To the House of Lords
Session 2015 –16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF the HS2 Amersham Action Group

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners

Your Petitioners are the HS2 Amersham Action Group (the Group), an association of Amersham residents, formed in December 2010 to provide information on HS2 to the wider community affected by the proposals contained in the Bill and to represent their views in consultations, Community Forums and at the petitioning stages. The Group also campaigns with other HS2 Action Groups against the principle of HS2, based on concerns which include those identified in the report of the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee (printed 10th March 2015). Due to its position in the HS2 Chilterns Corridor, Your Petitioners living in and around Amersham, and Old Amersham in particular, are directly and specifically affected by the proposals for the construction and operation of HS2 as contained in the whole Bill.

3. Your Petitioners’ concerns

Your Petitioners are specifically and directly affected by the Bill in the following ways:

(i) The A413 is the social and economic lifeline which links Amersham with the Chalfonts, Chesham, Little and Great Missenden, Wendover and Aylesbury. It
runs through the heart of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which is also the HS2 Chilterns Corridor. Evidence presented to the Commons Select Committee demonstrated that construction of the Amersham tunnel vent shaft in Whielden Street, together with other major works on the A413 (tunnel portal, viaducts, haul routes, compounds etc) will adversely affect traffic flow and journey times within Amersham and to and from the town. The sequence in which these structures will be built will mean that for Amersham (and the whole HS2 Chilterns Corridor) the disruption of traffic along the length of the A413 will last for at least 8.5 years.

This will result in the disruption of residents’ daily lives - travel to work, schools, hospitals, crematorium, leisure etc., and the disruption of emergency services.

This will also result in the disruption of Amersham’s vital visitor economy. This currently benefits local businesses by £21m per year and underpins more than 600 jobs. At its proposed level, the Business and Local Economy Fund cannot possibly provide appropriate compensation for Your Petitioners in Amersham, as well as those in all other communities along the line of HS2.

(ii) Construction of Amersham’s Whielden Street vent shaft will impact directly on residents living nearby. The lack of clarity in the Draft Code of Construction Practice means that, under current provision for Additional Working Hours, work on the vent shaft could take place both at weekends and well beyond core working hours. In such instances, residents would find the resulting noise and traffic movements both unreasonable and unacceptable. It is unclear what weight will be given to local stakeholders in the agreement of Local Environmental Management Plans and what remedy, if any, will be available to Your Petitioners in the event of any failure to observe the Code of Construction Practice or the terms of local agreements.

(iii) Permanent impacts of the Bill. Your Petitioners will suffer intrusion of operational noise (where the line runs above ground, and from the Whielden Street vent shaft) and the permanent degradation of their local landscape through the visible intrusion of the track, viaducts, pylons and other features
which are totally inappropriate to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Consequences of these permanent impacts will include impaired enjoyment of the local environment, reduction in property values and severe blight of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty landscape leading to loss of visitor spending throughout the HS2 Chilterns Corridor.

(iv) Your Petitioners are concerned that the Safety Case has not been published, specifically that there are on-going issues regarding the stability of High Speed trains operating on ballast tracks and particularly on viaducts constructed on soft soil. This raises the potential for derailments. This may necessitate future construction changes that could be introduced, with no consultation, after the Bill has been passed.

(iv) Your Petitioners are already, and will continue to be, disproportionately affected by financial burdens arising from the whole Bill. Both Buckinghamshire County Council and Chiltern District Council have already incurred, and will continue to incur, considerable costs in meeting obligations arising from the Bill. These costs are by no means fully recognised, or reimbursed, under current proposals to fund Local Authorities for their activities relating to HS2. Your petitioners will suffer corresponding reductions in vital services (such as social services) provided by county and district councils until these additional burdens are met. Your Petitioners will also suffer reductions in services provided by central government (such as the NHS) as the huge and rising costs of HS2 are met. Your Petitioners must bear these financial burdens in addition to the adverse impacts of HS2 on their environment as already outlined above. Since HS2 brings no benefits to Your Petitioners whatsoever, these burdens are unfair and unacceptable.

4. **Your Petitioners therefore ask that:**

(i) The Bill be amended to provide a continuous tunnel under the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, to exit at a portal to the north of Wendover. Crucially, this measure largely avoids the permanent degradation of the landscape of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the subsequent
consequences outlined in point 3 (iii) above. In addition, it also lessens impacts of the construction period relating to such features such as tunnel portals, viaducts, cuttings, bridges, spoil, construction compounds etc. as outlined in points 3 (i) and 3 (iii) above.

(ii) The Draft Code of Construction Practice be amended to incorporate firm and clear assurances of limits on working hours and traffic movements at all sites, plus assurances of how these and all working practices agreed with local stakeholders will be independently monitored, and what redress will be readily and easily available to Your Petitioners when breaches occur. Penalties for breaches of the Code should be included in all contracts. These changes to the Draft Code of Construction Practice must be publicised before the Bill receives Royal Assent.

(iii) The results of on-going junction assessments relating to traffic flows on the A413 be publicised within a timeframe which provides the opportunity for any related further Petitioning and for any necessary amendments to be made to the Bill.

(iv) The Safety Case must be published to include solutions to the issues raised in point 3 (iv). Progress of the Bill should be halted until this is published.

(v) The Business and Local Economy Fund and Community and Environment Fund be increased from the present derisory level, to enable Your Petitioners to receive adequate compensation for loss of business during the construction of HS2 in the Chilterns Corridor. The choice of the funding delivery agencies to be agreed with local authorities to ensure fair consideration of all community needs.

(vi) The funding of Local Authority Additional Burdens be increased to include all activities relating to HS2, to ensure that no further costs fall on Your Petitioners.
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

Stanley Mason, Agent.
3rd April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Wendy Robertson

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

2. The Petitioner is, Wendy 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 she 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, she uses and supports the local shops in Great Missenden. 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 (GMI/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 her 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 her 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 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.

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 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.

Wendy 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 Cubbington Parish Council

Declares that:

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

The petitioner is the elected local council representing approximately four thousand residents of the Parish of Cubbington in the County of Warwickshire, many of whom will be specially and directly adversely affected by the Bill. The Parish adjoins the north-eastern outskirts of Royal Leamington Spa and comprises the old village core, and New Cubbington which is to the west, although both are usually referred to as Cubbington.

Approximately three kilometres of the route of High Speed Two, as defined within the Bill, will lie within the Parish of Cubbington, passing through the open countryside to the east of the old village core.

In pursuance of Section 239 of the Local Government Act 1972, the petitioner advertised that a meeting of Cubbington Parish Council to be held on the thirteenth day of May 2014 would consider a resolution to oppose the Bill in either House of Parliament by petition and this meeting duly adopted that resolution.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Sustainability

The petitioner supports sustainable development. It is evident from the promoter’s own Appraisal of Sustainability for the London-West Midlands section of High Speed Two, however, that the project has significant sustainability issues: only two of the eighteen “key sustainability issues” identified by the appraisal have been rated as supportive of the sustainability objective.

The petitioner is particularly concerned that the works enabled by the Bill will result in damage to in excess of thirty ancient woodlands and to veteran trees, which are irreplaceable natural assets that Government policy seeks to preserve. One such woodland, and one such veteran tree, are located within the Parish of
Cubbington. The destruction of irreplaceable natural assets is, by definition, an unsustainable activity.

Seeking amelioration

The petitioner has taken every opportunity that has been offered to engage with the promoter to raise and discuss the impacts that the works to be enabled by the Bill will have on the Parish of Cubbington, including involvement in community forum and bilateral meetings and responding to public consultations in 2011 and in 2013 on the draft and final Environmental Statement. The petitioner has contributed energetically and enthusiastically to these processes, and has submitted proposals for consideration that would reduce environmental impacts.

The petitioner regards this engagement experience as having been largely unsatisfactory, in that environmental and community concerns have not received the full and sympathetic consideration that should be expected. On the contrary, whilst this process has been taking place the promoter has, in a succession of design changes, progressively increased the trackbed height over its entire run through the Parish of Cubbington, thereby exacerbating some environmental impacts. The petitioner is firmly of the opinion that the design of the works fails to secure the level of protection for the local environment of Cubbington that should be expected from a world-class project, and that the environmental mitigation measures are insufficient.

The petitioner's prayer has previously been heard by the Bill Select Committee of the Honourable House of Commons but without any amelioration being achieved. The petitioner therefore feels obliged to make this present prayer to your Right Honourable House, concentrating on two key issues from the original petition.

Cubbington's countryside amenity

The western side of the Parish of Cubbington is largely amalgamated into the north-eastern suburbs of Leamington Spa with the result that the open countryside to the east of the old village core, through which High Speed Two trains will run, fulfils an important function in retaining the rural character of the old village and providing an appropriate backdrop to the conservation area that is at the heart of the old village. This countryside is also an important natural amenity for Cubbington residents and the wider community, being served by two public footpaths running from the old village core (one of which is a section of a long-distance footpath), and providing access to open countryside within a ten-minute walk of the village. This amenity value will be considerably reduced by large-scale construction activities in the short term and the noise and visual impacts of high-speed train operations in the long term.

The countryside east of the old village core contains two natural assets that are particularly valued by many of our residents. The first of these is South Cubbington Wood, which is designated semi-natural ancient woodland and a local wildlife site (LWS). Although this wood is privately owned, a tolerant landowner permits free access by the public so that it may be widely enjoyed.
The second asset is a veteran pear tree, growing in a hedgerow immediately to the south of South Cubbington Wood, which is listed on the National Tree Register as a “champion” tree and is the current holder of the title “England’s Tree of the Year”.

The works to be enabled by the Bill will have a severe effect on both of these assets. The promoter estimates that slightly more than two hectares of the ancient woodland (representing thirteen per cent of the fifteen hectare LWS) will be lost by the construction of a cutting through the wood, which will also sever the south-western part of the woodland from the main body, creating two smaller woods. The veteran pear tree will be felled to make way for the cutting.

In addition to the effects on local amenity, these losses are unacceptable on ecological grounds.

The significance of ancient woodland and veteran trees

The promoter accepts that ancient woodland is “an irreplaceable resource” and this, to all practical purposes, is also the case for veteran trees. This status is recognised by government policy, which seeks to preserve ancient woodlands and veteran trees as far as is possible.

Since ancient woodland and veteran trees cannot be recreated by new planting, it is not a viable proposition to compensate for the loss of biodiversity resulting from their destruction by offset habitat creation. This obvious fact undermines the credibility of the promoter’s mitigation policy, relying, as it does, heavily upon this palliative.

The petitioner is very disappointed that, despite a request made by the Environmental Audit Committee of the Honourable House of Commons to the Bill Select Committee of that House to “report to the House on any issue relating to the environmental impact of HS2”, the latter Committee neglects to address the general problem of loss of ancient woodland and veteran trees in any of its special reports. This omission is particularly regrettable in the light of the former Committee’s assessment that there had been “shortcomings” in the way that the environmental impacts of HS2 had been “addressed in the legislative and assessment processes” associated with the Bill.

Mitigation proposals

The promoter has investigated alternative route alignments, either by horizontal realignment or by bored tunnelling, that avoid all damage to South Cubbington Wood and the veteran pear tree, but has rejected these alternatives on either operational or cost and construction complexity grounds. It was a great disappointment to the petitioner that the Bill Select Committee of the Honourable House of Commons concurred with this view.

The promoter has incorporated retaining walls in the design of the section of cutting to be excavated within South Cubbington Wood, in order to reduce the width of the cutting at ground level and with the aim of restricting the area of woodland that will be disturbed. The petitioner considers, however, that the full benefits of this measure can only be assured if steps are taken to protect woodland lying outside of the minimum area necessary to allow the cutting to
be constructed from accidental damage during construction operations.

A retained cutting can provide no protection for the veteran pear tree as the latter would be growing within the excavation limits, even were the cutting design to incorporate retaining walls.

Outside of the mitigation offered by the retained cutting, the promoter's proposals for making good the ecological damage in the vicinity of South Cubbington Wood rely on compensatory planting of new woodland, the translocation of excavated ancient woodland soil to newly-created woodland sites and the attempted propagation of the pear tree. It is the petitioner's view that this will be inadequate compensation and will result in a significant loss of biodiversity.

Proposed remedies (woodland and veteran tree)

The petitioner requests your Right Honourable House to review whether the damage that the works to be enabled by the Bill will inflict upon South Cubbington Wood and the veteran pear tree is consistent with government policy to protect ancient woodland and veteran trees, as set out in Keepers of Time and the National Planning Policy Framework, and with the promoter's aim of achieving "no net biodiversity loss".

The petitioner requests your Right Honourable House to reconsider whether a change to the design as defined within the Bill should be made in order to avoid any damage to South Cubbington Wood and the veteran pear tree.

The petitioner requests the Promoter to specify the maximum limits of damage for the construction of the retained cutting through South Cubbington Wood, and to provide an assurance that no damage to trees or woodland soil will be caused outside of these limits.

Impacts of construction traffic

The Environmental Statement within the Bill identifies two locations for satellite construction sites within the Parish of Cubbington: the Cubbington retaining wall compound near to South Cubbington Wood and adjacent to the B4453 Rugby Road, and the Coventry Road overbridge compound on Coventry Road near to Furzen Hill farm. The highways access routes specified for these compounds in the Environmental Statement converge at the junction of Rugby Road and Coventry Road and both utilise Rugby Road, between its Coventry Road and Kenilworth Road junctions, and Kenilworth Road for ultimate access to the A46 and M40.

The Petitioner regards the choice of route that the Promoter has made as inappropriate because –

a) The route requires the negotiation of a compact mini-roundabout at the junction of Rugby Road and Kenilworth Road, with restricted sight lines, quite unsuitable for large haulage vehicles

b) The route passes the frontages of approximately two hundred dwellings in Rugby Road and Kenilworth Road, causing unacceptable levels of nuisance
c) Coventry Road offers a direct access to an alternative route via the A445 Leicester Lane, regaining the route proposed in the Environmental Statement at Westhill Road, and this alternative route passes comparatively few dwellings.

The Petitioner accepts that a short section of Coventry Road is probably too narrow to allow two HGVs to pass each other, but considers this as easily rectifiable within the realignment of this carriageway planned within the works to be enabled by the Bill.

Proposed remedy (construction traffic)

The Petitioner requests your Right Honourable House to require the Promoter to prohibit construction traffic from using, in the normal course of events, Rugby Road between its Coventry Road and Kenilworth Road junctions.

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 John Delow, Agent

12th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF BARBARA JANE COOPER

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 PRIORY BUCKINGHAM MK184LB("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 undertaking.

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. 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 JANE COOPER

04/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF KENNETH LAURENCE COOPER

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 PRIORY BUCKINGHAM MK184LB ("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 andSections 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 consider this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

*each petitioner (or his Agent) MUST sign the petition here*

KENNETH LAURENCE COOPER

04/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

Mr Alan Andrews and Mrs Christine Richfield-Andrews
45A Chiltern Road
WENDOVER,
Bucks. HP22 6DA

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill and the measures proposed within Additional Provision APS.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioners Alan Andrews and Christine Richfield-Andrews reside at 45A Chiltern Road, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6DA and are the owners of that property, and are "specially and directly affected" by the Bill. The proposed line would run within 403 metres of their property.

2.1 Your Petitioners’ property is shown in the Zone of Theoretical Visibility in ES C252-ETM-EV-MAP-020-003463-PO7.00 and C252-ETM-EV-MAP-020-003515-PO7.00, and in the Draft Environmental Statement Map Book Community Forum Area 10, map reference C222-ATK-EV-MAP-020-000030 PO3.

2.2 Your Petitioners have been the recipients of e-mails, letters and information in the post from HS2 Ltd, which indicate that HS2 consider that they are affected by the Bill due to their proximity to the construction and operation of the High Speed line.

2.3 Your petitioners have previously been heard in proceedings at the House of Commons Select Committee on HS2 where their locus standii was accepted by HS2.

2.4. Your petitioners have previously submitted evidence to the Lords Economic Affairs Committee’s investigation into the economics of HS2.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Objection is taken to both the construction and operation of certain scheduled works described in the proposed scheme to be undertaken in and near Wendover. These works consist of the following:-

- An embankment between Hartley Farm and Road Barn Farm
- The Small Dean and Wendover Dean viaducts
- An embankment between the northern end of the Small Dean viaduct and the southern end of the Wendover green tunnel
• The so called Green Tunnel to the west of Wendover, and the embankment to the north of the entrance of the so called Green Tunnel

• Ancillary works such as the so called noise barriers up to 6 m in height, satellite compounds, auto-transformer stations, balancing ponds and portal buildings

3.2 The effect of these proposed works which include the effects of Additional Provision AP5 on your petitioners are as follows:-

3.3 Deleterious visual effect of the proposed construction upon the AONB, the village of Wendover in which your petitioners live and work and the quality of life they currently enjoy. The proposed constructions outlined above will not properly mitigate the visual impact on Wendover and will be a perpetual eyesore blighting the AONB landscape in which Wendover sits.

3.4 Increased noise levels emanating from the operation of 36 high speed trains each operational hour will have a deleterious effect on your petitioners’ enjoyment of both their property in which they live, the general environment of Wendover and its surroundings, in which your petitioners currently live and work and the amenity they enjoy from that environment. The proposed constructions outlined above will not effectively mitigate the envisaged noise levels produced by the railway once it becomes operational.

3.5 The operational baseline of noise assessment (SV002-010) published in November 2013 by HS2 Ltd. stated that, of the 161 noise assessment locations chosen by HS2 for CFA10 (Dunsmore, Wendover & Halton) to describe the existing noise environment in and around Wendover, only 49 of those locations had noise measurements recorded in those locations. Consequently the baseline noise data reported by HS2 as representing the existing noise environment for the majority of Wendover is actually based upon 112 locations where HS2 did not actually measure noise levels at the noise assessment locations chosen by HS2 Ltd. In these locations HS2 have provided data which HS2 consider representative of the area, but not actually measured in the locality.

3.6 Your petitioners’ consider that the baseline level of noise reported by HS2 is wholly unrepresentative of the existing noise levels experienced across Wendover and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, such baseline noise levels are over-stated by HS2 in order to reduce HS2’s financial risk against successful future Part 1 LCA claims.

3.7 Your petitioners’ consider that HS2’s predicted noise levels arising from the operation of the railway under-state the noise impact of the railway, as this would reduce HS2’s financial risk against successful future Part 1 LCA claims.

3.8 The visual and noise impact upon your petitioners during the construction phase of HS2 will be worse than the combined effects suffered by your petitioners once the operational phase commences, given the number, size and scale of railway cuttings and embankments that HS2 Ltd envisage necessary to build the proposed scheme. This impacts upon their enjoyment of their property and garden and as occasional concert attenders at St. Mary’s, impacts upon their enjoyment of music concerts at that venue.
3.9 As a result of the construction and operational phases of HS2 your petitioners will suffer significant disruption to their daily lives and will suffer financial losses in the form of reduced value of their only residential property. Your petitioners' financial loss is unlikely to be fully compensated.

3.10 The proposed “Need to Sell” scheme places arbitrary conditions upon those who feel they may need to sell their properties, and is designed not so much to compensate householders’ financial losses, but to prevent householders from selling their properties in the first place. The terms and conditions of the “Need to Sell” scheme place an unacceptable burden on householders.

3.11 The process by which applications under the “Need to Sell” scheme are assessed is not open and transparent, and HS2 Ltd are under no legal obligation to provide written reasons for their decisions. As HS2 Ltd are acting in a quasi-judicial role when assessing applications, the current process is unjust and is operating outside the normal rules that apply to judicial and quasi-judicial tribunals.

4 Your petitioners ask the committee to grant the following:-

4.1 Your Petitioners request that, in order to protect Wendover and the Chilterns AONB from the visual and noise effects of HS2 Ltd’s. proposed scheme, HS2 Ltd. be instructed to extend the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover. This requires the construction of an extended tunnel based on the T3i proposals, proposals which have previously been considered by HS2 Limited, and would ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel.

4.2 These extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by both the DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable, and have been discussed extensively with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums that comprise the Chilterns AONB, Wendover and Stoke Mandeville, and is supported by them.

4.3 Your Petitioner requests that an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full AONB tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area. This is especially relevant in the light of the House of Commons Select Committee’s view expressed in its final report (Paragraph 122) which stated “We were sceptical about costs estimates from all parties. We do not believe it was justifiable to say that the Promoter went out of its way to mark up costs of certain options”.

4.4 It is the view of your petitioners that a deep bored tunnel will remove their concerns expressed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.10 in respect of visual and noise blight associated with the current scheme.

4.5 It is the view of your petitioners that a deep bored tunnel will reduce significantly their exposure to financial losses under any potential Part 1 LCA 1973 claim associated with the current scheme.

4.6 It is the view of your petitioners that a deep bored tunnel would significantly lessen the construction impact upon Wendover and your petitioners in particular.
4.7 Should the Committee not be minded to authorise such a tunnel, then your petitioners request that the so called Wendover Green Tunnel is extended southwards from its current southern portal to across to the east side of the currently proposed Small Dean Viaduct. Such a scheme would enclose that viaduct enabling that construction to blend better within the landscape as well as reducing operational noise emissions.

4.8 Your petitioners request that the current “Need to Sell” scheme be changed into a “Wish to Sell” scheme, so that qualifying residents effected by HS2 can sell their residential properties at the unblighted market value without having to justify their reasoning to sell against HS2’s restrictive and arbitrary situations. Qualification would be determined by residents “locus standii” and them being resident prior to the 2010 scheme announcement.

4.9 Should the Committee not be minded to authorise a “Wish to Sell” scheme, then your petitioners request that HS2 Ltd are required to give written reasons for any decision they make in respect of any successful or unsuccessful application.

4.10 Your petitioners request the Committee to direct HS2 Ltd to publish the criteria by which HS2 Ltd assess each Need to Sell application against their published “compelling need to sell” examples that HS2 Ltd themselves consider a justifiable need. Furthermore, your petitioners request the Committee to direct HS2 Ltd to publish the guidelines that HS2 Ltd’s assessors use to interpret each application against their assessment criteria. Doing this would bring a greater degree of transparency to the assessment process and would cost HS2 (in financial terms) nothing.

4.11 Your petitioners request the Committee to put in place a monitoring and reporting process with HS2 that will prevent HS2 Ltd from arbitrarily refusing NTS applications simply because HS2 Ltd wish to reduce their project costs.

AND your Petitioner will ever pray, etc.

The prayer

Your 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.

Alan Andrews

Christine Richfield-Andrews

11th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CHETWODE PARISH MEETING

 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 Chetwode Parish Meeting (the “Petitioner”), petitioning on behalf of the residents of the parish of Chetwode in Buckinghamshire. Chetwode Parish Meeting is recognised by Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council as a consultee on planning applications, highway works, and other matters affecting the area in which those whom it represents live. Your petitioners include owners and occupiers of properties within the limits of land to be acquired and used as shown on the plans deposited with the Bill and therefore a number of your petitioners’ properties are liable to compulsory acquisition under the Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

As discussed with the Promoters, your petitioners favour 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 petitioners understand that the residents of the parish of Chetwode enjoy the full support of their local MP, the Church of England, the District Council and the 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 petitioners seek 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 concerned by the possibility of land in Chetwode being acquired permanently for a temporary purpose and considers it inappropriate for
the Bill to contain compulsory purchase powers in respect of its land when the
nominated undertaker’s requirement is for a temporary use only. We propose the
Promoter make temporary arrangements to satisfy their conservational
requirement, and that thereafter appropriate covenants and management
agreements can ensure the continued stewardship, whilst ownership remains
with the existing land owner.

