning operations and the high risk to users of the Skate Park, Tennis Courts and children’s play area adjacent to the roundabout and children going to the Great Missenden Combined Church of England school nearby.

Remedies:
1. The construction haul road should be relocated further north, distant from the larger settlements of Great Missenden and Prestwood, and beyond the Mobwell junction hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts. It would also lessen the impact and visual blight of the haul road on parishioners, visitors and businesses in Great Missenden. Traffic signals can be implemented on the junction with the A413 to control the flow of construction traffic.

---

1 HS2 Ltd had given Bucks CC in January 2016 an assurance that it would relocate this haul road but the conditions placed upon the County Council to achieve this were unrealistic
2. The amount of spoil requiring transport by road can be reduced by moving more spoil down the trace.

8. **Maintenance Access Road**: The permanent maintenance and access road - Work No 2/18C from the South Heath portal joins Frith Hill (SHL) at a bend on a narrow part of the road. This leads to your petitioner having concerns about road safety especially as the footway and road is used for walking and cycling to Great Missenden. Safety could be further exacerbated by temporary contractors using it to access the portal during construction. Furthermore there is concern for the safety of children at the Great Missenden Church of England Combined School using their Forest School Outdoor Learning Centre and their playing fields as they are adjacent to the Frith Hill roundabout.

**Remedies:**
1. Construction traffic should not use the maintenance access road off Frith Hill during construction.
2. Any temporary construction contractors should not park their white vans at the South Heath portal but at the main construction compound at Wendover and be bussed onto the site.
3. If the construction haul road is relocated as mentioned above, it could be retained so that access to Frith Hill (SHL) will no longer be required.

9. **Noise and Dust**: Your petitioner is concerned that there will be construction noise and dust (and operational noise) as a result of the deep, wide cuttings at the South Heath portal and the cuttings beyond towards Wendover. The dust and noise will be at its worst during the eight year construction period but thereafter some mitigation of the dust will be provided when plantings have matured but not the noise.

**Remedies:**
1. Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to be monitored and enforced by Bucks County Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd
2. A tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB, or at minimum to Leather Lane will obviate the need for deep, wide cuttings in the South Heath and Potter Row area.
3. Other remedies would be retained sides for the cutting and higher trackside noise barriers with barriers on the east side (as well as west) of the line towards Leather Lane.

10. **Dysfunctional Housing market**: Your Petitioner is 800 metres from the trains exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel and are the finding their house prices blighted. They are concerned that they are unable to sell in what has become a dysfunctional housing market. They feel that they are trapped for 10 or more years and find the ‘Need to Sell scheme’ (NTS) complex, slow and does not ensure unblighted house prices.

**Remedies:**
1. A further Chiltern tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns to the edge of the AONB or at least as far as Leather Lane would largely stabilize the dysfunctional market.
2. A compensation scheme that provides full current un-blighted house value to all residents when they wish to sell... A Right to Sell Scheme. The scheme is to be administered by a body independent of HS2 ltd, with a right to appeal. The NTS scheme needs to be made less complex, faster, more accessible, less onerous to prove qualification, friendly to the elderly and with more stringent rules to ensure reasonable un-blighted valuations.

11. **Operational Noise:** Your petitioners are close enough to the surface line to suffer operational noise at night close to the peak WHO target LOAEL of 60dBmax (23.00 - 24.00 and 06.30 to 07.30).

**Remedies:**
1. Your petitioner feels that not exceeding the peak LOAEL level of 60dBmax should be a mandatory requirement and not just an aim as outlined in Information Paper E20. Anticipated noise levels should be independently verified and based on evidence of the efficacy of alternative noise reduction methods.
2. Reasonably practicable measures to dissipate the noise should include having retained sides, or steeper slopes to the portal cutting and beyond; deeper cuttings; reducing the train speed; lengthening the porous portal; higher more absorbent noise barriers adjacent to the line to protect Potter Row; noise barriers both sides of the line and to the south of the portal to protect South Heath and Frith Hill properties and those using footpaths GMI/12 & 13.

12. **Health and Wellbeing:** Your Petitioner is concerned that their Health & Wellbeing has been adversely affected, and continue to be, since the announcement of HS2 in 2010. The undeniable result of HS2 is worry, anxiety and stress and, in some cases, clinical depression requiring medical treatment. A further worry is that emergency response times will deteriorate further during construction when ailments such as respiratory disorders will be at their maximum.

**Remedies:**
1. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern over high levels of dust and pollution, with independent monitoring and powers to halt construction until preventative measures are implemented and verified.
2. The provision of an air ambulance service is requested to complement emergency medical services which are already struggling.

13. **Business impact:** Businesses in the area will be specifically affected by a reduction in tourists and in customers footfall, including 12 small businesses in the hilltop villages and approximately 70 businesses in Great Missenden. In addition, delivery vehicles will be delayed by the congestions caused by construction traffic, for example deliveries, often by articulated lorry with a trailer from Europe, to the South Heath Garden Centre.

Tourism plays a significant part in local business, with visitors to the Roald Dahl Museum, local cycling groups using this area as a centre for the Chiltern Cycle way and the Chiltern Hundreds Cycle routes. There are 55 million visits a year to the AONB bringing in £471.6 million of expenditure associated with leisure visits to the Chilterns and sustaining an estimated 12,000 FTE jobs.

**Remedy:**
1. For businesses which are indirectly or only temporarily affected; compensation for loss of profit, loss of trade and the fees of any professional advisor appointed by the business.

2. A substantial reduction in business rates where applicable.

14. **Chilterns AONB:** The proposed line is above ground from the South Heath portal of the Chiltern tunnel for 9 kms to the edge of the Chilterns AONB just north of Wendover. It is in a cutting for approximately 3 kms and will be visible at the highest point of the line in the vicinity of Liberty Lane, notwithstanding the sight of the security fences and catenary masts above the cuttings which will be a major permanent eyesore along the length of Potter Row.

The proposed line from Liberty Lane descends to Wendover and crosses two large unsightly viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean in the Chilterns AONB before reaching a green tunnel running alongside Wendover.

Construction will last up to 8 years with a peak period of more than 3.5 years. HGV traffic, noise and dust will render the rural lanes and footpaths less attractive to all visitors to this area of the AONB whether they are ardent walkers/hikers, currently popular with those groups taking the Duke of Edinburgh Award, or cyclists as it is Route 57 on the National Cycle Network or just families coming for a day-out from London to enjoy the countryside.

Remedies (apart from a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB):

1. The AONB review body must ensure that the viaducts and embankments with enclosures to reduced noise are made as visually pleasing as possible. The design of the new permanent buildings erected by HS2 Ltd to be in-keeping with the surrounding area.

2. The vertical alignment of the track between the South Heath portal and Wendover should be lowered further, if it is not to be placed in a tunnel, to reduce the intrusion of the viaducts; to conceal catenary masts and gantries and reduce the height above the general ground surface of accommodation footbridges. The contractor should not be empowered to raise the line at all on the AONB section.

3. The need for spoil dumps should be minimised either by tunnelling or moving the spoil down the trace or by rail. This particularly applies to the spoil dump planned for Hunts Green farm and those by the construction compounds.

4. The Rights of Way are not to be closed for any length of time and any diversion not to be parallel to the track; furthermore diversions should be over green bridges and not accommodation bridges.

5. All overhead power lines adjacent to the route be buried.

6. Alternatives to Balancing Ponds be considered, and they should be made ecologically and visually attractive, in-keeping with AONB.

15. **Code of Construction Practice:** The Code is a draft; it is not specific about timing of works, or monitoring by the Local Authority and is subject to a sub contract with the nominated undertaker.

Remedies:
1. Daily movements of HGVs to be restricted to between 09.30 and 15.30 hrs and prohibited from using rural lanes.

2. Construction activities should be subject to strict noise limits and light emission limits from night security lighting (there is no street lighting near the construction compounds) and activities restricted to times that are unlikely to affect the sleep patterns of children and the elderly. Furthermore, the Local Authority should be funded to enforce monitoring and policing of the noise and light emission limits and activities, and work should stop if the limits are exceeded.

3. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern and for road users to report damage, also for an independent HS2 adjudicator to review issues, monitor progress with enforcement orders and facilitate claims.

16 Primary Mitigation
Accordingly, your Petitioner objects to the associated works and the clauses in the Bill that empower the works involved, and humbly requests your honourable House to modify the Bill, and/or require undertakings of the Promoter, to remove these adverse effects, primarily through a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least to Leather Lane.

17 Secondary Mitigation
In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the haul road from the South Heath portal to the Link Road roundabout be moved along the A413 beyond the Mobwell junction, as it will help to lessen the impact of the construction traffic on the Great Missenden Area.

18 Other Matters
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners, their rights, interests and property, and for which no adequate provision is made to protect them.

Conclusion
19 Your Petitioner supports the petitions for a longer fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that extends throughout the Chilterns AONB. Such tunnel extension is being petitioned by the local County, District and Parish Councils and the Chiltern Conservation Board and in the alternative a shorter extension to Leather Lane. If your honourable House alters the Bill to provide for such an extended tunnel most of your Petitioner's objections would be removed (your Petitioner's objection to unsuitable ancillary structures and to the present proposals for compensation would remain – albeit far fewer residents would be affected).

20 In the alternative to extending the fully bored Chiltern tunnel, your Petitioner seeks a significant secondary mitigation by relocating the haul road at the South Heath portal.

21 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully requests that unless the Bill is amended as proposed above or suitable undertakings obtained from the Promoter, the Bill, along with accompanying Schedules, so far affecting your Petitioner and your Petitioner's area, along with the wider AONB, be not allowed to pass into law.

6
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner’s, their rights, interests, property and your petitioner’s area and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the petitioner, or someone representing the petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Signed

Colin Spence
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mary Spence

Declares that:

1. Your petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

Your petitioner is the joint owner of the freehold property at Fortuna, 36 Lappetts Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0RA, which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located 550 metres from the portal cutting and 800 metres from the train exit/entrance at the portal as outlined under deposited plans Volume 2.1 Replacement sheet 2.25.

Your petitioner lives in part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

1. Your Petitioner will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner requests that the presently proposed fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the Chilterns AONB, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner and will reduce the impact on the AONB.

2. Your Petitioner further requests that in assessing the alternatives of adopting the full tunnel proposals instead of the Promoter’s current proposals for the AONB section of the line, the Promoter is instructed to commission and publish a fully independent cost analysis of such alternatives and to undertake and publish a full cost benefit analysis of the environmental impacts for such AONB section.

3. The adverse effects of the Bill with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects are primarily caused by and associated with the works proposed from the
South empowered and associated powers include works 2/14 to 2/20 in Schedule 1 and are detailed primarily on Deposited Plans, Vol.2.1, Plan Replacement Sheets 2-24 to 2-28

4. In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB, which is the primary alteration to the Bill your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended to Leather Lane, as it will address, most but not all, of your Petitioner's concerns.

5. The fall back alternative to these solutions is numerous individual mitigations of the adverse impacts, all of which will cost time and money (over and above the mitigation presently proposed by the Promoter). Your Petitioner expands on the individual adverse impacts that concern it and to which it objects, and the (additional) mitigation that would be required for each, if its fully bored tunnel proposals are rejected, below.

6. Traffic Congestion: The disruption over eight years of access to and from Great Missenden for your petitioner travelling to the shops, medical appointments and to the station arising from the major adverse effect that will occur with the large amount of construction traffic at the Link Road (A4128) and Frith Hill roundabouts. This major adverse effect will continue for your petitioner who needs to travel along the A413 to and from Wendover and Stoke Mandeville Hospital and Aylesbury. Your Petitioner is also concerned that avoidance of the congestion at the Link Road Roundabout will lead to rat-runs through Great Missenden and the hilltop villages especially along Kings Lane with its associated safety hazard.

Remedies:
1. An effective Traffic Management Plan to be approved by Bucks County Council with all costs of monitoring and enforcement to be borne by HS2 Ltd.
2. Reduce the amount of spoil that requires to be transported through the use of retained cuttings or a bored tunnel extension or reduce the road transportation of spoil by taking it all along the trace.
3. HS2 to work with Bucks County Council to facilitate traffic flow at the congestion points and consider slip roads, road widening etc

7. Construction Haul Road: Your Petitioner is particularly concerned about the impact of construction traffic using the haul road from the South Heath portal onto the A413 at the Link Road roundabout, such as damage from HGVs (270 HGVs a day at the peak), noise and dust from vehicle cleaning operations and the high risk to users of the Skate Park, Tennis Courts and children's play area adjacent to the roundabout and children going to the Great Missenden Combined Church of England school nearby.

Remedies:
1. The construction haul road should be relocated further north, distant from the larger settlements of Great Missenden and Prestwood, and beyond the Mobwell junction hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts. It would also lessen the impact and visual blight of the haul road on parishioners, visitors and businesses in Great Missenden. Traffic signals can be implemented on the junction with the A413 to control the flow of construction traffic.

---

1 HS2 Ltd had given Bucks CC in January 2016 an assurance that it would relocate this haul road but the conditions placed upon the County Council to achieve this were unrealistic
2. The amount of spoil requiring transport by road can be reduced by moving more spoil down the trace.

8. **Maintenance Access Road:** The permanent maintenance and access road - Work No 2/18C from the South Heath portal joins Frith Hill (SHL) at a bend on a narrow part of the road. This leads to your petitioner having concerns about road safety especially as the footway and road is used for walking and cycling to Great Missenden. Safety could be further exacerbated by temporary contractors using it to access the portal during construction. Furthermore there is concern for the safety of children at the Great Missenden Church of England Combined School using their Forest School Outdoor Learning Centre and their playing fields as they are adjacent to the Frith Hill roundabout.

Remedies:
1. Construction traffic should not use the maintenance access road off Frith Hill during construction.
2. Any temporary construction contractors should not park their white vans at the South Heath portal but at the main construction compound at Wendover and be bussed onto the site.
3. If the construction haul road is relocated as mentioned above, it could be retained so that access to Frith Hill (SHL) will no longer be required.

9. **Noise and Dust:** Your petitioner is concerned that there will be construction noise and dust (and operational noise) as a result of the deep, wide cuttings at the South Heath portal and the cuttings beyond towards Wendover. The dust and noise will be at its worst during the eight year construction period but thereafter some mitigation of the dust will be provided when plantings have matured but not the noise.

Remedies:
1. Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to be monitored and enforced by Bucks County Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd.
2. A tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB, or at minimum to Leather Lane will obviate the need for deep, wide cuttings in the South Heath and Potter Row area.
3. Other remedies would be retained sides for the cutting and higher trackside noise barriers with barriers on the east side (as well as west) of the line towards Leather Lane.

10. **Dysfunctional Housing market:** Your Petitioner is 800 metres from the trains exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel and are the finding their house prices blighted. They are concerned that they are unable to sell in what has become a dysfunctional housing market. They feel that they are trapped for 10 or more years and find the ‘Need to Sell scheme’ (NTS) complex, slow and does not ensure unblighted house prices.

Remedies:
1. A further Chiltern tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns to the edge of the AONB or at least as far as Leather Lane would largely stabilize the dysfunctional market.
2. A compensation scheme that provides full current un-blighted house value to all residents when they wish to sell.... A Right to Sell Scheme. The scheme is to be administered by a body independent of HS2 ltd, with a right to appeal. The NTS scheme needs to be made less complex, faster, more accessible, less onerous to prove qualification, friendly to the elderly and with more stringent rules to ensure reasonable un-blighted valuations.

11. **Operational Noise:** Your petitioners are close enough to the surface line to suffer operational noise at night close to the peak WHO target LOAEL of 60dBmax (23.00 – 24.00 and 06.30 to 07.30)

Remedies:
1. Your petitioner feels that not exceeding the peak LOAEL level of 60dBmax should be a mandatory requirement and not just an aim as outlined in Information Paper E20. Anticipated noise levels should be independently verified and based on evidence of the efficacy of alternative noise reduction methods.
2. Reasonably practicable measures to dissipate the noise should include having retained sides, or steeper slopes to the portal cutting and beyond; deeper cuttings; reducing the train speed; lengthening the porous portal; higher more absorbent noise barriers adjacent to the line to protect Potter Row; noise barriers both sides of the line and to the south of the portal to protect South Heath and Frith Hill properties and those using footpaths GMI/12 & 13.

12. **Health and Wellbeing:** Your Petitioner is concerned that their Health & Wellbeing has been adversely affected, and continue to be, since the announcement of HS2 in 2010. The undeniable result of HS2 is worry, anxiety and stress and, in some cases, clinical depression requiring medical treatment. A further worry is that emergency response times will deteriorate further during construction when ailments such as respiratory disorders will be at their maximum.

Remedies:
1. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern over high levels of dust and pollution, with independent monitoring and powers to halt construction until preventative measures are implemented and verified.
2. The provision of an air ambulance service is requested to complement emergency medical services which are already struggling.

13. **Business impact:** Businesses in the area will be specifically affected by a reduction in tourists and in customers footfall, including 12 small businesses in the hilltop villages and approximately 70 businesses in Great Missenden. In addition, delivery vehicles will be delayed by the congestions caused by construction traffic, for example deliveries, often by articulated lorry with a trailer from Europe, to the South Heath Garden Centre.

Tourism plays a significant part in local business, with visitors to the Roald Dahl Museum, local cycling groups using this area as a centre for the Chiltern Cycle way and the Chiltern Hundreds Cycle routes. There are 55 million visits a year to the AONB bringing in £471.6 million of expenditure associated with leisure visits to the Chilterns and sustaining an estimated 12,000 FTE jobs.

Remedy:
1. For businesses which are indirectly or only temporarily affected; compensation for loss of profit, loss of trade and the fees of any professional advisor appointed by the business.

2. A substantial reduction in business rates where applicable.

14. **Chilterns AONB:** The proposed line is above ground from the South Heath portal of the Chiltern tunnel for 9 kms to the edge of the Chilterns AONB just north of Wendover. It is in a cutting for approximately 3 kms and will be visible at the highest point of the line in the vicinity of Liberty Lane, notwithstanding the sight of the security fences and catenary masts above the cuttings which will be a major permanent eyesore along the length of Potter Row.

The proposed line from Liberty Lane descends to Wendover and crosses two large unsightly viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean in the Chilterns AONB before reaching a green tunnel running alongside Wendover.

Construction will last up to 8 years with a peak period of more than 3.5 years. HGV traffic, noise and dust will render the rural lanes and footpaths less attractive to all visitors to this area of the AONB whether they are ardent walkers/hikers, currently popular with those groups taking the Duke of Edinburgh Award, or cyclists as it is Route 57 on the National Cycle Network or just families coming for a day-out from London to enjoy the countryside.

Remedies (apart from a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB):

1. The AONB review body must ensure that the viaducts and embankments with enclosures to reduced noise are made as visually pleasing as possible. The design of the new permanent buildings erected by HS2 Ltd to be in-keeping with the surrounding area.

2. The vertical alignment of the track between the South Heath portal and Wendover should be lowered further, if it is not to be placed in a tunnel, to reduce the intrusion of the viaducts; to conceal catenary masts and gantries and reduce the height above the general ground surface of accommodation footbridges. The contractor should not be empowered to raise the line at all on the AONB section.

3. The need for spoil dumps should be minimised either by tunnelling or moving the spoil down the trace or by rail. This particularly applies to the spoil dump planned for Hunts Green farm and those by the construction compounds.

4. The Rights of Way are not to be closed for any length of time and any diversion not to be parallel to the track; furthermore diversions should be over green bridges and not accommodation bridges.

5. All overhead power lines adjacent to the route be buried.

6. Alternatives to Balancing Ponds be considered, and they should be made ecologically and visually attractive, in-keeping with AONB.

15. **Code of Construction Practice:** The Code is a draft; it is not specific about timing of works, or monitoring by the Local Authority and is subject to a sub contract with the nominated undertaker.

Remedies:
1. Daily movements of HGVs to be restricted to between 09.30 and 15.30 hrs and prohibited from using rural lanes.

2. Construction activities should be subject to strict noise limits and light emission limits from night security lighting (there is no street lighting near the construction compounds) and activities restricted to times that are unlikely to affect the sleep patterns of children and the elderly. Furthermore, the Local Authority should be funded to enforce monitoring and policing of the noise and light emission limits and activities, and work should stop if the limits are exceeded.

3. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern and for road users to report damage, also for an independent HS2 adjudicator to review issues, monitor progress with enforcement orders and facilitate claims.

16 **Primary Mitigation**
Accordingly, your Petitioner objects to the associated works and the clauses in the Bill that empower the works involved, and humbly requests your honourable House to modify the Bill, and/or require undertakings of the Promoter, to remove these adverse effects, primarily through a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least to Leather Lane.

17 **Secondary Mitigation**
In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the haul road from the South Heath portal to the Link Road roundabout be moved along the A413 beyond the Mobwell junction, as it will help to lessen the impact of the construction traffic on the Great Missenden Area.

18 **Other Matters**
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners, their rights, interests and property, and for which no adequate provision is made to protect them.

**Conclusion**

19 Your Petitioner supports the petitions for a longer fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that extends throughout the Chilterns AONB. Such tunnel extension is being petitioned by the local County, District and Parish Councils and the Chiltern Conservation Board and in the alternative a shorter extension to Leather Lane. If your honourable House alters the Bill to provide for such an extended tunnel most of your Petitioner’s objections would be removed (your Petitioner’s objection to unsuitable ancillary structures and to the present proposals for compensation would remain - albeit far fewer residents would be affected).

20 In the alternative to extending the fully bored Chiltern tunnel, your Petitioner seeks a significant secondary mitigation by relocating the haul road at the South Heath portal.

21 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully requests that unless the Bill is amended as proposed above or suitable undertakings obtained from the Promoter, the Bill, along with accompanying Schedules, so far affecting your Petitioner and your Petitioner’s area, along with the wider AONB, be not allowed to pass into law.
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner's, their rights, interests, property and your petitioner's area and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the petitioner, or someone representing the petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Signed

Mary A Spence
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Anthony O’Connor

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is Anthony O’Connor, the freeholder of the property Anworth, Frith Hill, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP169QF which is wholly within a protected AONB.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioner living at his property in a protected AONB will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects caused directly by the Bill and your Petitioner requests that the presently proposed fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the AONB, in accordance with proposals such as the Tunnel Bored One Way from the South and CRAG’s T3i already assessed by the Promoter. This will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects and the concerns of your Petitioner and will reduce the impact on and protect the AONB.

The HS2 House of Commons Select Committee has already extended the Chiltern Tunnel by 2.6 kms, specifically to protect the majority of the AONB and the communities within it, but I do not understand why it is in the public/national interest to leave the remaining 8 kms unprotected. Therefore the Petitioner requests further mitigation.

a) Operational noise.

Your petitioner is particularly concerned about the operational noise that will be heard at my property only 200 metres from the Chiltern Tunnel North Portal. South Heath is a tranquil rural hill-top Chiltern hamlet with current noises levels recorded at 50dB/40dB (day time and night time). HS2 Ltd continues to mislead and then trivialise the impact of the noise at our location by the use of average noise level contour maps. The continued use of these misleading average noise contour maps enables HS2 Ltd to falsely claim that there will be no operational noise affecting residents on Frith Hill. On further investigation the actual meaningful data on noise can be found in their predicted maximum noise levels expected to result from each individual HS2 train pass. These maximum noise levels are conservatively predicted by HS2 Ltd to be 65+dB at our location on Frith Hill, (receptor 374849) which is 3 times louder than
current day time background noise levels and 5 times louder than current background night time levels. I will experience these maximum noise levels from 5am in the morning and they will continue until 11pm at night, with a frequency of one maximum noise event every 100 seconds for at least 14+ hours per day, every day. HS2 Ltd seeks to trivialise the significant damage this will have on our lives by stating in an email to me dated 22nd October 2015: 'Frith Hill: With respect to day-time and night-time LAeqs properties are unlikely to experience adverse operational noise effects. With respect to properties represented by ......., 374849 and ....... although LAMax predicted levels are above the 60 dB threshold, being up to 67 dB for HS2 trains, they are the same or below the existing highest 5 min LAMax figures'.

So HS2 Ltd confirms that the maximum noise levels will be above the WHO threshold of 60dB at 65+dB. HS2 Ltd then deliberately distorts these data by stating that these maximum levels are the same as those we are already experiencing. We do not currently experience the noise of High Speed train passes at 65+dB every 100 seconds for 14+ hours per day, every day just 200 metres from our home.

What HS2 Ltd are shamelessly attempting to do is analogous to a doctor stating, 'You are going to have a pin stuck into your hand every 100 seconds every hour, for 14+ hours a day, every day for the rest of your life but don’t worry as you have experienced an injection before, it won’t be any different'. The HS2 Ltd operational noise claims are blatantly intended to deceive, I am not misled and I do not expect anyone who is judging the merits of their misleading claims against the valid concerns of affected local residents will be misled either.

Remedy: Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least extend the Chiltern Tunnel to Leather Lane. Failing that HS2 Ltd to provide independently verified factually based evidence of noise reduction for the alternatives offered. Undertake to implement the more effective alternative. Undertake to provide additional remedial noise suppression, if the barriers fail to comply with WHO standards once HS2 is operational.

b) Traffic, impact on daily life for 7+ years.

Your petitioner is very concerned about the effect of the new temporary construction route, (the exact location of which is still undecided) and the number of additional HGVs and other vehicles entering and leaving the Link Road/A413 roundabout. As has been acknowledged by HS2 Ltd, this roundabout and other associated roundabouts are already at capacity at peak times. As there are no longer any facilities in South Heath, we must travel to other villages for our everyday requirements. Every journey to/from Great Missenden, Amersham, Chesham and Aylesbury over the next 7+ years will be disrupted, which is over 10,000 journeys. To have this categorised as 'a major adverse effect' but with no suggested remedy is totally unacceptable. Indeed at the recent HS2 information event held in Ballinger Hall on 16th October 2015 HS2 personnel commented: "The number of HGV and other HS2 vehicles coming onto the A413 is a major issue, particularly at peak times when the junctions are already at capacity. We are still working on that with Bucks County Council and may have to amend our plans for the projected number of HGV trips per day. We may have to extend the period over which the HGVs operate or temporarily store more waste material at the Hunts Green site'.
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Remedy: A fully developed and approved Traffic Management Plan. The plan should be approved by BCC with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd.

c) Construction noise.

Your petitioner is very concerned about the construction noise and the impact it will have on us and all South Heath residents. **Our property is only 200 metres from the Portal**, HS2 Ltd have produced projected construction noise level data (receptor: 374849) that suggests we will experience no construction noise above current background noise levels.

Construction includes:

A new permanent 400+ metre long access road will be built from Frith Hill to the Portal.

A new temporary construction road approx. 1km long will be built 200 metres from our home down to the A413 and used by hundreds of HGVs and other vehicles every day.

A construction compound measuring 700 metres by 175 metres (1.225 Km$^2$) will be created 200 metres from our property.

The TBM will emerge 200 metres from our property to be disassembled in this area and then transported away.

A deeper and wider cutting at 17 metres deep and approx. 150 metres wide for approx. 3kms will be dug.

However despite all of the above construction activity HS2 Ltd have claimed in an email to me dated 22nd October 2015, 'There are no adverse construction noise effects predicted at properties along Potter Row, Frith Hill and Wood Lane, or anywhere in South Heath'.

The reason this is not credible is as follows: each year the week-long 'LightHouse' event is held on BuryField in Great Missenden, which is over a mile away. During this event we can clearly hear the music being played and the announcements made by loudhailer/megaphone. If we can clearly hear sounds over a mile away but HS2 Ltd claim we will be unable to hear any of the noise caused by 7+ years of the construction activities outlined above just 200 metres away, then this is clearly not credible. It is misleading for HS2 Ltd to continue to suggest that we will hear no construction noise, however by continually denying that there will be a problem HS2 Ltd are never challenged to remedy a problem, as it apparently doesn’t exist. The HS2 Ltd construction noise claims are blatantly intended to deceive, I am not misled and I do not expect anyone who is judging the merits of their misleading claims against the valid concerns of affected local residents will be misled either.

Remedy: Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB or at the very least an extension to Leather lane.

d) Property blight since 2010 and continuing until at least 2026.

Property blight in South Heath, as one of the most significantly affected communities on the entire proposed route of HS2, has been well documented (PWC report for HS2 March 2104). At 200 metres from the Portal our property has suffered and will continue
to suffer from an approx. 28% loss in value. The previous extremely restrictive EHC and its replacement scheme requiring compelling reasons to sell, including accepting offers 15% less than the market valuation, were not/are still not fit for purpose. As I am now retired if I wanted to sell our house to move to be nearer our children/downsize to release equity in the next 10+ years, we will be unable to do so without incurring significant financial loss.

How is this reasonable or acceptable when the Government/Philip Hammond said on 20th December 2010 in The House of Commons; “Where a project which is in the national interest imposes significant financial loss on individuals, I believe it is right and proper that they should be compensated fairly for that loss. He went on to say “it is right and proper that individuals who suffer serious financial loss in the national interest should be compensated”.

**Remedy:** Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least as far as Leather Lane. An objective, non-means tested compensation scheme that provides full unblighted house value (based on 2007, with house price inflation) to all residents when they wish to sell. The scheme should be administered by an independent body (not HS2 Ltd).

4. **The prayer**

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Anthony O’Connor

10th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Sarah Jane O’Connor  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner is Sarah Jane O’Connor, the freeholder of the property Anworth, Frith Hill, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP169QF which is wholly within a protected AONB.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

Your Petitioner and your Petitioner’s area will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner requests that the presently proposed fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the AONB, in accordance with proposals such as the Tunnel Bored One Way from the South and CRAG’s T3i already assessed by the Promoter. This will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner and will reduce the impact on the AONB. Failing which, the Petitioner requests further mitigation.  

The adverse effects with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects are:  

- Traffic, impact on daily life for 7+ years.  

Your petitioner is very concerned about the effect of the new temporary construction route and the number of additional HGVs and other vehicles entering and leaving the Link Road/A413 roundabout. As has been acknowledged by HS2 Ltd, this roundabout and other associated roundabouts are already at capacity at peak times. As there are no longer any facilities in South Heath, we must travel to other villages for our everyday requirements. Every journey to/from Great Missenden, Amersham, Chesham, Aylesbury over the next 7+ years will be disrupted, which is over 10,000 journeys. To have this categorised as ‘a major adverse effect’ but with no suggested remedy is totally unacceptable.
**Remedy:** A fully developed and approved Traffic Management Plan. The plan to be approved by BCC before the Select Committee stops sitting. All costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd.

- **Construction noise, dust.**

Your petitioner is very concerned about construction noise, dust and other air borne pollution on South Heath residents. **Our property is only 200 metres from the Portal,** HS2 Ltd have produced projected construction noise level data (receptor: 374849) that suggests we will **experience no construction noise above current background noise levels.** A new permanent 400+ metre long access road will be built from Frith Hill to the Portal. A new temporary construction road approx. 1km long will be built down to the A413 roundabout and used by hundreds of HGVs and other vehicle movements per day. A construction compound measuring 700 metres by 175 metres will be created 200 metres from our property. The TBM will emerge 200 metres from our property to be disassembled in this area and then transported away. A deeper cutting at 17 metres deep and wider approx. 150 metres wide for approx. 3kms will be dug. It is misleading for HS2 Ltd to continue to suggest that we will hear no construction noise, it is not credible.

Dust from digging a cutting through chalk, which is 17 metres deep and 150 metres wide, will generate significant amounts of dust. Chalk dust when wet will form a dirty film on every surface it comes into contact with. Dry chalk dust will pollute the air and will settle on every surface it comes into contact with to form a fine dry powder. HS2 Ltd seek to down play the significance of this issue by dismissing it as covered by Codes Of Practice, which they try their best to adhere to where practical.

**Remedy:** Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB. High-level dust and pollution suppression during construction with independent monitoring and powers to halt construction until preventative measures are implemented and verified.

- **Operational noise.**

Your petitioner is particularly concerned by the operational noise that will affect her at 200 metres from the Portal. HS2 Ltd continually seeks to mislead with the publication of average dB noise contour maps. The concern I have is not the average noise levels but the maximum decibel noise which HS2 Ltd estimate to be 66dB from a train pass every 100 seconds. The background noise on Frith Hill is noted as 50dB daytime and 40dB night time. The HS2 train pass every 100 seconds will be at least 3 times louder than the current background daytime noise levels and 4 to 5 times louder than current night time levels. HS2 Ltd seeks to further mislead by stating that these max. noise levels are consistent with current max levels, as measured in a 5 minute period and therefore it will not be different to what we already experience. This blatant distortion to deny the real impact of the operational noise of HS2 results in HS2 Ltd claiming that there will be minimal impact on us, the reality will be very different. We will be subjected to 65+dB HS2 train passes every 100 seconds of every hour for 14+ hours a day every day we remain in our house. It is not acceptable that HS2 Ltd seeks to deliberately mislead and deny this very real issue.
Remedy: Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB.

An acceptable alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB, which is the primary alteration to the Bill your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended to Leather Lane, as it will address, most but not all, of the above concerns.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Sarah Jane O’Connor

10th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF CHETWODE PAROCHIAL CHURCH COUNCIL  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-3, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.  

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioners are the members of the Parochial Church Council (PCC) of the parish of Chetwode in Buckinghamshire. The members of the Parochial Church Council are elected annually by those on the Church Electoral Roll. The members are all volunteers and their duties are defined by two Acts of Parliament. The Parochial Church Council is responsible for fundraising, the financial affairs of the church and the care and maintenance of the church fabric and its contents. Chetwode Parochial Church Council (the “petitioner”) is petitioning on behalf of the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode (the “Property”). This Property and associated Conservation Area will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill. The Property is identified in the Environmental Statement that accompanies the Bill (“the ES”) as being permanently affected by the operation of Phase One of HS2. Your petitioner met with High Speed 2 Limited and officers of the Church about the proposals in the Bill in April 2013, indicating that the promoter of the Bill is of the view that your Petitioners will be specially and directly affected by the Bill. According to the Environmental Statement, your petitioners’ property lies within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility with respect to the construction phase of the railway and is 60 metres from the construction zone.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

As discussed with the Promoters, your petitioner favours a cut and cover (“Green”) tunnel banked and landscaped over the top, starting to the south of the village of Chetwode and continuing through the high ground past Manthorne Farm, the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode village and School End to avoid the many injurious effects in the Parish of Chetwode. Your petitioner understands that the residents and parishioners of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their District and County Councils in petitioning for such a change to the construction of the scheme, and would respectfully point out that a tunnel on the alignment proposed by the Promoter would relieve many of the injuries to residents of Chetwode, the Conservation Area, the Grade I listed Church and the local environment identified in the Environmental Statement. Accordingly, your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that
the railway, will be placed in a cut and cover tunnel to minimise the local environmental impact, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and Sections will be amended accordingly.

Your petitioner is very concerned at the depopulation of the Parish of Chetwode, which has started already due to the blight from HS2. Many worshippers and Church officers have confirmed they will vacate their homes and leave the village, drastically reducing the size of the congregation and the source of funds on which the Church of England depends for its ministry and for the upkeep of the Grade I listed parish Church. Fundraising is a fundamental responsibility of the Parochial Church Council and the loss of members of the Parochial Church Council and reduction in congregation inevitably results in a consequential crippling reduction in income. If this reduction in members means that those remaining are no longer sufficiently numerous and invested in the future of the Church, then the Church cannot continue to exist as a community organisation caring for its members and preserving its place of worship. The closure of the Church then becomes a necessity. Chetwode Parish is a thriving community and closure has not been a possibility that the Chetwode Parochial Church Council has ever had to face until now, but it is a very real possibility and would leave an historic building of significant national importance essentially abandoned. Your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that a substantial endowment will be provided to produce the alternative revenue to continue to maintain the Church building as a monument in perpetuity.

Alternatively, a cut and cover tunnel would save the village and the Church and would also save the money that it will cost the Promoter to buy the properties and compensate appropriately in the existing situation.

The Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Nicholas in Chetwode is a Grade I building of great national significance with extremely fragile leaded windows containing some of the oldest in situ stained glass in the world, including an early 13th Century depiction of the “three lions” that are now in the arms of England. Your petitioner proposes that the Promoter should pay for an independent and suitably qualified historic buildings expert to survey the building and make recommendations for any further mitigation or repair that may be necessary. Similar reports must be commissioned from specialist stained glass and wall painting experts. The cost of implementing any recommendations from the independent experts must be born by the Promoter who must also establish a long term locally held fund to pay for any future repair work necessitated by the use of the line.

The Environmental Statement predicts that the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas will have its setting permanently changed by the movement of trains and the associated increase in noise. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the impacts to this unique historic asset and its setting, in order to safeguard it for future generations.

Your petitioner has set out in the preceding paragraphs just some of the harms that would befall residents, land owners, businesses, visitors, and the environment were the scheme to be constructed as proposed currently by the Promoter. These harms would be alleviated by constructing the entire section as a cut-and-cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top to prevent the requirement of lowering the route.
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Rupert Sweeting, Churchwarden
On behalf of Chetwode Parochial Church Council

04/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF George Samuel Gulliver

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-3, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is a resident of Prestom Bissett and lives at Casemore Farm, Preston Bissett, Nr Buckingham ("your petitioner's property"). The proposed route for HS2 runs through the middle of Casemore Farm and onto the village of Chetwode. Your petitioner's property and Farming Businesses are accessed by roads that will be used during construction. Your petitioner uses the The Green and School End daily when commuting to and from work and to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. The Green is scheduled to be diverted during construction. School End and the School End Overbridge are scheduled to be diverted and to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner also regularly uses the footpaths through Chetwode that will be diverted under the scheme. Your petitioner is likely to suffer inconvenience from the closure and diversion of roads and footpaths, and from the additional and diverted traffic on the routes that remain open when conducting his day to day farming business from Casemore Farm to Manthorne Farm.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Your petitioner favours a cut and cover ("Green") tunnel banked and landscaped over the top, starting to the south of the village of Chetwode and continuing through the high ground past Manthorne Farm, the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode village and School End to avoid the many injurious effects in the parish of Chetwode.

The residents of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their local MP, the Church of England, Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council in petitioning for such a change to the construction of the scheme, and would respectfully point out that a tunnel on the alignment proposed by the Promoter would relieve many of the injuries to residents of Chetwode, the Conservation Area, the Grade I listed Church and the local environment identified in the Environmental Statement. Accordingly, your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the railway will be placed in a cut and cover tunnel to minimise the local environmental impact, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and Sections will be amended accordingly.
The proposed railway will pose a major severance issue for wildlife due to the long stretch of cutting, but also due to the security fencing that will be installed along most of the planned route. The Chetwode cut and cover Tunnel proposed by your petitioner would provide some relief to this by allowing the migration of local resident species.

Chetwode is a very tranquil parish. High noise levels from the operation of HS2 are predicted for a high percentage of residential properties in Chetwode and the agricultural operations at Manthirne Farm after the mitigation currently proposed by the Promoter. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the noise impacts. Chetwode is predicted to experience in-combination effects of significant visual and noise effects which, it is stated in the Environmental Statement, would have a major adverse effect. Current proposed mitigation of earthworks and noise barriers where the HS2 line passes Casemore Farm along just one side of the track are not sufficient. Also The Promoter should undertake further mitigation in the form of a cut and cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top at Chetwode. A cut and cover tunnel would be consistent with numerous Government statements of intent to minimize impact on communities and the environment.

The Environmental Statement predicts that the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Nicholas in Chetwode will have its setting permanently changed by the movement of trains and the associated increase in noise. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the impacts to the Church and its setting. Without more effective mitigation for both the Church and its officers, a substantial endowment will be needed to safeguard the future of this internationally important Church.