Your petitioner proposes to your honourable House that the Promoter should be
required to undertake that it will seek to agree with your petitioner a suitable
specification for security and prevention of light pollution from the Chetwode
cutting satellite compound and the Chetwode autotransformer station.

Your petitioners are concerned that during the construction phase, high-intensity
lighting would be used during nocturnal working, and that this would be very
disruptive for residents. Your petitioners seek amendments to the Code of
Construction Practice that would require strict guidelines and control criteria, as
well as the regulation of working outside core hours.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the
Chetwode autotransformer station and overhead power lines, which introduce
new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Your petitioner seeks an
undertaking from the Promoter that there will be no above-ground wires or cables
to the autotransformer Station, and that the future operator of the
autotransformer Station will be required to place underground any future wires or
cables to the autotransformer Station. Your petitioner also requests that a
sensitive design is used for the autotransformer station building with additional
screening added. The design of the station should be produced in consultation
with the local community, and it must be designed to fit in with the character of
the area.

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 with a very long history. 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. 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 petitioners are concerned about the lack of detailed proposals for security fencing of the line, and the potential impacts on the landscape. It is understood that for maximum effectiveness, the noise barriers would be close to the line, and cable troughs and access tracks would result in a typical trace width, across fences, of 22 metres. It is anticipated that, were the noise barriers to provide insufficient security, steel palisade fencing will also be fitted. Your Petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that any security fences will be screened and coloured to tone into the environment, such as olive or yellow-green in rural settings, and that the advice and wishes of the parish will be followed.

It is noted that the proposed Works will entail damage or removal of hedgerows throughout the parish of Chetwode, including removal of an ancient hedgerow that is showed unchanged on a map dated 1638. This has serious implications for the complete ecosystems to which they give shelter. 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 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.

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.

Jennifer Collins, Correspondent to Chetwode Parish Meeting
On behalf of Chetwode Parish Meeting

04/04/16
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Martin Richard and Georgeina Bolton

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 11, 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 but is located 600 metres 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 road should be relocated further north, distant from the larger settlements of Great Missenden and Prestwood, and beyond the Mobwell junction1 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 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

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
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 850 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
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).

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.

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.

Martin Richard Bolton

Georgeina Bolton

Dated
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Margaret Aleida 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 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.

22 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

Margaret Aleida Johnstone
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Christopher Peeler and Mary Peeler  

 Declares that:  

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

2. The petitioners are resident at 64a Lionel Avenue, Wendover, where they have lived for over 35 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 the scheduled works proposed to be undertaken in or near Wendover between Little Missenden and Stoke Mandeville. 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) Damage to their view of the Aylesbury Vale.  

   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) Noise.  

   f) Dust causing health problems.  

   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) Permanent damage to their view by the passing of trains up to 400 metres long every 100 seconds.
b) further permanent damage to their view by the passing of trains up to 400 metres long every 100 seconds.

c) Noise caused by trains exiting the green tunnel and continuing north.

d) Reduction in value of their property.

e) Damage to local heritage and facilities

f) Continuing damage to the aquifer.

g) The permanent scarring of the Chiltern Hills in the AONB

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.

Christoopher Peeler

Mary Peeler

10th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Norman Fletcher Nicholson and Sally Anne Nicholson

Declares that:
1. The Petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioners

Your Petitioners are resident at 16 Hale Road, Wendover HP22 6NF, part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). They will be specially and directly affected, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioners are concerned about the serious adverse consequences of the proposals regarding this part of the AONB and in particular on the town of Wendover. The proposed HS2 route between South Heath and Wendover is mainly on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, two large and intrusive viaducts and embankments. This is despite the protection resulting from the area being designated an AONB under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, 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 and beauty of this part of the AONB - qualities that lead to it being visited over 50 million times a year. During its construction HS2 will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and general cohesion of the communities in the area, and will permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents and visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area. Wendover’s population of about 9,000 will be the most seriously affected and its economy is likely to be significantly damaged.

Your Petitioners are extremely concerned about the disruption which will occur as a result of traffic movements during the construction of the line, particularly in the Wendover area. They are also concerned about the noise, dust, congestion and access problems during what will be a long period of construction. Your Petitioners believe that the proposed use of six
metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and could radically alter the character of the town.

Your Petitioners request that the Chilterns AONB be fully protected by extending the proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover. If this is not possible your Petitioners request that, in order to protect Wendover with its large population, a short tunnel is built past the town. Your Petitioners understand that technically feasible designs for both tunnels have already been drawn up.

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.

...........................................................

N F NICHOLSON                              S A NICHOLSON

9 April 2016
To the House of Lords Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF AMANDA JESSON

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the the whole High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill.

2. Your petitioner is a resident of Wells House Road and chairs the Wells House Residents Association that she set up with the sole purpose of helping residents through the complex and arduous HS2 consultation process. She lives with her 20-year old daughter who is at university. Their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill and the Additional Provisions.

   Your petitioner is a 50-something single mother who plans to use rent from her spare rooms to support her through her retirement.

   Your petitioner’s house is a characterful and well maintained three-bedroom Edwardian house with a garden, and an attic that is earmarked to be converted into a fourth bedroom.

   The house location is outstandingly quiet, with low levels of traffic. It is well situated for transport in Zone 2.

   Your petitioner’s garden is her pride and joy but will be compulsory purchased by HS2 once the Bill is passed. Your petitioner’s property is also located directly above the Wells House Road’s fragile sustaining wall.

   Your petitioner’s property is situated on the east side of the Wells House Road, backing over the site for the Old Oak Common HS2 and Crossrail stations, over one of the main construction compounds and Old Oak Common Lane that is due to be lowered.

   Your petitioner purchased 50% of her home via a shared ownership scheme.

   From the back rooms of your petitioner’s home, there are exceptional views across London to the London Eye and the Shard.

   Currently your petitioner is a freelance market researcher. Previously, she was at director/department head level in full time employment before finding the balance between full time work and handling the consultations with HS2 impossible to manage. HS2 management takes a minimum average of one day per week.

   Your petitioner has a medical condition that may not allow her withstand the air quality or the stress of continuing negotiations with HS2 Limited.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

   3.1. Overall, your petitioner supports all the concerns outlined in the Wells House Road Residents Association petition, many of which directly impact on her home and quality of hers and her daughter’s life.
3.2. Your petitioner and her property will be in the centre of the major construction site for Old Oak Common (OOC) Station.

3.3. Behind your petitioner’s property will be the main construction compound. Much of this construction will be carried out 24/7. Your petitioner will also be directly exposed to construction below her home and garden with the lowering of Old Oak Common Lane and the rebuilding of the sustaining wall, as well as from the AP2 impacts at the base of the road.

3.4. Once this is complete, your petitioner will no longer live in the quiet corner of the city she desires. Behind your petitioner’s property will be a busy station, the size of Waterloo with 250,000 people passing through per day. With it, will come noise and disruption. In addition, HS2 has led this part of Old Oak Common to become the catalyst for the Old Oak Park Royal Development Corporation’s development of 34,000 homes and 65,000 work spaces. The highest density and highest rise buildings are proposed for above and around the HS2 station. This will effectively change the quiet character of your petitioner’s home and garden and her home will be hemmed in by highrises that could block out light and views, rendering her back garden useless.

3.5. Working from home: Your petitioner works from home as a freelance market researcher. This requires hours of concentration in peace and quiet while analysing results and writing reports. In addition, she conducts business calls and video conferences from her home. It is likely that the noise will force your petitioner to need to rent office space. HS2 Limited should to liable to pay for this space.

3.6. Compensation: Currently Wells House Road and other urban areas have no compensation beyond the inadequate ‘Need to Sell Scheme’. We desire compensation. Wells House Road properties are blighted and their value is significantly below equivalent housing in the area. One property, four doors north of your petitioner’s home, received a £0 valuation due to HS2, making properties undesirable for mortgage buyers. Your petitioner only owns 50% of her property via shared ownership and would be forced to significantly trade down or leave London if she is forced to or wishes to move. This means that she is effectively locked into her property in this nightmare scenario until at least the end of HS2/OPDC development in 20 years time. Your petitioner asks for the option to be permanently OR temporarily rehoused in a property that is the same size, quality and similar Zone 2 location. However, she reserves the right to wait until the construction starts, as your petitioner cannot foresee how her and her daughter’s quality of life will be impacted.

3.7. Quality of life/health: Your petitioner suffers from respiratory disease that may not allow her to live in the middle of a construction site. In addition, the 5+-year dispute with HS2 has caused your petitioner a high level of stress and anxiety that has also caused a deterioration in her health.

3.8. Loss of income: The HS2 Limited process is time consuming and negotiations with their team has proved fruitless with no assurances given to residents. There has been widespread reporting of HS2’s handling of the consultation and their poor treatment of its victims. Many residents of WHR have not been capable of handling the complexities of the process and therefore the burden – in terms of responsibility, time and cost - of the never-ending consultations, communications and petitioning has fallen on the shoulders of your petitioner. Your petitioner therefore has been forced to reduce her working hours and move into part-time freelance work, resulting in a severe loss of income. Due to point 3.7 and 3.8, your petitioner no longer wishes to be exposed to the stress of the consultation process and negotiations with HS2 Limited. Therefore, your petitioner asks that HS2 Limited to pay a salary for someone to take on your petitioner’s current role in supporting the Wells House Road community through the impacts of HS2.
3.9. **Loss of rental income:** Your petitioner would also like compensation for loss of ‘spare room’ rental income due to the construction.

3.10. **Old Oak Lane Closure:** Although some assurances have been discussed between Ealing and HS2 Ltd, nothing has been confirmed to residents. We are seeking mobility & delivery services, 228 bus burning point, confirmation that the road will be kept open for pedestrians.

3.11. **WHR sustaining wall:** Your petitioner's home and garden is directly above the sustaining wall and if the wall collapses, it is likely to take her garden and even her home with it. It requires reinforcement before work begins to allow it to withstand the vibrations from HGVs and construction. In addition, we need assurances that when it is rebuilt, it is built to the top of residents' fence height, is visually appealing and absorbs sound and air pollution e.g. a plant wall. It addition, temporary sound proofing of gardens should be provided.

3.12. **Temporary loss of gardens:** HS2 Limited has failed to provide a consistent story as to the future of your petitioner's garden that will be subject to a CPO once the Bill is approved. Gardens need to be photographed before the work begins and all structures and foliage taken or damaged need to be replaced and any costs associated with this should be reimbursed by HS2 Ltd.

3.13. **Baseline report on all properties:** We request that properties are photographed and surveyed before construction commences in order to monitor and correct any structural damage.

3.14. **Works entrance on Old Oak Common Lane:** We are asking that a new location is found for this that is away from WHR properties. It is currently located directly behind your petitioner’s property.

3.15. **Old Oak Common Station:** We ask that the platforms are moved east so that the impact of noise and disruption from the operation and the high-density overbuild of the station is moved away from WHR and other existing communities. This would also be a benefit to The Scrubs who believe an access point further east would not be so damaging to the environment. We also ask that HS2 Limited’s pledge for green space between WHR and the Old Oak Common HS2 Station be retained.

3.16. **Supplementing the Code of Construction Practice:** HS2 Limited continues to dismiss noise, air, light and vibration pollution as impacts that will be covered by the Code of Construction Practice. We challenge their current level predictions and also require clarifications and assurances that the construction will not impact on residents’ quality of life. We have been verbally offered some sound proofing but believe this should be offered to all WHR properties on all sides of homes. We also need clarification as to what type of sound proofing would be offered and what measures will be taken for ventilation. Again, if it is not possible to retain a quality of life and health, including to be able to safely open windows, we would require options for temporary rehousing. It addition, we require controls of working hours to limit work that creates noise to weekday working hours, where possible.

3.17. **Area cleaning:** Currently Ealing does not adequately enforce strict controls over developer cleanups. We require HS2 to keep roads and pavements clean, to be responsible to cleaning brickwork of private housing, and to control vermin that will come from demolitions.

3.18. **Accountability:** HS2 Limited has a shocking record of engagement with the community. Their relationship has soured with communities all along the line and bred
activism. We therefore require measures for engagement throughout the process, e.g. independent mediation, subsides for legal and professional advice, oversight by OPDC to limit direct contact with HS2 personnel, single body that regulates and secures accountability in real time. Note: HS2 pledged regular meetings following the Select Committee hearing in January. They have only arranged two meetings across the three past months and no assurances have been given. In addition, beyond one phone call from their new ‘Senior Engagement Manager’, no attempt has been made to meet with residents of Old Oak Common. This exemplifies HS2’s lack of commitment to any meaningful engagement with the community or resolution of their issues. We do not wish for Ealing Council to act as mediators as their resources are limited.

3.19. **To keep the doors open for on-going dialogue**: Since HS2 plans are continually changing, we need flexibility and a means by which HS2 is forced to continue to provide written assurances and responses for new developments as and when they occur.

The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they or someone representing 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.

Petitioner: Amanda Jesson (nee Souter), Chair Wells House Road Residents Association & resident of 31 Wells House Road, London, NW10 6ED (on behalf of the residents of Wells House Road)

Petitioner signature:

Date: 8th April, 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Jack Nigel Martin

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 "Rosemundy" 1 School End Chetwode. 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.

Jack Nigel Martin
04/04/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Nevil Andrew Eltringham Coulson

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Nevil Coulson, resident at Little Oak, Chiltern Road, Ballinger, Great Missenden, HP16 9LJ, 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, 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, Prestwood 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. In the construction period the works will effectively cut off dwellings in his area from all the services and amenities in Great Missenden and Prestwood, not least the railway, to which there is no ready alternative. 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, 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 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 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 in 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.

.................................................................

Nevil Andrew Eltringham Coulson

9 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill


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 the London Borough of Hillingdon at Thornhill Road and Derwent Avenue.

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.

Introductory

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 construct and carry the Railway over ground through the area between Ruislip and the M25 will give rise to many adverse 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 honorable House not find in favour of a tunnel.
Specific Concerns

Traffic Volume Issues
7. Your petitioners live close to Swakeleys Road, a principal route designated by HS2 for construction traffic. Thornhill Road and Derwent Avenue are residential roads which suffer from “rat running” or “re-assignment “as a consequence of congestion. Our properties will be affected as a result of the HGV and other construction related traffic which HS2 generates and causes to be “reassigned” onto the roads where we live. Your petitioners are concerned that they will be badly affected in terms of accessing their properties, travelling to employment and using local services.

8. HS2 intends to move vast quantities of spoil and construction materials over the roads of Ickenham. They intend to introduce signalization and road works that will also extensively disrupt the traffic flows in the area. However, they have not assessed how the resultant congestion will affect us and identified appropriate mitigation. The implicit assumption seems to be that traffic will “evaporate” or “reassign” onto roads such as ours to accommodate the disruption caused by HS2. We doubt the practicality of this assumption and anyway it has not been tested in a meaningful way.

9. TfL provides guidance for its Sub-regional Highway Assignment Model which makes clear a number of matters. Strategic models need to be validated & adjusted for local situations so that they reflect what is “on the ground” and are “fit for purpose”. The guidance requires comprehensive analysis where traffic is displaced. That is for “congested areas where the network has difficulty in accommodating the additional traffic” such as Ickenham. Sadly the requisite analysis by HS2 for our roads is conspicuous by its absence.

Road Safety

8. Your petitioners live close to and use a principal pedestrian crossing over Swakeleys Road. This is used particularly by adults and children going to and from Brakespear and Vyners Schools. The volumes of traffic expected to be diverted into the local areas and the proposed levels of HGV traffic are a major concern in term of road safety.

Communication between HS2 and Ickenham Residents

9. Your petitioners are concerned that HS2 Ltd has not previously answered our questions despite giving assurances to us that they would respond. HS2 have handled the consultation poorly. Plans have constantly changed. There have been major gaps in information and inadequate transparency. There have been inconsistent messages and assertions made without supporting evidence. As a result, there has been a breakdown in trust. Hence we ask that any proposals from HS2 are subject to independent validation and scrutiny.
Mitigation

10. Given all the concerns and issues arising from the plans to build the line overland your petitioners believe that there should be a detailed and independent cost comparison of options to extend the tunnel either, beyond the West Ruislip portal to the Harvil Road construction site or all the way to the M25, versus the total costs of overland construction through Ickenham and the Colne Valley. These costs should include amongst others, relocating the Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre, compensation packages, the cost to the local economy, the long-term costs of maintaining ecological mitigation sites, etc.

11. In the absence of a tunnel or an extension, steps to eliminate the effects of HS2 “reassignment” onto our local roads are required. These should include

a) Creating facilities and phasing construction in such a way that the use of rail is the method of removing spoil and bring material into the construction sites.

b) Adoption of construction “best practice” whereby any spoil and materials are moved on internal haul roads between the construction sites.

c) Require staff and workers at the sites to travel on public transport and provide environmentally friendly shuttle services to and from rail and bus stations.

12. If your honourable House accept there is no option but to move some spoil and materials on local roads then HS2 should be required to

a) Set out the volumes of materials to be moved and the traffic movements this generates.

b) Set out the likely impact on the local traffic infrastructure, including “reassignment” routes, of all traffic movements, not just HGVs, resulting from HS2 activities.

c) Adopt a holistic approach to traffic modelling and management in our area. Validate and set out the analysis in a way that follows TfL guidance, make this available to stakeholders such as Ickenham Residents and subject it to independent scrutiny.

d) Set out plans, acceptable to residents, that minimise the effects of HS2 related traffic. This could include restricting operating hours to avoid peak traffic hours and school opening times, agreeing not to extend operating hours in case of programme slippage etc.
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.

Ian Phillips  Anke Phillips  Sandra Mace  Ralph Hughes
3 Thornhill Rd.  3 Thornhill Rd.  1 Thornhill Rd.  5 Thornhill Rd.

Pat Hughes  Peter Cotmore  Pamela Cotmore
5 Thornhill Rd.  2 Thornhill Rd.  3 Thornhill Rd.

Jackie Willis  Tony Willis  J Wilson-Main  Nassim Sadeg
2 Derwent Avenue.  2 Derwent Avenue  6 Derwent Avenue  8 Derwent Avenue

8 Derwent Avenue  12 Derwent Avenue  12 Derwent Avenue

12 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

**High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill**

**THE PETITION OF The Wendover University of the Third Age**

Declares that:

The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill and specifically the fact that the proposed elevated surface route of the train is 280m from St Mary's Church, the defacto home of the Petitioner, resulting in unacceptable noise within the building.

Your petitioner

Your petitioner, The Wendover University of the Third Age ("Wendover U3A/ the U3A"), is an independent charity (Number: 1083897). Wendover U3A was formed in 2000 and currently has approximately 415 members who pay an annual fee. This fee entitles members to attend the U3A’s monthly meetings and join the various specialist interest groups created and run by the members of Wendover U3A.

Wendover U3A has the objects of:

1) advancing the education of the public and in particular the education of middle aged older people who are not in full time employment in Wendover and its surrounding locality; and

2) the provision of facilities for leisure time and recreational activities with the object of improving the conditions of life for the above persons in the interests of their social welfare.

In order to achieve the above aims Wendover U3A makes payment to St Mary's church in Wendover for the use of space and facilities within the building. Wendover U3A has enjoyed the grant of the facilities and space within this building from 2005 ie 11 years).

The building is regarded as the focal point for the U3A. Not only is it the U3A’s nominated and long-established meeting place, it is the only building within Wendover that offers the space for the U3A’s average attendance during monthly meetings, together with the practical and necessary facilities necessary for members to come along and enjoy furthering their knowledge. These facilities include: a kitchen, easy walking access to and from the town centre, close parking for those with mobility issues, the necessary technical capabilities for showing digital presentations to a large audience plus a hearing loop which is of benefit to many members.
**Your petitioner’s concerns**

St Mary's church is used by Wendover U3A for the purposes of:

i) holding its monthly meetings when members are updated on all relevant U3A issues and an invited external speaker provides an hour long talk on matters considered to be educational in nature. These educational talks take place ten times per year; in one of the remaining two months in the year when an external speaker is not engaged, the building is used to hold the U3A's AGM and the remaining month it is used for an extended general meetings.

These monthly meetings require the U3A to occupy the main body of the building for a full morning each month. The average attendance at the monthly meetings is approximately 180 at present and the plan is to increase this number.

ii) providing a room for eleven of the U3A’s specialist interest groups to hold their own regular monthly meetings. These groups hire the building’s facilities for half a day each. The specialist groups cover topics such as Understanding Latin, Archaeology, Art and a general Discussion Group. Approximately 160 people from the various specialist groups attend the building over the course of a typical month.

The building currently provides a quiet, contemplative and peaceful place in order for the U3A's members to enjoy the monthly meetings and the various groups meetings. The members who use the building are used to a quiet environment free from disturbances and distractions which allows them to concentrate fully on the subject matter being discussed. The members are mature in age and in nature, they are there on an entirely voluntary basis and fully appreciate the fact that they are in a building that fully allows them the opportunity to focus and receive education without any intrusive, irritating and avoidable noise.

The proposed HS2 line is only 280 metres from the church and some 36 trains per hour will pass the building. It has been accepted by HS2 Ltd that sound insulation needs to be provided to help deal with the impact of the noise generated by the trains on the activities carried out within the church. Wendover U3A has considerable concerns that the level of funding offered in mitigation by HS2 will be grossly insufficient to meet the requirements set out by experts in a report formally commissioned by William Avery of St Mary's Church who engaged Steve Summers of ACCON to provide the report. This report has been part paid for by and made available to Wendover U3A with the full knowledge of the expert firm concerned.

**Wendover U3A’s proposals to deal with its concerns**

The Environment Statement acknowledged the importance of the building as a venue and AP5 set out additional mitigation measures. However, these measures are not sufficient in the view of Wendover U3A to protect fully the internal acoustics of the building without either:

(a) fully enclosing/ tunnelling the trains, which would benefit both the inside and outside environment; or
(b) appropriate sound attenuation of the fabric of the building which would reduce disruption inside the church.

According to ACCON’s report, the scope of sound attenuation that is acceptable both technically and from a heritage point of view will cost £670,000 at today’s prices. Although HS2 assert that sound attenuation is not necessary on account of the additional mitigation offered, it has agreed the scope in principle and offered a contribution of £250,000. Wendover U3A asks, as a minimum, the House of Lords to instruct HS2 to increase the contribution to £670,000 with the amount adjusted following the application of the BCIS All-in TPI once the timing of the works is established.

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,

Paul Stephen Grey
Roll B Agent
12 March 2016
TO the House of Lords
SESSION 2015–16
HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF
(i) The Association of the Residents of the Drive. (Harefield Place)
(ii) The Drive (North End) Residents Association (Harefield Place)
(iii) Manor Grove Homes Ltd (owners of Harefield Place House).
(iv) Hole 19 Ltd (proprietors and operators of Uxbridge Golf Course).
(v) Harefield Place Golf Club.

Declares that:
1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.
2. Your Petitioners are:
   (i) The Association of the Residents of the Drive. (Harefield Place)
   (ii) The Drive (North End) Residents Association (Harefield Place)
   (iii) Manor Grove Homes Ltd (owners of Harefield Place House).
   (iv) Hole 19 Ltd (proprietors and operators of Uxbridge Golf Course).
   (v) Harefield Place Golf Club.

3. This Petition is brought by the Petitioners consisting of the associations businesses, club and residents of “Harefield Place Estate” as set out below. The Association of the Residents of the Drive also act on behalf of the owner of Highfield Drive private road and the Residents of Highfield Drive. The total number of properties in Harefield Place Estate represented by this Petition is 158 properties. Uxbridge Golf Course is a public golf course open to all but there is also a members club, Harefield Place Golf club open to golfer and social members and with a membership of some 200 persons.
4. The Association of the Residents of the Drive was established in the 1930s and have financial records going back to 1975. The Drive (North End) Residents Association was formed in 1953 and has records from that date. Hole 19 Ltd runs the Golf Course known as the Uxbridge Golf Course, over which development is to take place and Manor Grove Homes Ltd own Harefield Place House and are both public listed companies. Harefield Place Golf Club was formed and dates back to the 1930s and is the golf club associated with Uxbridge Golf Course.

5. Your petitioners concerns are that they and their members' property, rights and interests in Ickenham in the London Borough of Hillingdon 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.

**Harefield Place Estate**

6. Harefield Place Estate is made up of a number of roads: The Drive (which in fact split into three parts, North and South and the Golf Course branch also known as the Drive. The South part of The Drive includes Dukes Ride, Pine Trees and Georgian Close all of which are no through roads off the Drive. Highfield Drive has an entrance into it from Harvil Road and The Drive, but its southern end is also a No Through Road. All Roads in Harefield Place Estate are private roads within the Ickenham Ward. There are currently some 81 properties in the (South) Drive and its associated roads, 12 in the (North) Drive, and 9 properties in the golf course branch including Hillcroft House, Woodlands, The Cottages, and the Golf course apartment. There are some 58 properties in Highfield Drive which does not have a formal association and the Residents Association of the Drive represents their concerns for the purposes of this Petition. As stated above the total number of properties in Harefield Place Estate currently is 158 properties.

7. There are also two significant business properties that form part of Harefield Place Estate, Uxbridge Golf Course itself (one of only 3 Public Golf Courses in Hillingdon Borough), and the former Blockbusters office site consisting of Harefield Place House (a listed building) and adjoining office block (now owned by Manor Grove Homes Ltd) which are again accessed off the Drive.

8. Uxbridge Golf Course is a public golf course owned by The London Borough of Hillingdon but operated under lease by Hole 19 with a members Association known as (Harefield Place Golf Club). Uxbridge Golf Course has been in existence for many years and is open to the public, while the club (Harefield Place Golf Club) has been in existence for over 60 years and currently has approximately 80 members.

9. Together these roads, properties, businesses, club and associations form the “Harefield Place Estate”. The Petitioners recognise that they are fortunate to live in one of the most unique and beautiful locations anywhere in the Borough and have always worked collectively to protect both the amenity and ambience of the area and its countryside for residents and the community as a whole.
10. There are limited access routes into Harefield Place Estate, one from the North and one from the South. From the North, motorists can access Harefield Place Estate from both Harvil Road (two points of entrance one directly into the Drive and one into Highfield Drive which leads back into the Drive), and from the South, at the junction between Swakeleys Road and the Drive, which is immediately before Swakeleys Roundabout. Swakeleys Roundabout is the main route both into London and to access the M40 and M25, as well as for access to offices, schools in the Ickenham / Uxbridge area as well as commuter traffic to Heathrow Airport.

11. The uniqueness ambience and charm of the Estate arises in part from the beautiful countryside surrounding the roads that form the estate, the access to that countryside and the views enjoyed from properties on the estate over the Colne Valley. Public footpaths take you directly through to the Colne Valley and to the Rivers, Colne, Frays and Misbourne, with additional ambience associated with the Golf Club and access to amenity associated with it and its surroundings.

12. The Drive itself is a narrow private road, with no separate pedestrian foot path and therefore pedestrians, bicycles and vehicle traffic share the road space. In the mornings the Drive is a significant school access route to Vyners School situated in Warren Road and other nearby schools and also for access to Hillingdon Station and Bus Stops situated by Swakeleys Roundabout.

General impact on Harefield Place Estate, Ickenham and North Uxbridge

13. The Petitioners raise two concerns - complaint is taken specifically as to the impacts of the development on Ickenham and Uxbridge North generally and residents and business forming the neighbourhood referred to in this Petition as Harefield Place Estate. These impacts include significant highway and safety concerns regarding the level of construction traffic proposed on already highly congested minor roads around Ickenham and Uxbridge North, and the associated noise, pollution, damage to the environment, damage to residential amenity and public amenity that will occur by construction traffic the proposals as they stand for a period of up to 10 years.

Route of the Proposed Haul Road and its inadequacies as a solution

14. Secondly complaint is taken specifically in regard to that part of the Development referred to as “AP4” which relates to a proposal for a haul road located in and dissecting Uxbridge Golf Course and the effects on Harefield Place Estate generally and particularly at Swakeleys Roundabout. This was designed to address the highway concerns referred to above, but itself creates more problems than it solves in terms of traffic congestion, highway safety, damage to the environment, damage to residential amenity.
15. In regard to the proposal for a haul road, the Petitioners will say that if a haul road is required then the promoters have failed to grasp the nettle and that better and more sustainable routes are available which would take traffic directly to the main A40 trunk road and thereby bypass Ickenham and North Uxbridge entirely.

16. The burdens imposed on the Petitioners are unnecessary and better mitigation needs to be investigated.

17. As this House should be aware from submissions placed before them by the London Borough of Hillingdon, residents of Harefield Place Estate significantly suffer from rat run at peak times, when traffic diverts through the private estate to avoid the queues on Harvil Road; they then cut back into Swakeleys Road just before Swakeleys Roundabout. As the Committee of the other House acknowledged, those problems would get significantly worse by the Proposals unless significant mitigation could be achieved. It was as a result of that concern that the developers proposed AP4 and the Haul Road; however the route of that proposed haul road would have significant impact on Harefield Place Estate in addition to impacts on congested roads leading to the A40 / Swakeleys Roundabout.

18. At present residents enjoy unrestricted access to the Golf Club and the public footpaths across the Golf Course, the countryside through to the Colne Valley and beyond. The current route of the haul road will go through a significant number of tees and thus destroy the Golf Course business. The Golf Course will effectively have to close, the business will not be able to trade and this important local amenity will be jeopardised. Further, the proposed Haul Road in proximity to housing will generate significant noise, dust and diesel exhaust pollution (specifically particulates P2.5 / P5 / P10) which will be to the detriment of the residents.

19. A full metalled and raised haul road, with associated heavy goods vehicle traffic as proposed would be formed on the Golf Course to the rear of the gardens on the west side of the Drive and Harefield Place House, both affecting the residential amenity, visual amenity and environmental amenity of residents and adversely affecting the setting of the listed building and the viability of current proposals by Manor Grove Homes to restore Harefield Place House to residential use, not to mention the views into and out of this part of the Countryside.

20. This Petition is placed before the House of Lords by all the above collectively, the haul road proposal is a significant new element to the bill which clearly directly and specifically affects your humble Petitioners.

21. As a result of ("AP4") the residents, businesses and public visiting the Golf Course and enjoying the footpaths across Harefield Place and countryside beyond, will now be directly affected by the Phase 4 proposals in regard to the Haul Road and this petition is directed to those concerns.
Allegations

22. Your petitioner alleged that they and their members' and houses they represent, property, rights and interests would be significantly and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill and/or in particular ("AP4") if passed into law in its present form. That such injury is unnecessary because the promoters of the bill have failed to bring forward significant and/or available mitigation and therefore accordingly object to the Bill for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Key Points

23. Your Petitioners do not oppose the Bill in principle realistically and pragmatically accepting that that battle has been lost and acknowledge that the principle of the Bill was democratically established. However your petitioner's strongly object to the proposals as they currently stand, and further in regard to AP4 as they currently exist and if a haul road is to be advanced as the solution to the significant problems acknowledged by the Select Committee argue for a route, a bypass along a different and more sustainable route connecting the works directly to the main Trunk Road is a far better solution.

24. Your Petitioners also argue that better and more sustainable locations for the disposal of soil have not yet been properly investigated and indeed would invite consideration to be given to the disposal of soil to benefit the Petitioners particularly by the full re-instatement of the Golf Course to 18 holes and by the provision of a substantial noise attenuation bund or bunds on land proposed to be acquired by the Promoters to the north west of the A40 all of which would have materialised and identified had proper consultation been made.

Failure to Consult

25. Your Petitioners are gravely concerned that the Promoters have properly and actively consulted with the residents of Harefield Place in regard to AP4. The failure to consult and be transparent as to their investigations and deliberations in regard to their chosen route for the haul road in particular, should be regarded as a major failing. It does not give confidence in their choices, competence or ability.

26. The Petitioners believe that this failure has put them at a considerable disadvantage in terms of having and obtaining the necessary information from the promoters in regard to their choice of the haul road route and the alternatives to that route. We consider this not only shows a lack of candour by the promoters but also undermines the democratic process and is a further clear hindrance to the best route being found. The Petitioners believe it is in everybody's interest that the best route is found.

27. Your Petitioners are also concerned that the Promoters of the bill have failed properly to look at suitable and available alternative to reduce highways and traffic impact, possibly out of a desire to move the bill forward but at the expense of finding and promoting better solutions than the ones currently on offer. A
feature of the proposals has been a failure to coherently and comprehensively address the highway safety and traffic concerns and find sustainable and acceptable solutions.

**Significant Problems in regard to highway safety and traffic impact**

28. The Developers acknowledge these problems and at the root of them is the plan to use Swakeleys Road Roundabout as a main construction route when they know that this roundabout is already operating up to and or beyond design capacity and that additional traffic would create significant safety issues as well as intolerable traffic impact.

**Significant Problems with haul road route proposed**

29. In short the current “haul route” AP4 does not solve the problem. The Haul Road needs to bypass Swakeleys Roundabout completely; all that is achieved by the route currently being promoted is that traffic is diverted back onto the Roundabout a little further down. It is neither is an answer to the congestion nor is it sustainable or value for money and the Select Committed should require the Promoters to do better. It clearly does not amount to significant mitigation.

**Specifically**

30. Further, the current proposals and/or route of the haul road will have major burdens for your Petitioners.

   a. The route will increase significantly the current congestion at Swakeleys Roundabout the main entrance and exit from the Estates roads and have significant knock on effects to the rat run problems the estate already experiences.

   b. Large numbers of HGV vehicles exiting the slip road to enter Swakeleys Roundabout will add to the existing congestion at this junction and safety concerns associated with the volumes of traffic using the road at peak times.

   c. The proposed traffic light installation will slow up the progress of backed up traffic not improve it, as the adjoining roads are all at capacity so unable to absorb traffic released when the lights are green.

   d. The route will unnecessarily adversely affect travel to and from the homes and workplace of the Petitioners and those they represent and the taking children to and from Ickenham schools.

   e. The route will seriously and unnecessarily affect both their residential and visual amenity of the Petitioner’s, the enjoyment of resident’s gardens, and expose them to new and closer sources of traffic noise and fumes than at present.
f. The route will have significant effect on their rights to property and the enjoyment of those rights.

g. The route will have a clear effect on the setting of the listed building Harefield Place house both physically, environmentally and audibly and will have serious commercial implications on the proposed redevelopment of the Harefield Place House and office block for residential use by Manor Grove Homes Ltd. The presence of a haul road and ensuing noise, dust and pollution for up to 10 years directly below the south side of the property may jeopardise the viability of the restoration of this important local building.

h. The route will mean the closure of the golf course and destroy a well-respected local business and employer.

i. The amenity value of the golf course will be lost to both members of the Harefield Place Golf Club and members of the public that use this public course and residents.

j. Both public and other rights of way enjoyed by the Petitioners over the golf course and into the countryside will be curtailed and lost with lengthy and unattractive diversions.

k. The route will introduce new levels of air pollution from the construction HGV diesel engines into Petitioners gardens and to the golf course in breach of EU regulations (specifically NO2 particulates – P2.5 / P5 / P10).

l. The uniqueness and ambience of the Estate will be gravely damaged.

31. Your Petitioners respectfully submit that a better choice of route for the haul road would avoid all of the above concerns and connect directly onto the A40 at several points where existing, little used, connections already exist.

32. Your Petitioners respectfully request that the House of Lords order the Promoter be review the route of the haul road as proposed and to properly consult disclosing information and acting with candour.

33. That the House of Lords should require that the route be changed so as to avoid the loss of the land used by the Golf Course and Golf Club and the use of the Golf Club and associated land behind the residential properties on the Drive including Harefield Place House.

34. Further that the route must be planned so as to avoid the use of the A40 Swakeleys Roundabout completely as this is in fact the source of existing traffic problems in Ickenham and Uxbridge.
35. Your Petitioner also respectfully requests that the House of Lords require the Promoters to further review the need for and location for the spreading of soil and waste associated with the construction of HS2 and of the specific need to use the fields around Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South. The Petitioners suggest that if there is need for soil to be stored, that there are better locations and more sustainable ways of storage, in particular as stated, the Petitioners had they been consulted would have stated that they would welcome the creation of substantial earth noise attenuation bund(s) on the north west side of the A40 adjacent to Swakeleys Roundabout (on land to be acquired by the promoters) which would have significant lasting benefits for the residents and users of Harefield Place who have been plagued by traffic noise ever since the previous noise attenuation fence was removed by the Highway Agency. Again further sensible and sustainable benefits to balance against the burdens that residents are expected to endure by these proposals.

36. A further important issue for the Petitioners is the proper reinstatement of the Golf Course back to 18 holes. The Petitioners suggest that a more sustainable use for waste soil is to restore the Golf Course back to 18 holes which would have significant lasting benefits for the residents and users of Harefield Place and the public using the Golf Course as a whole. This can and must also be achieved without interruption to the Golf Course use - another clearly achievable benefit to balance against the burdens.

Summary and Conclusion

Highway Concerns

37. The Petitioners seek relief against a badly designed and unsustainable construction proposals and arbitrary imposed timetable and seek a reappraisal of both method and timetable so that the significant concerns set out above can be properly addressed without impairing on the development objectives as a whole.

Haul Road alternative

38. Whilst the Petitioners acknowledge that there are some benefits to the use of a haul road as set out in “AP4”, this requires significant more land to be acquired than before and for the first time requires the acquisition of land from and around Uxbridge Golf Course close to residencies, the listed building and amenities referred to above.

39. The overall impacts are totally unnecessary with better planning and are clearly totally unacceptable to the Petitioners because of the effects as listed above. If a haul route is still required, the Promoters can and must be required to find a better route.

40. Therefore your Petitioners respectfully requests the House of Lords to ask the Promoter to reconsider these proposals such that they do not have devastating impact on Harefield Place Estate, its residences, its business, its public golf course and its beautiful countryside.
41. This should include a proper and independent assessment of both the construction methods as a whole, the timetable, and/or the route of any proposed haul road or bypass with the promoters encouraged to give full and proper assistance to any independent re-assessment ordered.

42. As an absolute minimum your Petitioner seek measures to ensure that that disturbance is minimised that traffic from any haul road does not enter Swakeleys Roundabout at the North Western slip road adjacent to the residential properties of the Drive, that disruption to Uxbridge Golf Course be reduced to a minimum and that ecological and landscape mitigation be comprehensive and ordered to the highest standard.

43. There are other clauses and provisions of the “AP4” which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect the rights and interests of your Petitioners and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

44. 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 will ever pray etc.

On behalf of the following Associations:

(i) The Association of the Residents of the Drive; (Harefield Place)
(ii) The Drive (North End) Residents Association; (Harefield Place)
(iii) Manor Grove Homes Ltd (owners of Harefield Place House);
(iv) Hole 19 Ltd (proprietors and operators of Uxbridge Golf Course);
(v) Harefield Place Golf Club.

Signed by the agent for all the Associations, Golf Club and Limited Companies

Simon Clarke.

13/04/2016
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Wells House Road Residents Association

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

2. Your petitioners are Wells House Road Residents Association, an association of residents, that represents the interests of some 400+ Wells House Road residents and landlords directly affected by the HS2 Old Oak Common interchange construction and operation, and the works described in the HS2 Environmental Statement. Their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill and the Additional Provisions.

Wells House Road is a triangular cul de sac of around 125 Edwardian homes of which 45 are occupied by people who have lived in the street for 25-70 years. At least ten homes are occupied by the children of the original residents and many are caring for elderly parents in these homes. It is a culturally diverse and integrated street. In short, this is a traditional family community that has a strong desire to retain its integrity as such. It should also be noted that many people chose to move to Wells House Road as it is an oasis of peace and quiet, close to West London areas such as Notting Hill, Shepherds Bush and Kensal Rise and with excellent transport connections in Zone 2. There are around 25 children under the age of 18 living in Wells House Road who can be seen and heard playing safely in the street.

Wells House Road also has exceptional views across London to the London Eye and the Shard.

It should be noted that your Petitioners believe that the negative impact of HS2 on communities along the length of the line, the economy, the environment and broader rail improvements far outweigh any tangible benefits. Indeed, as specified in the Environmental Statement, there will be significant job losses in the 'deprived' Old Oak Common Park Royal area while demolitions and construction are underway, causing many businesses to close.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Wells House Road is in the centre of a major construction site for Old Oak Common Station, which will be the size of Waterloo Station. Much of this construction will be carried out 24/7.

3.2. To summarise the impacts, the tunnel will go under homes on the north of Wells House Road (WHR) with trains coming into the open as they reach the station about
120 feet from the homes. The east side of WHR will have the construction compound for the station behind gardens and their own gardens will be seized for at least a year while the road is lowered. The west side of WHR backs over the main construction compound with a 24/7 conveyor belt. The South side of WHR faces long-term blight from the HS2 AP2 impacts – a viaduct higher than their homes against their back gardens carrying the West Coast Mainline; the Crossrail Turnback with trains shunting back and forth against their garden borders; a massive electrical substation also against garden borders; the loss of woodland views; and the threat of another waste-carrying conveyor belt during construction at the base of their gardens. WHR residents will be isolated by the closure of Old Oak Common Lane that will cut residents off from all major amenities. All properties will be hemmed in by the subsequent OPDC development, which will include buildings up to 42 stories above the station that will block views and light from homes.

3.3. These are exceptional circumstances that demand that WHR is treated as a sensitive receptor and a special case and that compensation and mitigation measures are tailored to our needs.

3.4. Objections are being presented around numerous issues arising from the scheduled works and proposed Bill and amendments to the Bill (AP2) in the Old Oak Common area in the London Boroughs of Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham, the lack of mitigation of effects and the lack of compensation for communities impacted by the construction and operation of HS2.

3.5. Your petitioner objects to AP2 as it both ignores the previous 4-5 years of consultation submissions by Wells House Road Residents Association, offering no solutions for the negative impacts and, in fact, worsens the already extreme and long-term impact on residents’ homes, lives and the community.

3.6. It should be noted that HS2 Ltd has only provided written assurances to the Borough of Ealing and is yet to offer any assurances to Wells House Road Residents Association and individual residents. After objections to the lack of response and poor engagement by HS2, broadly shared by communities along the line, we wish for there to be a conclusion with firm answers to our questions and for our needs to be met.

3.7. We are concerned that this has led to considerable stress and extreme wastage of time and residents’ personal funds.

4. Summary of required action via House of Lords Hearing

4.1. Wells House Road requires recognition as a sensitive receptor and and to be treated as a ‘special case’

4.2. Compensation: Currently Wells House Road and other urban areas have no compensation beyond the inadequate ‘Need to Sell Scheme’. Property values are currently so low due to HS2 that owners would not be able to afford to move to other equivalent properties. One property received a £0 valuation due to HS2, rendering this scheme even more useless. We are seeking compensation schemes that will assist people who wish to stay throughout construction and operation and
those who wish to move. In addition, schemes need to be developed to include landlords and people renting spare rooms, shared ownership properties, people who purchased after 2010, and small businesses being operated from home/road based businesses. We also need the option of temporary or permanent rehousing if the disruption and pollution proves too much. People losing gardens or views, will also require compensation and/or reparation.

4.3. Old Oak Lane Closure: Although some assurances have been discussed between Ealing and HS2 Ltd, nothing has been confirmed to residents. We are seeking mobility & delivery services, 228 bus turning point, confirmation that the road will be kept open for pedestrians.

4.4. WHR sustaining wall: requires reinforcement before work begins. This is made of clinker and is unlikely to withstand the vibrations from HGVs and construction. In addition, the foliage on this wall adds both character and insulation. HS2 wish to replace this with a concrete structure. We wish to be consulted over the design of the wall and would ask for consideration to be given to a plant wall. Currently ownership of the wall is disputed and we ask that OPDC takes ownership of the wall from day one of construction.

4.5. Temporary loss of gardens: HS2 has failed to provide a consistent story as to the gardens that have been CPOed for the lowering of Old Oak Common Lane. Gardens need to be photographed before the work begins and all structures and foliage taken or damaged needs to be replaced. Storage may be required for structures. Residents temporarily losing gardens should be compensated for loss of land and, as required, rehoused for that time.

4.6. Baseline report on all properties: we request that properties are photographed and surveyed before construction commences in order to monitor and correct any structural damage.

4.7. Works entrance on Old Oak Common Lane: We are asking that a new location is found for this that is away from WHR properties. It is currently located directly behind properties on the east side of WHR.

4.8. Crossrail turnback, West Coast Mainline Viaduct and electrical substation (AP2): all these structures pose long-term impacts on the quality of life of residents on the southern. We ask that alternative options are explored for the positioning, height and impact of these structures. In addition, we ask that the woodland and view of this woodland is preserved.

4.9. Conveyors to south of WHR: we are asking that the option to take waste below Old Oak Common Lane in the tunnel built for the new overground station is used. We strongly object to conveyors close to homes on the south side of WHR. If these are to be used, we would require that they are silent and are covered.

4.10. Old Oak Common Station: we ask that the platforms are moved east so that the impact of noise and disruption from the operation and the high-density overbuild of the station is moved away from WHR and other existing communities. This would also be a benefit to The Scrubs who believe an access point further east would not be so damaging to the environment. We also ask that HS2 Limited’s
pledge for green space between WHR and the Old Oak Common HS2 Station be retained.

4.11. **Supplementing the Code of Construction Practice:** HS2 continues to dismiss noise, air, light and vibration pollution, including the vibrations from the tunneling, as impacts that will be covered by the Code of Construction Practice. We challenge their current level predictions and also require clarifications and assurances that the construction will not impact on residents' quality of life. We have been verbally offered some sound proofing but believe this should be offered to all WHR properties on all sides of homes. We also need clarification as to what type of sound proofing would be offered and what measures will be taken for ventilation. Again, if it is not possible to retain a quality of life and health, including to be able to safely open windows, we would require options for temporary rehousing. In addition, we want controls of working hours to limit work that creates noise to weekday working hours, where possible.

4.12. **Area cleaning:** currently Ealing does not enforce strict controls over developer cleanups. We require HS2 to keep roads and pavements clean, to be responsible to cleaning brickwork of private housing, and to control vermin that will come from demolitions.

4.13. **Accountability:** HS2 Limited has a shocking record of engagement with the community. Their relationship has soured with communities all along the line and bred activism. We therefore require measures for engagement throughout the process, e.g. independent mediation, subsidies for legal and professional advice, oversight by OPDC to limit direct contact with HS2 personnel, single body that regulates and secures accountability in real time. Note: HS2 pledged regular meetings following the Select Committee hearing in January. They have only arranged two meetings across the three past months and no assurances have been given. In addition, beyond one phone call from their new ‘Senior Engagement Manager’, no attempt has been made to meet with residents of Old Oak Common. This exemplifies HS2’s lack of commitment to any meaningful engagement with the community or resolution of their issues. We do not wish for Ealing Council to act as mediators as their resources are limited. **To keep the doors open for on-going dialogue:** since the plans are continually changing, we need flexibility and a means by which HS2 is forced to continue to provide written assurances and responses for new developments as and when they occur.