Your petitioner is concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on the single track country lanes currently proposed as a construction route. These lanes are not suitable for HGVs and are popular with dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There are no passing places and it is unsafe to take large amounts of construction traffic past the homes at School End where children live and play. Your petitioner constantly uses these roads during his Farming Business and therefore will be directly affected by these issues. Your petitioner requests that School End is not used by HGVs at any time in order to decrease the negative impacts of construction. Your petitioners suggest that an alternative temporary construction route for HGVs is created along the trace of HS2. During construction, the nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the roads in Chetwode and Preston Bissett parish, and after construction, the roads must be returned to their original size and character (no road widening, curb stones or urbanization of this rural parish), and all damage must be repaired by the nominated undertaker.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed new Overbridges carrying public roads over HS2 at The Green and School End, which will be clearly visible from rights of way and residential properties in Chetwode, and which introduce new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Plus the noise of the trains could be a hazard for people riding or leading horses across the proposed Overbridges, due to the high sound level and its rapid onset. Your petitioner requests that, in order to minimise the impact of the proposal, the design of the scheme should be produced with meaningful consultation with the local community, to fit in with the surrounding environment and character of the area, using materials that mirror local buildings and materials. Additional screening must also be put in place and this must be maintained to a high standard.

Your petitioner has set out in the preceding paragraphs just some of the harms that would befall residents, land owners, businesses, visitors, and the environment were the
scheme to be constructed as proposed currently by the Promoter. These harms would be alleviated by constructing the entire section as a cut-and-cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top to prevent the requirement of lowering the route.

There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc

George Samuel Gulliver

09/04/16

04/04/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Barbara Clare  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-3, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.  

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner is a resident of Chetwode and lives at The Old Vicarage, Chetwode, Buckingham, BUCKS, MK18 4JZ ("your petitioner's property"). The proposed route for HS2 runs through the middle of Chetwode. Your petitioner's property is accessed by roads that will be used during construction. Your petitioner uses the The Green and School End daily when commuting to and from work and to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. The Green is scheduled to be diverted during construction. School End and the School End Overbridge are scheduled to be diverted and to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner also regularly uses the footpaths through Chetwode that will be diverted under the scheme. Your petitioner is likely to suffer inconvenience from the closure and diversion of roads and footpaths, and from the additional and diverted traffic on the routes that remain open.  

3. Your petitioner's concerns  

Your petitioner favours a cut and cover ("Green") tunnel banked and landscaped over the top, starting to the south of the village of Chetwode and continuing through the high ground past Manthorne Farm, the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode village and School End to avoid the many injurious effects in the parish of Chetwode. The residents of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their local MP, the Church of England, Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council in petitioning for such a change to the construction of the scheme, and would respectfully point out that a tunnel on the alignment proposed by the Promoter would relieve many of the injuries to residents of Chetwode, the Conservation Area, the Grade I listed Church and the local environment identified in the Environmental Statement. Accordingly, your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the railway will be placed in a cut and cover tunnel to minimise the local environmental impact, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and Sections will be amended accordingly.  

The proposed railway will pose a major severance issue for wildlife due to the long stretch of cutting, but also due to the security fencing that will be installed along most of
the planned route. The Chetwode cut and cover Tunnel proposed by your petitioner would provide some relief to this by allowing the migration of local resident species.

Chetwode is a very tranquil parish. High noise levels from the operation of HS2 are predicted for a high percentage of residential properties in Chetwode after the mitigation currently proposed by the Promoter. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the noise impacts. Chetwode is predicted to experience in-combination effects of significant visual and noise effects which, it is stated in the Environmental Statement, would have a major adverse effect. Current proposed mitigation of earthworks and noise barriers along just one side of the track is not sufficient. The Promoter should undertake further mitigation in the form of a cut and cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top. A cut and cover tunnel would be consistent with numerous Government statements of intent to minimize impact on communities and the environment.

The Environmental Statement predicts that the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Nicholas in Chetwode will have its setting permanently changed by the movement of trains and the associated increase in noise. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the impacts to the Church and its setting. Without more effective mitigation for both the Church and its officers, a substantial endowment will be needed to safeguard the future of this internationally important Church.

Your petitioner is concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on the single track country lanes currently proposed as a construction route. These lanes are not suitable for HGVs and are popular with dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There are no passing places and it is unsafe to take large amounts of construction traffic past the homes at School End where children live and play. Your petitioner regularly uses these roads and therefore will be directly affected by these issues. Your petitioner requests that School End is not used by HGVs at any time in order to decrease the negative impacts of construction. Your petitioners suggest that an alternative temporary construction route for HGVs is created along the trace of HS2. During construction, the nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the roads in Chetwode parish, and after construction, the roads must be returned to their original size and character (no road widening, curb stones or urbanization of this rural parish), and all damage must be repaired by the nominated undertaker.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed new Overbridges carrying public roads over HS2 at The Green and School End, which will be clearly visible from rights of way and residential properties in Chetwode, and which introduce new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Plus the noise of the trains could be a hazard for people riding or leading horses across the proposed Overbridges, due to the high sound level and its rapid onset. Your petitioner requests that, in order to minimise the impact of the proposal, the design of the scheme should be produced with meaningful consultation with the local community, to fit in with the surrounding environment and character of the area, using materials that mirror local buildings and materials. Additional screening must also be put in place and this must be maintained to a high standard.

Your petitioner has set out in the preceding paragraphs just some of the harms that would befall residents, land owners, businesses, visitors, and the environment were the scheme to be constructed as proposed currently by the Promoter. These harms would be alleviated by constructing the entire section as a cut-and-cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top to prevent the requirement of lowering the route.
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

*each petitioner (or his Agent) MUST sign the petition here*

Barbara Clare

04/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Poppy Clare

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-3, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is a resident of Chetwode and lives at The Old Vicarage, Chetwode, Buckingham, BUCKS, MK18 4JZ ("your petitioner’s property"). The proposed route for HS2 runs through the middle of Chetwode. Your petitioner’s property is accessed by roads that will be used during construction. Your petitioner uses the The Green and School End daily when commuting to and from work and to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. The Green is scheduled to be diverted during construction. School End and the School End Overbridge are scheduled to be diverted and to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner also regularly uses the footpaths through Chetwode that will be diverted under the scheme. Your petitioner is likely to suffer inconvenience from the closure and diversion of roads and footpaths, and from the additional and diverted traffic on the routes that remain open.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioner favours a cut and cover ("Green") tunnel banked and landscaped over the top, starting to the south of the village of Chetwode and continuing through the high ground past Manthorne Farm, the Church of St Mary and St Nicholas, Chetwode village and School End to avoid the many injurious effects in the parish of Chetwode.

The residents of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their local MP, the Church of England, Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council in petitioning for such a change to the construction of the scheme, and would respectfully point out that a tunnel on the alignment proposed by the Promoter would relieve many of the injuries to residents of Chetwode, the Conservation Area, the Grade I listed Church and the local environment identified in the Environmental Statement. Accordingly, your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the railway will be placed in a cut and cover tunnel to minimise the local environmental impact, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and Sections will be amended accordingly.

The proposed railway will pose a major severance issue for wildlife due to the long stretch of cutting, but also due to the security fencing that will be installed along most of
the planned route. The Chetwode cut and cover Tunnel proposed by your petitioner would provide some relief to this by allowing the migration of local resident species.

Chetwode is a very tranquil parish. High noise levels from the operation of HS2 are predicted for a high percentage of residential properties in Chetwode after the mitigation currently proposed by the Promoter. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the noise impacts. Chetwode is predicted to experience in-combination effects of significant visual and noise effects which, it is stated in the Environmental Statement, would have a major adverse effect. Current proposed mitigation of earthworks and noise barriers along just one side of the track is not sufficient. The Promoter should undertake further mitigation in the form of a cut and cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top. A cut and cover tunnel would be consistent with numerous Government statements of intent to minimize impact on communities and the environment.

The Environmental Statement predicts that the Grade I listed Church of St Mary and St Nicholas in Chetwode will have its setting permanently changed by the movement of trains and the associated increase in noise. The Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for further, more effective mitigation against the impacts to the Church and its setting. Without more effective mitigation for both the Church and its officers, a substantial endowment will be needed to safeguard the future of this internationally important Church.

Your petitioner is concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on the single track country lanes currently proposed as a construction route. These lanes are not suitable for HGVs and are popular with dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There are no passing places and it is unsafe to take large amounts of construction traffic past the homes at School End where children live and play. Your petitioner regularly uses these roads and therefore will be directly affected by these issues. Your petitioner requests that School End is not used by HGVs at any time in order to decrease the negative impacts of construction. Your petitioners suggest that an alternative temporary construction route for HGVs is created along the trace of HS2. During construction, the nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the roads in Chetwode parish, and after construction, the roads must be returned to their original size and character (no road widening, curb stones or urbanization of this rural parish), and all damage must be repaired by the nominated undertaker.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed new Overbridges carrying public roads over HS2 at The Green and School End, which will be clearly visible from rights of way and residential properties in Chetwode, and which introduce new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Plus the noise of the trains could be a hazard for people riding or leading horses across the proposed Overbridges, due to the high sound level and its rapid onset. Your petitioner requests that, in order to minimise the impact of the proposal, the design of the scheme should be produced with meaningful consultation with the local community, to fit in with the surrounding environment and character of the area, using materials that mirror local buildings and materials. Additional screening must also be put in place and this must be maintained to a high standard.

Your petitioner has set out in the preceding paragraphs just some of the harms that would befall residents, land owners, businesses, visitors, and the environment were the scheme to be constructed as proposed currently by the Promoter. These harms would be alleviated by constructing the entire section as a cut-and-cover tunnel, banked and landscaped over the top to prevent the requirement of lowering the route.
There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your petitioners.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

*each petitioner (or his Agent) MUST sign the petition here*

Poppy Clare

04/04/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF:  
Chalfont St. Peter Parish Council

Declares that:

1) The Petitioner's parishioners and area will be directly, specially and injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill to which the Petitioner objects for the reasons hereinafter appearing.

2) The Petitioner is Chalfont St. Peter Parish Council representing the 13,000 people of Chalfont St. Peter which is an ancient village located within the Chiltern District of Buckinghamshire.

The Petitioner's concerns and objections to the Bill and requested mitigation

3) The Bill proposes a vent shaft at Chalfont St. Peter off Chesham Lane which will have its own construction compound. The Bill will also position the main Chiltern Tunnel construction compound just south of Chalfont Lane, an area just outside the border of Chalfont St. Peter.

4) The Petitioner's parishioners and the Petitioner's area face a range of adverse impacts from HS2. These will begin with the drawn out construction works and will continue with permanent impacts from the railway once constructed. These are detailed as follows:

Chalfont St. Peter Vent Shaft – construction traffic

5) The proposed Chiltern tunnel runs through Chalfont Common, the northernmost part of the village where the vent shaft is proposed to be constructed in Chesham Lane.

6) This area includes roads which are proposed to be used by construction traffic, namely Chesham Lane, Denham Lane and Joiners Lane. The Petitioner is concerned about the effects that heavy goods vehicles will have on these country lanes which will have major implications for residents and in particular the elderly and young children.

7) Chesham Lane is the main route to the Open Air Museum which has 50,000 visitors per annum. It has two grade II listed buildings and a listed monument. Construction traffic will pass the entrance to the Epilepsy Centre, a national charity housing vulnerable residents who can suffer seizures when out walking.

8) The junction of Chesham Lane, Denham Lane and Rickmansworth Lane is already an accident black spot.
9) Moving onto Denham Lane, construction traffic will pass Robertswood School which is an infant/junior school as well as a nursery. This lane is heavily congested mornings, midday and afternoons and the impact of construction traffic will cause gridlock at peak hours as well as safety issues for the young school children.

10) At the bottom of Joiners Lane is a Montessori Nursery and parents park in Joiners Lane close to the junction with the A413 to walk their young children around the corner to the school.

Mitigation Sought

11) The Petitioner requests an amendment to the Bill and/or require undertakings from the Promoter to provide for the construction of a temporary new road at the rear of the Chalfont St. Peter vent shaft for all construction traffic to access and exit the site from the A413. This area is already marked on the maps as an area which may be required by HS2. This will mitigate the effect of all construction traffic on Chesham Lane, Denham Lane and Joiners Lane.

Chalfont St. Peter Vent Shaft – visual intrusion

12) The site of this proposed vent shaft is in a field in a narrow country lane. The Petitioner believes that the landscaping around the vent shaft proposed by the Promoter is inadequate. The environmental statement states that by year 15 and beyond to year 60 “planting around the perimeter of the vent shaft site will have matured providing effective screening of much of the vent shaft from this location” The headhouse for the vent shaft will be above ground and this, in addition to the 550 sq. metres of hardstanding, will be a permanent scar on this rural location.

Mitigation Sought

13) The Petitioner requests undertakings from the Promoter to provide additional planting so that the entire vent shaft compound is not visible from the road or from Grade II listed buildings Ashwells Farm and Ashwells Barn.

14) The removal of the hedgerow to construct the access road should be kept to the absolute minimum.

Tunnel Compound

15) The construction compound at the Chiltern Tunnel portal in the Colne Valley area will adversely impact on the residents of Chalfont St. Peter. The A412/North Orbital is accessed by the Petitioner’s parishioners through either West Hyde Lane/Chalfont Lane or Rickmansworth Lane/Hornhill Road to Watford, Rickmansworth and the M25. Chalfont Lane offers a direct route to both Harefield and Mount Vernon Hospitals.

16) The Bill as presently formulated would close Chalfont Lane and build a temporary road across the fields to join Hornhill Road which is a narrow twisty lane with passing places. The Petitioner believes that the junction of these two lanes will be extremely dangerous. This diversion could also lead to traffic using Roberts Lane, a narrow residential lane, instead.
Mitigation Sought

17) Your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended to require the Promoter not to build this temporary new road and that all traffic should use Rickmansworth Lane/Hornhill Road to access the A412.

18) Your Petitioner also requests that the junction of Roberts Lane/West Hyde Lane be closed to protect its residents from any vehicles using it as a cut through.

19) Your Petitioner also requests that no construction lorries use these lanes.

The Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that Chalfont St. Peter Parish Council, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this Petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

Cllr. Linda M Smith BEM
Chairman,
Chalfont St. Peter Parish Council
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF STONELEIGH ACTION GROUP (STAG)

 Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioner is a member of an association of residents of STONELEIGH village Warwickshire that has been active since 2010 and which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

The village and its immediate neighbourhood has a population of up to 2500 people when taking into account of Crew Lane, Stoneleigh Abbey and Park and Stareton hamlet.

It is an historic area with 2nd cent Anglo Romano settlements, Saxon and Norman buildings, a large number of listed buildings and structures from the 14th cent onwards many of which have a direct relationship with Stoneleigh Abbey a grade 1 listed building.

Your petitioner’s concerns

The overriding concerns are that HS2 LTD have not shown reasonable care or fair behaviour when dealing with the local community who are committed to avoid collateral damage and make positive improvements to the area by sensible and professional negotiation.

STAG welcomes the assurances so far but they fall short of the community’s expectations in many cases as shown below.

STONELEIGH PARK

The plans and negotiations for the park have now continued in commercial secrecy for some 2 years. The results for the village are unknown.

We request to be informed and consulted so that the positives can be managed by all concerned.

RIVER AVON BRIDGE B4115 CROSSING AND CUTTING TO A46

The only plans are those drawn on the maps dated 2015 and have very limited detail.

The section follows on from the extensive cutting proposed through Stoneleigh park already detailed above.

This section which include a river and flood plain crossing, a road overbridge and open
cutting. This will have a direct noise and visual bearing on the area and impact on the community.

We request further consultation on this section which has been very limited to date.

A46/A452 THICKTHORN B4115 ASHOW STONELEIGH TRAFFIC ROUTE

This route was presented by letter to WCC Jan 15, in AP4 and SES Oct 15 and letter to WCC Jan 16.

We contend that 400 HGVs per working day is a major safety hazard to all community users and consider in spite of recent limited assurances that this route is unacceptable to the community.

We request a full re-evaluation of this proposal in conjunction with other routes.

A46 CROSSING

The current plan is to divert the A46 a major national strategic highway over the top of the line of route as a cut and cover. This will entail and large amount of soil works material stockpiling and movement. We have contended that a tunnel would be a better solution not requiring diversion and make much less impact on the area.

We have asked for the costed evaluation documents without success and believe when all factors are considered a tunnel will be a more green and environmentally friendly solution in both short and long term and that other factors beyond cost should have a greater weighting in the evaluation.

We request leave to hold this discussion with HS2.

A46 STONELEIGH ROAD TRAFFIC ROUTE

The current 2 lane crossing is inadequate to meet the traffic flow models today 2016 and HS2 have been appraised of the suggested improvements to a full grade separated crossing by Coventry CC, WCC, Highways England etc.

We seek fuller and further assurances that this project will be actioned before HS2 work starts. Thus enabling some traffic flow improvement to take place and the project to proceed without major collateral damage and safety. It will enable reasonable access to our community as this junction is a major village access route.

MAINTENANCE COMPOND STONELEIGH RD (MCS)

The MCS area is shown on documents dated 2013 and mentioned without much detail.

It is located some 1000m from the village boundary and has little further definition other than;

It is believed will be in place for at least 3 to 10 years and will house from 250 - 500 persons.

We are concerned that the impact on the local area has been given limited thought and request consultation and planning to be put in place for the control of personnel and the
habitat by HS2 and or its contractors to mitigate behavioural, social, noise and traffic impact on the Kenilworth area and the village, both of which have limited facilities available for health, medical and leisure for such an influx of employees.

We seek assurances that this agricultural and local green space will be returned in the present condition by HS2 to the owners and the community and that some timescales are agreed.

**STARE BRIDGE LISTED MONUMENT**

The grade 2 star 15th cent listed bridge.

It is with regret that the petition lodged by the Stoneleigh History Society has been discounted and thus the proposed scheme threatens the setting of the heritage bridge.

We ask that the threat to Stare bridge be re-evaluated and additional mitigation put in place.

**COMPENSATION AS DIRECTLY AFFECTING LOCAL RESIDENTS**

The current scheme of need to sell is very slow in our area we have documented cases to show. It is unreasonable for this to continue.

In a rural area we have the lanes and B roads that are the main links of communication. In our area we are specifically affected and can show as with other areas examples of how the current scheme makes no provision for those residents who live within 1000 to 4000 m of the line on those routes and yet will be much disadvantaged by truck routes and construction works.

We believe it is totally unfair for those persons to be outside any compensation package when their lives will be disrupted for many years.

The suggested package by HS2AA of zoned compensation has not been fully evaluated. We commend this package for discussion and evaluation in the interests of fairness to our community.

4 The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that they or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains etc.

ANTHONY ALEXANDER BIANCO

12 APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  
PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF NICHOLAS AND VERONICA WARD  

Declares that:  

1. The Petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.  

2. The Petitioners  

2.1 The Petitioners are Nicholas and Veronica Ward, who are the freehold owners of Bacon House, Greatworth, Banbury, OX17 2DX. Bacon House is a Grade II listed building and is in the Greatworth Conservation Area; the oldest part of the house is thought to be some 450 years old. The Petitioners have lived there for 34 years, since 1982.  

2.2 The Petitioners also own the freeholds of Cherry Tree Cottage and Lane Cottage, two old stone houses on The Lane, Greatworth, also in the Conservation Area. These cottages, which adjoin the Bacon House property, have in the past been lived in by members of the family of the Petitioners and are currently let on assured shorthold tenancies.  

2.3 The three properties are in the southern part of Greatworth village, roughly 0.6 miles from the line of HS2.  

2.4 Throughout their time at Greatworth, the Petitioners have been and continue to be frequent users of the two roads northwards out of the village, Helmdon Road and Sulgrave Road (known locally as “the Dump Road”), and of the network of bridleways and public footpaths in South Northamptonshire, particularly those to the north and east of Greatworth, which the Petitioners consider an important amenity for the village.  

2.5 The Petitioners also frequently travel between Greatworth and Chipping Warden, where their son-in-law and daughter, Alexander and Natasha Douglas, live with their family. The Petitioners are thus frequent users of Culworth Road, Chipping Warden.  

2.6 Veronica Ward is a member of Greatworth Parish Council. Nicholas Ward is not a member of Greatworth Parish Council but has been asked by the Parish Council to take forward discussions in respect of proposals relating to public rights of way in the Greatworth area, as referred to in paragraph 8.  

2.7 The Petitioners allege that they and their property, rights and interests in the Greatworth area and in the wider South Northamptonshire area
would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in its present form.