4.14. **Order of hearings:** Your petitioners requests that London presentations to the House of Lords are heard early in the proceedings. The HS2 Select Committee left ours to the last and by which time we felt there was a loss of interest.
The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they or someone representing 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.

Amanda Jesson (nee Souter), Agent for Wells House Road Residents Association

Date: 13th April, 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the  
HIGH SPEED RAIL (London – West Midland) Bill

THE HUMBLE PETITION of Ms. PRIMAVERA R. BOMAN-BEHRAM

Declares that:

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

The petitioner

2. The petitioner is the freehold owner and sole occupier of 27 Oval Road, Camden Town, London NW1 7EA (“your Petitioner’s property”). It has been her family home since 1950. Her mother, the Viennese Expressionist dancer, Hilde Holger, had a School for Modern Dance in the lower ground floor for fifty years. Your Petitioner’s property is within fifty metres of the existing London Midlands and Virgin London to Glasgow passenger trains, and three hundred meters from the top of Parkway, where Oval Road, Gloucester Avenue, Delancey Street and Parkway all meet. Your Petitioners’ property is also on the road that will be used by regular commuter, construction and rerouted traffic during the realization of the Scheme.

3. If this proposed bill, --which falls short of public support, --were to come into law, it would put a dual strain on the health and financial future of the petitioner, and would ruin both the petitioner’s property, and its contents. It currently houses an extensive archive ranging from Vienna in the 1920’s to Mumbai in the 1940’s, to London, onward from 1950.

Your petitioner’s concerns and asks are:

Compensation

4. The petitioner just turned seventy, so if her property were to fall prey to subsidence, she may not be alive to claim any compensation at the completion of the Euston Station and the HS2 route from the Central London terminus to Birmingham. With Crossrail 2, now also proposed for this terminal, the construction period is estimated to go from 2017 to 2033, which is an unprecedented unbearable length of time to have one’s daily living so extremely compromised.

There should therefore be a Binding Undertaking laid out by HS2 Ltd to protect your petitioner from loss, liability, or damage of any sort as well as to help mitigate any major discomfort caused by its construction and including finally the train’s operation. If your petitioner should want to move
because living in her property becomes unbearable, the Petitioner asks for HS2 Ltd to finance at least one hundred percent, an exchange and move to a like property in a like centrally located London area, with all costs paid by HS2 Ltd. . . . If France helped its blighted citizens in this way, shouldn’t Britain? As it stands now, while residents of Camden will be subject to actual greater blight, they do not have even the compensation offered to rural residents and landowners, which seems unfair.

_Euston Station Design, and the Need for an Integrated Transport System_

5. Your petitioner requests that the DFT and TFL prepare a tunneling, road and rail, master plan to determine how all the tunneling and shafts in the London NW1 Camden area will be accommodated. This also includes a reappraisal of the plan to move all the Utilities from Primrose Hill to Oval Road and Gloucester Avenue. TFL, Network Rail, Crossrail 2, HS2 and the main Highways may need tunneling in the future, but at present, there seems to be no integrated transport plan anywhere on view, to support London’s needs.

The entire essence of the HS2, London to Birmingham bill, which falls short of public support, needs to be reappraised. Your petitioner adds a sincere plea to the House of Lords to pause HS2 for one or two years, and for obvious reasons hopes that the House of Lords will unanimously recommend that the bill needs more fundamental work before it passes to Royal Assent. Britain’s modernized transport system must withstand the challenge of Climate Change, which brings up the question whether high speed travel, with its greater carbon footprint, is consistent with this objective. --Britain’s size cannot be compared to the scale of China.

_Code of Construction Practice_

6. Your petitioner is unaware of any of the base lines being provided by HS2 for her property. All the assurances in the world to the London Borough of Camden are meaningless, unless backed by transparency and action. Your petitioner would like to know the Air Quality measurements, within less than fifty meters of the property, and the Noise, Vibration and Electromagnetic Radiation measurements within the property, so a base line can be established for these criteria, before work begins. The same would apply to an Independent Surveyor coming to monitor possible future Subsidence. ie For your petitioner to take out some sort of Settlement Deed for her protection. If HS2 Ltd is footing the bill for this preliminary work before construction begins, your petitioner is totally unaware of this, and so feels totally unprepared for the major construction that lies ahead in several areas surrounding her property.

Supposing that the baseline for all the above measurements have been done. When and how will your petitioner keep abreast of these measurements and their comparisons after the works have started? And how will your petitioner communicate to HS2 Ltd that the levels have gone way out of hand, if need be? Will there be a code of practice to stop construction if that were to happen?

_Noise – Groundborne and from Fixed Installations and Tunneling_

7. As the construction will continue 24/7 for a long period of time, your petitioner suggests that the groundborne noise level should not exceed 28dBL_{AMAX}, s, and this for both the lengthy construction period as well as when the trains are up and running in the tunnel close to the petitioner’s property under the existing train tracks. If necessary, after the promoter has a noise assessment carried out in the Petitioner’s property, noise insulation measures may have to be taken.
Air Quality and Dust

8. Already your petitioner experienced a very bad cough for eleven months last year, as London’s air pollution level in its center is already high above the EU’s recommended level. She also had Cancer, when no one in her family ever had Cancer. The archive housed, will also deteriorate even faster, when having to deal with massive amounts of airborne waste, soil, and hazardous material, and the construction works leading to significant increases in two of the most serious air pollutants, Nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5).

As science editor Jonathan Leake quoted in the Sunday Times, “A tenth of Britain’s annual toll of early deaths, are due to air pollution. And, Diesel fumes even affect babies’ brains in the womb, with children being born with attention deficit, hyperactivity disorder, depression, anxiety and more.”

As your petitioner asked the Select Committee in the House of Commons last December, she asks again that double glazed windows be installed, along with an air purification unit, including running costs; all at the expense of the promoter.

Tunneling

9. Your Petitioner is justly apprehensive of tunneling so close to your Petitioner’s property. Much further away when the flats were being built at the north end of the Petitioner’s road, and they were digging under Oval Road, new cracks appeared in the petitioner’s freshly rendered outside walls --immediately! There are the River Fleet and other rivers running under this area. They may be hidden, but they are very active and can flood, and are most likely to be diverted into the sewer system. The Regent’s Canal, originally owned by the British Railways, is also located there. Underneath this canal are the Victorian Camden Catacombs, the horse tunnel, the Victorian Warehouses, and the Underground Regent Canal Water Basin. The tunnels run under the Euston mainline, under the goods depot at Primrose Hill, beneath what was before, Gilbeys Bonded Warehouse on the Regents Canal, and under Camden Lock Market. The Petitioner is anxious about the fact that Homeowner’s policies do not cover damage from water entering the property at, or below, the surface of the ground. Hence, as mentioned above, your petitioner would need a Binding Undertaking from HS2.

Your Petitioner understands that in 2009, the German Cologne State Archive building collapsed, due to hydraulic ground seepage, which destabilized the State Archive and neighboring buildings, because a nearby transport tunnel was being constructed.

In Gerrard’s Cross in 2005 the Network Rail had an incident when the Tesco site above the tunnel that Network Rail was constructing, collapsed. There have also been countless tunnel fires.

Flooding

10. In 2007, Thames Water renewed all the major pipes in Oval Road, the Petitioner’s Street. A burst water main pipe flooded the basements of your Petitioner’s property and the adjacent three terraced houses. In the expensive flood reinstatement that began in 2009 your Petitioner suffered an eight and a half foot fall from the builder’s hoist, breaking ribs and clavicle that healed incorrectly, which in 2012 led to further terrible pains in the lower joints making walking difficult. These pains continue and therefore the future disruption when again Thames Waste pipes and Utilities will be moved from Primrose Hill to your Petitioner’s road, is of concern.
Electromagnetic Radiation

11. The massive tunnel-boring drilling machines emit very high Electro-Magnetic Radiation, as do high-speed trains that also consume much electricity when they accelerate. Not only could that possibly interfere with television reception, as an HS2 engineer commented, but as written in the Taipei Times in 2012, the International Agency for Research on Cancer has classified radio frequency electromagnetic radiation as a “Group 2B” substance. That means it is probably carcinogenic to humans. HS2 dismisses their emanating EMR as so low, but over extended periods of time it is a health hazard.

Rats

12. Your petitioner has experience of rodents finding their way into homes when their habitats are disturbed. This is another unwelcome long-term effect of having building sites all around the petitioner’s property.

Traffic

13. HS2 has changed the heavy HGV traffic taking spoils away mainly along the Petitioner’s road through James Town Road, to an alternative route. Never the less there will be much more traffic on this small old road, which means more vibration and noise, besides more dust and pollution. Your petitioner hopes that a weight restriction will be imposed for vehicles, along with speed restrictions. Also that low carbon-footprint vehicles would be employed, so as to lessen carbon emissions.

It will definitely be harder for your petitioner to shop or even get to Regent’s Park. The tubes, buses and trains will also be on a reduced schedule probably, making traveling hard for a very long period of time. And of course traffic gridlock, all over Camden for cars and buses.
14.  *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.

…………………………………………..

Primavera R. Boman-Behram

12th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

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

THE PETITION of FELICITY AND ANTHONY SYKES  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

Your Petitioners are Anthony and Felicity Sykes, resident at Mayertorne Cottage, Wendover Dean, London Road, Aylesbury, Bucks HP22 6QA, 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 Chelmers 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 Chelmers AONB  

Your Petitioners, as residents of this part of the AONB are 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 considerably concerned about the financial impacts upon their B&B business that attracts visitors who wish to walk and cycle within the AONB, and are attracted by the beauty and tranquillity of the natural landscape. Many visitors are from overseas. Your petitioners have already seen a significant fall-off of business as a direct result of adverse publicity regarding HS2 in this area, and anticipate continuing and worsening damage to our business if construction according to current plans starts.  

The blight associated with HS2 has meant that property within your petitioners immediate environs has proved impossible to sell and they see no likelihood of this situation being resolved. Your petitioners are 70 years old and would like the possibility of being able to downsize.
It is apparent therefore that petitioners will suffer serious financial damage unless actions are taken to mitigate these effects. Your petitioners request that they are protected from this damage by ensuring the line passes throughout the AOBN in a bored tunnel.

Your petitioners have dogs and walk regularly using the footpaths from their home which will be closed during the construction period.

Your petitioners are also seriously concerned about the disruptions to their 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 A 413 for London and all other areas. The A413 is already particularly busy and is prone to accidents including fatalities, and even minor disruption already causes traffic jams. Your petitioners further regard this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and are 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 also have a business in home tuition and rely upon pupils having easy access to their home. This will be substantially impaired by the inevitable congestion on the A413 due to construction traffic.

Your petitioners live within 620m of the proposed HS2 route which is sufficiently close that they will be exposed to harmful levels of noise, as the Proposer has not made adequate arrangements to prevent exposure to night time peak noise, which the Bill as drafted allows to be above the level the World Health Organisation has identified at which adverse health and wellbeing effects are observed.

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 HSZ 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 emphasise 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 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 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.

FELICITY SYKES

ANTHONY SYKES

[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] 13th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Wendover Financial Ltd

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioners are Wendover Financial Ltd of 10 Station Approach, Wendover, Bucks HP22 6BN, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in Wendover adjacent to 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 Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is 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.
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 reputation, social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction. 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 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 contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. 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 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 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.

Your Petitioner requests that an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full AONB tunneling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover 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

Hierarchy of Mitigation

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover by boring or mining 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 improved mitigation 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 replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.

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 the highest quality design and the 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.

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 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. 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 given the traffic congestion that will on the main emergency routes.

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 timely manner.

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.

For Wendover Financial Ltd

Alastair Moir
Director

11th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF Liam James Harrison

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 Burrows, Chetwode, Buckingham, MK18 4LB within the Chetwode Conservation Area. 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 via Bicester North Station to London 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 petitioner understands the potentially greater impact of this proposal during the construction phase but is more concerned with mitigating the longer term impact of the proposed scheme on 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.

Your petitioner is concerned that the temporary and permanent impacts on sound, visual amenity and general tranquility within the Chetwode Conservation Area is having a significant impact on the value of property and the ability to sell and this is not adequately recognized by the Promoter. Construction in the Chetwode area is forecast to continue for a significant period (2 years and 9 months). The Environmental Impact Statement for Chetwode concludes that the magnitude of permanent change on the Chetwode Conservation area will be high. Your petitioner feels that the lack of adequate compensation is encouraging some local residents to seek a move under the Extreme Hardship Scheme which is further increasing the impact of blight as families move from the area. The petitioner understands the business case for this new piece of national infrastructure and respectfully requests that adequate compensation for both construction impacts and the permanent loss of tranquility and utility need to be made as part of the overall investment case.

Your petitioner is also concerned that the opportunity to improve one area of rural blight is being missed. Chetwode and the surrounding villages all suffer from very poor broadband services and with the considerable amount of fibre optic infrastructure being provided as part of this new railway corridor and the works to undertake major utility diversions and new installations, there is the opportunity to efficiently and permanently address this for the benefit of local residents.

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.

Liam James Harrison
11/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Jennifer Faith Collins, Amanda Jane Sweeting and Belinda Carey Naylor

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1-8, 10, 11, 13-18, 29, 31-35, 44-48, 51, 52, 57-65.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioners are Jennifer Faith Collins, Amanda Jane Sweeting and Belinda Carey Naylor, the freehold owners of Chetwode Manor Farms, Chetwode, Buckingham MK18 4BB ("the Property") which is a farm in Buckinghamshire. Your petitioners' business is farming. Your petitioners and their forebears have farmed this land for 100 years. It is proposed by the Bill to authorise the compulsory acquisition of certain interests in land or property of your petitioners and in accordance with the standing orders of your honourable House notice has been served on your petitioners of the intention to seek such compulsory powers. Your petitioners' property will also be used for the Chetwode cutting satellite compound. Your petitioners' property is located on School End, a public highway which is proposed to be closed for a period during the construction period. Your petitioners' property is also located on The Green, a public highway which is proposed to be realigned during construction period. Your petitioners' property is also located on the road to Manthorne Farm which is proposed to be replaced by an overbridge. Your petitioners are regular users of the above roads which are liable to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioners estimate that currently approximately 3,000 vehicle movements per year use the accesses to and from Manthorne Farmyard along narrow, single track public roads and private farm tracks now proposed to be used by additional traffic including construction vehicles and many of the roads are proposed to be temporarily severed during construction.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Your petitioners favour 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 petitioners seek 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.

Land in the ownership of your petitioners is liable to compulsory acquisition under clauses 4 to 8 of the Bill. The limits of deviation and of land to be acquired and used are drawn very widely and your petitioners are unsure why that is. Your petitioners propose that land temporarily required is temporarily acquired. Your petitioners and their forebears have been custodians of this land and landscape for 100 years and wish to continue. Your petitioners are willing to enter into an agreement with the promoter of the Bill that necessary areas of your petitioners' land are made available on a temporary basis only, so as to reduce the land needing to be compulsorily acquired to the minimum.

There are sections of the proposed railway through Chetwode, Barton Hartshorn and Newton Purcell where the promoter does not intend to provide any sound barriers (Maps CT-06-059 & CT-06-060a). This would result in a swathe of farmland and woodland being subject to very high noise levels, and this high noise will affect the working farmyard at Manthorne Farm as well as many residential properties and in Chetwode, Barton Hartshorn and Newton Purcell. As well as agriculture, this whole area is used for outdoor recreation including walking, nature watching, horse riding and cycling. Your petitioners seek an undertaking from the promoter that effective noise barriers will be provided along the length of the railway, on both sides of the proposed line.

Access during construction. Your petitioners need a guarantee of proper farm access, with details of how this will be achieved, if the farm is going to be able to continue to operate, and houses need to be able to be accessed 24 hours a day.

Manthorne Farm buildings are going to be on an island surrounded by construction and in very close proximity to the line – structural integrity of the existing buildings needs assessing and mitigation proposed. Your petitioners request a structural survey.

Your petitioners have been told that ongoing access rights will be required along the narrow, unmetalled farm track from School End for maintenance of the land drainage area. This access should be from the other direction – ie via the public road to Manthorne from the Green. This would be a much shorter route and is already a tarmac road.

In the assessment made by the promoter of the effect of the proposed scheme on the landscape, no account was taken of the consequential effects of the economic damage done to agricultural businesses during the construction phase. Your petitioners anticipate that their agricultural business could cease to function or would function at a reduced level during the construction period, and that afterwards, the reduction in land area and fragmentation will reduce the economic viability. Your petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that compensation will take into account the temporary, permanent and future loss of income due to the scheme.

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 petitioners are 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 petitioners regularly use 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 petitioners are 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. Your petitioners request 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.

There are several local equestrian businesses. The noise and sight of the trains would be a hazard for people riding or leading horses across the proposed overbridges carrying public roads over HS2 at School End and The Green, due to the high sound level and its rapid onset. Barriers that are higher than the minimum currently specified need to be fitted to protect equestrians and to reduce noise to a safe level. A horse rider was killed on the existing bridge over the Great Central Line when a train frightened their horse. Bridge parapets of a safe height is not a difficult request. Your petitioners seek an undertaking from the Promoter that these overbridges will be furnished with noise protection and with parapets of a height of at least 2.5m.

Your petitioners have 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. Many of 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.
Your petitioners have met and corresponded with HS2 Ltd to attempt to find solutions to the specific issues affecting their farming business. However, HS2 Ltd have not turned generic assurances into specific provisions for our business. We have been asking for engagement and clarity on the above issues and feel we have been fobbed off with standard responses that do not address our concerns. All we want is meaningful engagement to reflect our circumstances - a large commercial farm in an equestrian area that is to be divorced from its farm buildings, cut in half and rendered dangerous for riders.

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.

Jennifer Faith Collins, Amanda Jane Sweeting, Belinda Carey Naylor

08/04/16
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-6

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF LONG ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the works specified in Clauses 1 and 2 and Schedule 1 to the Bill and other works which are specified in Schedule 2 to the Bill

2. Your petitioner.

The petitioner is the Parish Council of Long Itchington in the County of Warwickshire, representing a community of some 2500 residents.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

The Bill proposes to run a railway through a cutting to the east of Offchurch, Warwickshire. The effect of this cutting will be to close Long Itchington Road at Offchurch, severing a major access and commuter route and isolating wildlife from neighbouring woods and fields. The road is a primary route for residents of Long Itchington, Birdingbury, Napton, Stockton and other nearby villages to their places of work and many other amenities in Kenilworth, Leamington Spa and Warwick. The proposed diversion quite unnecessarily takes the traffic along a wholly unsuitable narrow lane, Welsh Road West.

In our petitions to the House of Commons (Petitions Nos. 172 and 1298) in January 2015 we requested a relatively short "green tunnel" to allow both Long Itchington Road and the Fosse Way to cross the proposed railway. This green tunnel, only 200m long, would
and question HS2 why the proposal is as shown and not as per the Community request for a 200m green tunnel or a pair of structures that would provide community and environmental connectivity.

Following the above petitions in the House of Commons the Promoter has agreed to install a five-arm roundabout at the junction of Long Itchington Road and the Fosse Way. It seems illogical then to close one of the major routes off this roundabout, without properly costing the alternatives.

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

Signed .................................. (Petitioner) Date..........................
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mary Morgan

 Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is the owner of the freehold property at 6, Kings Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QZ, which the Bill may specially and directly affect. This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location but is located 300 metres from the portal cutting and 550 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. 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
3. 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.

4. 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.

5. **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

6. **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\(^1\) 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. 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.

7. **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.

8. **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.

9. **Dysfunctional Housing market**: Your Petitioner is 550 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.

10. **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.

11. **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.

12. **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.

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 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.

22 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 - Agent

Date
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF Barnaby H D Usborne

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Barnaby Usborne resident at Garden Cottage, Cherry Tree Lane, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks. HP16 9LB, 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. It will have a 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. 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 Wendover in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services.

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.

Furthermore, your petitioner requests that full consideration should be given to the option of boring the tunnel completely from the south end.

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 many of the mitigation measures set out below would be unnecessary.

Your Petitioner requests that if no provision is made for a full extended tunnel through the AONB 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 the section of the line which is not in a tunnel be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds where appropriate, to reduce noise and to conceal the line and gantries.

c. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges.

d. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the
Help reduce the environmental impact.

That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be made as visually pleasing as possible with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides.

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.

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

That a full cost benefit analysis be undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

Your Petitioner further requests that there should be independent assessment of compliance with the Code of Construction Practice and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

a. The prohibition of 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.

b. The Prohibition of any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes.

c. The Construction of 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.

d. That contractors in the AONB 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.

e. 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.

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that there should be independent assessment of compliance with the Code of Construction Practice and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

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.

B H D Usborne 12/4/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF MARTIN SHEPPARD

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner, Martin Sheppard, is a householder of 102 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8HX

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

1. My legitimate and reasonable concerns about the impact of HS2 on my house and the wider areas around it, including Primrose Hill and Camden Town, have not been addressed by either HS2 or the House of Commons Select Committee.

2. I am subject to a gross injustice and have been denied a fair hearing by HS2. Other safeguards of property and personal rights have failed to protect my interests. The process by which HS2 is being imposed by power on me and on the citizens of Camden is undemocratic and arbitrary. It is a breach of the legitimate rights of citizens.

3. 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 my interests and of those of the citizens of Camden as a whole.

4. No proper Air Quality measurement has been carried out by HS2. Air Quality measurements on a proven scientific basis, acceptable to both HS2, Camden Council and petitioners in Camden, are an absolute necessity to protect my health and that of others in Camden. HS2 should be told by your committee to buy a mobile Air Quality measuring vehicle to provide this.

5. HS2’s plans to remove spoil using the carriage sidings alongside Gloucester Avenue were introduced too late, and with inadequate information, for them to be digested before the House of Commons Select Committee hearings. They are still uncertain. It is an injustice if
the Bill is allowed to go ahead with major areas of its operation, including Euston, being still unknown and undefined

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.

**MARTIN SHEPPARD**

12 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015 - 16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF MR NIGEL JOHN FRENCH & MRS CAROLINE ELIZABETH FRENCH  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioners  

Your Petitioners have lived at Woodlands, Grange Close, Twyford, Buckingham, with their three children (aged 16, 14 & 12) since they purchased the property freehold in March 2000. The property is detached, was originally built in 1977 of brick under tile construction and is located in a close of 6 similar homes. The property borders the village Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary.  

Twyford village is situated in open countryside between the towns of Bicester and Buckingham. The village has very little through traffic with very low ambient noise level – in fact it is extremely quiet, especially at night.  

The property is a family home of about 3000sqft of accommodation and it consists of 4 bedrooms, 3 reception rooms, kitchen and study. Outside there is a garden of c0.2 of an acre and a detached double garage.  

Your Petitioners purchased the property specifically to bring up our young family (we had one child at the time of purchase) in a village environment which was both safe and tranquil. Twyford village benefits from a school, village shop and village pub. It is a sociable village, with a strong community borne out by the fact that very few properties have come up for sale over the years. The property has a current unblighted market value of between £520,000 and £550,000.  