3 The Petitioners’ concerns

3.1 The Petitioners’ concerns are set out below under the following headings, as follows:-

- Noise and visual intrusion (see paragraph 4)
- Junction of Dump Road with Welsh Lane (see paragraph 5)
- Temporary closure of Helmdon Road (see paragraph 6)
- Closure of Culworth Road, Chipping Warden (see paragraph 7)
- Public rights of way in the Greatworth area (see paragraph 8)

3.2 The Petitioners expect that a number of the concerns listed above will also be raised by other Petitioners, including Greatworth and Chipping Warden Parish Councils. If this expectation proves correct, the Petitioners would hope to confine their own appearance before the Select Committee to their concerns and requests in respect of public rights of way in the Greatworth area, as set out in paragraph 8.

4 Noise and visual intrusion

4.1 The Petitioners are very concerned about the impact on their properties, and on those parts of the village through which they regularly walk or drive, of the noise that will be created by HS2 and of the way it will visually dominate the north end of the village. The present tranquillity of the village and the beauty of the surrounding countryside will be severely damaged by HS2. The Petitioners therefore ask that the green tunnel to the north and north-west of Greatworth should be extended as far as possible in an easterly direction. This would significantly reduce the noise that will be experienced by the village and it will remove the green tunnel portals to a point where they will be less visible from the village.

4.2 This proposal is technically feasible but has been refused by HS2 Ltd, who claim that it would not constitute value for money. The Petitioners believe that this argument is wrong in principle:-

- At the petitioning stage, the judgement should be made on whether a particular petitioner’s proposal is technically feasible and is a sensible step towards doing everything possible to mitigate the effect of HS2 on the local residents and the landscape.
- The right time to judge whether HS2 represents taxpayer value for money is at the end, when all the mitigation measures have been decided and all the costs are known, and when Parliament can judge whether the project as a whole constitutes value for whatever taxpayer money is to be invested in it.
- In any event, it is by no means clear that the money required to fund a particular petitioner’s proposal will automatically come from
the taxpayer. It may come from lenders or farepayers, or even from savings on other parts of the line.

4.3 Accordingly, the Petitioners ask that taxpayer value for money should not be used as a basis for assessing the proposal to extend the Greatworth green tunnel or any of the other proposals in this petition.

5 Junction of Dump Road with Welsh Lane

5.1 In various submissions to the House of Commons Select Committee, the Petitioners and other Greatworth residents argued that HS2 Ltd should provide a roundabout where Sulgrave Road (known locally as the Dump Road) meets the B4525 (known locally as the Welsh Lane). That Committee was sympathetic to these requests and recommended accordingly.

5.2 However, the scheme that has been adopted by HS2 Ltd falls short of what was requested. Instead of a roundabout, HS2 Ltd are proposing to widen the Welsh Lane at the junction by creating a new central lane for traffic coming from the west which wants to turn right onto the Dump Road. This proposal may well be satisfactory for Welsh Lane traffic from either direction wanting to turn onto the Dump Road, and for traffic turning left from the Dump Road westwards onto the Welsh Lane, but it does not cater adequately for Dump Road traffic which wants to turn right onto the Welsh Lane and then head eastwards. Under the current HS2 scheme, this manoeuvre will be even riskier than it is at present.

5.3 In normal circumstances, Greatworth traffic wanting to travel eastwards along the Welsh lane uses Helmdon Road and very little Greatworth traffic turns right from the Dump Road onto the Welsh Lane. However, HS2 Ltd currently plans to close Helmdon Road for a considerable period of time and, whilst Helmdon Road is closed, all traffic wanting to travel east along the Welsh Lane (a route often taken by the Petitioners) will have to use the Dump Road. Such traffic will be put at great risk by the inadequacy of the junction currently planned by HS2 Ltd.

5.4 Accordingly, the Petitioners ask that the present design for the Dump Road/Welsh Lane junction be replaced by a roundabout as originally requested.

5.5 The Petitioners point out that there are already two new roundabouts on the Welsh Lane where it passes Middleton Cheney, one of which is to access a new housing estate, and believe that this should be the solution adopted where the Welsh Lane passes Greatworth.

5.6 As requested in paragraph 8.9(a), the Petitioners also ask that the junction between the Welsh Lane and Dump Road be designed so that pedestrians wishing to walk between the Dump Road and footpath AN 39 can do so without having to risk walking on the Welsh Lane itself at this point, where the traffic is likely to be even more dangerous than it is at present.
6. Temporary closure of Helmdon Road

6.1 As indicated in paragraph 5 above, the proposed closure of Helmdon Road will be a major inconvenience to the Petitioners and other residents of Greatworth and will expose them all to increased danger at the Dump Road/Welsh Lane junction.

6.2 Accordingly, the Petitioners ask that HS2 Ltd be required to revisit their plans to find a way that would make it possible for Helmdon Road to be kept open throughout the works period.

7 Closure of Culworth Road, Chipping Warden

7.1 The Petitioners are gravely concerned at the proposal that Culworth Road, Chipping Warden should be closed not just during the construction phase but on a permanent basis. Culworth Road is approximately 1.0 miles long and the shortest alternative route between the two ends of that road would be more than twice this distance at 2.3 miles, of which 1.1 miles would be along the heavily used and dangerous A361. The Petitioners believe that Culworth Road, Chipping Warden is too valuable to be lost and that the suggested alternative route is too long and too dangerous to be acceptable. The Petitioners therefore ask that HS2 Ltd be required to make every possible effort to find a way of keeping Culworth Road open on a permanent basis.

8 Public rights of way in the Greatworth area

8.1 The Petitioners believe that the network of footpaths and bridleways immediately to the north and east of Greatworth is extremely important to walkers and riders in Greatworth and the neighbouring villages.

8.2 HS2 will have a serious adverse impact on this network. Although no rights of way will be closed permanently, some will be diverted either temporarily or permanently, and they will all suffer the adverse impact of the noise from HS2 and the visual intrusion into the adjoining countryside.

8.3 For the last two years or more, the Petitioners have been trying to persuade HS2 Ltd to go further than they currently plan. The Petitioners believe that HS2 Ltd should be required not only to mitigate as much as possible the damage that the project will do to the network, but also to make improvements which would leave a lasting legacy to compensate the Greatworth community for the damage being done to it.

8.4 A key driver has been the desire to improve connectivity amongst those footpaths that will remain after HS2 has been built by linking together footpaths and bridleways that used to be accessible from each other along the Welsh Lane when the Petitioners first came to Greatworth, but which are no longer connected because the Welsh Lane is now so full of traffic and so dangerous. The Petitioners believe that the advent of HS2 will make it even more dangerous for pedestrians and equestrians to use the Welsh Lane and that the opportunity should be taken to rectify this problem in a way that can be done very easily and at little cost and, it is
believed, entirely on land that HS2 Ltd will acquire for at least part of the
works.

8.5 The Petitioners made proposals to this effect in their petition to the
House of Commons Select Committee and in Nicholas Ward’s
appearance before that committee on 17 March 2015.

8.6 Towards the end of that appearance, Sir Peter Bottomley MP twice
referred to the Petitioners’ proposals as “sensible” and paragraph 84 of
the Second Special Report noted that “in Greatworth, construction of
HS2 may present an opportunity to improve the local footpath network”.

8.7 Fortified by what was said, Nicholas Ward has subsequently had a
number of discussions with the Highway Authority and HS2 Ltd to try to
find a way of taking forward the Petitioners’ proposals.

8.8 As these discussions have continued, the proposals have been modified
to take account of information obtained, but even now they are not
finalised because the Petitioners do not know precisely what land HS2
Ltd is taking on a permanent basis and what land it plans to take for the
period of the works but then return to the current owners at the end of
the works.

8.9 The latest proposals that have been put forward are as follows, moving
west to east:

(a) Linking footpath AN39 to the Dump Road. HS2 Ltd is acquiring land
for the improvement of the junction between the Welsh Lane and the
Dump Road and it is believed that this opportunity should be taken to
link AN39 to the Dump Road, by designing in a path that could
possibly run to the south of the Welsh Lane and the east of the Dump
Road.

(b) Linking footpath AN39 to footpath AN40 on the north side of the
Welsh Lane, on land that is being acquired in connection with the
diversion of the Welsh Lane.

(c) Linking footpath AN40 to footpath AN4 on the south side of the
Welsh Lane through the woodland at the northern end of Greatworth
Park which it is understood will be owned by HS2 Ltd and which in
due course will be sold rather than being returned to the present
owners/occupiers. This would create a new circular route to the north
of the village as well as improving connectivity to the network to the
north of the Welsh Lane.

(d) Extending footpath AN13 along the full length of Helmdon Road north
of the HS2 line and inside the field to the east of that road to a
crossing point opposite where footpaths AN7 and AN9 meet the
Welsh Lane. Provision was made in AP2 for AN13 to run all the way
to the Welsh Lane crossing point but was subsequently withdrawn
without any proper explanation.

(e) Linking bridleway AN14 to bridleway AN37 on land that HS2 Ltd will
acquire to the north of the track and which it is understood will be
retained on a long term basis with balancing ponds and an access
track. It is understood that this area could be redesigned so that the proposed bridleway link could run through it along the access track.

8.10 It is important to emphasise that these proposals are open to discussions as to the best way to achieve the desired effect. For instance, the proposal in 8.9(b) could be achieved by having the new link path entirely to the north of the Welsh Lane or it could be entirely on the south side, or it could be partly on the north and partly on the south.

8.11 It is also important to emphasise that these five proposals each stand on their own and achievement of any one or two of them would be a good step forward. However, the Petitioners would argue that HS2 Ltd should be required to take forward all five proposals.

8.12 The Petitioners believe that all these desired outcomes could be achieved without the need to divert or otherwise alter any existing footpaths. This means that it would not be necessary for any of these proposals to go through the cumbersome process involved in diverting or otherwise changing an existing right of way.

8.13 The local Highway Authority (Northamptonshire County Council) have indicated in principle that they would support these proposals provided they have the consent of the landowners, this being the landowners at the time the new public right of way is dedicated. The Petitioners believe that this consent could be obtained easily and for little cost as part of the wider negotiations between HS2 Ltd and the relevant landowners in connection with land required for the project and mitigating damage done by the project.

8.14 The Petitioners’ proposals also have the support of Greatworth Parish Council. Indeed, Nicholas Ward has been asked by that Council to take these discussions forward on its behalf.

8.15 The Petitioners have also sought the support of the Northamptonshire Local Access Forum and hope to be in a position to report on this when they appear before the Select Committee.

8.16 There have been a number of communications with HS2 Ltd concerning the Petitioners’ proposals. At first, good progress was made but the discussions seem to have stalled since last December. The Petitioners hope that HS2 Ltd will be persuaded to re-open these discussions and to pursue them in a constructive manner with a view to finding solutions that achieve the desired outcomes.

8.17 The suggestion has been made that these proposals should be taken forward by an application to the Community Fund but the Petitioners believe these ideas should be taken forward by HS2 Ltd as part of their mitigation of the damage their project is doing to the public rights of way in the Greatworth area. As one example, the proposal at (e) above to link bridleway AN14 to bridleway AN37 is to provide a link between those two bridleways which currently is only available on the Welsh Lane. Because of the traffic on the Welsh Lane, the existing link is already very dangerous for horses and it will be made infinitely more dangerous if there is a risk of high speed trains going past within sight and hearing of
horses. It is therefore important that equestrian traffic should be taken off the Welsh Lane and it is HS2 Ltd that should do it.

9 General

9.1 There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights and interest of your Petitioners and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

10. The prayer

The Petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the Petitioners remain, etc.

Nicholas Ward

Veronica Ward

7 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against

The High Speed Rail (London–West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Chiltern Society

 Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1 to 65 of the Bill.

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioner is the Chiltern Society, a registered charity, founded in 1965 with the purpose of conserving the uniqueness of the Chiltern Hills. We aim to do this by
   • Helping people conserve and improve footpaths, rivers and streams, areas of tranquility, heritage buildings and landscapes
   • Promoting high standards of planning and architecture, and arguing against developments that will spoil the area
   • telling people about the Chilterns’ unique character and history
   • encouraging people to walk or cycle in the area, and visit attractions
   • encouraging people of all ages to enjoy and care for the natural environment and beauty of the area.

   The Society has approximately 7,000 members, many of whom live in the vicinity of, or are affected directly by the Proposed Route, which passes through the middle of the Chilterns, and affects the amenity and enjoyment thereof by our members and other members of the public that use the many services provided by the Society. The Society has interest groups covering walking, cycling, rivers and wetlands, rights of way network maintenance, Chilterns heritage, and photography. Over 500 members volunteer regularly.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns
   a. The proposed route passes through the upper Misbourne Valley on a series of raised embankments and viaducts. These will have a severe adverse impact on a unique ancient landscape, and introduce significant noise and light pollution to a tranquil part of a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The loss of 58ha of Best and Most Versatile farmland, and the removal of 22km of hedgerows will not only impact the historic landscape, but also adversely affect its wildlife.
   b. The impact on Bacombe Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest, which is the only known location in the United Kingdom of the fringed gentian.
   c. The proposed route will disconnect and/or disrupt a number of Rights of Way crossing the Misbourne Valley during the construction period. A number of long-standing footpaths will be permanently diverted. This will adversely affect the pleasure of thousands of walkers, including the Petitioner’s members.
   d. The impact of tunnelling on Hydrogeology, with potentially wide-ranging impacts, including the risk of losing the River Misbourne, a globally rare chalk stream, and the risk of diverting water away from the Weston Turville SSSI and the Grand Union Canal near Wendover.
e. The impact on the Society’s members who live in the vicinity of the Misbourne Valley, both during the construction period and operation. In particular the impact of traffic, noise and light at night.

f. Whether, in the absence of adequate evidence from HS2 Ltd or its safety regulators, the safety integrity of the current tunnel design has yet been comprehensively and robustly evaluated, particularly with regard to the evacuation of passengers following a major safety incident. Failure to have comprehensively assessed tunnel safety risks in a timely manner could have wide ranging impacts on inter alia tunnel design and length and its impact on the Chiltern countryside.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel to beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils, action groups and within local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in this petition.

Further that consideration is given to increasing the tunnel depth where the proposed route passes in two places underneath the River Misbourne, thereby providing additional protection for the river and also reducing the potential of possible ground collapse at the southerly crossing point.

Should the requested tunnel extension, not be granted, then consideration is given to extending the tunnel portal north towards Leather Lane.

Failing this, the ‘Haul’ road from the South Heath tunnel portal be connected to the A413 near Leather Lane.

4. The prayer
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the Society, or someone representing the Society in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

For and on behalf of Chiltern Society

John Gladwin (Agent)
12 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF John L Gladwin

Declares that:

1. Your petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioner is a semi-retired Chartered Accountant, who lives at 4 Manor Close, Prestwood. This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located approximately 3km from the train exit/entrance at the portal as outlined under deposited plans Vol 2.1 Replacement sheet 2.25.

   Your petitioner lives in a part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) which the Bill as drafted will specially and directly affect.

   Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

   a. Your Petitioner will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner requests that the presently proposed fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the Chilterns AONB, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DIT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner and will reduce the impact on the AONB.

   b. Your Petitioner further requests that in assessing the alternatives of adopting the full tunnel proposals instead of the Promoter’s current proposals for the AONB section of the line, the Promoter is instructed to commission and publish a fully independent cost analysis of such alternatives and to undertake and publish a full cost benefit analysis of the environmental impacts for such AONB section.

   c. The adverse effects of the Bill with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which it objects are primarily caused by and associated with the works proposed from the South Heath portal, empowered by Clauses 1 and 2 and Schedules 1 and 2 of the Bill and associated powers in the Bill (including the power of compulsory purchase). These include works 2/14 to 2/20 in Schedule 1 and are detailed primarily on Deposited Plans, Vol.2.1, Plan Replacement Sheets 2-24 to 2-28.

   d. Should the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB, which is the primary alteration to the Bill your Petitioner seeks, not be agreed, your Petitioner requests that the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended to Leather Lane,
Misbourne Valley. In particular a walk from Wendover using the Ridgeway National Path and other paths to return to Great Missenden. A number of footpaths will be disrupted or closed during the construction process, and the pleasure in the Landscape will be ruined during the construction period, and during operations by the 9km scar introduced into the landscape, with attendant noise.

i. **Business impact:** Businesses in the area will be specifically affected by a reduction in tourists and customer footfall, including businesses in Prestwood, Great Missenden and the hilltop villages. In addition, postal vans and delivery vehicles will be delayed by the traffic congestion. Tourism plays a significant part in local business, with
  - visitors to the Roald Dahl Museum,
  - local cycling groups using this area as a centre for the Chiltern Cycle Way and the Chiltern Hundreds Cycle routes.
  - People accessing the network of footpaths from Gt Missenden and Wendover stations
  - There are 55 million visitors a year to the AONB contributing approximately £500 million to the local economy, helping to sustain an estimated 12,000 FTE jobs.

**Remedy:**
  - For businesses which are indirectly or only temporarily affected; compensation for loss of profit, loss of trade and the fees of any professional advisor appointed by the business.
  - A substantial reduction in business rates where applicable.

j. **Chilterns AONB:** The Proposed route through the Upper Misbourne Valley will include embankments, viaducts and bridges topped with catenary towers. These will form a highly visible scar across the valley. This is an ancient landscape that has hardly altered in 400 years. The route will also partially destroy a scheduled ancient monument Grim’s Ditch.

The cut-and-cover tunnel around Wendover will put Bacombe Hill SSSI and Weston Turville SSSI at risk. The Proposed route comes within 25m of Bacombe Hill, and the tunnel excavation risks diverting water away from Weston Turville SSSI and an arm of the Grand Union Canal. In addition the mitigation measures proposed to protect St Mary’s Church involve installing 400m of 6m high sound proofing, which will be a highly visible unnatural intrusion into the AONB.

The proposal includes over 20 balancing ponds to enable track drainage. These are an alien feature in the Chilterns.

I believe that the Bill should not impact the integrity of the Chilterns AONB.

**Remedies (apart from a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB):**
  - The Promoter must ensure that the viaducts and embankments with enclosures to reduce noise are made as visually pleasing as possible.
  - The design of the new permanent buildings erected by HS2 Ltd to be in-keeping with the surrounding area.
  - The vertical alignment of the track between the South Heath portal and Wendover should be lowered further to reduce the intrusion of the viaducts and embankments; to conceal catenary masts and gantries and reduce the height above the general ground surface of accommodation footbridges. The contractor should not be empowered to raise the line at all on the AONB section.
  - All bridges crossing the line should be extended to green bridges to enable animal migration routes.
the Promoter, the Bill, along with accompanying Schedules, so far affecting your Petitioner and your Petitioner’s area, along with the wider AONB, be not allowed to pass into law.

4. **The prayer**
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the petitioner, or someone representing the petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Date
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Mr Stuart John Smith  

Declares that:  
1. The petitioner ('Your Petitioner') is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner, who is resident at Wheatsheaf Cottage, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 ORQ, the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.  

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

3. Your Petitioner's concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.  

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards the network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and the impacts of the Proposed Route would be otherwise effectively mitigated. If the Bill is not amended to include the provision of a full tunnel your Petitioner requests that, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented to mitigate the effects of the Proposed Route:

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at
Wendover be adopted, particularly as these also have acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred
in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 16:00 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts
Green.

**g.** That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

**h.** That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

**i.** That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.

**j.** A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. **The prayer**

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your Petitioner, or someone representing your Petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

MR STUART SMITH

Date: ... J.3. ... !.J:.~~) .......... .

[each petitioner (or his Agent) MUST sign (or seal) the petition here
Print the name of the person signing below each signature (and add "Agent" if appropriate]
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mrs Philippa Madeline Smith

Declares that:

1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner, who is resident at Wheatsheaf Cottage, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 ORQ, the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards the network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and the impacts of the Proposed Route would be otherwise effectively mitigated. If the Bill is not amended to include the provision of a full tunnel your Petitioner requests that, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented to mitigate the effects of the Proposed Route:

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at
Wendover be adopted, particularly as these also have acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred
in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413
b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 16:00 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your Petitioner, or someone representing your Petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

........................................................................................................................................

MRS PHILIPPA SMITH

Date: ........................................