As it passes the property, the proposed new high speed railway line will be on a nominally 3 metre high embankment with an acoustic sound barrier and an earth bund finishing approximately 5 metres above the rail line level.  

Your Petitioner’s property will not be demolished as a result of the Bill but it is located within 300 metres of the line.  

Your Petitioner’s home is referred to in HS2 documents as follows:  

i) Map SV-05-028 – Operational Noise and Vibration Impacts and Likely Significant Effects – the property is highlighted as suffering from ‘Moderate Adverse’ (5dB to 10dB).  

ii) Book ES 3.2.1.13 Environmental Statement Vol2 Community Forum Report CFA13 – Page 91, Section 5 Community, 5.1.2. – Key issues concerning the community assessment for this study area comprise: impacts on amenity affecting some residential properties and The Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Twyford during operation.  

iii) Book ES 3.2.1.13 Environmental Statement Vol2 Community Forum Report CFA13 – Page 98, 5.5 Effects arising from operation. Assessment of impacts and effects – Twyford. 5.5.3: Approximately five residential properties in Twyford, located on Church Street and in Grange Close are predicted to experience in-combination effects arising from the operation of the
Proposed Scheme: These in-combination effects are: Significant visual effects due to the visibility of the Twyford viaduct and overhead line equipment; and, Significant increases in airborne noise due to the new train services. 5.5.4. The combination of these effects will have a major adverse effect on residential amenity and this is considered to be significant.

iv) Book ES 3.2.1.13 Environmental Statement Vol2 Community Forum Report CFA13 – Page 236 11. Sound, noise and vibration. 11.4.32 'Taking account of the avoidance and mitigation measures and the local context, the residual permanent noise effects on the acoustic character of the following areas of residential community closest to the route are considered significant: Twyford, in the vicinity of Grange Close and Church Street.

v) Book ES 3.0.0 Non-technical summary – Nov 2013. Section 8.13 Page 102 – Community: the amenity of...a small number of residential properties and the Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Twyford closest to the route, will experience operational noise and views of the project. The noise and visual effects arising during the operation of the project will affect...the village of Twyford.

vi) Your Petitioners is also concerned at the increased levels of construction traffic, and the likely disruption it will cause to the day to day running of family life in a rural community, including up to 2,480 HGV & LGV lorry movements per day on the nearby Perry Hill Road (ES3.2.1.13 – page 244) which is the main route into and out of the village to the south east (Aylesbury) and the north (Buckingham).

vii) Your Petitioners also notes countless other references to the village of Twyford throughout various HS2 documents which refer to the adverse impact of not only the operation of the scheme, but the period of construction with its associated noise, transport disruption, dust and light pollution, which is expected to last for 10 years from 2017.

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

3. Your petitioners concerns

Your Petitioners is petitioning against the Government's bill to design, build and operate a high speed railway line for two reasons:

* Increase in the level of sound
* Inadequate compensation

Increase in the level of Sound

Your Petitioner's property is in a very quiet, tranquil area of the village of Twyford situated in a cul de sac, alongside The Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, with no passing traffic. As a result the ambient noise is very low.

In September 2012, a baseline sound survey was carried out at a neighbouring property, St Mary's House, and this has been allocated the "noise receptor" ID 288448.

Appendix SV002-013 Table 1, lists the results of this survey with the maximum daytime noise level as 50.4dB and night as 39.9dB.

Page 16, Table 3 of Volume 5, Technical appendix SV-004-013 CFA13, Calvert, Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Chetwode, Operational assessment Sound, noise and vibration, sets out the baseline noise levels as predicted at Opening Year and the expected impact on this part of the village as the increase in noise from the Opening Year baseline to the predicted noise at baseline plus 15 year traffic. This records a daytime increase of 4dB and a night time increase of 5dB. It is further recorded that this will have an adverse effect on the receptor.

The significant effect criteria recorded in Table 3 as OSV13-CO2 is defined in Table 5 as:
"Approximately 10 dwellings in the vicinity of Grange Close and Church Street closest to the route and their associated shared community open areas (local playing fields with clubhouse). Forecast increases in sound from the railway are likely to cause a moderate adverse effect on the acoustic character of the area around the closest approximately five properties."

The World Health Organisation (WHO) regards 50dB day time noise level as the level that should not be exceeded to protect the majority of people from being moderately annoyed during the daytime. It also says that to protect the majority of people from being seriously annoyed, the day time level should not exceed 55dB. However, the WHO guidelines refer to a steady continuous noise which HS2 is not.

The WHO says that most countries in Europe have adopted 40dB as the maximum allowable for new developments whenever feasible.

The WHO states that for the primary prevention of subclinical adverse health effects related to night time noise in the population, it is recommended that the population should not be exposed to night noise greater than 40dB outside the residential property during that part of the night when most people are in bed.

It is the opinion of your Petitioners from the evidence set out in the Environmental Statement that the mitigation proposals are insufficient to protect your Petitioners from the increase in noise levels that are predicted.

**Inadequate compensation.**

Your Petitioners considers that the compensation package offered to residents who are seriously affected by the proposed plans to construct a high speed rail line, but are outside the 120m zone which allows for purchase by HS2, are completely inadequate.

Your Petitioners have consulted with local Estate Agents Thomas Merryfield and have been told that they will not be able to sell the property for anything approaching unblighted market value as it is so seriously blighted by the HS2 scheme. This situation is unlikely to change until a few years after the line is opened and house prices may start to recover to some degree. However, this is unlikely to be until 2029 at the earliest at which point your Petitioners will be 65 and his wife 61 years old.

As a direct result of the Proposed Scheme your Petitioners and his wife will be unlikely to exercise any form of choice should they wish to sell their property and exercise the right to move at any time during the construction and operation of the railway. Whilst they accept that the Government has introduced a new "Need to Sell" scheme, this appears to be appropriate to them only if they have an urgent need to sell and not as a lifestyle choice.

Your Petitioners also notes that the Rural Support Zone (RSZ) is a linear area, 120 mtrs either side of the railway line, and does not take into account sound mapping, produced by HS2, which shows the real adverse impact of the scheme on residents such as your Petitioners.

Your Petitioners considers that the revised compensation scheme as published on 9th April 2014 is completely inadequate to compensate them as they are so seriously affected by blight that they are unable to sell their property now or in the foreseeable future.

Your Petitioners objects 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 the community of...
Twyford by reducing the proposed noise levels and proposing a fair and equitable compensation scheme. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, so far affecting your Petitioners, it should not be allowed to pass into law.

There are remedies which the government could implement to alleviate the proposed high levels of noise and subsequent blight as follows:

- Move the line further away from the village of Twyford to the north. There is sufficient open farm land to allow such a diversion of the proposed route.
- Construction of a 'green tunnel' as the railway passes the village of Twyford, as an alternative to the proposed bund (which appears to offer little mitigation as currently proposed).
- Bring forward the timetable for the planting of any trees for screening (as included in the proposed scheme) so as to improve the chances of more effective noise and visual mitigation.
- Reduce the speed of the trains as they pass the village. Speed reduction will not only significantly reduce the noise but also allow greater route flexibility to avoid village blight.
- Increase the height of the bund to above the pantograph level. Although this will inevitably reduce the overall noise levels, your Petitioners note that the level of the bund is not stated in the Environment Statement but it is assumed to be the same level as the sound wall at 5 metres above track level.
- Lower the track level. If the track level is lowered, and assuming that the bund is maintained at its proposed height, it will reach nearer to the pantograph level and hence be more effective at reducing noise.
- Purchase your Petitioner's property at the full unblighted value should your Petitioners be unable to sell the property at full market value. Such purchase to be at any time of the Petitioner's choosing, as if the Petitioners was exercising the right to sell at a time of his choosing.
- Your Petitioners and other seriously affected property owners in Twyford, are unable to sell their properties for anything approaching their true value due to the blight caused by the contents of the Bill. The Government should offer a Property Bond to all seriously affected residents. The Property Bond should guarantee that when they choose to sell, the resident will be compensated for any loss of sale income against unblighted value. The residents of Twyford attended a meeting in September 2010 with the then Secretary of State for Transport, Philip Hammond, who told them that the affected residents would be fairly compensated. He further reiterated this statement in Parliament.
- For the purposes of any mortgage on the property, for government to ensure that any shortfall between actual valuation and unblighted market value is covered by government so that the mortgagee is not disadvantaged in any way with regard to mortgage offers and subsequent interest rates which are based on loan to value. We have experience already of a valuation being hindered by the HS2 Scheme and a subsequent remortgage offer. The valuation for mortgage purposes was in the region of 40% below the unblighted value for the property. The property valuation, conducted by E N Marriner-Kyle of Metropolis Surveyors LLP in March 2014, quotes "Market conditions were weak at the date of valuation for properties such as this one which are close to the proposed HS2 rail line" and "The comparables used are the best available bearing in mind the location of the subject property in relation to 'bad neighbours'" – If HS2 is being referred to as a 'bad neighbour' within the property valuation market, there is little hope of unblighted values being achieved for mortgage purposes.

With regard to the Compensation Scheme announced on the 9th April 2014, the amount proposed for house owners situated between 120m and 300m from the track doesn't even
begin to compensate the seriously affected home owners for their loss of value and inability
to sell a property.

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 remains, etc.

Signed, Nigel/John French

Date: 13th April 2016

Signed, Caroline Elizabeth French

Date: 13/4/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16
PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midland) Bill

THE PETITION OF JOHN & AMANDA MALPASS

 Declares that:

1.  • The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the works proposed to be authorised by the Bill as specified in clause 1 and 2 of and schedules 1, 2 and 3 to the Bill. In addition, the petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the works proposed in the Third Additional Provision, introduced on 28th May, 2015 (hereinafter called “AP3”), to amend the powers in the Bill. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed amendments under AP3 to schedule 1 of the Bill, which confer additional power to accommodate changes to the design of Euston station and the approach area and other design changes in the London Borough of Camden.

2.  • Your Petitioners live at 46, Mornington Terrace, NW1, where they have benefitted from the peaceful enjoyment of their home, family and private lives for the last twenty five years. The residential street is situated on the east side of the Euston throat railway cutting just south of the Parkway tunnel. Mornington Terrace overlooks the railway, which runs through the cutting at a depth of some twenty metres. Your Petitioners’ property will not be demolished as a result of the Bill but it is located ten metres from the cutting retaining wall. Your petitioners will be “very old people [75+]” when the works begin in 2017 (see para. 3.2.4 High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) – Equality impact assessment update: CFA1 Euston Station and approach – September 2015); one of your petitioners suffers from asthma. Although your Petitioners are described as being “very old”, they currently lead very active lives. The location where they live currently allows fast and easy access to all parts of London; it is well served by both the Underground, national and international rail and by many bus routes.

3.  • HS2’s original plans envisaged the overall development, by 2026, of the forty-acre Euston site, with a modern state-of-the-art terminus, serving not only HS2 passengers, but all the ordinary passengers. The new plans, included in the AP3 Bill, envisage the building of an extension to the west of the current station, which will take until 2026; secondly, HS2 envisages taking over five of the eighteen existing lines within the station (a reduction in capacity of 28%) and replacing them with further high speed tracks. This secondary stage will not be completed until 2033, at the earliest by which date your
petitioners will be over ninety. The AP3 Bill does not include any plans for the re-development of the remainder of the existing Euston station.

- These new curtailed plans, as defined in AP3, highlight the extraordinarily difficult engineering problems of bringing a high speed train into a narrow constricted and densely populated urban area. In France, these issues have long been recognized. The development of their highly developed TGV network has demonstrated that in restricted urban areas it is more practical, and hence less costly, to run the trains on existing tracks (40% of French TGV’s run on existing track – Cour des Comtes Report – October, 2014).

- The amendments contained in AP3 include powers for the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker to do construction works which are estimated to take in excess of seventeen years; the eventual re-development of the remainder of Euston station, not included in the Bill or AP3, will extend the construction period by possibility a further ten years or more; this will be the largest, longest and most invasive construction project ever undertaken in the United Kingdom. The impact on the community in which your petitioners live will be massive and continuous. The consequential blight will dramatically transform your petitioners’ lives into a living nightmare and it will impinge massively on the quiet enjoyment of their home, lives and family. It will represent a major infringement of their basic human rights.

POLLUTION, NOISE AND VIBRATION:

- Mornington Terrace is comparatively quiet, with low volumes of through traffic, and low ambient noise levels from the railway. This is borne out by HS2’s recent survey (July, 2015) of base noise levels where the average decibels recorded were **54.55 dB in the day & 49.74 dB at night.**

- The complete demolition and eventual re-construction of three major bridges in the area and the massive retaining wall in Park Village East will largely have to be undertaken during off-peak hours either at night or over weekends and holiday periods when track possession can take place. This will result inevitably in high levels of continuous noise during periods when your petitioners are attempting to relax, work at home, garden or sleep.

- The exceptional amount of vibratory piling and other heavy civil engineering work in the cutting required to construct a replacement wall in Park Village East, a new bridge at Mornington Street and to excavate the deepened cutting for the High Speed trains will equally result in long periods of high-level and continuous noise and vibration far in excess of current ambient levels.

- Such high levels of noise are inherently disturbing to sleep patterns and to health particularly among the “very old”. A recent investigation by The London Hospital of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (see – European Heart Journal – 23rd June, 2015) found that daytime road traffic noise increased the risk of hospital admission for stroke with relative risk of 1.05 for adults & 1.09 in the elderly in areas with over 60dB. An earlier study in Copenhagen found an incident rate ratio of 1.14 for stroke per 10dB higher level of road traffic noise. There was a statistically significant interaction with age, with a strong association between road traffic noise and stroke among cases over 64.5 years of 1.27 (see – European Heart Journal – 26th January, 2011).
• The extent of the works are unprecedented with a minimum of six years in the cutting alone together with the associated impact of the redevelopment of Euston Station over at least a twenty year period; this does not include further works, still to be announced to develop the remainder of Euston.

• The ‘noise modelling’ conducted by HS2 Ltd. in their detailed design work has not taken into account the effect of the depth and shape of the cutting. As a consequence, the effects of the reflection and the echo of the noise and vibration are likely to have been seriously underestimated.

• **Levels of pollution in the street, both from dust and fumes, are low** by comparison with most of central London and other conurbations. The trees and verdant gardens, both in front of the houses and to the rear, provide much oxygen to counterbalance the impact of urban pollution. Similarly, the 197 hectares (486 acres) of Regents Park are some 400 yards to the west of the terrace, and provide a very important open green space that makes a huge contribution to the air quality in the surrounding area. Your petitioners use the park twice daily for recreation and to exercise their dog.

• Recent research has demonstrated that 23,500 people die prematurely each year in the United Kingdom from NO2 pollution and a further 29,000 die from poisoning by particulates. This estimated death toll means that pollutants are a likely factor in 9% of all UK deaths. Defra has indicated that Road transport is the largest contributor to NO2 pollution.

• **Euston is one of the single most polluted areas in the United Kingdom, with levels of NO2 per cubic metre of air up to 152 (ug) or nearly four times the EU maximum permitted mean level of 40(ug).**

• The use of Heavy Goods Vehicles to remove the spoil or deliver equipment and material will only increase the pollution to unprecedented levels in the very confined urban area around Euston station and the approach. This will result in additional premature deaths amongst the local residents, particularly among the “very Old”.

• The construction works as defined in the Bill and AP3 include digging down a further eighteen metres in the cutting, demolishing the twenty metre retaining wall on the west of the cutting, demolishing local bridges, diverting sewers and digging up most of the surrounding roads (Delancy Street, Parkway, Oval Road, Gloucester Avenue, Regents Park road, Mornington Crescent, Mornington Terrace etc.). Park Village East, a main access road to Mornington Terrace will be closed for at least two years and the bridge to Mornington Terrace removed for five years. In addition, HS2 intends to take over the London Zoo car park (7,077 m2), which is 300 yards from Mornington Terrace, for use as a HGV lorry park. The consequent impact on Camden and, in particular, to Mornington Terrace removed for five years. In addition, HS2 intends to take over the London Zoo car park (7,077 m2), which is 300 yards from Mornington Terrace, for use as a HGV lorry park. The consequent impact on Camden and, in particular, to Mornington Terrace will result in very high levels of air pollution with increased levels of nitrogen dioxide, with up to 600 HGV lorry journeys per day (over the first ten years of the project, this will equate to 1.3 million movements); enormous traffic congestion to the entire area; huge delays and diversions of bus and other transport links; noise pollution both within the cutting and on all surrounding roads on 24 hour/ 7 days; rat infestations caused by the diversion of sewers; dust & mud from the transport and disposal of spoil; extremely difficult and limited access to all areas and, in particular, to Mornington Terrace. Your petitioners will suffer years of sleep deprivation and increased respiratory problems for one of your petitioners who is asthmatic.
COMPENSATION:

- Although the works will impact inevitably on the value of your petitioners' home, the more important aspect is the intention of HS2 to offer absolutely no compensation for the colossal disruption to their lives. This compares to Railtrack, which paid £300 to each resident of Mornington Terrace during the modernisation of the West Coast Mainline for disturbance caused between 24th and 28th December, 1999.
- HS2 Ltd. have claimed that the Secretary of State for Transport considers that the Bill is compatible with the European Convention on Human Rights and HS2 Ltd. considers that interference with these rights is justified by the considerable public benefits of the railway. However, the works are a major infringement and violation of our human rights.
- HS2 Ltd. have claimed that no compensation is due because of the “temporary nature” (i.e. very short-term) of the works. As far as your “very old” petitioners are concerned, the works will last for the remainder of their predictable lives and are therefore of a “permanent nature”
- HS2 Ltd., through their legal representative, have claimed that the “while the works overall in the Euston area will endure for a substantial number of years, those works will not be operating at the maximum level of intensity for each and every day during those 10 or 17 years, depending on whether one is dealing with stage A or stage B1” This is obvious. But, the works still represent the largest, longest and most invasive urban construction project ever undertaken in the United Kingdom and, as such, will have a catastrophic and permanent impact on the remainder of your petitioners' lives.

MITIGATION:

- HS2 Ltd. have offered to install secondary glazing in our houses in an effort to reduce the impact of the noise rather than offer compensation. There is no guarantee that these measures will be totally effective in reducing the anticipated high levels of noise and will provide absolutely no protection from vibration from the works.

4.

The Petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that they 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.

JOHN MALPASS  
AMANDA MALPASS.

14th 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 COLES

Declares that:

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

Your Petitioners

1. Your Petitioners are owners of the property at 39 Mornington Terrace, NW1 7RS. The property forms part of a Grade II Listed Terrace. Our family have lived here since 1982. The current residents include Rachel Coles, Andrew Coles and Maisie Coles. Rachel’s parents were living in the house until August 2015, but for matters relating to her father’s disability and previous stroke moved to a more secure Older Persons Extra Care accommodation. Rachel Coles is a hospital doctor, currently working at University College London Hospital which involves her working out of hours and night shifts. Maisie is currently 16 months old and attends a local nursery in Gloucester Gate, which is a road potentially required during construction, and a defined Construction Traffic Route within AP3. The proposals will blight the whole of her childhood and teenage years, as works are now set to continue for 17 years, due to air and noise pollution and the danger of the circa 680 trucks per day removing waste. Mornington Terrace is also a Construction Traffic Route.

2. Your Petitioners’ property will not be demolished as a result of the Bill, but is located within 15 metres of the Camden Cutting (hereinafter referred to as “the Cutting”), directly overlooking the construction site of the Euston portal and associated railway tracks. The Mornington Street overbridge satellite construction compound is 75 metres to the south and the Mornington Terrace Sidings Satellite compound proposed 40 metres to the west. Your Petitioners’ property is on a residential street which will be used by construction traffic during the construction of the Scheme, as it is a defined Construction Traffic Route and includes two Satellite compounds as described above.

3. Your Petitioners support the Camden Cutting group petition and are adversely affected by the proposals for the second London HS2 station at
Euston. The first, at Old Oak Common, would provide a quicker connection time to central London than Euston.

4. Your Petitioners concerns are fully described below, however, their key requests can be summarised as:

A. If HS2 is to be built, the London terminus should initially be located at Old Oak Common which has connections with Crossrail, London Underground's Central and Bakerloo lines, London Overground and National Rail services. If there is subsequent evidence, support and economic justification for an extension of HS2 to other London transport hubs then that can be delivered at a later date without delaying the construction of the HS2 line north of London.

B. If HS2 is terminated at Euston as set out in AP3 then HS2 Ltd must properly mitigate and compensate for the extreme environmental damage, significant public health impact and disturbance on the London Borough of Camden (hereinafter referred to as “LBC) and the Camden Cutting area in particular.

C. HS2 Ltd must provide evidence that the Northern Line and Victoria London Underground lines have sufficient available capacity to safely and efficiently handle the extra volume of travellers they have estimated HS2 will bring into Euston if that is to be the final terminus.

Your Petitioner's Concerns

Construction Noise and Disturbance

5. Your Petitioners object to the changes between the Hybrid Bill and AP3 not only because the impact of construction between 2016 and 2033 is now more severe, but has also lengthened in time with a significant increase in total lorry movements. AP3 proposes a 22% increase in waste coming out of the Euston Portal, 3,444,929 tons (Supplementary Environmental Statement and Additional Provision 3 Environmental Statement [Hereinafter referred to as “SES2 and AP3 ES”] Volume 2 – CFA1 Table 7) which will be partly driven out of the site by lorries, through the densely populated residential streets of the LBC. Moreover the length of the total construction period has been extended from 2026 to 2033. This will result in our home being exposed to the disruption of noise, filth, vibration and air pollution caused by the large scale engineering and construction work in the cutting for 17 years the whole childhood and teenage years of our daughter. We will also suffer loss of visual amenity and the works will undermine the quiet enjoyment of our home and damage the health and wellbeing of our family. At present we would receive no compensation for this enormous drop in our living
standards and quality of life. There has been no precedent for any community to be subjected to such high levels of disturbance for such a long, sustained period. This extended period of construction and the inherent high levels of disturbance are a violation of the human rights of all those residents of LBC living in the area, and particularly those living on Mornington Terrace. The Bill does not propose sufficient remedies to compensate or reduce the suffering of those affected.

6. Within the SES2 and AP3 ES volume 5, table 3 describes the impact of duration of night-time noise construction works to last up to 38 months. This is one of the longest periods of noisy construction along the Station Approach to Euston. The average monthly noise, measured by LpAeq, in Mornington Terrace at night-time is estimated as up to at least 65/75dB. This suggests that individual noise levels, measured by LAmax will be significantly higher than this, and likely to exceed maximum levels. The maximum noise trigger levels have been defined as 75dB (daytime), 65dB (evening) and 55dB (night-time) in the Code of Construction Practice (Hereinafter known as “CoCP”).

7. SES2 and AP3 ES Volume 5 paragraph 4.4.1 and 4.4.3 state the Mornington Terrace, amongst other residential streets “are forecast to experience noise levels higher than the noise insulation trigger levels as defined in the draft CoCP.” Paragraph 4.4.7 states “mitigation measures, including noise insulation where necessary, in these buildings, should reduce noise inside all dwellings to a level where it should not significantly affect residents”. However, residents of Mornington Terrace have only been offered mitigation for secondary glazing from HS2 Ltd in this regard, which is far less effective at noise insulation than double or triple glazing. At present, the Grade II Listing of properties in the aforementioned Terrace restricts the ability of property owners such as ourselves to install double glazing, however we would like HS2 Ltd, LBC and English Heritage to work together to help fund and permit the installation of the most effective acoustics glazing for the whole of Mornington Terrace, rather than the cheapest option.

8. Your Petitioners would like to draw your attention to 4.3.11 and 4.3.12 within Volume 5 appendix SV003-001 of the SES2 and AP3 ES. Paragraph 4.3.11 confirms “significant effects” from construction vibration are expected in residential dwellings in Morning Terrace. Within paragraph 4.3.12 in regards to Mornington Terrace it concludes “the effects on these dwellings are considered to be a change in the acoustic character of the area and hence to be perceived as a adverse effect on the quality of life. In combination these individual effects are considered significant”, occurring for periods of up to three months. In this vein, HS2 Ltd should mitigate residents to cover all costs to replace all windows with acoustic glass and double or triple glazing not just those facing the cutting or by simply using secondary glazing.
9. Within SES2 AP3 Volume 5 appendix SV003-001 paragraphs 4.4.13-15 HS2 Ltd admits that “130 properties on Mornington Terrace are likely to experience construction noise levels during the day above 75dB (LpAeq,12hr) and/or 3dB above baseline for a continuous period exceeding one month. The majority of these will also be impacted at night (above 55dB LpAeq,1hr and/or 3dB above baseline) for a continuous period exceeding one month”. These measures are likely to significantly impact the mental and physical health of residents due to repeated sleep interruption over this lengthy period.

10. The Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State to do construction works which are estimated to take 17 years to complete and will include lorry movements, the creation of dust and noise, vibration, poor air quality, light pollution, and 24 hour, 7 days a week working “for operational reasons”. Your Petitioners would like to make it clear that Mornington Terrace is a residential street, with many families and young children living in the vicinity. The length of this work will extends for the whole of our daughter’s childhood and teenage years and that of others, exposing them to potential illness and disease due to the prolonged exposure of noise and air pollution.

11. Long-term exposure to loud noise has the potential to cause ill effects including Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. It has also been shown in London that noise levels lower than those predicted for the HS2 work in AP3, long term exposure to road traffic noise is associated with increased cardiovascular morbidity and mortality. Long term exposure to traffic-related air pollution also increases the risk of asthma and allergic diseases in children. All of these conditions contribute to premature death and has been fully addressed or considered in the HS2 Phase One impact assessment: Health impact assessment addendum.

12. As described in SES2 and AP3 ES Volume 5 Draft Code of construction practice CT-003-000 5.2.6 to 5.2.10, most of the construction activities taking place in the Camden Cutting will be allowed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This is completely unacceptable in a densely populated residential neighbourhood. As well as funding for double or triple glazing for all facades of Mornington Terrace, HS2 Ltd must commit to the following to alleviate the noise pollution on residents:

- Night-time work must be suspended during school exam periods.

---

2 Halonen JI et al. Road traffic noise is associated with increased cardiovascular morbidity and mortality and all-cause mortality in London. Eur Heart J 2015 June 23
3 Fuertes, E. et al. The influence of childhood traffic-related air pollution exposure on asthma, allergy and sensitization. European Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology. 2015; 70(10): 1350-2
• When noisy night-time work is planned, it should occur at the beginning or end of the night shift, rather than in the middle.
• All work should be done during core hours except when required for technical, not cost or programme reasons.
• Exceptions to the core working hours are removed from the Code of Construction Practice and that all exceptions are justified on a case by case basis with LBC.

Given the total construction period is over 17 years, the above is a reasonable and modest request. Alternatively Old Oak Common could be used as the London HS2 terminus until an independent assessment has been made into alternative routes to a second London HS2 station.

**Carbon Emissions and Safety**

13. The planned lorry movements in AP3 would result in local increased Carbon/Nitric Oxide and pollution emissions and safety risks to children, pedestrians and cyclists in the local residential area, especially those on Construction Traffic routes (including Mornington Terrace). No consideration is given to residents of the affected roads and areas, even though they will be facing much higher levels of pollution on a continual basis. Mornington Terrace and Park Village East have not been deemed locations where there will be significant adverse effects from Nitric Oxide, despite being on Construction Traffic Routes? (SES2 and AP3 Volume 2 CFA 1 pages 145-6).

14. There has been no assurance from HS2 Ltd that there will be appropriate monitoring of both particulate matter and Nitric Oxide levels, especially near nurseries and schools. It will be vital to have air filtration systems for receptors in the affected areas.

15. Epidemiological studies have consistently found that long-term exposure to road traffic noise and ambient air pollution are associated with asthma, allergy, cardiovascular disease and raised cholesterol. Therefore it is imperative for public health reasons that air pollution and noise are kept to a minimum at all times. This has not been fully addressed in the HS2 Phase One impact assessment: Health impact assessment addendum. Again, removing the spoil by train from the LBC area to the northern end of the tunnel leading to Old Oak Common, rather than with lorries.

**Road Traffic and Road Works and Closures**

---

16. In addition to the increased heavy goods traffic, roads and streets will be subject to extensive and prolonged excavation and construction work in order to divert sub-surface services such as sewers, water and gas mains, electric and other cabling. The provisions for bus, train, private vehicle access and parking give no apparent consideration to the adverse impact on local residents and businesses.

17. In addition your Petitioners object to the removal of 32 parking bays in Mornington Terrace, without provision of alternative parking spaces or compensation for the residents parking permit. Insufficient parking spaces for families with young children and disabled relatives, such as in our case alone makes this a significant loss of accessibility to our property. LBC residents pay for residents parking permits for the right to park on the street where they live. Therefore HS2 Ltd should to reimburse and compensate the residents of LBC, including Mornington Terrace, for the time periods when the parking bays are removed for HS2 construction works.

18. Your Petitioners are concerned that the Bill does not provide for a proper Traffic Management scheme. Since the Bill concerns a major railway project, with existing lines, we are surprised to find that there is little provision for the transport of either construction materials and machinery or soil by rail, but only by road. SES2 has now stated that the amount of waste has increased from 2 815 319 tonnes to 3 444 929 tonnes (SES2 AP3 ES Volume 2 – CFA1 Table 7) – a 22% increase. We feel, safe and secure routes to schools and other local services and facilities should be a priority, and lorry routes should minimise their impact on these by mostly being on main roads rather than residential streets.

19. It is noted that the levels of pollution found in LBC are already in excess of maxima stipulated by EU directives, and the lorry routes through LBC as part of the Bill and the proposed works will only make this worse. We therefore propose that all lorry drivers should be specially trained, should drive at slow speeds (LBC currently imposes a 20mph limit on many roads), and lorries should have all appropriate safety devices fitted. We also believe that the statutory obligations of the Local Environment Management Plans should apply regarding noise and vibration, and that any night-time works and lorry movements should be minimised.

Euston Station is not an appropriate terminus for HS2

20. Your Petitioners aver that HS2 Limited have made an incorrect decision to use a vast sum of British tax payers money and or saddle future generations with public debt for a second and unnecessary London HS2 station at Euston for the following key reasons:

(i) There is no link with High Speed 1 (hereinafter referred to as "HS1")
(ii) There is no direct link with any of London's airports (Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted or City)
(iii) There is no link with Crossrail Phase 1
(iv) Therefore there is no capacity for direct onward travel
(v) This will involve a long and hugely environmentally damaging construction period, thereby prolonging the HS2 project as a whole
(vi) Using Euston as the London terminus does not appear to be the most cost-effective option

21. The justification of HS2 Ltd is to increase the capacity on the railways. SES2 and AP3 ES Volume 5 appendix TR-001-000 paragraph 3.5.47 recognises that the key London Underground connections from Euston, namely the Northern and Victoria lines will be significantly overcrowded with a huge increase in passenger volumes (predicted 23% increase by the end of Phase two in 2041). These lines are already dangerously overcrowded at peak rush hour times, and there is no current strategy of how London Underground will manage these increased numbers of passengers. Therefore if HS2 terminates at Euston with the current London Underground network this will severely exacerbate the overcrowding problems.

22. One of the reasons for the proposed route between Old Oak Common and Euston in the original Bill was the enablement of the link with HS1. Now that this has been removed in AP3, the justification for the multi-billion pound and environmentally damaging link between Old Oak Common and Euston has even less or no justification.

23. Your Petitioners suggest that Old Oak Common would be a far superior terminus with fast transport connections with sufficient capacity provided by Crossrail Phase 1. AP3 fails to recognise the great potential to develop Old Oak Common served with Crossrail Phase 1 to provide the quickest access to London Heathrow Airport, London Docklands, The City and the West End of London. A terminus at Old Oak Common would relieve a great deal of pressure and congestion on Euston and its stretched onward connections.

24. Your Petitioners suggest that if Euston were to be considered as a necessary final destination to HS2, then disruption and costs of work to upgrade Euston and the Cutting and the various bridges on rail entry into Euston Station could be minimised by initially terminating HS2 at Old Oak Common, allowing necessary work and planning to continue concurrently to an operating service. HS2 Ltd have acknowledged that the detailed plans for the redesign of Euston Station are not yet finalised, and this may take at least another two years.

25. If it is believed that a connection to Euston is totally necessary. Your Petitioner would like to make you aware there are several alternatives for a second London HS2 station such as proposal by Lord Berkeley and the
Cross City Connect solution proposed by Burohappold Engineering. We would like an independent costing and technical assessment of all the alternative routes proposed before many billions of pounds if committed to a final route within London.

**Compensation**

26. Your Petitioners note that it is manifestly unfair to offer compensation to those affected (defined as within 120 metres of the track) in the rural areas of the planned route of the HS2 service, while apparently offering nothing to those within 20 metres of the track, such as those living on each side of the Cutting. We feel that the proposed plans, suggesting 17 years of construction work, raise an undue burden on local residents and businesses with a potentially significant health impact, and that as such there is a requirement to consider these burdens when making such a decision. We reiterate that the total number of lorry movements as a result of AP3 has increased by 16% since the original Bill. The construction works are now more intense and over a longer period of time. HS2 Ltd have not taken into account the substantial potential harm, danger and disturbance AP3 will cause.

27. Your Petitioners object to the requirement under the Homeowner Payment scheme, that Owner-occupiers must have bought their property before 9 April 2014. The HS2 project has significantly evolved since that date, and continues to do so as evidenced by AP3. Since 2014 there have been many reasons why the public may believe the project will not go ahead, such as the General Election in May 2015 and subsequent changes in the Cabinet and Shadow Cabinet together with London Mayoral candidates who oppose HS2. Even Conservative think tanks just as the Bow Group continue to discredit HS2.

28. Your Petitioners object to the Homeowner Payment zone within the LBC showing no correlation or concern to the actual impact of HS2 and its construction. Residents on Mornington Terrace and Park Village East will in the current plans, not be entitled to any compensation, despite being some of the most affected areas along the whole HS2 Phase 1 route. We would again like to draw you attention to 4.3.11 and 4.3.12 in Volume 5 of the SES2 and AP3 ES. Both streets front directly onto the Cutting which will see some of the most intense, severe and long periods of construction work. Table 3 in Volume 5 appendix SV003-001 of SES2 and AP3 ES estimates that Mornington Terrace will be affected by night-time noise for up to 38 months, one of the lengthiest noisy construction periods along Station Approach. Both streets will also have construction compounds located on them and will be defined Construction Traffic Routes, despite currently being minor, one-way residential roads. The decision not to compensate residents in this area is clearly an economic decision, rather than for moral or factual reasons which we strongly oppose. We would like HS2 Ltd to act correctly and consider the impact of construction to residents living in Mornington Terrace and Park Village East, and provide
appropriate compensation to at least the equivalent of that given to those in rural areas within 180 metres of the route.

29. Your Petitioners would also note the precedent for compensation has been established in the Camden Cutting area during by the very minor works to the West Coast Main Line (also out of Euston Station), scheduled to take place over 3 days and nights, Railtrack Limited paid out £300 per household (in advance) to compensate for the disruption. Currently HS2 Ltd are not proposing to pay any compensation to your Petitioners or their neighbours despite 17 years of disruption.

30. Your Petitioners are concerned about the disruption from noise during the construction works in the Cutting. Currently sound will be measured by LAeq which takes an average sound level, rather than LAmx which will measure individual levels. It is not clear whether any acoustic tests have been carried out in Mornington Terrace or Park Village East and properties have not been surveyed to assess the impact on residents, particularly for night-time work.

31. Your Petitioners consider that should noise levels from the works in the Cutting and the surrounding area exceed 85dB that residents should be given options including but not limited to, rehousing or compensation monies to install appropriate glazing to attenuate such noise levels. We are concerned that the number of properties identified by the SES2 and AP3 Volume 2 CFA1 paragraph 14.3.13, where noise will exceed the limit for sound insulation/rehousing is now 1025 (a 16% increase from the previously estimated 880 properties). Compensation for construction disturbance should be provided according to individual need. Acoustic screening should be provided along the Cutting to reduce the noise of construction and such screening could also mitigate some of the adverse effects of the light pollution from overnight works – HS2 has not yet considered any such measures. We urge them to look at other similar screens, such as in Paris, France.

32. Your Petitioners request all properties along Mornington Terrace should be repainted on completion of the works following years of construction pollution to make good. All utilities, which will have to be moved, should be upgraded to the newest technology together with the installation of charging points for electrical vehicles.

33. Upon completion of HS2 Phase one works in 2026 and Phase two works due for completion in 2041, the traffic increase along residential streets such as Mornington Terrace, Mornington Street and Park Village East is significant (AP3 SES2 table 272 and 273). Following the Phase two completion there is almost a 30% increase in traffic, which AP3 SES2 admits will significantly risk a road traffic accident occurring (Appendix TR-001-000 paragraph 3.5.510).
34. Your Petitioners object the powers that are proposed to be provided to the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker by 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 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must review the construction strategy for the Camden Cutting area and its related works activities by considering their cumulative impacts on area communities, and come forward with necessary changes arising from that review before works packages design and tendering strategies have been finalised or construction contractors employed.

CONCLUSION

Your Petitioners in summary makes three proposals:

A. If HS2 is to be built, the London terminus should initially be located at Old Oak Common with connections with Crossrail, London Underground’s Central and Bakerloo lines, London Overground and National Rail services. If there is subsequent evidence, support and economic justification for an extension of HS2 to other London transport hubs then that can be delivered at a later date without delaying the construction of the HS2 line north of London.

B. If HS2 is terminated at Euston as set out in AP3 then HS2 Ltd must properly mitigate and compensate for the extreme environmental damage, significant public health impact and disturbance on the LBC and the Camden Cutting area in particular.

C. HS2 Ltd must provide evidence that the Northern Line and Victoria London Underground lines have sufficient available capacity to safely and efficiently handle the extra volume of travellers they have estimated HS2 will bring into Euston if that is to be the final terminus.

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.

Signed:...........[ANDREW COLES]

Signed:..................[RACHEL COLES]

14/4/16
To the House of Lords Session 2015-2016 and 2016-17

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

THE PETITION OF Kenneth Roy Searle and Mary Margaret Searle declares that:

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

Your petitioners

The first petitioner is the owner of residential property situated at 1 Grange Close, Twyford, Buckinghamshire, MK18 4HE. He is married to the second petitioner and they jointly reside at the above property.

Your petitioner's concerns

We submitted a petition to the Commons Select Committee in November 2015 and attended in person to present it. At that time we objected to a number of issues including the predicted effects of noise from construction and operation on our quality of life and the disruption and inconvenience that will be caused during the construction phase. We soon realised there was little point in individual citizens challenging the might of HS2 and the Government on highly technical issues and although we were not in the slightest reassured by the responses of the Promoter we see little point in taking up the time of the House by challenging all those issues again. We also understand that objecting to the HS2 scheme in principle is outside the remit of this Petition, even though we actually have strong views about that.

We were initially encouraged by some of the responses from the Select Committee to our petition but overall the outcome of that process for us has been no change whatsoever in our predicament.

At our petition hearing we protested about the situation inflicted on us due to the fear induced in the local property market by the whole HS2 scheme and the way it
has been handled over the last 7 years. The fact that HS2 and the Commons Select Committee have failed to recognise and address this is the primary issue about which we wish to petition this House.

We have lived in ‘Lime Cay’, Grange Close, Twyford since we purchased the property freehold in July 1996. Having lived in both urban and rural environments, we had both decided that a home in the countryside was what we wanted, in order to obtain the best quality of life for ourselves and any family we might have. Twyford is a relatively remote village and the surrounding countryside is unspoilt and peaceful and these were very important ingredients in our decision to move there.

In its report on Twyford in 2011 the Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society describes the village as “tranquil” and adds: “However the village, unlike many, could not be described as a ‘dormitory’ since it retains a strong communal spirit, with numerous village events”

We have two sons, Cameron and Joseph, who are both pupils at the Royal Latin Grammar School in nearby Buckingham, 7 miles away and who travel to and from school by bus. Buckingham and Bicester are the nearest towns of any significant size to Twyford.

Our home is situated in Grange Close, which is a cul-de-sac at the northern end of School Lane in the village where we and our family can enjoy views past the cricket pavilion and across the recreation ground to open meadows beyond. We enjoy having immediate access to peaceful countryside by means of the local network of footpaths. Being a cul-de-sac at the end of a no-through road, there is no passing traffic and hence noise levels are consistently very low. At night time the area around the house is virtually silent.

Our property was built in 1978 of traditional brick construction in a corner plot at the junction of School Lane and Grange Close. It is not of any particular architectural significance but is a traditional family home, consisting of 4 bedrooms, living room, dining room, kitchen and utility room and an external garage. We felt it would provide a good basis for improving our situation in the property market or at a later time provide for our old age.

We have worked hard in the public and private sectors throughout our working lives and by careful budgeting we now have no mortgage on the property. The family decision many years ago was to focus on buying our family home as the best means of investing for our future in older age and to provide our family with financial stability and security.

Since we purchased our home, we have refurbished it throughout and we continue to work hard to maintain it in good repair and sustain its market value.
It was always a likely eventuality that we would decide to sell the property at a suitable time of our choosing. This could be to better our situation, to down-size when our children have left home or to relocate to a less expensive area and allow us to free up a significant amount of our equity as capital to fund a comfortable retirement without being a drain on any state resources. However, it might equally be that we simply wish to move house as a lifestyle choice, should the opportunity arise or we see the ‘house of our dreams’ or just because we like the idea of living somewhere else.

Our family home will not be demolished as a result of the HS2 Bill but it is located approximately 320 metres from the centreline of the proposed route. As such we are not subject to any of the current compensation measures in place other than the “Need to Sell” scheme.

The terms of the compensation package offered to residents who are seriously affected by the proposed plans to construct a high speed rail line, but whose properties lie outside the 120m zone which allows for purchase by HS2, are in our view wholly inadequate and unfair.

We have consulted with a number of experienced local property professionals about the market conditions should we decide we wish to sell our home. We have been told that the ‘shadow’ of the HS2 scheme has effectively blighted our property even though the scheme is strictly speaking still a proposal. The professionals we consulted were unanimous that they will not be able to sell the property for anything approaching its market value as it is so seriously blighted. Each company we approached told us the value of our house was reduced by about 40% from the unblighted value due to the ‘shadow’ of HS2. However the view of all the agencies was that they would be unlikely to sell it at all, except possibly as a rental investment, and even that would be at the above reduction in price. This situation is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future until sometime after the line actually comes into operation. Locally the HS2 project is regarded by property professionals as a ‘bad neighbour’ and indeed some of the agencies we approached are charging substantial upfront, non-refundable fees before they will even accept an instruction to market properties like ours that are so seriously affected.

Because of the severe impact on the local property market ever since the proposal to build HS2 was unexpectedly announced in 2009, our right to free movement and lifestyle choice has been curtailed to the point of being removed entirely without any prospect of compensation or redress. We consider this to be grossly unjust and the loss of a fundamental freedom. It feels to us like the Government and HS2 Ltd are riding roughshod over the rights and interests of people adversely affected by their proposal in order to bulldoze the scheme through without recognising their responsibilities. Unless we accept a massive reduction of around £200,000 in the value of our home (which represents our life savings and our provision for our
retirement) we are effectively prisoners in our own property until well into old age, by which time moving house will have become a much more onerous affair. We are not prepared to accept that situation.

Under the Government’s current arrangements the lack of an applicable compensation mechanism for families in our position, other than for home-owners with a ‘compelling reason to sell’, will continue throughout the construction period until a few years after the line is opened and house prices start to recover to some degree. However, this is unlikely to be until 2029 at the earliest at which point we will be 82 and 63 years old.

We attended a meeting in September 2010 at which the then Secretary of State for Transport, Philip Hammond, offered assurances that residents affected by the HS2 proposals would be fairly compensated. He further repeated this statement in Parliament. These assurances have come to nothing as far as we are concerned.

We accept that after further consultation the Government has put in place a revised “Need to Sell” scheme. However, this is applicable only if the house owner can demonstrate a ‘compelling reason to sell’ and would not apply if we want to simply exercise our freedom to choose where we want to live.

We consider it to be unfair and unreasonable to expect us to have to apply for permission to move house as a lifestyle choice, when that requirement is not imposed on any other homeowners in the country. What gives HS2 the right to sit in judgement as to whether our reasons for moving are sufficiently ‘compelling’ to qualify for compensation in respect of the damage inflicted on us by their own project? In addition, we have seen at first hand through the experience of our elderly neighbours how onerous and intrusive the processes of the ‘Need to Sell’ scheme are, and we do not see why we should have to submit ourselves to such humiliation.

We are aware that following the Commons Select Committee hearings, recommendations were made to HS2 regarding the structure and conduct of the Need to Sell Scheme, in particular regarding provisions for ‘Age and Stage’ eligibility. Our understanding is that any changes made would not affect our position as at this time ‘Age and Stage’ are not particularly relevant for us and we do not have a ‘compelling reason’ to want to move - other than possibly to get away from this awful project if and when it starts. We repeat however that we may well want to move for other reasons without financial detriment and we greatly resent the loss of that option.

We therefore consider that the revised compensation scheme as currently in place is completely inadequate to recompense us, and others in a similar situation, for the loss being inflicted by HS2 and we ask this House to delay approval of the Bill until this issue is fairly addressed.
In conclusion, all we want is the ability (enjoyed by every other householder unaffected by HS2) to realise a fair market value for our property at a time of our choosing and for reasons of our choice. This is being denied to us by the HS2 proposal at this time and this has been the case since 2009. We did not ask the Government to build HS2 alongside our village (or at all, actually) and we think it manifestly unfair that our life savings are being drastically reduced as a consequence of their project. We are effectively being asked to subsidise the Government’s project with our savings.

Furthermore we do not expect to have to convince a ‘Panel’ that we have a compelling reason to move and then have to endure a process that probes into our personal finances and sometimes medical history before deciding whether it will allow us to sell our own property at a fair price.

Remedy

To our mind a simple and equitable solution would be to offer a Property Bond to residents who can show that they are being significantly and adversely affected at any time by the HS2 project. Under such a scheme HS2 Ltd should offer to make good the difference in value between a fair unblighted market value and the best price actually achievable at whatever time the homeowner decides they wish to move. The need to have a ‘compelling reason to sell’ shouldn’t come into it. Such a bond would only apply until the first sale of the property took place.

A Property Bond scheme would restore fairness to the current situation and confidence to the property market and allow us to exercise the same right of free movement as any other householder not affected by HS2. If the Government and HS2 believe that a Property Bond is not needed, then actually they should have the integrity to put one in place with the confidence that recipients would not need to draw on it.