[each petitioner (or his Agent) MUST sign (or seal) the petition here
Print the name of the person signing below each signature (and add “Agent” if appropriate]
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16
PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill
THE PETITION OF THE INLAND WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION
Declares that:
1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.
2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is a registered charity, founded in 1946, and a company limited by guarantee registered in England & Wales, with approximately 16,000 members which advocates the conservation, use, maintenance, restoration and development of the inland waterways for public benefit. Individual and corporate members of The Inland Waterways Association, and members of the public whose interests in waterways are promoted and protected by the Association, include boat owners, holiday boat hirers, boat building and hiring companies, marina and moorings operators and other waterway related businesses of all kinds, canal restoration groups, community boat charities, canoeists, anglers and users of canal towpaths for recreational walking, cycling, travel to work and for access to the natural and built heritage of the waterways.

Your Petitioner’s Concerns
Your Petitioner does not object in principle to the decision to construct the new railway however considers that the built heritage, tranquillity and amenity value of various canal navigations, their access and enjoyment by the public and their commercial interests will be injuriously affected to an unnecessary extent by certain details of the design and construction of the railway authorised by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects.

Noise Mitigation
Your Petitioner notes that the Environmental Statement treats all waterway users as ‘transitory’ noise sensitive receptors. However boats on canals are generally permitted to moor for up to 14 days in any one location and can be residential during that time. At designated long term moorings and in marinas boats may be used residentially for considerably longer periods or permanently.

With the Promoter’s current plans people resident on boats mooring in proximity to the high speed railway would be subject to excessive noise disturbance unless noise mitigation is being provided for other nearby residential property. In practice this would create zones near the railway where mooring for other than very short periods would be intolerable due to noise nuisance, thus depriving users of their use and enjoyment of the waterway.

In addition, whilst moving along the canals at or near crossings of HS2 boaters will be exposed to very high absolute levels of noise, and major changes in noise pressure for brief periods. These will be unavoidable as boats will be moving slowly along canals unable to stop or reverse within the time a high speed train will cross the navigation.

The locations particularly affected include: the Grand Union Canal and Harefield Marina by the Colne Valley viaduct (CFA7); the Oxford Canal crossing and a 'loop' of the canal in close proximity to the HS2
line near Wormleighton (CFA16); the Grand Union Canal at Longhole viaduct (CFA17); the Birmingham & Fazeley Canal at Curdworth (CFA20); the Lichfield Canal and Lichfield Cruising Club moorings at Cappers Lane, and the Trent & Mersey Canal and moorings by the crossing of the Manchester spur and close running of the diverted Wood End Lane at Woodend, Fradley (CFA22).

Your Petitioner notes that the shell of a canal boat has inherently lower sound insulation properties than a building and cannot readily be improved by modifications such as double glazing offered to affected houses. As a result boats used residentially are dependent on external controls of noise transmission.

Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to provide and maintain the best available technology noise mitigation measures to full residential standards at all canal crossings and wherever the railway runs close to a canal.

Canal Crossings at Woodend, Fradley

Original proposals for HS2 around Lichfield proposed four crossings of the Trent and Mersey Canal. Additional Provisions in the House of Commons in part responded to your Petitioner's concerns reducing the crossings to one, and your Petitioner welcomed the changes to the horizontal and vertical alignment of the railway in that vicinity. However, these Additional Provisions included an amendment to the previously indicated route for the diversion of Wood End Lane which was made without prior consultation with your Petitioner, who considers that this will injuriously affect the built heritage, tranquillity and amenity value of the Trent & Mersey Canal and its Conservation Area to an unnecessary extent.

Wood End Lane, although a minor road, now carries significant traffic including HGVs accessing the Fradley Park Industrial Estate. As the estate and an adjacent housing area continue to grow this traffic will only increase and improvements to this part of the road will further encourage its use. At present this has little impact on the canal but HS2’s Additional Provisions proposes to divert it to run alongside the canal below Woodend Lock, rising onto a high embankment to cross over the Handsacre Link tracks (heading to the West Coast Main Line), and with a further embankment for the access road to Woodend Cottage.

Your Petitioner has proposed an alternative route for the Wood End Lane diversion which would take the road under rather than over the Handsacre Link tracks to better protect the canal, and also the local environment and landscape. The benefits of this include:

- Avoidance of the very high road embankments in close proximity to the Trent & Mersey Canal, reducing visual impact and noise disturbance from road traffic to the canal, and to the local landscape;
- Avoiding noise and visual impacts on the heritage interest of the Trent & Mersey Canal Conservation Area and the setting of its Listed Buildings;
- Minimising construction impacts on the canal and towpath users, and minimising ongoing loss of tranquillity;
- Avoiding wider impacts on the recreation, tourism and economic benefits of the canal system.

Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to fully assess and implement this alternative route for the Wood End Lane diversion.

Conclusion
In consideration of the above, your Petitioner reserves the right to raise any further matters of concern related to the above matters and related to any changes or additions to the Bill that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any revisions that may be made to current plans or any other matters relevant to our expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to our representation before the Select Committee.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, including amendments to the design of the Wood End Lane diversion at Woodend, Fradley near Lichfield, and noise mitigation for boaters travelling or moored on the canals then the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their rights and interests and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

NAME: Grenville Messham
Director Trustee and duly authorised representative of The Inland Waterways Association

Signature........ ..................................................

NAME: Ivor Caplan
Director and Trustee of The Inland Waterways Association

Signature........ ......................

Date: 9 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION AGAINST THE

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION of Priors Hardwick HS2 Action Group and The Wormleighton Parish Meeting

Declares that: -

1. Your Petitioners are specially and directly affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your Petitioners are the Priors Hardwick Action Group (PHAG), representing 116 members who are residents of the villages of Priors Hardwick, Priors Marston and Wormleighton in the county of Warwickshire and the Wormleighton Parish Meeting representing 84 residents. Your Petitioners are particularly affected by the proposed alignment of HS2 which will run through the valley that lies between the three villages.

Background and problem

3. Your Petitioners are concerned about the environmental damage that would be caused by the proposed height of the HS2 line which will have a substantial adverse noise and visual impact on our communities. The line is currently intended to be on a 2-kilometre-long embankment across the valley and could be up to 14 metres in height in order to take it over the Oxford Canal. Your Petitioners have already demonstrated to HS2 Ltd that it is feasible to engineer a route which would take the line under an aqueduct conveying the canal. On behalf of the promoter, at the House of Commons Select Committee hearing on 9th February 2015, Mr Mould QC rejected this proposal for the following reason –

"Then, option B is the petitioner’s alternative. And that will generate additional excavated material, over the bill scheme, the disposal of which, remote from the construction site, we estimate to cost to the order of £73.6 million"
4. Later, the promoter's witness, Mr Smart stated: -

"It [excavated material] would be used for fill where possible but we have a major surplus in terms of material. So, there will be an overall requirement to take material off site to tip, unless we can identify other areas to take material to".

5. We now know from Wardington Parish Council's presentation to the House of Commons Select Committee on 18th January 2016 that there is a demand for excavated material for infill and bunding in the immediate neighbourhood at Lower Boddington, around 2 kilometres to the south of Wormleighton involving up to an estimated 1000 HS2 construction vehicles per day. Your Petitioners consider that the additional excavated material generated by their proposal could be used at Lower Boddington instead.

6. This would avoid, as presently planned, transporting material by road to Lower Boddington from the Greatworth and Turweston areas, approximately 24 kilometres away. By reducing the need to transport spoil by road, the environmental impact on the area would be less serious, there would also be a reduction in the number of HGVs travelling through Wardington, Chipping Warden, Aston le Walls and Lower Boddington: clearly, there would also be cost savings.

The request

7. Put simply, your Petitioners request that the track bed of the line be lowered so that it passes below the Oxford Canal, instead of over it. Lowering the line is the single most effective way of reducing the damage to the landscape and limiting the noise impact in this attractive and tranquil area of countryside. For users of the Canal (9,200 boats a year use this section), walkers on the rights of way that cross the area, and the residents of Wormleighton, Priors Marston and Priors Hardwick, this is the most important protection that could be provided.

8. The Environmental Statement in Section 6.5.3 states "the dominant presence of the embankments and (canal) crossing coupled with the substantial changes in noise and visual environment will result in a high adverse impact and major adverse effect." Despite recognising this damage, the Promoters have proposed little in the way of mitigation.

9. The Promotors asserted (23 Jan 2015) that a solution including an aqueduct would cost substantially more because of additional spoil needing to be removed to landfill, but are now making the case (Jan 2016) to bring in additional material from much further afield because of a shortfall needed to create bunds and embankments. These statements cannot both be correct.
The prayer

10. Your petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

And your petitioners remain, etc.

Signature(s)

Signature of Petitioner ........

Christopher Hodgson on behalf of Priors Hardwick HS2 Action Group

Signature of Petitioner ........

Irvin Klegerman on behalf of Wormleighton Parish Meeting

Address: Pingle House Priors Hardwick Southam CV47 7SL
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Philip Robertson  

Declares that:  
1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill  
2. The Petitioner is, Philip Robertson, resident at The Warren, Potter Row, Great Missenden, HP16 9LT, where I have lived for the past 14 years and who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect. Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  
3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  

In general, your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB. In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention. Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.  

Specifically your Petitioner is hugely concerned about construction noise, dust and other air borne pollution for residents of Potter Row, particularly as I understand a construction road will be squeezed in between Potter Row and Jenkins Wood. Your Petitioner’s property is only 100m from the proposed construction land. Your Petitioner is a keen gardener and opens the garden at The Warren for charity and the Ballinger
Horticultural Society on a regular basis. One of the main selection criteria used by your Petitioner when he chose to purchase this property was its tranquil setting on a quiet country lane with wonderful views of open countryside, which can be enjoyed from all aspects of the garden. The house is of Victorian construction with traditional single glazed wooden sash windows and the unique location and peaceful setting was significantly reflected in the valuation and purchase price paid.

Specifically your Petitioner is very concerned that the new temporary access road from the Chilterns tunnel north portal exits at the Link road roundabout and will add to traffic congestion already on the A413 which HS2 accepts is a major adverse effect. Your Petitioner regularly uses Great Missenden station to travel into London, he uses and supports the local shops in Great Missenden, and has a growing need to attend the Doctors’ surgery in Prestwood and the Chiltern hospital. Your Petitioner understands that an HGV will enter or exit the GM link roundabout every 1.8 minutes. Furthermore your petitioner is concerned about dust and noise from continuous lorry movements and any lorry cleaning operation carried out adjacent to the A413. Your Petitioner is particularly concerned about the potential loss of farm land, the scar on the countryside and the estimated 8 years before the road is returned to footpath (GM1/13), an often used facility that will be lost for that time.

Specifically your Petitioner has huge concerns about the levels of operation noise; I understand that peak noise at 100 second intervals is key to sleep disturbance at night, not average noise values. Over 150 homes in the immediate area of the portal and along Potter Row will suffer operational noise at night substantially above the peak World Health Organisation target LOAEL (60dBmax façade).

Specifically your Petitioner has been advised by professional and highly experienced local Agents that the value of his family home, The Warren, is at least 20% lower as a direct result of HS2 and under the current plans, this blight will remain or quite likely increase during the 10 year construction phase if indeed any serious buyers could be found at all during this period of severe disruption. Your Petitioner is extremely concerned that under the “Need to Sell Scheme”, the valuation process is undertaken by valuers appointed by HS2, who are unfamiliar with the area, do not take into consideration that blight has existed since March 2010, when HS2 was first publicly announced and reject Red Book Valuations undertaken in 2010 as being out dated. When challenged on the assumed protection that an area designated level 5 of an AONB would afford local residents, Government and HS2 Ltd have stated that HS2 is in the national interest and therefore allows them to undertake construction in the AONB. Your Petitioner firmly believes therefore, if it is in the national interest then individual residents should not be expected to shoulder the financial burden without fair and equitable compensation, the cost of which should be spread across this scheme as a whole.
Specifically your Petitioner wishes you to know the undeniable result of HS2 on his doorstep is worry, anxiety and stress and it would be hard to find anybody in the community who has not been detrimentally affected in some way. Local life has changed enormously since HS2 was first announced in 2010. Properties already lay empty and semi derelict, Annie Baileys and North Lodge to name but two, as no buyers can be found due to the threat of HS2. In addition to the worry about the value of their homes and how they can ever move when they wish to, is the effect of the associated noise of HS2 pre and post construction, adverse health effects during construction due to dust and airborne pollutants, especially worrying for those already diagnosed with respiratory disorders. The effects of HS2 on outdoor leisure activities and the enjoyment of open spaces; getting about by car when construction traffic starts; visual impacts of construction equipment, cranes, lorries etc in what is currently picturesque countryside; the influx of a temporary workforce and the fear of crime and disorder that may ensue; emergency service response times that are particularly important for the elderly. Some residents have already been served with CPOs, others are desperately seeking help from the Need to Sell scheme, many are taking a financial loss on their property just to get away and all of this has a deep and devastating effect on the lives of local people, many of whom have lived here for decades.

Specifically your Petitioner is very concerned about the permanent damage to the landscape, wildlife and loss of tranquility in the AONB; Your Petitioner is a keen and active cyclist and dog walker and enjoys the peace, tranquility and beauty of this environment on a daily basis and is concerned that it should be preserved for future generations to come. Your Petitioner is concerned about the visual impacts to the whole immediate landscape and regards the network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner therefore requests that the Chilterns AONB be further and adequately protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.
3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power
lines are reinstated underground.

I. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413.

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08:00 and 09:00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes.

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same
with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Philip Robertson

11th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF ANTONIETTA WINTON

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. Your petitioner is

Your petitioner lives in her flat in Coniston, Harrington Street, London NW1 3SG. Her flat is only 30 m from Silverdale, one of the three blocks on Camden's Regent's Park Estate which is due for demolition to make way for the HS2 tracks. Your petitioner has lived in Coniston since 1983 and brought up her family here. In 1994 she bought a lease under the Right-to-Buy scheme and she has 105 years remaining on her lease. When she submitted her first petition to the House of Commons two years ago, she was in employment, but has since retired on grounds of ill-health due to the worry and stress of HS2.

3. Your petitioner's concerns are

3.1 Habitability – have HS2 done an assessment of the noise level for your petitioner's flat? How will they determine how your petitioner is to be protected from the greater and longer works of phase 2 AP3 in Euston IDno. 535501 from table 2 on SV004-001 as shown on map no. SV-01-001. It is impossible for your petitioner, a second language speaker, in this short petitioning period to read all the books and documentation that HS2 has produced, particularly as there are omissions and inaccuracies and all the information the community has requested has not been provided. For instance their documents say there are 40 flats in Coniston, but there are only 24 flats.

3.2 Noise, dust, vermin – Double glazing is not enough to protect against noise and what package is your petitioner entitled to for insulation? Assessors sent by Camden Council, from Savills have spoken about triple glazing as your petitioner already has double glazing and you can hear the traffic on Hampstead Road constantly. He spoke also of some air filtering system, but your petitioner does not see how this will protect her from noise and dust, nor pollution and vibration.

3.3 Intruders, security. The increased risk of intruders is particularly
distressing to your petitioner, as she lives on her own and is elderly and ill. The construction site means greater access to the estate by workmen and many more strangers coming and going. How is your petitioner to be kept safe?

3.4 Transport: for six years there will be only one lane of traffic in each direction on the Hampstead Rd, which will make it very difficult for your petitioner to shop as the traffic will be constantly congested. The nearest bus-stop will be suspended and your petitioner will have to walk up to Mornington Crescent which will be difficult as her health is poor. All the extra lorries will be making the roads congested and polluted, which will affect her health adversely. The construction of the Hampstead Road Bridge much higher than street level will make it difficult for your petitioner to access public transport like buses.

3.5 Compensation arrangements have not been given to people in Euston, and this causes your petitioner massive stress and anxiety about the future.

The mitigations your petitioner is asking for include:

3.6 Your petitioner wants clear information about how the assessment of habitability will be carried out. Your petitioner will need HS2 to pay for the insurance and security on her flat in Coniston, as well as for a flat of the same size in the vicinity for your petitioner to live in, away from the disruption of construction. People in Euston needed this information in advance so that petitioners can include it in their petitions, but it is not available.

3.7 Will your petitioner be able to decide later once she sees what it is going to be like? If it is intolerable for your petitioner carry on living here, then she needs to be able to exercise the right to compensation, to enable your petitioner to live somewhere else for the duration of the works. All the lorries and extra traffic must comply with CLOC and ULEZ so that pollution is kept to a minimum, and the LEMPs must be agreed in consultation locally so that residents can ensure they have input into the agreements reached with the local authority. There needs to be a proper system in place for residents to complain where safeguarding measures are being breached.

3.8 HS2 must ensure the security of the block. It is terrifying for your petitioner to be afraid in her own home, and your petitioner is in such fear about intruders and what will happen to your petitioner while the construction goes on for 17 years. Your petitioner had hoped for a peaceful retirement, but now this.

3.9 Spoil should be carried out by rail, not put hundreds of additional HGVs on the local residential streets around the Regents Park Estate. Only six trains a day would be needed to take spoil out and bring concrete in, and this would be better for the environment and much better for the residents.

3.10 No green spaces should be taken away from residents. It is
unreasonable to deprive children and elderly residents of the amenity of green spaces for recreation. None of these should be taken for construction compounds, and none should be built on. All should be restored to us and no mature trees should be cut down. Your petitioner is particularly concerned about the small green area next to Coniston between the Cartmel parking area and the Hampstead Road open space. It is immediately below your petitioner’s windows, and might protect her from some of the disruption of construction from the demolition of Silverdale, the next block, and the HS2 building works.

3.11 Air quality should be monitored in at least six locations agreed with the community 12 months in advance of the commencement of construction. These should be funded, installed and maintained by HS2, with the data accessible to the public in real-time, and remain throughout the period of construction.

3.12 There should be a credible system in place for instant policing of the operating agreements, that your petitioner and all residents can rely on for immediate remedy and satisfaction during the whole period of construction.

3.13 Noise target levels should be based on the total noise your petitioner will be exposed to, not just one noise source, and levels need to be lower to take account of the cumulative impact of many years of construction, which HS2 call residual in-combination effects. In particular, construction during the night will disrupt sleep for your petitioner and all residents for long periods of time. HS2 must protect the health and welfare of the residents of Euston during the construction of HS2.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks) the House of Lords that she, or someone representing her in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Name: ... Antonietta Winton... Signature...
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF BRIAN BATTERSHILL

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. Your petitioner is Brian Battershill

Your petitioner is disabled and has lived for over 40 years in Silverdale, one of the blocks on the Regents Park Estate due for demolition under the HS2 proposals.

3. Your petitioner's concerns are: Loss of his home of over 40 years.

   a) Loss of the community to which he belongs, and the help he gets from them as he is disabled and over 70 years old.

   b) Years of breathing in health destroying dust and particulates, in an area that already exceeds the safety limits set down by international standards.

   c) Safety for your petitioner as the roads are to be filled with heavy goods vehicles every minute of the day and night, making crossing the roads very dangerous.

   d) The effects on your petitioners health because of the very loud building noise that will be constant 24 hours a day.

   e) The sound of heavy goods vehicles night and day crashing over manholes covers, ridges in the road and potholes.

   f) Noise coming from storage yards and depots that handle large steel girders and pipe-work.

   g) The disturbance caused by floodlights at night shining into your petitioner's home.
4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that (s)he/they, or someone representing her/him/them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Name: ... Brian Battershill ..........................................

Signature: ..........................................................
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF ROZALYN THOMSON, HEAD TEACHER, ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNORS OF GREAT MISSENDEN CHURCH OF ENGLAND COMBINED SCHOOL

Declares that:

1. Your Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your Petitioner
   Your Petitioner is the Head Teacher of Great Missenden CE Combined School, on behalf of the Governors, Staff, Parents and Children.

   Great Missenden CE School is situated in the very heart of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It is an Outstanding School, with 403 pupils and 60 staff. The school has an exceptional outdoor education programme. This includes outdoor sports coaching throughout the year. The school has an allotment, polytunnels and a large growing area. The school is a flagship, Gold Award "Food For Life" school, promoting growing, cooking and healthy eating.

   The school is dependent on the outdoor environment for the delivery of its outstanding curriculum.

   Your Petitioner's school community, including children, parents and staff, and the whole area will be directly, specially and injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, to which your Petitioner accordingly objects for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner's concerns and objections to the Bill and requested mitigation
   a. The school is directly next to the A413, the main access road for HS2 construction traffic. The proposed tunnel exit is on a hill just above the school, and the haul road will bisect a field currently used for cross country running practice. The allotment and gardening area is right next to the A413. The Early Years "Mud Kitchen" used by 2 – 4 year olds for creative outdoor
learning, den building and forest skills, is within 5 metres of the A413. Your Petitioner is concerned about the hazards caused by the hundreds of additional HS2 lorries (Promoter's own estimate of 270 HGVs a day at the peak) which will use this route.

b. The line of HS2 lies between Great Missenden School and two of its linked Infant Schools (Lee Common and Hyde Heath). Many families will have to cross the line daily via roads which are already jammed at peak times.

c. Your Petitioner is deeply concerned that the proposal will worsen levels of congestion and rat-running in the village, with direct negative impacts on the safety of children and parents accessing the school. The Promoter acknowledges that the proposed new haul road from the Link Rd roundabout will result in a "major adverse significant impact" at the A413/Link Rd junction, which is the main access route to the school.

d. Your Petitioner is particularly concerned about the impact of construction traffic using the haul road from the South Heath portal onto the A413 at the Link Road roundabout, such as damage from HGVs, noise and dust from vehicle cleaning operations and the high risk to users of the Skate Park, Tennis Courts and children’s play area adjacent to the roundabout and children going to and from the school.

e. The construction haul road should be relocated further north, distant from the larger settlements of Great Missenden and Prestwood, and beyond the Mobwell junction\(^1\) hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts. It would also lessen the impact and visual blight of the haul road on residents, visitors and businesses in Great Missenden as well as the risk to children.

f. Your Petitioner is concerned that the addition of the access road satellite compound immediately adjacent to the A413, the relocation of two material stockpiles to the new access road, the requirement for 10.6 ha of additional land for the construction of the new portal access road on land directly opposite the village centre and the 8 year operation of the main Chiltern north portal satellite compound, will have a severe impact on the school, plus associated noise and air quality impacts on the children, staff and the whole school community.

g. Your Petitioner is dismayed that despite the Promoter's claim in July that the extended Chiltern tunnel would benefit people in Great Missenden, the proposal largely ignores the impacts of the revised scheme on the largest population centre in the Community Forum Area 9 area, failing to consider

---

\(^1\) HS2 Ltd had given Bucks CC in January 2016 an assurance that it would relocate this haul road but the conditions placed upon the County Council to achieve this were unrealistic.
the existing traffic congestion throughout the village and the disastrous effects of HS2 construction on roads that are already impassable at peak times. The Promoter completely ignores the negative impacts of the scheme caused by the eight year construction period on access to Great Missenden’s three schools.

h. Your Petitioner requires the Promoter to undertake further viewpoint and noise impact analysis from south of the A413, including from the grounds of Great Missenden School. In addition, your Petitioner requires the Promoter to consider the noise impact on teaching and learning both inside and outside the school buildings and to take further steps to mitigate the noise of both the construction and operation of the railway.

i. Your Petitioner believes that the only practicable solution to the noise, transport, local economy, environmental destruction, educational blight and other negative impacts of the scheme will be to further extend the Chiltern tunnel northwards throughout the Chilterns AONB, as an absolute minimum to Leather Lane.

j. Chilterns AONB: The proposed line is above ground from the South Heath portal of the Chiltern tunnel for 9 kms to the edge of the Chilterns AONB just north of Wendover. It is in a cutting for approximately 3 kms and will be visible at the highest point of the line in the vicinity of Liberty Lane, notwithstanding the sight of the security fences and catenary masts above the cuttings which will be a major permanent eyesore within the AONB.

k. The proposed line from Liberty Lane descends to Wendover and crosses two large unsightly viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean in the Chilterns AONB before reaching a green tunnel running alongside Wendover.

l. Construction will last up to 8 years with a peak period of more than 3.5 years. HGV traffic, noise and dust will render the rural lanes and footpaths less attractive to all visitors to this area of the AONB whether they are ardent walkers/hikers, currently popular with those groups taking the Duke of Edinburgh Award, or cyclists as it is Route 57 on the National Cycle Network or just families coming for a day-out from London to enjoy the countryside.

Remedies (apart from a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB):

1. The AONB review body must ensure that the viaducts and embankments with enclosures to reduce noise are made as visually pleasing as possible. The design of the new permanent buildings erected by HS2 Ltd to be in-keeping with the surrounding area.

2. The vertical alignment of the track between the South Heath portal and Wendover should be lowered further, if it is not to be placed in a tunnel, to
reduce the intrusion of the viaducts; to conceal catenary masts and gantries and reduce the height above the general ground surface of accommodation footbridges. The contractor should not be empowered to raise the line at all on the AONB section

3. The need for spoil dumps should be minimised either by tunnelling or moving the spoil down the trace or by rail. This particularly applies to the spoil dump planned for Hunts Green farm and those by the construction compounds

4. The Rights of Way are not to be closed for any length of time and any diversion not to be parallel to the track; furthermore diversions should be over green bridges and not accommodation bridges.

5. All overhead power lines adjacent to the route be buried

6. Alternatives to Balancing Ponds be considered, and they should be made ecologically and visually attractive, in keeping with AONB.

Your Petitioner notes the Prime Minister's commitment in June 2015 to build HS2 in the "most environmentally friendly way possible." Your Petitioner believes that only a fully bored tunnel throughout the entire AONB would fully protect Great Missenden School, the village and the central Chilterns area in its entirety, delivering very significant environmental advantages including (but not limited to) minimal disruption to our village community and the very large number of pupils and parents who come to the village schools.

Your Petitioner further requests that Members of the Committee visit our village for a public meeting and also please visit the South Heath portal site area, including the proposed new access road, before reaching a final decision on the extended tunnel issue.

4. Primary Mitigation
Accordingly, your Petitioner objects to the associated works and the clauses in the Bill that empower the works involved, and humbly requests your honourable House to modify the Bill, and/or require undertakings of the Promoter, to remove these adverse effects, primarily through a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least to Leather Lane.

5. Secondary Mitigation
In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the haul road from the South Heath portal to the Link Road roundabout be moved along the A413 beyond the Mobwell junction, as it will help to lessen the impact of the construction traffic on the Great Missenden Area.
6. Conclusion

a. Your Petitioner supports the petitions for a longer fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that extends throughout the Chilterns AONB. Such tunnel extension is being supported by the local County, District and Parish Councils and the Chiltern Conservation Board and in the alternative a shorter extension to Leather Lane. If your honourable House alters the Bill to provide for such an extended tunnel most of your Petitioner’s objections would be removed (your Petitioner’s objection to unsuitable ancillary structures and to the present proposals for compensation would remain – albeit far fewer people in the Great Missenden community would be affected).

b. In the alternative to extending the fully bored Chiltern tunnel, your Petitioner seeks a significant secondary mitigation by relocating the haul road at the South Heath portal.

c. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully requests that unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, or suitable undertakings obtained from the Promoter, the Bill, along with accompanying Schedules, so far affecting your Petitioner and your Petitioner’s area, along with the wider AONB, be not allowed to pass into law.

d. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner’s whole school community, their rights, safety, interests, property and locality and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner and her school community.

7. The prayer

The Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the Petitioner, or someone representing the Petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

Signatories:

Rozalyn Thomson
Head Teacher

Date 11th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Pippa Bannister

Declares that:
1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Pippa Bannister of Swyllmers, The Lee Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9NA, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect

Your Petitioner, is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads in order to get her children to school which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

   a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged
environmental benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.
g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.
h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.
i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.
j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the
construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and
temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that
local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary
sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must
be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after
construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and
character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during
working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt
response.

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the
Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary
additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and
to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of
crime in the area during construction.

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern
arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any
damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have
access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a
reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone
representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House,
be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition
to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

[each petitioner (or his Agent) MUST sign (or seal) the petition here]

Print the name of the person signing below each signature (and add “Agent” if appropriate]

[add the date here]  ROA GANNISTER
12th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF DAVID GEOFFREY SELIGMAN

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is an owner of property in Great Hampden, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

I have lived in the Chiltern Area of Natural Beauty (“AONB”) all my life and I thoroughly appreciate and respect its amenities. In my regular walks, I can understand how the area came to be called “the lungs of London” as I meet so many walkers from London whose close proximity means that they can enjoy its peace and beauty.

On the, frankly, unspeakable assumption that HS2 was to be constructed, notwithstanding the constantly flawed economic case made for it in the context of ever-rising and still clearly understated costs, I petition to ensure that the irreparable damage to the AONB is restricted to the maximum degree. Moreover, the threat to the wildlife habitat needs to be minimised.

in my view, HS2 should be tunnelled throughout the AONB to and beyond Wendover. HS2 should be compelled to justify why it has rejected such tunnelling. To-date, HS2 has refused to publish its justification and it should be compelled to do so in the interests of full public transparency.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

DAVID GEOFFREY SELIGMAN /
13th April, 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Miss Elizabeth Hall and Mr Gary Davis.

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioners are Miss Elizabeth Hall and Mr Gary Davis of No2 Colne Cottage, Old Uxbridge Road, West Hyde Rickmansworth Herts WD3 9YB

   The above property is within the Colne Valley and just inside the Hertfordshire boundary and county of West Hyde. Colne Cottages (1&2) are also the only property's that sit roadside parallel with the main A412 on the Old Uxbridge Road, and are not set back in the lane as others are. Colne Cottages are also just outside of HS2's Safeguarded and Rural Zones. Approx location is ..

   50m construction site
   275m C V Viaduct
   900m C Tunnel
   325m Centre line of track

   The above Cottages have been in my family since 1941, they are believed to be nearing 300yrs old, and were old roadside café where riders changed their horses years ago, No2 also has an old 60ft brick cess pit under garden serving both properties.

   My Grandfather moved into No2 as part of a new job with a local company, he later started his own business taking over units behind the cottages and acquired No1 Colne Cottage as well.

   My Grandparents, Parents, Aunts and Uncles have all taken a part in running the business's and all lived in the Cottages at different times since 1941, I myself have lived in both Cottages over the last 30 years neighboring my Grandparents when they were still alive.

   In later years the field to the right of the property was dredged for mineral extraction and is now a lake within Troy House, there is also a motor garage and storage yards behind and to the side of the Cottage, which are monitored and project very low noise levels.
Directly in front of the property the other side of the A412 is a very large field due to hold the CV Viaduct Main Construction Compound, and the Chiltern Tunnel Main Compound & Tunnelling, both operating 24/7. The Chiltern Tunnel South, South Portal, South & Portal Buildings are also in this field along with the Electric sub stations for HS2 and Scottish & Southern Electric. There are also further construction compounds in close proximity to the left of the property being the CV Viaduct Laydown, North Embankment, & North launch, plus the passive provision for the Heathrow Spur which if resurrected is also documented as 24/7. The expanse of the above spread out opposite will be all the eye can see in front, left and right of our property making for a very unpleasant view.

The main A412 and parallel lane of the Old Uxbridge Rd where the property sits, are both residential roads which will be used by construction traffic, these roads are also all that separate the property from the main construction compounds opposite, inflicting unbearable noise/dust/vibration/traffic congestion & unsightly visual impact on us for approx 10yrs, this making living/sleeping conditions in our own home intolerable.

Both Gary and I work full time presently but are due to retire in the next 4-7 years (mid construction) which will be very obtrusive, uncomfortable and noisy for us being at home.

My Cousin who had owned No1, recently sold although took over a year and sadly breaking family chain, but interestingly at a fraction of its value, due to Solicitors advising purchasers not to buy, and lending agents refusing to provide mortgages.

**Medical Issues & Dust**

Dust in the area is currently minimal, but with large main site construction compounds and increased traffic movements right in front of us, dust will increase considerably changing air quality and causing a serious issue to my partners existing heart condition, we are also advised by our Doctor to avoid any unnecessary stress bringing on angina & respiratory problems which are linked to his condition, and I myself also have a skin condition that dust is known to aggravate.

Aside of health issues, just putting washing on the line in our garden will also be impossible due to dust, our cars outside the cottage will also be covered and constantly need cleaning.

We are also not mentioned in the air quality reports even though it is advised in Vol2 CFA7 4.4.5 that dust will be in the area having the main construction sites directly opposite.

**Proposals**

- Put Colne Valley Viaduct in a tunnel.
- Run line parallel with M40 corridor.
- Temporarily re house us during construction.
- Purchase our Property.
Noise

As stated the property sits roadside and currently the noise levels of the road and our surroundings are acceptable. The garden of this property is also to the side and not the back which is again directly in front of the construction compounds, increased noise from heavy machinery, boring machines and construction traffic, turning, reversing, up and tipping where reversing beeps will be constantly heard will affect us considerably, also making relaxing in our garden unbearable.

Noise monitoring equipment was left at my property initially, but on asking recently for the report, was informed by email that the equipment was set up incorrectly and therefore could not be used in any of the noise analysis reports, this confirming that no noise calculations have been recorded from my property at all. I’ve since been informed 2 readings taken either side of my property would be the same as mine, roadside maybe, but in my property is totally different to other 2 as they are set back further in lane, and secluded, whereas my property is roadside with no protection.

It’s also noted on noise calculation maps that my property would be 40-55 db at night. These levels are very vague and also outside of the WHO Guidelines which state acceptable night time noise should not exceed 40 db before health impacts are felt.

Additionally with noise fence barriers shown on cross section and noise significance maps P5414,P5417 these barriers are much longer away from my property than they are in front of it (on these maps looking like hey end parallel with my property offering no protection at all.

Proposal

Supply triple glazing for all windows of property (side & back as train passes diagonally)

Higher and longer noise fence barriers on our side of track.

Put Viaduct in tunnel. Run line up M40 Corridor

Nominated undertaker must liaise with local resident’s ref their requirements and implement long before works begin

View & Photomontages

There are no photos projecting my view at all, I spoke to an agent who advised that photomontages are not a requirement, although there are several taken to the left and right of me, but nothing showing any kind of projection view from near my property at all that would show a very large construction compound directly in front of it.

I do have photographs of the area and the close proximity of the property should I be given the opportunity to present.
Currently the only pleasing sign of natural beauty to the eye is the rolling field in front of me which is soon to become a major construction site.

Proposal

Higher and more aesthetically pleasing hoardings/barriers/walls to construction sites.

Higher barriers to rail line our side of track.

Extra planting and more mature plantings.

Traffic

The A412 in the mornings and evenings is already over saturated with traffic and currently queues on the hill towards Denham and right past my property, I work at Bosch in Denham, and because of this congestion, have to go up Tilehouse Lane past the Aerodrome to be able to avoid it and get to work which is normally a 5 min journey. However, of late Tilehouse Lane has become so busy because of this that traffic, I now have to do a round trip up to Harefield and round to Denham increasing my journey to 40 mins.

When there is an accident or congestion on the M25 (which is regularly) vehicles exit at Maple Cross onto the A412 which increases congestion further past my property. When this happens drivers then turn down into my lane (Old Uxbridge Road, top end) and past by property at speed hoping to get out, but when they find it’s a dead end fly back even faster annoyed at the fact they were not able to get anywhere, this has already become a danger to residents at No’s 1 & 2 Colne Cottages (which has already been reported) as when coming out of our front gates to access our bins, and into the Old Uxbridge Rd, these vehicles are within inches of us, I was nearly knocked down by a vehicle swerving in shock when he saw me in the lane. After the above, these vehicles then queue in our lane (Old Uxbridge Rd) to get back out into the A412, which then makes it harder for us residents to get out of our properties, onto the lane, and get out onto the main road ourselves.

With all the points above considered and the increased traffic per day to and from the construction sites via A412 and Old Uxbridge Rd which will be used, this area will be completely gridlocked and totally impassable and making us prisoners in our own home.

This above congestion is also a serious problem when having to make regular visits to Harefield Hospital with my partner, Emergency services would also be seriously affected and could possibly even be fatal.
Proposal

Make Old Uxbridge Rd out of bounds to construction traffic/staff.

Move construction site nearer to M25 Junc 17 (open ground away from residents).

Temp re house us through construction Purchase property

**Working Hours - 24 hr working**

We note the main construction site compounds of Colne Valley Viaduct and Chiltern Tunnel are documented as operational for 24hrs day, the passive prov for Heathrow Spur is also stated as 24/7, all this in an area that's currently quite quiet, therefore this noise will be heard more, especially at night, making it very difficult for us to sleep and leading to sleep deprivation which would impact on our health and ability to hold down our full time jobs

Proposal

Reduce evening and night time working hours.

Temporarily re house us during construction or Purchase Property

**Compensation**

We feel as if we have been completely left out, we are not mentioned within any of the “affected areas” reports at all, there are also no photo views taken of our projected outlook, and now no noise recordings either. We feel trapped in our own home as HS2 currently offer no help at all to homeowners who had initially not planned to sell and are outside of the rural zone.

My property is directly opposite the large main construction compounds of the Colne Valley, this immense site stretches the length and breadth of the fields right in front, to the left, and to the right of our property, which will completely dominate our outlook and affect our lives and enjoyment of our property considerably through health concerns, noise, traffic, congestion, dust, etc and majority or works operating 24/7.

Ironically we could not even get on the train even if we wanted to use it without having to travel to another area & station to be able to catch it as well!

The above construction will make living in our property at this time totally unbearable
Proposal

Sound insulation. Triple glazing. Temp re housing. Purchase
Property

In addition to the proposals above per section we believe that many of these could be totally eliminated if..

- The Colne Valley Viaduct & cutting were put in a tunnel to meet with the Chiltern Tunnel at M25
- Run line parallel with M40 corridor eliminating need to destroy additional green belt and AONB

Personal Preference

Personally given our situation above, and the health issues we face with noise, dust etc, our personal requirements by order preference and the only real solution for us would be ...

- Temporary re housing for construction period
- Triple glazing and sound insulation supplied for all windows of property (side and back as train & construction noise heard diagonally from side to front)
- Failing items 1 & 2, Then a guarantee that HS2 would purchase my property under the below conditions. (as already “suggested” by the Select Committee), as we know living through this construction in our retirement will be unbearable...

But without the requirement for putting up for sale for 3 mths, (neighbours already having time wasted by some Estate Agents sending buyers round with no knowledge of HS2 who when find out have no intention of buying and having trawled through house and wasted their precious weekends.

3. The prayer

The petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that they or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remains, etc.

Miss E. Hall
Dated 11th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015 • 2016  

Petition against the  

High Speed Rail [London – West Midlands] Bill  

THE PETITION OF GAWCOTT with LENBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE  

Declares that:  

1. The Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the Clauses in the Bill which relate to the passage of construction and workers’ vehicles through the Parish during the construction period and thereafter in perpetuity after HS2 becomes operational.  

2. Your Petitioner is the Gawcott with Lenborough Parish Council, representing a population of approximately 800 residents, and situated between the proposed Infrastructure Maintenance Depot [IMD] at Steeple Claydon/Calvert, Buckinghamshire and the town of Buckingham.  

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns relate to the numbers of additional vehicles which HS2Ltd propose will regularly pass through the Parish along the rural road network presently supporting the residents and agricultural and engineering businesses in the Parish and in adjoining parishes.  

4. In particular, your Petitioner is concerned about the numbers of additional vehicles which HS2Ltd estimate will be using the Buckingham-Gawcott-Calvert road [BCC Classification C3] which has been designated as a principal access route. This route is narrow, sinuous in part and passes through residential streets, lined by residents’ parked cars and giving access to schools, churches and leisure facilities. It is not designed for, nor has a capacity to accommodate, large numbers of additional vehicles, particularly HGVs.  

5. HS2Ltd proposed in their CFA No13 Report, that between 1,120 and 2,480 additional vehicles each working day would use this rural road through the Parish. Subsequently, at the House of Commons Select Committee Hearing on 20th October 2015, HS2Ltd revised the figures to 116 additional vehicles each working day. The present traffic flows through the Parish on Route C3 each working day total 2,100 vehicles.  

6. Your Petitioner is concerned that HS2Ltd’s revised estimates of vehicle flows were not noted in the House of Commons Select Committee Hearing Minutes and unless HS2Ltd formally confirms these lower vehicle figures, they may revert to higher numbers without
redress for the Petitioner on behalf of the Parish. Such increases would have a detrimental effect upon the residential environment and threaten the efficient operation of the businesses in the Parish.