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

13 April 2016
Kenneth Roy Searle

13 April 2016
Mary Margaret Searle
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Springfield Farming Ltd

Declares that:

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

2. The Petitioner owns about 130 Acres of prime Arable Agricultural land off Nash Lee Road, near Wendover. The Petitioner has been the recipient of letters and information in the post from HS2 Ltd, which would indicate that HS2 Ltd considers that the Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the Bill.

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

4. The Petitioner requests that the Promoter should give Assurances on 3 points concerning access to the land in question, land drainage and the routing of a Haul Road. Discussions have taken place with the Promoter, the issues have been raised with the Select Committee of the House of Commons, but still the Promoter has refused to issue appropriate Assurances.

The Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that Springfield Farming Ltd, 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

Robert William Lewis
Director,
Springfield Farming Ltd

10th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF THE WENDOVER SOCIETY

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioner was founded in 1965 and exists to protect and enhance the charm and scale of Wendover which has a population of more than 9,000. The petitioner is the largest organisation in the town with just under 500 members and over 600 associates via corporate membership whom the Bill may specially and directly affect.

3. The petitioner’s members’ interests, including their daily domestic, social, educational, working, commercial and cultural life, will be injuriously affected by the noise generated by the HS2 train. The max and peak noise levels, that we aver have been under-estimated by the promoter, will be insufficiently mitigated by the promoter’s proposals for noise barriers which have not been proved to be effective. In addition, these six metre high noise barriers are aesthetically objectionable and quite inappropriate in an historic market town within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

4. The petitioner requests that an independent assessment be made into the promoter’s estimated tunneling costs since their highly variable and over cautious estimates have led to properly appropriate mitigation measures being rejected as too expensive, even after allowing for offsetting savings.

5. The petitioner would like the proposed cut and cover tunnel at Wendover replaced by a longer bored tunnel from 500 metres further north to join the currently proposed bored tunnel at South Heath. Should such a tunnel not be regarded as acceptable, the minimum mitigation required is a tunnel past Wendover as far south as Durham Farm. The better mitigation would result if this were a bored (or, if preferred, mined) tunnel although, as a last resort, we would accept the poorer solution of an extended cut and cover tunnel.

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.

Robert Lewis, Agent  
10th April 2016
THE PETITION OF Marie-Rose von Oppenheim

 Declares that:
 1) The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill
 2) The petitioner lives at Boswells Farm which is specially and directly affected by HS2
 3) Your petitioner's concerns:

   Our area is declared an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the present plan to run HS2 in an elevated position through this part of Buckinghamshire is a travesty! The historically important Ridgeway runs along Boswells Farm and HS2 specially and directly affects thousands of hikers and walkers using it in this beautiful part of the Chiltern Hills.

   Your petitioner's main concern is to preserve and conserve this area of Outstanding Natural Beauty for our future generations.

 4) The prayer

   The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she, min 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, most respectfully
Marie-Rose von Oppenheim

11th April 2016
IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF
LORDS
SESSION
2015 - 2016

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON TO WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION of ROGER DAVID CONNOR

SHEWETH as follows:-

1.1 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.”

1.2 The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLoughlin, 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.

1.3 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,
1.4 Clauses 37 to 42 of the Bill deal with the regulatory regime for the railway.

1.5 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 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.

1.6 The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill 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.

1.7 Your Petitioner is specially and directly affected by the whole of the Bill, particularly those parts which relate to the construction and operation of the railway within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ("the AONB"), the Misbourne Valley and the area around Little Missenden in Buckinghamshire in particular.

1.8 Your Petitioner is Roger David Connor, the joint owner/occupier of Bourn's Meadow, Little Missenden, Amersham, Buckinghamshire HP7 ORF, which is within the the AONB, and within 500 metres of the route of the proposed railway and within 600 metres of the site of the proposed Little Missenden Vent Shaft and Auto-transformer Station. He is particularly affected by the parts of the Bill which authorise the construction and operation of the proposed railway within the Misbourne Valley and within the AONB as a whole and the construction and operation of the proposed Little Missenden Vent Shaft and Auto-Transformer Station as follows:

2. THE CONCERNS
2.1 The beauty, peace and quiet of the area in which your Petitioner lives are matters of importance to him and he derived comfort from the fact that the area is protected by designation as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The construction and operation of the proposed railway as is presently proposed would inevitably diminish your Petitioner's enjoyment and adversely affect his sense of wellbeing. It is submitted that, in planning the route and features of the proposed railway, the Promotor and HS2 Ltd have failed to give due weight to that designation and, perhaps more significantly, to the importance of preserving an area of beauty, peace and quiet, a large part of which has been virtually unchanged since Saxon times and the moral duty to preserve that asset for future generations.

2.2 Your Petitioner believes, upon the basis of credible information and properly qualified opinion, that there is a risk, at present unquantified, that the construction of the proposed railway would result in loss of flow in the River Misbourne, a rare and vulnerable chalk stream that flows through the village of Little Missenden and which is a significant amenity for the residents of the village and others. There is also a risk of pollution which is made more significant by the fact that the river and its aquifer provide a very large volume of drinking water to parts of London.

2.3 HS2 Ltd has admitted that the route and depth of the proposed tunnel through the chalk of the Misbourne Valley were decided upon in the absence of any investigation or survey of the hydrology or geology of the valley. It appears that they relied upon the geological maps of the area published in the early 1920s. At least one eminent geologist has expressed the view that to bore a tunnel through the Valley along the proposed route and at the proposed depth would give rise to a risk of collapse of the chalk above the tunnel and (separately) of fissures in the chalk being created through which water from the river would drain, thus removing the flow in the river itself. Despite that, HS2 Ltd have still not carried out any such survey or drilled the boreholes required for this purpose. They acknowledge that it will be necessary to do so before work of construction can commence but say that this will not be done until after the Bill has completed is passage through Parliament.
2.4 Your Petitioner asserts that it is apparent that HS2 Ltd has failed to assess adequately the extent and consequences of the traffic congestion upon local roads likely to result from the additional traffic upon those roads generated by the construction of the proposed railway and to take this factor into account sufficiently or at all when deciding upon the route of the railway and when assessing the arguments for a long tunnel throughout the AONB. Further, it is submitted that HS2 Ltd refuses to acknowledge the extent and significance of the problem. Little Missenden, where your Petitioner lives, is situated on a loop off the A413, a road regularly and necessarily used by your Petitioner. Both the A413 and the village road would be adversely affected by that additional traffic and considerable delays and inconvenience to your Petitioner would be inevitable if the construction were to proceed as is, at present, planned.

2.5 In respect of the proposed Little Missenden Vent Shaft and Auto-Transformer Station, your Petitioner asserts that HS2 Ltd has failed to plan for appropriate and safe vehicular access to and from this site.

PARTICULARS

3. The AONB

3.1 Your Petitioner submits that, given that the construction and route of the proposed railway have been decided, the legal and moral obligations described in paragraph 2.1 above can by satisfied only by the continuation of the currently proposed tunnel throughout the AONB.

3.2 Your Petitioner understands that HS2 Ltd has accepted that the construction and operation of such a continuation is feasible, that it can be constructed within the required timetable, that it would provide significant environmental, social and business benefits and that it is environmentally preferable to their scheme. Their rejection of the proposal is primarily based upon assertions as to the cost of the extended tunnel. In that respect your Petitioner submits that, given the significance of the decision, those assertions should be subject to independent review and comparison with the cost of the alternative mitigation necessitated by the currently proposed scheme.
are, in the main, a single carriageway of limited width with no separate footway and very few places in which vehicles travelling in the same direction can pass. Currently, at peak times, the volume of traffic on this road is close to, and sometimes exceeds, its capacity. The additional traffic from the construction of HS2 created by those planned activities would cause major congestion and result in significant delays for all users of the road. Your Petitioner is also concerned that congestion on the A413 would result in drivers using the, totally unsuitable, village road through Little Missenden as a rat run.

6.2 Your Petitioner is informed and believes that throughout the planning process, HS2 Ltd has failed to engage with or provide promptly and, in some cases, at all, information required by the Highways Authority, the Buckinghamshire County Council. Furthermore the numbers provided from time to time by HS2 Ltd in relation to traffic have proved to be inaccurate and misleading. They are, it seems, unwilling to acknowledge the obvious, namely that their transport proposals are not realistic and, if carried out, would cause immense problems for residents of the area.

6.3 The great majority of the excavated material referred to in paragraph 6.1 above would be generated from the excavation of cuttings. (Spoil from boring the tunnel would be removed along the trace.) If, as your Petitioner urges, it were concluded that the tunnel should be extended throughout the AONB, there would be a resulting reduction in the amount of material to be transported by road and a consequent reduction in the degree of the problem.

6.4 Your Petitioner respectfully urges the House of Lords not to pass the Bill until solutions, satisfactory to the Highways Authority, have been found to the many anticipated problems of traffic congestion resulting from the activities of HS2 Ltd to be authorised by the Bill.

7. The Little Missenden Vent Shaft and Auto-Transformer Station

7.1 HS2 Ltd plans to create a vent shaft and erect the head building and an auto-transformer station in what is now a cornfield adjoining the A413 a short distance to the east of Little Missenden. The majority of excavated material from the excavation of the vent shaft would be transported by road and all the
building and other materials required for the construction would, likewise, be delivered by road. The published plans of the site show that HS2 Ltd is planning that vehicles entering and leaving the site should do so by a new access point onto the A413. Before the Select Committee in the House of Commons it was asserted on behalf of HS2 that those construction activities would take only 3 months. Your Petitioner believes, upon the basis of the opinions expressed by other village residents with expertise in this field, that this is a considerable under-estimate.

7.2 The new access referred to in paragraph 7.1 is at a point at which the A413 is dual carriageway with a speed limit of 70 miles per hour. There is insufficient space to construct a cross-over to enable traffic to turn into or out of the west-bound lane of the road or to construct deceleration and acceleration lanes. In the submission of your Petitioner, the plans of HS2 Ltd in these respects are manifestly ill-considered and would give rise to an unacceptable degree of danger to road users. Indeed, it is unlikely that they would receive the required approval of the Highways Authority. Your Petitioner along with others has, some months ago, suggested that it would be safer and far more satisfactory for access to the site to be via the road that runs about 25 metres from the field in question on its south-east side. (This would bring the added benefit of reducing the nuisance caused to residents of the village by the heavy vehicle movements.) Before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, HS2 Ltd rejected this suggestion upon grounds that subsequently proved baseless. There have been indications that the matter is being reconsidered by HS2 Ltd but, for reasons that are not apparent, they have not yet made any commitment in this respect.

7.3 Your Petitioner seeks, if necessary, an amendment to the Bill so as to require the revision of the proposals for access to the site and the transfer of the access point to the road referred to above.

8. OTHER MATTERS

8.1 There are other matters which concern your Petitioner, such as the inadequacy of the draft Code of Construction Practice, the likelihood of dangerous air pollution, noise and damage caused by vibration and the
appearance of the buildings at the Little Missenden site. He is, however, aware that others will seek to raise those points and does not seek to do so himself.

Your 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.

Dated: 13th April 2016

SIGNED

Roger David Connor
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL.

THE PETITION OF WENDY LEVITT

Declar-es that:

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

2. Your Petitioner is Wendy Levitt, resident of 37 Princess Road, Camden, NW1 8IS

3. Your Petitioner and her interests are injuriously affected by the Bill for reasons outlined below. If the Bill were to be passed in its present form, my property and enjoyment of life would be significantly blighted for many years to come. I have lived within the tiny conservation area of Primrose Hill for more than 40 years. My children and some of my grandchildren grew up here. I moved to 37 Princess Road four years ago with the intention of making it my final home. Yet now, there is no doubt that, once construction starts, the quality of my life will be adversely and most severely impacted for many years to come, as will the value of my property and my ability to sell. I therefore ASK that Princess Road be removed from the scope of the Bill.

My concerns

4. Like other residents of Princess Road, I have been served with Compulsory Purchase Notice Orders in respect of the cellars stretching under the pavement. HS2 Ltd say that these orders are required so that a sewer can be re-routed along Princess Road, but they have never explained exactly why this is necessary. Other nearby roads such as Albert Street NW1 have had their cellars exempted from the bill, overriding Compulsory Purchase Order Notices previously been served by HS2 Ltd.

5. I ASK that the Compulsory Purchase Notice Orders on our Princess Road cellars are similarly withdrawn.

6. Princess Road is within the Primrose Hill conservation area and almost all houses on Princess Road are early 19th century, of special historical interest or Grade 2 listed. They are important local buildings and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
7. Princess Road is now designated as a Construction Traffic Route (CTR).\(^1\) In
spite of several requests, HS2 Ltd has failed to explain why our street has
been so designated. We have merely been told that their traffic modelling
now predicts more than 24 HGV movements per day, and that therefore our
beautiful street, home to a large primary school and filled with small children
every day, now falls within the CTR category. A lollipop lady helps children
cross Princess Road morning and afternoon, performing this task amid HGVs,
and additional pollution could be untenable. The extra traffic is predicted to
last during construction scenarios 2 and 3 (2017 through 2022). More traffic
means more noise, pollution and other negative effects for all of us residents.

8. HS2 Ltd has not said how many HGV movements they expect for our street.
Any increase in HGV traffic will be injurious to all who reside and use this
street – extra noise, vibration, air pollution and risk to pedestrians and
children. And there is the undoubtedly risk that HGV traffic prediction may be
seriously underestimated, and that the injury and blight will be far greater.
We have seen nothing that would give any confidence that we as residents
would have any way of preventing this from happening.

9. I ASK that HS2 HGV movements be not permitted in Princess Road on the
basis that they are entirely inappropriate for a street used by so many small
children and with such high historical and architectural value.

10. In the event of Princess Road remaining within the scope of the Bill and
remaining a designated CTR, there should be:
- an enforceable limit on the number of HGVs allowed to transit our
  street each day;
- a limit to the size and weight of HGVs transiting our street;
- there should be no HGV traffic at night between 22.00 and 09.00
  and no HGV traffic on Saturdays and Sundays.

11. I appreciate any reduction in HGV traffic on Princess Road may only add to
HGV traffic on other fragile and attractive streets in Primrose Hill. We would
not wish this to happen. We are especially concerned that HS2 Ltd has
increased its estimate of the volume of waste to be removed from the Euston
and approach construction sites by 22% - which must mean more HGV traffic
on the streets of Camden.\(^2\)

12. I ASK that HS2 Ltd is required to develop a plan which would ensure that
75% of the waste from the construction site is removed by rail.

13. If construction traffic is to be reduced in Camden Town, this would require
that the total volume of equipment and materials to and from the construction
site now planned to be carried by road be very significantly reduced.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Map CT - 05 - 001 in SLS 2 Volume 5

\(^2\) Environmental Statement CTA 1 (2015) [check]
support TIL's view that a large proportion could be carried by rail. HS2 Ltd has been resistant to this on the grounds that it would disrupt normal rail services.

14. I ASK that in the light of AP3, the compensation measures relating to Princess Road be reviewed to include the increased disturbance to be faced by residents. It is increasingly clear that if the Bill is passed in its present intended form, I, as a resident of Princess Road, will be severely damaged; the mitigation measures so far proposed for our neighbourhood and for Princess Road in particular go nowhere near far enough in offsetting or compensating me for the amenity damage and blight to my home that construction is likely to cause.

15. I ASK that HS2 Ltd adopt a more positive and generous attitude to both mitigation and compensation for urban areas such as Camden Town. It is not sufficient for them to say they are doing all that is "reasonably practicable". They are not.

YOUR 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 your petitioner remains, etc.

WENDY L'VII

13th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Veronica and Andrew Challinger

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioners are, Veronica and Andrew Challinger resident at 143, Aylesbury Road, Wendover, Bucks. HP22 6U, who 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

Your Petitioners, are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects 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.

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 reputation, social,
environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction. 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, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. For the HS2 viaduct and “green” tunnel there will be construction work and road changes from Rocky Lane to Bacombe Lane all along the by-pass up to Nash Lee Road. This will cause considerable disruption. It would be very likely that people will want to avoid this and the obvious route to take, as also for those affected by the closure of Ellesborough Road, will be the Aylesbury Road. Wendover, currently as a vibrant town, has traffic to and from schools, surgery, shops, railway station, churches. Wendover is also driven through/crossed for access to the A41 and M25 and M1, Tring station and possibly Hemel Hempstead station for trains travelling north and trains that cross London with connections to Gatwick (St Pancras International). Some of the transport lorries and other transport linked to the works, depending on the direction they are coming from and going to, may also use the Aylesbury Road. Wendover is also travelled through, at the moment using the by-pass, for the Amersham/Aylesbury routes. This is also likely to be affected by the extensive construction works.

What will this extra load do to Aylesbury Road? Will there be any safety measures or traffic calming? Between the bollards at the playing fields and the traffic lights by the Health Centre there is no other crossing. However, at peak times there are pupils catching school buses or returning by bus – The Floyd, Aylesbury High and Aylesbury Grammar -. Either in the morning or in the evening every one of those pupils will need to cross Aylesbury Road (there is a bus stop by Bryants Acre/Perry Street). There is a garage that has a shop and ATM that for many necessitates crossing the road to visit. Many residents, including your petitioners, need to reverse into their parking places in front of/at the side of their properties in order to drive out safely. There are several potential problems here: holding up the traffic whilst waiting for a space to reverse (it can already take quite a while); other motorists not expecting a stationary vehicle; others getting impatient and making dangerous manoeuvres; waiting for a space if needing to cross the traffic before reversing; trying to get out from the parking space. Whilst it is considered that residents will not suffer from construction or train noise, there will be a substantial rise in traffic noise and pollution and dust. On such a busy road properties will not be so desirable and inevitably prices will fall.
If there were to be a tunnel the road changes will not be necessary and construction sites along the side of Wendover will largely not be required. The amount of disruption will be considerably less and further away from the residential area of Wendover.

Your Petitioners contend that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. 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 further regard this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and are 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.

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

3.2. Your Petitioners accordingly emphasise that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover 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.

Hierarchy of Mitigation
a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover by boring or mining 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 improved mitigation 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 replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.

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 the highest quality design and the 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.
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

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 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 given the traffic congestion that will be on the main emergency routes.

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 timely manner.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks 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.

UM CHALLINGER

ANDREW CHALLINGER
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL


Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners

   The petitioners are owners of canal boats, moored in Harefield Marina and along the Grand Union Canal between Denham Lock and Widewater Lock. The boats are for some of the petitioners', their sole and permanent residence and for the remainder, a second home or weekend retreat. The petitioners have owned boats at this location for up to 30 years. This is currently a tranquil, scenic rural environment comprising a closeknit community on the London periphery.

   The petitioners' boats are all located specifically in this area, because of the quiet rural setting and access to surrounding countryside. Some are also here for their work, have children at a local school, or for their retirement. Two of the petitioners often work in the marina painting and repairing boats.

   The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the planned construction site of the viaduct immediately adjacent to Harefield Marina and the canal.

   During construction, the petitioners who live an outdoor lifestyle, will be surrounded by construction activity, totally destroying the scenic, tranquil environment.

   After construction, the petitioners will be adjacent to the viaduct and therefore continue to be subject to intolerable noise, visual pollution and poorer environmental quality. This will be disruptive to daily life for many of the petitioners and have a devastating effect on their quality of life and their's and their children's health.

   Part of Harefield Marina may possibly be required for the construction of the viaduct, causing huge disruption for the petitioners.

   The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the loss of towpath moorings and access due to the temporary closure of the Grand Union Canal towpath. Closures, diversions and visual devastation to other local public rights of way will also adversely affect the petitioners.

   The petitioners will also be directly adversely affected by traffic problems, caused by the many local HS2 construction works, which will affect Moorhall Road where the marina and canal are located.
3. Your petitioners concerns

Your petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed viaduct across the Colne Valley, which will have a hugely negative impact on their way of life.

Your petitioners choose to moor their boats in Harefield marina or use the temporary moorings along the towpath because of the rural location. Many boats in the marina are only used for short trips or rarely used for cruising. This includes some of your petitioners, who use their boats, especially at weekends or sunny periods, as a rural second home or just somewhere to go and relax for the day, because of the location.

Your petitioners are gravely concerned about the impact of the proposed viaduct which will pass across the HOAC sailing lake adjacent to the marina and the canal, passing just a few metres from part of the marina, where it would continue across the Grand Union Canal and then over Savay lake, adjacent to the canal and visible from the marina. The Viaduct will be a massive blight on the landscape.

During construction your petitioners will be immediately adjacent to the viaduct construction site and so subject to intolerable noise and dust. Your petitioners' rural views of trees, wildlife and surrounding lakes will be destroyed and replaced with machinery and concrete.

Once the viaduct is complete, your petitioners' once rural and long distant views, will then be replaced with a huge structure immediately adjacent to them. Screening of this structure with trees would be difficult due to the location. The viaduct would even obscure the evening sun.

Your petitioners currently enjoy quiet surroundings and the sounds of the wide variation of bird life around the marina and canal. The sounds of people enjoying themselves in neighbouring HOAC can also be heard. The viaduct will destroy this. When completed there maybe up to 36 trains every hour, travelling at very high speeds, immediately adjacent to the marina and canal. Your petitioners are gravely concerned about the noise pollution that will surround them, which will be heightened due to the trains travelling over large areas of water.

Your petitioners are concerned that the boating community in Harefield Marina and the canal will be damaged by the displacement the viaduct will cause. Some of your petitioners and others, are likely to leave the area or sell their boats, as moorings of a rural nature are scarce in this area, so relocation could prove impossible.

One of your petitioners will be specially and directly adversely affected, as they work mainly in the marina painting boats. This may be impossible at times, if there are large amounts of dust in the air. This petitioner spends most of their time in the marina and alongside the opposite towpath, so their whole way of life will be ruined. Being self-employed, relocation would be difficult, as restarting in a new area can be very slow. Damage to the community could result in less customers for this petitioner and for another who also often works in the marina.
Your petitioners are also concerned that part of the marina may still be compulsory acquired by HS2 Ltd. This would specially and directly adversely affect your petitioners, as a large number of moorings would have to be temporarily relocated, causing huge disruption.

Your petitioners will be specially and directly adversely affected by the temporary closure of the towpath, which they use regularly for moorings, commuting to work, to access services and for leisure. This and the opposite track (next to H.O.A.C.'s lake), along the east side of the Grand Union Canal pass under the site of the proposed viaduct. Closure of both these routes at the same time would restrict access to Denham and Uxbridge.

Other local rights of way that your petitioner's regularly use for commuting to work, leisure and visiting family, will be adversely affected by closures, diversions and visual pollution.

Your petitioners are concerned that access to the marina and canal in Moorhall road, will be affected by road closures and extra HGV traffic, causing delays to the petitioners directly and also to any emergency services they require.

Your petitioners request that the tunnel be extended under the Colne Valley, as proposed by Hillingdon council, instead of the proposed viaduct. This is the only solution that would avoid the destruction of their community and way of life. Extending the tunnel would remove the direct impact on your petitioners, of noise, dust and visual pollution during construction and operation, as well as being sympathetic to the surrounding environment. Tunneling would also prevent closure and disruption to roads as there would be no need for construction traffic to pass through Harefield. Less public rights of way would also be affected.

If the viaduct goes ahead, then your petitioners request that it be designed and constructed as sympathetically as possible. Sound barriers should be of the same height and quality as they would be in a residential area. The speed of the trains travelling across the viaduct should be reduced, to reduce noise levels. Screening of the railway and other sites, using embankments and trees should be installed well ahead of construction.