7. Your Petitioner's anxieties further relate to the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders who regularly use the C3 road and to the damage to road surfaces and rural verges which increased traffic flows, particularly of HGVs, will cause to the highway infrastructure through the Parish.

8. Your Petitioner is further concerned that delays to the opening of the East-West rail link will result in the increased movement of HS2-related construction materials along the rural road network.

9. Your Petitioner submits that HS2Ltd be mandated not to exceed the traffic-count figures submitted at the 20th October 2015 House of Commons Select Committee Hearing [i.e. 116 additional vehicle movements per working day].

10. Your Petitioner also submits that HS2Ltd be mandated to provide a temporary contractors rail link to Bicester, along the alignment of the East-West rail alignment, to be used for materials and spoil transport until the Network Rail route is available for use.

11. Your Petitioner further submits that HS2Ltd should undertake to upgrade the kerbings, verges and road surfaces of the C3 route through the Parish to facilitate the safe passage of all vehicles, and to introduce traffic calming measures, in collaboration with Buckinghamshire County Council and your Petitioner, to ensure the safety of all road users and residents by reducing the speed, noise and air contamination resulting from increased traffic volumes.

12. The Prayer. Your Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that they, or their Agent representing them, in accordance with the Rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the Petitioner remains etc.

Signed............................................................................................................

Dated: 12th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF ANDREW HARTLEY DISMORE  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by clauses 1-65 of the bill, the scheduled works contained in Schedules 1 and 2 and the third Additional Provision (hereinafter called “AP3”)  

2. The petitioner is Andrew Hartley Dismore AM, who is the elected London Assembly Member for Barnet and Camden. As such the petitioner is responsible for representing the people of Camden to the Mayor of London and Greater London Authority and has a responsibility towards the protection of said constituents, including the protection of property rights, security and interests and those of the citizens, inhabitants of Camden. The petitioner can be contacted at the London Assembly in writing at City Hall, The Queens Walk, London, SE1 2AA or by email at andrew.dismore@london.gov.uk.  

3. The petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which the petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

4. The petitioner alleges that the Bill is completely unacceptable to the inhabitants of the area affected.  

5. The petitioner alleges that his constituents and their property, rights and interests in their area and the inhabitants thereof could be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill and AP3 if passed into law in their present form and they accordingly object to the Bill and AP3 for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

6. The petitioner requests an independent technical assessment of current plans, and of the alternative railway schemes.  

7. The Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State and Nominated Undertaker to undertake works of construction which are estimated to take at least 10 years to complete and will include creation of dust, noise pollution and poor air quality.  

8. The construction works will lead to increased lorry movements in the Euston area. The scheme will visually blight the area over the minimum 10 years period and 24 hour working will leading to sleep deprivation and health issues for the petitioner’s constituents living within the HS2 construction area.  

9. The Bill if not amended will mean that social housing tenants who are to be evicted from their homes will not be rehoused locally. The compensation offer
for home owners who purchased their properties under ‘right to buy’ and for
leaseholders ranges from inadequate to scandalous. The compensation
arrangements for the London Borough of Camden to rehouse affected citizens
are poor. There should be compensation for those who wish to stay but where
any mitigation offered cannot fully address the problems caused by HS2, both
for reluctant landlords and for tenants.

10. Citizens residing nearby will be affected by 10 years of local devastation. Little in
the Bill offers assistance to residents affected and little mitigation, if any is
offered. Residents ‘blighted’ by the Bill’s proposals will not receive the same
compensation arrangements as those living outside Greater London. The
petitioner urges your noble house to look at an urban property bond that will
unwind itself once the work is complete.

11. The petitioner is concerned to ensure that the hours during which construction
activities take place are restricted so as to ensure that disturbance is minimised
for residents of the Borough, businesses, tourism, educational establishments
and health care facilities.

12. The type, proximity and inter-related nature of the many proposed work sites
that will be required strongly suggests to The petitioner that 24 hour working will
be inevitable over extended periods if the Promoters and Nominated Undertaker
are to meet their proposed timetable. The works in the Borough will take place in
high density urban areas and in very close proximity to hundreds of residents
and businesses, as well as others visiting the area. The petitioner asks that the
Promoters be required to give an undertaking fundamentally to review their
construction strategy to reduce the impacts of construction activities and to do
so in close and open cooperation with residents so that schemes and methods
of work can be devised that will minimise adverse impacts. The petitioner
specifically does not consider that the proposed COCP currently relied upon by
the Promoters is adequate to meet these particular circumstances.

13. It is unclear what the impact of the Bill will be on properties in this highly densely
populated and commercially intense area of London. The petitioner’s
constituents residing in the area remain extremely concerned over the effect of
vibrations from large construction works.

14. Residents whose properties are affected who are outside the compensation
zones will not be compensated for this blight, despite living within an affected
geographical area.

15. Air pollution within the Euston area is already amongst the worst in London. The
petitioner does not believe that the construction plans included in the Bill
address the issue of air pollution in Euston and believes that they need to be
revisited and amended. The duration of works will mean that residents will have
increased pollution levels for at least 10 years.

16. The petitioner has concerns relating to the effect on businesses which apply
throughout the Borough, where an estimated 244 businesses are in the
safeguarded area, 62 businesses are affected by demolition and many
hundreds more will be detrimentally affected by the impact of construction.

17. Euston in particular is one of London’s most successful commercial areas. It has an internationally renowned concentration of research and knowledge services alongside creative and cultural industries. Euston’s highly varied business environment also includes membership organisations, hotels, specialist independent and cultural businesses and local shops.

18. Businesses in the affected area face economic ruin. The Bill does not offer compensation arrangements for businesses facing losses from the proposal. No mitigation is offered to those businesses affected especially those in Drummond Street which rely upon the current Euston terminus.

19. As a result of demolition, 29 businesses in the Euston area will be forced to close or relocate. Major disruption from construction will deter visitors and reduce local spend in the economy.

20. It will be difficult for all the effects mentioned above to be mitigated to a satisfactory degree. The petitioner requests your noble House to require the Promoters or the Nominated Undertaker to implement at least the following mitigation measures:

   a) Significantly enhanced compensation for businesses: businesses must be fully compensated by HS2 Ltd for all adverse impacts of the scheme in advance;

   b) Business advice and support service: provision of a point of contact for advice and support service for businesses, providing businesses with access to specialist professional support and legal advice to enable businesses to plan for HS2 and maintain business as usual;

   c) Access to specialist commercial property support: for businesses forced to relocate due to the direct or indirect effects of HS2, fully funded support to find similar alternative accommodation in Camden or in the redeveloped station site, linked to a comprehensive package of compensation. This will maintain jobs and economic activity in the area alongside established ties and networks within the business community.

21. The petitioner is not satisfied that full consideration has been given to the severity of the detrimental impact of the cumulative effects of the proposed works, and the pressure that those effects will have on housing in the Euston area (including both sides of the station and Ampthill Estate), the railway cutting and associated areas. An assessment of the cumulative impacts and proper baseline surveys need to be undertaken by the Promoter in advance of the construction of the works and appropriate mitigation measures should be determined.

22. There are at least 250 homes which are located very close to the works in the Euston area and which the petitioner considers need further review to ensure they will be habitable during the construction phase and when the trains start
operating. There will be significant impacts due to increased traffic and road closures, loss of amenity and greenery, and effects of noise, vibration and dust from nearby construction works for at least 10 years.

23. In addition to these 250 homes, some hundreds of others in the Euston area will inevitably experience a number of cross cutting cumulative impacts for a long period of time. The Environmental Statement deposited with the Bill (the "ES") acknowledges that cumulative impacts arise from the construction of the Bill's proposals, but does not assess them. The petitioner considers it essential that the Promoters should carry out a habitability assessment forthwith to determine if any occupiers of those numerous homes would need re-housing on a temporary or permanent basis and for those that do not need rehousing, how the adverse impacts they face can be mitigated. The petitioner requests a commensurate undertaking be required from the Promoters to this effect.

24. The petitioner strongly opposes the decision to construct the HS2 railway line with a terminus station at Euston because of the devastating impact the construction and operation of the line will bring to parts of the Borough, which no amount of mitigation or compensation can address. Across the Borough the proposals will include the demolition of 223 homes (including 136 units of social housing in the Euston area). Over 62 businesses will be forced to close or relocate due to demolition with 242 businesses located within the safeguarded area. Many hundreds of additional homes and businesses will be put at risk due to their proximity to the proposed line. There will be a negative impact on local schools, the loss of open spaces and community facilities, and demolition of listed buildings.

25. Tunnelling is also proposed to go through parts of the Borough and as a result two ventilation shafts would need to be built within the Borough at Alexandra Place and Adelaide Road. Considerable disruption to the many residents and several businesses will be caused by the ventilation shaft works. Alternative sites have not been fully explored to mitigate this impact.

26. Clause 48 allows the Promoter to compulsorily purchase property where HS2 "gives rise to the opportunity for regeneration or development of any land". This power is not constrained geographically to the vicinity of the railway line, stations or depots so is very wide-reaching. The concern remains with this clause because it has the potential to interfere with Camden Council's own regeneration schemes. For example, it would be within the remit of the Bill to compulsorily purchase property in parts of the Regents Park Estate to allow it to develop the land adjoining the railway line that comes into its ownership upon Royal Assent. Or to compulsorily purchase the current Post Office site and the entire Ampthill Estate to enable it to develop the land behind the station as a regeneration opportunity linked to the station. As it presently stands the Bill would only require consultation with the local authority before proceeding and as these are not identified in the Local Plan as sites for regeneration then regard for the Local Plan would not prevent compulsorily purchasing property. The petitioner requests your noble House to remove this clause entirely.

27. The petitioner contends that the compensation framework devised under the
'Need to Sell' scheme is unfairly applied to urban areas, compared to rural. The petitioner requests that a scheme should be developed by Camden Council and costed up instead.

28. There are very many matters arising from the proposals in the Bill as proposed for amendment by AP3 which are of considerable concern to the petitioner. The petitioner believes the amendments contained within AP3 and the provisions of the Supplementary Environmental Statement 2 and the AP3 Environmental Statement ("SES") that accompany it do not overcome the petitioner's objections to the scheme, which were set out above, and therefore Camden, its inhabitants, its businesses and its environment will be unnecessarily injuriously affected by the Bill unless additional measures are implemented in an attempt to mitigate the impact of the proposed works.

Euston Station Design

29. The amendment to the station's design contained in AP3 would provide for the construction of the station in a staged programme that would take seven years longer to construct than the Bill scheme, meaning the construction of the HS2 station alone would not be completed until 2033, very significantly increasing the detrimental impacts on residents and businesses in Camden. The first stage, described as Stage A, would be the building of the six High Speed 2 tracks required for Phase 1 of the Bill and would include subsurface platforms and ground level concourses. The second stage, stage B1, would be the lowering of five tracks in the existing station to provide the High Speed 2 tracks required for Phase 2 of the Bill. The construction programme assumes that the final stage described as Stage B2 and being the remainder of the existing station works, could be redeveloped by Network Rail as the owner of the existing station at some as yet undetermined time in the future. Both Stage A and Stage B1 are said to incorporate passive provision that would allow the existing station to be redeveloped at a later date (outside the HS2 Bill process) and joined into the HS2 Station to create a comprehensively developed station.

30. The petitioner wishes to ensure that any alternative solution for the station takes account of the Euston Area Plan, which has been developed jointly by Camden Council and the Mayor of London, rather than the Hybrid Bill proposal consisting of an additional section of station bolted onto the current structure. Unfortunately, the amendments in AP3 as described above do not address the petitioner's concerns and do not take account of the primary objectives in the Euston Area Plan.

31. The continuing desire of the Promoter of the Bill to design the HS2 station in isolation from the existing station, which AP3 and the SES would authorise, would severely limit the ability of all parties involved (including the petitioner, Camden Council, Transport for London, Network Rail the Mayor of London and the Promoter) to achieve the Euston Area Plan objectives; particularly permeability, well planned over-site development across both sites and the delivery of an integrated world-class station. The spine building proposed in the AP3 design, which runs north to south between the proposed HS2 station and the existing station would prevent the type and layout of development that could
otherwise be possible for the existing station, were a truly integrated approach to be adopted.

32. The reintroduction of Line X creates additional significant construction works that will detrimentally affect the residents adjoining the throat. The Promoter has not adequately assessed (or assessed at all in places) the detrimental impacts the extended duration of the phased scheme will have on the health of residents, schools, organisations and other “receptors”, nor has a community safety audit been undertaken.

33. There is no acknowledgement of the Crossrail 2 proposals in the station design proposed in AP3. This is very likely to result in a missed opportunity to integrate Crossrail 2 fully into Euston Station and result in unnecessary additional land take to build the Crossrail 2 scheme leading to additional and unnecessary demolition, an unacceptable loss of homes and further significant disruption in the local area; all of which would not be necessary if the whole station site was planned at the same time. These issues and others lead the petitioner to the inevitable and unfortunate conclusion that the station design proposed in AP3 and the SES is wholly inappropriate.

34. To overcome the issues identified by the petitioner there must be a full and comprehensive development of the proposed HS2 works and the existing station to form one integrated station on a level deck, with provision to ensure the future delivery of over site development above the station and tracks, including a commitment to funding the Network Rail station redevelopment. This would entail the tracks within the existing station being lowered to the same underground level as the proposed HS2 tracks with a shared concourse covering the whole station at ground floor level. This alternative solution must take into account the Euston Area Plan, provide for coordination of all the elements of a strategic transport interchange, and for other proposed transport infrastructure projects such as the proposed upgrades to the Northern Line. It must require sharing worksites with Crossrail 2 and working with Network Rail, Transport for London and Crossrail 2's Nominated Undertaker to integrate better HS2 with Crossrail 2.

35. The proposals for a comprehensive station at Euston must enable the creation of a world class sustainable station building design which allows appropriate scale and quantum of over-station and other associated development, including replacement of and new open space and housing, and provision of sustainable drainage to bring about a high quality public realm. This should also include improvements to the eastern façade on Eversholt Street, replacing the existing blank and imposing wall with ground level activity, and improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity in and around the station, including a dedicated high quality, well lit and signed pedestrian walking connection to St Pancras as an alternative to Euston Road, always ensuring community safety. It must take into account the surrounding ultra-low emission zone ("ULEZ"), provide the best possible local transport integration, provide for the best use of the space to the front of the station and be developed in such a way as to protect and enhance the business profile of the area, addressing congestion within the station and elsewhere.
36. The petitioner believes that there is no need for a linear bus station in front of the station when the existing street network can be utilised. Camden Council have given a commitment jointly with the Mayor of London to produce a Planning Brief for the over-site development associated with the station, which will require detailed discussion and technical input in terms of station design work from the promoters and Network Rail. The petitioner seeks a similar commitment from the Promoters to undertake and share work on station design. Of crucial importance to the petitioner is the inclusion of the local community in the design process.

37. The petitioner requests that a temporary station at Old Oak Common should be provided, through the provision of turnback sidings or any other appropriate mechanism to allow Old Oak Common to function as a temporary station, to allow a sufficient amount of time to be given to the design and construction of Euston Station and importantly, to reduce the impact on the residents and businesses of Camden. The petition asks your noble House to request an independent adjudicator to undertake a cost-benefit analysis.

Transport

38. According to the SES, the scale of excavated waste identified as arising from the proposed works in AP3, originating from the Euston area alone will be 2.5 million tonnes. This is 21% more than identified in the original Bill scheme. Demolition and construction waste will amount to a further 1 million tonnes according to the SES, 26% more than identified in the original Bill scheme. As a result the further intensification of lorries and heavy goods vehicles will incrementally increase the unacceptable levels of risk to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users across a wide area of the borough. It will also increase the air pollution so that it further exceeds an already unacceptable level. The geographical extent of the impacts (including lorry and HGV routes), the duration of works, and the volume of lorry and HGV traffic will have significant and avoidable negative impacts on Camden.

39. The petitioner considers the use of rail for the delivery and removal of all construction related materials; spoil and equipment would overcome a considerable number of issues arising from the construction impacts of the scheme from road safety, noise and air pollution, to ground settlement. The SES assumes removal of waste material by road with only an unspecified limited volume that could be moved by rail. The petitioner therefore requests your noble House to require that the Promoters adopt the principle that rail haulage is used for the delivery and removal of all construction related materials, spoil and equipment unless transport by rail is manifestly impractical in particular circumstances. This has been achieved in the construction of Crossrail and would reflect best practice. Feasibility work carried out by TfL also indicates that this would be possible.

40. Where it is demonstrated by your Promoters to be impractical to use rail haulage the petitioner asks your noble House to require the Promoters to restrict lorry routes to the Transport for London Road Network and Strategic Road Network
and in any event avoid routes of a sensitive nature. To that end the petitioner asks your noble House to require the Promoters to enter into a binding Sustainable Construction Transportation Plan with Camden Council and Transport for London to agree specific routes for lorry movements associated with demolition, construction and utilities works (to be coordinated between the various work sites and construction compounds), lorry holding areas and fully funded mitigation that provides a network of safe pedestrian, school and cycle routes with penalties applied for non-compliance. This plan will need to take into account the impact on utilities, on emergency response times, and on development and change across the borough during the construction period and would therefore need ongoing agreement for changes from Camden Council and Transport for London.

41. Given the disproportionate risks of Heavy Goods Vehicles to cyclists and other vulnerable road users, the petitioner also requests that construction arrangements include a commitment to industry best practice on the safety and sustainability of construction vehicles, including the industry-led Construction Logistics and Cycle Safety (CLOCS) standards and Freight Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS). A commitment to meet London’s Ultra Low Emission Zone standards (which will be in place from Euston Road southwards) would assist in minimising air quality impacts.

42. The Code of Construction Practice (COCP) is still in draft and evolving as further iterations are published. One of the outstanding issues is that HS2 Ltd. has agreed to collect monitoring data from construction compounds, but then refuses to share this. An assurance on air quality secured the sharing of data but this has not been translated into the COCP for the remaining data collected.

43. The east-west link bridge at the northern end of the station, which was included in the original Bill scheme, would not be provided in AP3. This omission will exacerbate the petitioner’s concerns about the design of the existing station and the proposed station, where there is an absolute barrier to movement from east to west across the station. The petitioner considers this east-west link bridge is essential to allow safe travel and permeability of this part of the Borough at this point from east to west for cyclists and pedestrians. The bridge would also assist with pedestrian access between Euston and HS1 at St Pancras, and with access for passengers arriving at Euston Station using classic services to the relocated taxi rank facilities. Even with the comprehensive redesign that the petitioner is requesting, the reinstatement of this east-west link bridge should be provided by the Promoters in the final scheme.

44. In the context of the significant increase in rail demand and the need for the delivery and removal of all construction related materials, spoil and equipment by rail, the petitioner is concerned that in order to construct HS2 the classic rail services will need to be reorganised in some way. This could involve diversion of rail services, short termination or some other rearrangement in the interim. This could have a detrimental effect on local residents and businesses, commuters and visitors to Camden. Therefore the petitioner considers it vital that, as options are developed, Camden Council are involved in the organisational process along with other key stakeholders. To achieve that, the
petitioner asks your noble House to require the Promoter to enter into a Construction and Rail Service Plan before construction commences, with a view to reducing the construction time at Euston and enabling the use of rail to transport material used during the demolition and construction process in a more sustainable manner, reducing the unacceptable impact of lorries and heavy goods vehicles on the Borough.

45. The petitioner is concerned about how changing patterns in the movement of traffic and pedestrians in and around the station will be dealt with during and after construction. The petitioner considers that the proposals for taxi facilities will exceed demand and create additional unnecessary congestion. The petitioner is keen to ensure that the strategic needs of safe, high quality provision for movement by cyclists and pedestrians is taken into account better at the station, with fully integrated cycle parking that does not encroach on open spaces. The Promoter should be required to fund any temporary or permanent changes to the highway network to achieve that aim.

46. The petitioner shares the concerns of Transport for London about the protection of onward access to interchange with London Underground during construction of the station works. Disruption to that access would worsen the already inadequate onward provision at surface level for pedestrians, cyclists and bus services. Careful management and mitigation would need to be agreed with Transport for London and Camden Council, and any necessary mitigation must be funded by the Promoter.

47. The petitioner requests that the Promoter must be required to demonstrate the need for the proposed height and size of the replacement Hampstead Road Bridge, given the likely disruption that will be caused during and following construction as a result.

Open and Green Space

48. The amount of open and space that would be lost remains the same in AP3 as was proposed in the Bill but the proposals for replacement have been revised. According to the proposals set out in AP3 and the SES, the period over which the public will have to endure the temporary loss of open space will be extended until 2033 – a period of more than 15 years. The temporary open space measures proposed for that period remain unsatisfactory and there is no commitment to the quantity or quality of the mitigation measures to be provided.

49. The proposals for the replacement of open and green space on a permanent basis would not provide equivalence in terms of quantum, quality or location. For example, the proposed open space to the north of the station appears to the petitioner to be poorly designed, with its use not clearly illustrated. It is shown as an island of open space between a large road bridge, service road, turn around point and taxi circulation space. That is most unlikely to be a well-used and vibrant open space, more a poorly designed area that has the potential to attract anti-social behaviour. Further, an additional development block which is unconnected to the station has been added in AP3, appearing on an area that was previously provided as open space under the original proposals in the Bill,
which further exacerbates the loss of quantum of permanent open space.

50. The petitioner asks your noble House to require the Promoter to enter into an agreement with Camden Council to secure an ongoing mitigation programme to address temporary reprovision of open and green space during construction including the identification of specific opportunities to mitigate the severe loss of open and green space to the local community, including the commitment actively to seek temporary or 'pop-up' solutions throughout the construction phase, ensuring that construction sites and compounds are not left idle for extended periods.

51. The petitioner asks your noble House to require the Promoter to enter into joint working with Camden Council to identify and create high quality open spaces which can be used to provide permanent reprovision of open spaces lost as a result of the HS2 scheme.

52. The petitioner agrees with the House of Commons Select Committee recommendation that Camden and Birmingham should receive specific extra financial allocations (on top of the Community and Environment Fund) in recognition of the significance of the environment in urban areas.

Habitability

53. The proposed changes in the nature, location and position of construction and construction sites, and the timing of the construction works as set out in AP3 and the SES will mean that more residential properties are likely to be adversely affected by AP3 than would be affected under the Bill as deposited. The petitioner notes that the SES identifies approximately 1,025 residential buildings that are forecast to experience noise levels higher than originally assessed; however, there is some uncertainty as to whether the Promoters will provide noise mitigation to those properties. The cumulative impact arising from construction of the scheme (including not just noise, but also dust and other impacts) are not adequately assessed nor are the impacts of the numerous utilities works that are scheduled during the construction phase. The petitioner considers it essential that the Promoters are required to provide an undertaking to agree to implement and maintain the following package of measures at its own cost:-

a. all the dwellings within the residential blocks identified in the SES as experiencing noise levels higher than the noise insulation trigger levels ("the qualifying properties"), and any subsequent properties identified as being so affected, should be provided with an appropriate noise insulation and ventilation package (as agreed by Camden Council) regardless of any on-site mitigation, unless otherwise agreed by Camden Council and/or the property owner;

b. currently the boundary for the SES is tightly, and in places incorrectly defined; as the baseline noise monitoring was not adequate and the model does not take account of the urban terrain adequately. The trigger level should not be LAeq (Equivalent Continuous Level) Significant Observed
Adverse Effect Level, but LAmax (Maximum Sound Level) as the loudest noises cause the greatest disturbance;

c. a habitability assessment (such as the adapted Housing Health and Safety Rating System proposed by Camden Council), should be carried out on the qualifying properties (together with properties that fall within 10% of the noise threshold used to determine the location of the qualifying properties) in order to establish whether additional appropriate mitigation measures are required to ensure habitability of the qualifying properties;

d. this customised approach for a package of mitigation, informed by the habitability assessment should be agreed with Camden Council and/or the property owner prior to installation;

e. a further habitability assessment should be undertaken after the mitigation measures have been installed with a view to assessing the effectiveness of the mitigation measures; and

f. if the measures installed do not sufficiently mitigate the impacts, the residents of the property will be rehoused at the cost of the Promoter.

Children's Services

54. The petitioner notes that according to the SES, new major adverse significant effects have been identified in relation to several schools and children's services in Camden. However, it is with some concern that the petitioner considers the assessment of impacts on those identified schools and children’s services in the SES is flawed and does not describe the actual scope and magnitude of detrimental effects that will be experienced.

55. In order to ensure there are no negative residual impacts on children’s services the petitioner asks that your noble House requires the Promoter to provide mitigation measures required by Camden Council.

56. The petitioner asks that your noble House requires the Promoter to enter into an agreement with Camden Council to provide a social worker to assist families with vulnerable children during the decanting of those buildings on and around the Regents Park Estate that are required to be demolished for the HS2 scheme and during the beginning of the construction phase (in total for a minimum of the five years), but no legally binding commitment has yet been made.

57. An agreement has been entered into which allows the Maria Fidelis Lower School which is currently located on the North Gower Street site, to be relocated to the Upper School's site on Phoenix Road to create a consolidated school complex. The necessary permissions are currently being obtained to allow the school to be built but the timing currently projected shows that the new school will not be completed before the promoter intends to commence the HS2 scheme works. The petitioner considers that the school would be so severely disrupted by the proposed construction works that it would not be able to operate effectively at the North Gower Street site. Therefore the petitioner asks
your noble House to require the Promoter to undertake not to commence any works of construction or demolition in the vicinity of the Maria Fidelis North Gower Street site until such time as the pupils of the school have been moved to their new school in Phoenix Road.

Impact on Utilities

58. There are numerous references in AP3 and the SES to the need to divert existing utilities on and around the station construction sites which will cause major disruption to all aspects of the borough, including for residents, business and road users.

59. The Promoter has failed adequately to assess the impact of utilities works, including on emergency services’ response times and bus journey times. The petitioner asks that these impacts are fully assessed and any adverse impacts on residents, businesses, pedestrians and cyclists, emergency services’ response times and bus journey times are appropriately managed and mitigated. This should be included in the Sustainable Construction Transportation Plan.

60. Despite the proposed extensive utilities work, there is no explanation of plans the Promoter may have to produce to prevent or manage any disruption to utility supplies to local residents or business. The petitioner asks your noble House to require the Promoter to put in place an emergency response plan to deal with any utility failures that result from the construction works. This plan should include provision to provide temporary accommodation, transport, food and other support to those residents who have suffered utility failure for a long period of time, all at the cost of the Promoter.

General

61. The petitioner is concerned that there is no overall management of the construction phase of the station and surrounds. There are a number of proposed construction work sites but there is nothing governing the interaction between these construction sites nor any mechanism for maximising spaces for innovative uses when they are not being used for construction for (as an example) the use of temporary open space or other temporary uses, or for a holistic assessment of the Euston area when making any applications for approval to Camden Council for specific sites all of which would ensure a holistic joined-up operation, which would also reduce the impact on the roads and thereby lessen the detrimental impacts on the residents, business owners and visitors to the London Borough of Camden. The petitioner asks your noble House to require that the Promoters adopt a Euston Management Plan that would secure the above in consultation with other stakeholders in and around the station which could be updated from time to time with the Council’s approval.

62. There are other clauses and provisions in AP3 which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights and interest of the petitioner’s constituents and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Signed Andrew Hartley Dismore AM

Date: .......................................
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Session 2015–16

PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Anthony Michael Jepson

Declares that:
1. The petitioner ('Your Petitioner') is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Anthony Michael Jepson resident at 5 Martindell Cottages, Ballinger Road, Lee Common, Great Missenden Bucks HP16 9LA, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged
environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the
construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaking be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts
Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

Your petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

...........................................................................................

Anthony Michael Jepson

9th April 2016
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF DIANA TAYLOR

Declares that:

1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Diana Taylor, resident at Dove Cottage, Sly Corner, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LD, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
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Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquility of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged
environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the
construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.30 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of
dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

Your petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Anthony Michael Jepson - Agent

9th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF KEITH TAYLOR

 Declares that:

 1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

 2. Your petitioner

  Your Petitioner is Keith Taylor, resident at Dove Cottage, Sly Corner, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LD, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

  Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

 3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

  3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

  Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

  In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged
environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.

g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the
construction and operation of the proposed line

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.30 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained

f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of
dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction

j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

Your petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

... 

Anthony Michael Jepson - Agent

9th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015 - 2016

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON TO WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF Brackley Town Council

1. The petitioner is specifically and directly adversely affected by the whole bill

Your petitioner

2. The petitioner is Brackley Town Council which represents almost 13,500 residents of the town of Brackley who will be injuriously affected by noise, atmospheric pollution and environmental degradation during the construction phase of the project, and by noise when the high speed line is in operation.

Your petitioners concerns

3. The impact of the construction of a high speed railway and its associated development including, but not limited to, the operation of the main construction compound to the north of the town adjacent to the A43 (Oxford Road), the satellite and storage compounds serviced by the main compound and the mobile material crushing plant based at the Turweston satellite compound.

Lack of Information

4. The lack and poor quality of the information supplied relating to the environmental impact of the project has made commenting and petitioning particularly difficult and prevented the petitioner's residents from appreciating the full impact of the construction of a high speed railway line in their neighbourhood.

Highways

5. The petitioner is gravely concerned about the use of the A43/A422 corridor by significant numbers of large vehicles delivering equipment and supplies, and removing spoil during the construction works, as well as use of highways by other vehicles associated with the main compound sited next to the A43 to the north of the town. The disruptive effect of these vehicle movements will be exacerbated by the residential nature of the main compound for a period of five years and nine months.

6. The Environmental Statement indicates that the construction compound at Brackley will be the largest outside London and Birmingham added to which the construction traffic routes will almost encircle the town. These will create significant increases in traffic congestion, particularly to the east of the town as HGV's negotiate the access to the Westbury viaduct (A422 Brackley Road
Overbridge) and the Turweston cutting—both of which have satellite compounds managed from the Brackley main compound. This will result in a 600% increase in HGV traffic on this junction with the A43, a road which is already operating at or above capacity.

7. The petitioner believes that the resulting congestion will be detrimental to the Nominated Undertaker’s ability to deliver this section of the project on time and that it would be in the Promoters interests to ensure that traffic congestion in the area is minimised.

8. The petitioner requests that improvement works to the roundabouts on the A43 corridor between the M40 and the A422 and those to the east and south of Brackley forming junctions between the A43 and the A422 (Turweston—Farthinghoe) all undergo major improvements prior to the commencement of construction in order to accommodate the significant increase in traffic movements predicted during the construction phase.

9. The petitioner further requests that the hours for the movement of construction traffic are limited to 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays, and that there are limits on the number of vehicle movements, limits on the size of vehicles, and other miscellaneous related matters.

10. The petitioner requests that the commitments made in the Code of Construction Practice are rigorously enforced, specifically a hotline allowing road users to report any damage to the roads, and that the highway authority should have access to all reports, in order to ensure these are addressed in a reasonable length of time.

11. The petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker be required to make maximum use of the haul route to minimise the HGV traffic on the trunk roads and that HGV’s used on the haul routes should be compliant with noise and pollution regulations as applied to vehicles on public roads.

12. The petitioner requests that detailed traffic modelling must be carried out by the Promoters, taking into account the planned growth in the town during the construction period, and that the cumulative effect of all the traffic is considered to avoid ‘overspill’ of existing traffic onto local roads as a result of HGV traffic generated by the construction of the proposed railway.

13. The petitioner requests that binding mitigation measures should include traffic management plans to be agreed between the Nominated Undertaker, the relevant local authority and the relevant highway authority to be monitored and enforced by Local Authority Environmental Health Officers, the employment costs of which to be met by the Nominated Undertaker.

14. The petitioner believes that risk assessments should be completed by the Nominated Undertaker, relevant statutory undertakers and emergency services in relation to the access and transport issues raised by construction activity for each Community Forum Area. The petitioner requests that the results of those risk assessments should be available to the appropriate authorities.
15. The petitioner requests that appropriate funding should be provided by the Nominated Undertaker to the highway authority for the maintenance, repair and re-instatement of highways which results from the use by construction traffic.

Noise

16. The petitioner is gravely concerned about the effects of noise arising from the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development including heavy lorry traffic. The petitioner has conducted local noise monitoring to assess the ambient levels within the parish which it would wish to agree as baselines with the Nominated Undertaker.

17. Currently all new housing development in Brackley is concentrated to the north and north east of the town where the noise and disturbance from the operation of HS2 will be experienced most and where residents will be most affected by any significant increase in noise from an elevated A43. Many of the new properties will experience levels of noise which cannot as yet be assessed, since these properties are yet to be completed.

18. The petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that the overall increase in noise levels in the town does not exceed 10% over the agreed baseline.

19. The petitioner requests that there should be binding mitigation measures including an effective noise mitigation and SMART monitoring system in place before commencement and during construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development. The binding mitigation and monitoring measures should be decided by a panel of independent experts and all monitoring information should be publicly available

20. The petitioner is concerned that Clause 36 of the Bill and Schedule 26 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State for arbitration. The petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 26 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the Nominated Undertaker.

21. The petitioner previously requested that Clause 36 and schedule 26 were deleted from the Bill. They are still included and still cause concern.

Dust

22. The petitioner is concerned about dust and dirt produced during construction of the high speed railway and associated development and the effects of this on the town and the environmental quality of the neighbourhood.

23. The petitioner is concerned that there are no binding mitigation measures in relation to emissions, especially in light of the siting of the sustainable
placement areas for spoil, material crushing and the amount of earth to be moved.

24. The petitioner submits that in relation to dust there should be a precise, comprehensive and binding management plan, with a clearly defined authority for the monitoring of its implementation, including the use of SMART monitoring.

25. The petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker provides forecasts showing the quantity and type of emissions that the construction will create, and the mitigation methods proposed.

**Wheel washing**

26. The petitioner is concerned about the risk to health and safety by presence of mud and other debris on the highways as a result of the construction traffic.

27. The petitioner is further concerned that the dust created, should wheel washing not be affected, will contribute to further environmental pollution by deposit on roadside vegetation which will then wash into local watercourses during periods of heavy rain.

28. The petitioner requests that there are binding mitigation measures for wheel washing of all vehicles exiting the site(s) onto the highway network, and the storage of water used for the purpose. A clear protocol should be defined within the Local Environmental Management Plan which is enforced and communicated to all employees of the Nominated Undertaker, contractors and visitors. The person(s) with overall responsibility for ensuring that the protocol is put into practice on sites should be clearly identified.

**Air Quality**

29. The petitioner is concerned about the potential adverse impacts on air quality as a result of the construction of the high speed railway line and associated development.

30. The petitioner requests that before construction an air quality baseline monitoring study benchmarked against the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 must be carried out and a copy of this report be provided to the relevant local authority.

31. The petitioner further requests that the Nominated Undertaker be compelled to provide estimates of the increase in levels of \( \text{NO}_2 \) and particulate matter as a result of diesel emissions from HGV traffic and construction machinery, as this information was previously omitted from the Environmental Statement.

32. The petitioner is of the opinion that the estimated volumes of traffic movement detailed in the Environmental Statement will lead to significant increase in the levels of \( \text{NO}_2 \) and particulate matter currently experienced in the area. The petitioner is further concerned that the traffic congestion consequential upon these vehicle movements will further contribute to additional air pollution.
33. The petitioner requests that a binding mitigation plan for controlling the levels of these pollutants be submitted to the local authority and further requests that the local authority should be provided with funding to manage compliance and enforcement for the monitoring of air quality in accordance with the mitigation plans and that the results of monitoring are made publicly available.

34. The petitioner is further concerned that the limits of deviation contained in Schedule 1 of the Bill allow for the vertical elevation of the route to be varied by 3.0 metres vertically upwards and downwards to any extent, beyond that considered by the Environmental Statement, and that there is a lack of any vertical restriction on all works which are not scheduled works.

35. The petitioner is concerned that a variation of this magnitude where it was to lower the vertical elevation would increase significantly the amount of spoil to be moved and thus increase traffic movements with the resulting increases in environmental degradation.

36. Should the Nominated Undertaker use these limits of deviation to increase the level of the line then the pollution and disturbance during operation would be felt across a wider area and would significantly increase the effects on residents in the north and north east of the town.

37. The petitioner requests that alignment be varied by a maximum of +/- 1.0 metres from the published levels (in the ES) and that any variation beyond those limits which is deemed necessary is notified to and consulted upon with the local planning authority. The petitioner further requests that height limits on other works at sensitive locations should be subject to local approval.

**Code of Construction Practice**

38. The petitioner is concerned that the Code of Construction Practice lays down core hours for the operation of the construction compounds and satellite sites as 08.00 – 1800hrs Monday – Friday and 0800 – 1300hrs on Saturdays but specifies so many exceptions to this as to make the core hours meaningless and 24 hour working during the summer months the most likely outcome. The cumulative effect on air quality and noise pollution of the extended working hours will have a significant impact over and above those predicted in the Environmental Statement.

39. The petitioner requests that the core working hours as stated in the Code of Construction practice should be adhered to and that the list of exceptions be reduced to only those which are vital, can be demonstrated to have no additional adverse effect on local communities and which are notified in advance to the local authority.

40. Given the proposed timescale for the operation of the main Compound to the north of the town, the petitioner requests that suitable screening is erected and planted around the main compound immediately its construction begins, and prior to its occupation, in order to reduce the visual impact of this intrusion into the rural landscape. The screening plan to be approved by the local planning authority and the town council.
41. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect the residents of Brackley and their rights, (including their human rights) interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect, and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

The Prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that someone representing him in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers the bill

AND The petitioner remains, etc.

____________________________
Cllr Fiona Baker
(Deputy Town Mayor)

____________________________
Mrs Linda Carter (Town Clerk)
Roll B Agent

Brackley Town Council
Town Hall
Brackley
Northants
NN13 7AB

Tel 01280 702441

11th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Antony Chapman and Carol Chapman

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. The petitioners are resident at Boddington East, Hale Lane, Wendover, in the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, where they have lived for over 37 years. They will be specially and directly affected by the whole Bill, both during construction and after completion of the project.

They have been the recipients of letters and information in the post from HS2 Ltd, which indicates that it considers that they are affected by the Bill.

3. The petitioners object to the construction and operation of certain of the scheduled works proposed to be undertaken in or near Wendover between Little Missenden and Stoke Mandeville. These works consist mainly of Wendover Dean viaduct, a cutting from the northern end of the Wendover Dean viaduct to Hartley Farm, an embankment between Hartley Farm and Road Barn Farm, Small Dean viaduct, and an embankment between the northern end of the Small Dean viaduct and the southern end of the Wendover green tunnel, and include ancillary works such as satellite compounds, auto-transformer stations, balancing ponds and portal buildings.

The only possible alternative is a fully-bored tunnel right through the Chilterns AONB to the north of Wendover.

4. During construction the petitioners will be affected by:

a) Disruption of traffic and substantial delays on local roads.

b) Dust causing health problems.

c) Damage to the Chilterns AONB with its exceptional beauty and legally protected landscape.

d) Damage to local heritage and facilities, including St Mary’s Church and many listed ancient buildings.

e) Closing of footpaths.

f) Noise.


g) Light pollution at night.

h) Reduction in the value of their property, which has already suffered blight for over
six years.

i) Damage to the local aquifer, with a serious effect on local water supplies.

5. Following completion of the proposed works the petitioners will be affected by:

a) the permanent scarring of their view of the Chiltern Hills in the AONB by the obtrusive viaduct and embankment 42 feet above ground level with gantries a further 16 feet high. The line would be overbearing and dominant in the landscape.

b) further permanent damage to their view by the passing of trains up to 400 metres long every 100 seconds.

c) Noise.

d) Reduction in value of their property.

e) Damage to local heritage and facilities

f) Continuing damage to the aquifer.

6. The petitioners propose that a fully-bored tunnel be built throughout the length of the AONB, thus reducing most of their concerns in paragraph 4 above and all of their concerns in paragraph 5 above. It accepted by all parties that such a tunnel is feasible. In their view the benefits of such a tunnel have not been fully evaluated and the costs have been exaggerated. The petitioners would accept the opinion of a fully independent costing. In the absence of one they consider the case for a fully-bored tunnel is overwhelming.

7. The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Antony Chapman

Carol Chapman

10th April 2016