If part of the marina is acquired temporarily, then alternative mooring sites should be provided nearby and for no more cost than the remaining part of the marina.
4. The Petitioner 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.

Sarah Brooks

Graham Adams

Susan Weller

Robert Steedman

Tina Hauder

Paul Burfoot

B Jones

Martin Rowe

C. CoacH

G. CoacH

[Signatures]

13/April/2016

Karen Newbold

Colin Tobin
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF M J MUSK MARINE SALES (HAREFIELD) LTD

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is the leaseholder of Harefield Marina, Moorhall Road, Harefield, UB9 6PD, which is a Marina in the London Borough of Hillingdon.

The route of the HS2 will not only directly affect the 45 Narrowboat mooring’s which are adjacent to the route, but will affect 100% of the Marina due to the noise and structure of the HS2. This will adversely affect the tranquillity of the Marina, which their mooring clients have enjoyed for over 60 years. This in turn will lead to a catastrophic loss of our business.

It is proposed by the Bill to authorise the compulsory acquisition of certain interests in land or property of the Petitioner and notice has been served on the Petitioner of the intention to seek such compulsory powers.

The Petitioners’ property will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill. The property is located approximately 5 metres from the nearest area of land which can be acquired and used under the Bill. The Property is identified in the Environmental Statement that accompanies the Bill (“the ES”) as being affected by Phase One of HS2. The Property Is located on Moorhall Road, which is liable, according to the Environmental Statement that accompanies the Bill (“the ES”) to be interfered with a route for construction traffic during the construction of Phase One of HS2.

The Bill contains wide ranging powers to enable the Secretary of State to acquire land compulsorily outside the limits of land to be acquired under the Bill for purposes including regeneration and because of the proximity of the Property to Phase One of HS2, those powers are more likely to be used in relation to the Property than other property, causing unnecessary blight. The Petitioner was not consulted by High Speed 2 Limited about the proposals in the Bill indicating that the promoter of the Bill is of the view that the Petitioner will be specially and directly affected by the Bill. According to the Environmental Statement, the Petitioners’ property lies within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility with respect to the construction and operational phase of the railway.

The Petitioners’ rights, interests and property will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, and the Petitioner accordingly objects thereto for the reasons, amongst others, here in after appearing.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Extent of land take
Land in the ownership of your Petitioner is liable to compulsory acquisition under clauses 4 to 8 of the Bill. The limits of deviation and of land to be acquired and used are drawn very widely and your Petitioner is unsure why that is. Your Petitioner may seek to enter into an agreement with the promoter of the Bill that the extent of compulsory purchase should be limited geographically, or so that acquisition and use of your Petitioners' land is on a temporary basis only.

Your Petitioner is particularly concerned by the possibility of land being acquired permanently for a temporary purpose and considers it inappropriate for the Bill to contain compulsory purchase powers in respect of this, when the nominated undertakers' requirement is for a temporary use only. The proposed use is for access and a safe guarding area.

Your Petitioner also wishes to ensure that it is properly compensated as regards the acquisition and use of its land, and is concerned to note that the compensation regime proposed by the Bill is inadequate and needs to be improved.

Maintenance of bunds and made-up ground

It is clear from the draft Environmental Statement that there will be significant lengths of bund, made-up ground, "sustainable placement" and ground re profiling alongside the proposed railway, much of it on good quality agricultural land.

In your Petitioners' submission, the Bill should be amended so as to include a provision requiring the Nominated Undertaker, unless the landowner agrees otherwise, to remain responsible for the safety and maintenance of land which is altered in that way and to be responsible for liability for any losses associated with the failure of such operations, such as settlement or slippage.

Accommodation works

Your Petitioners' Marina will be severed as a result of the construction of the proposed railway. Accommodation works in general and crossing points in particular are matters of significant importance for your Petitioner. Well-designed accommodation works which meet your Petitioners' needs are likely to reduce substantially a claim for compensation. HS2 Ltd or the Nominated Undertaker should, at a very early stage, seek to agree a specification for accommodation works with your Petitioner. That would help to mitigate the impact of the scheme. For crossing points, such a specification might include the width, height, weight limit and final surface. Once agreed, the specification should be binding on the Nominated Undertaker.

Your Petitioner proposes to your honourable House that HS2 Ltd should be required to undertake that it will, at a very early stage, seek to agree with your Petitioner a suitable specification for accommodation works where they are required as a result of the construction of the Authorised Works, and that the specification, once agreed, will be binding on the Nominated Undertaker.

Planning consent for replacement buildings and associated dwellings

Your petitioner notes that the Bill contains provision, in clause 48, enabling the Nominated Undertaker to carry out reinstatement works within the Act limits. In theory, that clause could be utilised so as to meet the concerns of your Petitioner but there is no
certainty in that regard, for a number of reasons, most notably that it only applies to reinstatement works within the Bill limits.

Your Petitioner proposes that the Bill should be amended so as to ensure that the process for relocating the Marina infrastructure that are lost are capable of being reinstated more easily. This could be achieved by clause 48 being amended so as to ensure that it will apply in any case where land is available for reinstatement works, and to remove other uncertainties.

Alternatively, the Bill should make provision for an amendment to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 so that the replacement of any building used for business purposes and any associated dwelling which is acquired under the provisions of the Bill will be permitted development subject only to the prior notification procedure. The permitted development should allow for modern building materials and if appropriate, modern design and layout, but the size of the replacement building will be restricted to the size of the original. A local planning authority would then be able to consider siting and access under the prior notification process, as for other permitted development.

Compensation, generally.

The compensation regime set out in the Bill is inadequate and must be improved. In any event, any payment of compensation that is due to your Petitioner must be made as early as possible and must carry interest at a rate higher than is proposed under the Bill.

Other mitigation

Your petitioner would like to request consideration of an alternative to the Colne Valley viaduct. Your petitioner supports Hillingdon council in its petition for a tunnel under the Colne Valley, instead of the proposed viaduct. This would eliminate most of the adverse affects on the petitioners.

General

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 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 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.

Mr Philip Musk
13th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF GREAT MISSENDEN VILLAGE ASSOCIATION
Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill, because the inclusion of Additional Provision 4 (AP4) moving the tunnel portal site directly adjacent to South Heath, clearly worsens the negative impact of the scheme on our members ie residents and businesses in the village of Great Missenden.

2. Your petitioner is Great Missenden Village Association. The Association was established in 2009 and represents residents and businesses in the Chiltern Council District Ward of Great Missenden. The Association is concerned about the negative impact of the Bill on Great Missenden as a tourist hub and on the local economy that is dependent on day visitors and other tourists. In addition the Association objects to the additional visual, noise and congestion blight that will arise in Great Missenden directly affecting residents in different parts of the ward and as a direct result of the C6 portal eight year construction period.

3. Great Missenden is situated in the very heart of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and its >50 village businesses (almost all independent businesses) and wide range of health, education, local transport and other services reflect the significance of the village to the AONB and to the communities within it. Great Missenden has a population of 2,500, making it by far the largest of the Misbourne valley and ridge top villages directly impacted by the promoters’ scheme in this part of the AONB.
4. Great Missenden is also a tourist and day tripper destination in its own right. The village is home to the internationally famous Roald Dahl museum, which attracts over 70,000 visitors to the village per annum, including approximately 10,000 school children in organised school trips and yet the promoter has consistently failed to consider the negative impact of its scheme on our crucial local tourist economy.

5. Your petitioner is concerned that the measures contained in AP4 will worsen levels of congestion and rat-running in the village, with direct negative impacts on the tourist economy and the long-term financial viability of businesses in the village. The promoter acknowledges that the C6 scheme’s reliance on a new haul road from the Link Rd roundabout will result in a “major adverse significant impact” at the A413/Link Rd junction. This represents a very significant worsening of the impact as reported in the scheme’s original Environmental Statement.

6. Despite the private agreement reached in January 2016 between the promoter and Buckinghamshire County Council to consider options for moving the proposed haul Rd further north, at the time of writing we believe that the promoter has still not provided the necessary baseline information which the Highways Authority needs to try to develop alternative solutions, all subject to local consultation. We are disappointed that this crucial issue for our village was never aired properly during the Commons Select Committee phase of the Bill, despite concerns being expressed by Committee members about the impact of the revised scheme on the village of Great Missenden, nor do we have any confidence that Bucks CC will in practice be in a position to deliver an alternative given the onerous conditions insisted upon by the promoter in the January agreement.
7. In particular your petitioner requires that spoil removal locally, should be north along the trace rather than via the new haul road and the local road network. The Association objects most strongly to the fact that little if no consideration has been given by the promoter to the negative impacts of the proposed new road, associated infrastructure, traffic movements and congestion on the village of Great Missenden. If spoil removal via the trace is not agreed, then as an absolute minimum, the proposed new construction access road from the A413/A4128 Link Rd roundabout, the main entrance point to the village from the A413, must be moved much further north (ie north of Leather Lane) to avoid such direct impacts on the village centre.

8. Your petitioner is concerned that the addition of the access road satellite compound immediately adjacent to the A413, the repositioning of electricity pylons, 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 visual impact on sight-lines from the village centre, plus associated noise and air quality impacts on people living, working in and visiting Great Missenden.

9. Your petitioner is dismayed that despite the promoter’s claim in July 2015 that C6 would benefit people “in” Great Missenden, the Bill largely ignores the impacts of the revised scheme on the largest population centre in the Community Forum Area 9 area by failing to consider the socio-economic impacts of the scheme for businesses in the village and in particular its impacts on tourism.
10. The promoter claims that the extension of the Chiltern tunnel will "result in the retention of a total of 5 jobs," presumably those currently affected by two business demolitions required by the original scheme, but once again the promoter completely ignores the negative impacts of the scheme, including the eight year construction period on tourism related jobs in the heart of Great Missenden.

11. Your petitioner requires the promoter to undertake further viewpoint and noise impact analysis of the revised scheme from west of the A413, including from the village primary school grounds and the residential Elmtree Green.

12. Your petitioner believes that the only practicable solution to the noise, transport, local economy, environmental destruction and other negative impacts of the promoter's scheme is a fully bored tunnel throughout the entire AONB. That is the only measure that would fully protect Great Missenden village and the central Chilterns area in its entirety, delivering very significant environmental advantages including (but not limited to) minimal disruption to our community and to its vital local businesses and services, no loss of jobs, no loss or severance of farmland, a significant reduction in noise issues, much reduced impact on wildlife and local biodiversity, limited damage to the vital AONB tourist economy and amelioration of stress, anxiety and depression among local residents. If that is rejected again, the Association asks that the "C6" tunnel portal site is moved northwards away from Great Missenden village, as an absolute minimum to implement in full the REPA C5 proposal.
13. Your petitioner further requests that Members of the Committee visit our village for a public meeting hosted by the Association and also to visit the extended C6 portal site area, including the proposed new access road, before reaching a decision on the extended tunnel issue.

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.

Cllr Sebastian Berry (Agent for Great Missenden Village Association)
11th April 2016
To the House of Lords Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill


Declares that:

I. The Petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the provisions of the whole Bill.

II. Your petitioner

1 The Petitioners are the residents respectively of the small Victorian terraced houses at 65, 79, 81, 83 and 85 Arlington Road in Camden Town Conservation Area of the Borough of Camden, approximately 250 metres from the proposed Camden Cutting and associated major works which the Bill may "specially and directly affect". Your Petitioners have all lived here for periods varying between 5 years and 12 years and chose to live in Camden because of its affordability in a central location, its attractive period properties, convenient amenities and friendly residential neighbourhood having a clear sense of local community. We are deeply apprehensive of the effects on our working and domestic lives of the provisions of this Bill. A number of us work from home and will therefore experience additional severe disruption during the many years of this project.

2. Your petitioners are submitting a further petition, because they received no satisfactory undertakings in response to our petition to the Other House, where our requests were ignored. The Select Committee’s Second Special report did, however, note that “Camden is exceptional, and needs special treatment. Many residents are going to have to put up with disturbance on a scale beyond the experience in most other locations.” Para 237, page 62.

III. Your Petitioner concerns

3. Your Petitioners are adversely affected by the proposals for Euston Station and works in the throat (also known as the Camden Cutting) for the following reasons: the Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State and
the Nominated Undertaker (HS2) to undertake works of construction which will include numerous negative effects, including unmitigated residual significant adverse effects in Arlington Road South.

4. The project will involve extensive, intrusive and unmitigated adverse effects over an unusually long period of ten years or more to a site less than 250 metres from our homes: as well as numerous road alterations (the raising and lengthening of Hampstead Road Bridge, the demolition and rebuilding of Mornington Street and Granby Terrace bridges and the closure of Park Village East and Mornington Terrace), there will be 24-hour working in the area involving noise and light pollution, with the impact of lorry movements, dust, poor air quality, the operation of plant and machinery (particularly the installation of ground anchors at Park Village East and the deep excavations in the Camden Cutting), and the deterioration in the visual aspect of our community resulting from temporary hoardings, diversions and storage of plant and machinery.

5. Your Petitioners object to the many years of vibration they are likely to experience, without any realistic or fair proposals for mitigation of the effect, also to the damage this is may cause to their properties, some of which are listed buildings, are a strip of late Georgian/early Victorian era terrace houses which sit on shallow corbels and do not have any deep foundations.

6. Your Petitioners object to the estimates of noise disturbance and do not believe that the acoustic model undertaken by HS2 has been properly tailored to our built-up urban area and its reflectivity problems, together with a prevailing south-westerly wind. Given that much work is to be undertaken on a 24 hour schedule, your Petitioners object to the inevitable night time disturbance to their sleep and seek appropriate redress.

7. Your Petitioners object to the adverse impact on our health (dust, noise, sleep deprivation), safety of the streets given the traffic volumes, enjoyment of our property and – particularly in the cases of those working from home – economic productivity. The Camden High Street area has been an increasingly pleasant environment in recent years with the council’s investment in street works and attractive new private businesses, and we are concerned that such long construction works, unless very well-mitigated, will do lasting harm to the regeneration of the area.

8. Your Petitioners do not wish simply to have to leave the area, which they have called their home for so many years, because of the unbearable and unmitigated effects of this project across so many areas of their working and domestic lives. Nor would your Petitioners be entitled to any compensation if they found themselves forced so to leave, which they believe is entirely unreasonable and unfair. These proposals call into the question your Petitioners’ basic human right to peaceful enjoyment of their property.

9. Your Petitioners, together with many other residents nearby, object very strongly to the fact that they are not being offered any compensation at all, which compares most unfavourably to the various compensation packages being offered to residents in rural areas.
10. Your Petitioners particularly object to HS2, the construction company’s request for a veto so as to be able to override the enforcement of environmental standards by the elected local authority (‘Section 60/61 powers’).

Arlington Road – requests

Construction Traffic on Arlington Road designated Cycle Route

11. Your Petitioners specifically request that the whole of Arlington Road and in particular the lower portion of the road, south of its junction with Mornington Street, (designated as a construction route) should not at any time be used by construction traffic, given that it is already impossible for two cars to pass one another in this section of Arlington Road. We specifically request that provision be made for this to be preserved as a safe route for cyclists. Arlington Road is due to be designated and signposted as an official Quietway as part of the London Cycle Grid in 2016 connecting to the proposed cycle lanes on Hampstead Road. It therefore needs to be kept free from additional traffic (both construction traffic and displaced traffic due to roadworks and diversions).

Avoidance of traffic disruption

12. Your Petitioners request that the maximum feasible effort is made to mitigate the effects of increased traffic in the Arlington Road area. We request that HS2 give a firm undertaking to maximise the use of rail for construction traffic. We request that lorry transport should be regulated to ensure the use of Euro VI compliant (low emission) vehicles, of a size appropriate for working in narrow residential streets, also to train all lorry drivers working in the area in safe driving techniques to reduce the danger to pedestrians and cyclists.

Need for real noise reduction

13. Your Petitioners request that HS2 undertake to always minimise noise during construction, through the use of the best available noise-reduction technology and that HS2 undertake to train its entire construction staff to reduce noise as a priority. Your Petitioners specifically request that any loading of materials by road or rail should be acoustically mitigated so that it does not cause any further noise and distress especially during night time working.
14. Your Petitioners request that further studies be undertaken of the effect of noise, properly related to this urban area and the problem of reflectivity, gaps between buildings etc., combined with the prevailing south-westerly wind and that financial provision be made to provide those affected by noise with sound insulation for example against sleep disturbance from night time removal of spoil.

Damage from vibration

15. Your Petitioners request that HS2 undertake structural surveys of all properties likely to be, or that will have been affected by vibration; to monitor these properties throughout the project; that serious proposals be made for mitigation or temporary rehousing and undertakings be given to all such property owners for making good any damage caused during the works. Also that vibratory piles should not be used for temporary reconstruction of bridges and that HGVs should be required to travel at slow speeds near any such properties. The removal of speed humps in residential roads, if vibration from construction becomes a problem should be considered with cameras used instead to control speed.

Avoidance of 24 hour construction work

16. Your Petitioners request that construction work be limited to core hours and any work outside these hours be limited to the essential needs of the work and not for any commercial or programme expediency. Your Petitioners ask that HS2 consults with residents to agree on changes to the proposed hours of work and for a number of non-work days at the weekends during high intensity work periods to give residents a peaceful break.

Secondary glazing and alternative housing

17. Your Petitioners ask that, because this is a project of such exceptionally long duration residents should be entitled to both secondary glazing and alternative housing provided by HS2, in the locality and at a place of their own choosing and that they should be entitled to both, at different periods of construction. Should your Petitioners or their neighbours find, during the course of construction work that their sleep is disturbed, there should be a right to redress at that time with relevant bedrooms provided with Noise Insulation even if they were not identified as requiring such during the original analysis and surveys.

Satellite Construction Compounds

18. Your Petitioners request that the size of local satellite compounds on Camden's streets should be minimised and made smaller than proposed by HS2, in particular that the London Zoo car park should not
be used as a holding area for construction lorries. Construction compounds, and in particular that on Mornington Terrace, must not be used for storage of materials only and should be removed as soon as the adjacent works are completed.

**Alternative parking arrangements**

19. Your Petitioners ask that existing “Pay and Display” parking spaces in the locality should be converted by Camden Council to Residents’ Parking spaces and that residents be given permits for other nearby areas to make up for spaces lost due to Construction Compounds and construction lorry routes. Camden Council should be reimbursed for any loss of revenue incurred.

**Temporary Mornington Street Bridge**

20. Your Petitioners request that the proposed temporary Mornington Street Bridge be designed to be more user-friendly to cyclists, the elderly and people with push chairs who will find the long approach ramps very difficult to use. It should be wide enough to allow people to pass each other easily.

**Enforcement**

21. Your Petitioners request the refusal of HS2’s request to be able to override the enforcement of environmental standards by the local authority (‘Section 60/61 powers’) which your Petitioners regard as unreasonable.

22. Your Petitioners also request that there should be an Independent Adjudicator to deal with problems that arise during the course of the project, that your Petitioners can seek redress with, as they do not believe that a Complaints Commissioner appointed by HS2 will be sufficiently independent from HS2 and will have adequate powers to enforce necessary actions on HS2.

**Compensation**

23. Your Petitioners request that compensation schemes should be available in their urban area, equivalent to that being offered in rural areas and they additionally request that an Independent Compensation
Commission should be established to draw up a fair compensation scheme and administer it. Compensation should be available for the loss of amenity that your Petitioners will suffer from the extensive construction works, including raised noise and pollution levels which it will be impossible to mitigate in their gardens and out on their street (homeowner payments). In addition some kind of support for the property market needs to be provided so that residents in the locality do not suffer blight during the extended period that works are taking place.

IV. The prayer

24. 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.

Hannah Nicholson, 81 Arlington Road NW1 (lead)

Lewis Baston, 81 Arlington Road NW1

Hillary Bauer, 85 Arlington Road NW1

John White, 85 Arlington Road NW1
IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGHSPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF David Michael Taylor AMBROSE

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 resident at 55 Church Street, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0AZ who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line.

2.2 Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (Chilterns AONB) and is a freelance provider of services to the Tourist Industry in the Chilterns AONB.

2.3 Your Petitioner and his rights, property and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3 Objection in Principle

3.1 In the light of the decision to approve in principle the construction of HS2, despite the report to your Lordships to the effect that there is no business case for such a project, the objections of the Petitioner are based on the adverse environmental and traffic flow impacts of the proposed route, both during the period of construction and in the long term.

3.2 These impacts affect the Petitioner personally, not only as a resident of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, [hereinafter referred to as the Chilterns AONB] but also as the provider of services in the area, the delivery of
which will be significantly inhibited during the construction period and the market for which will be significantly restricted, both during the construction period and in the long term, unless there is approval for the major change in the proposed construction as outlined below.

4 Adverse impacts as a resident

4.1 During construction

4.1.1 The construction traffic using the proposed haul road down to the Link Road roundabout and then the A413 northwards will cause severe problems at the roundabout so that other traffic is expected to divert to local roads causing significant congestion and disruption to local life, with the particular danger that in the absence of an A&E unit in High Wycombe, there could be possible fatal delays to ambulances on their way to Aylesbury.

4.1.2 Similarly, traffic problems are likely adversely to affect the viability of facilities in Great Missenden, such as the five restaurants, four cafes, three churches, three schools and the many shops and galleries offering fine art, antiques, objets d'art, craft products together with Doctors' surgeries and a fitness centre and the Roald Dahl Museum & Story Centre – with the risk that some will no longer be available to residents. Access to the railway station will be impaired. My quiet enjoyment of the footpaths and countryside will be seriously curtailed.

4.1.3 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.

4.1.4 His residence at 55 Church Street is close to the A413 and not far from the Link Road roundabout and the proposed haul road.

4.2 After Completion

4.2.1 Your Petitioner is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the Chilterns AONB.

4.2.2 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.
4.2.3 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.

5 Adverse impacts as a provider of services to tourism

5.1 During construction

5.1.1 As a guide to visitors from abroad and driver of vehicles catering for small groups of up to 16, I frequently bring tourists to the area because of its many attractions. These comprise both the beautiful countryside and pretty villages and also many specific locations of interest to such visitors, such as:

(a) those on the actual route of the proposed railway e.g.

- Film/TV locations for Midsomer Murders;
- Chequers and the adjacent estate of the Parliamentarian who, but for his death in battle, might have introduced a lasting republic to England;
- The Roald Dahl Centre and the author's grave;

(b) those not themselves on the actual route e.g.

- John Milton's Cottage (of great interest to Americans because of the posthumous grant of honorary US citizenship in recognition of his influence on the drafting of the American Constitution);
- The graves of William Penn and his family (of interest for similar reasons to Milton);
- Film locations, such as 'Four Weddings and a Funeral'.

5.1.2 Traffic congestion on the A413 and at the Link Road roundabout with its knock-on effect on Great Missenden High Street and other local roads would be a severe impediment to my activities as a provider of services to tourism.

5.1.3 Tours such as those I lead in registered buses are tightly controlled by 'Driving Hours Regulations', so that traffic delays can render such tours inoperable. Moreover, a delay of only 20 minutes can have a knock-on effect by making it impossible to coordinate timings with other venue opening times, compulsory
rest periods at places where a break is practicable and likely times of traffic congestion at other places en route.

5.1.4 These factors combine to mean that a location not on the actual route of the railway can be affected by delays at a location that is on the actual route if both locations are on the tour itinerary.

5.1.5 Your Petitioner points out that stipulations banning construction traffic from public roads in the traditional rush hour would be likely to increase such traffic after the rush hour. This is when your Petitioner is likely to be on those roads.

5.2 After Completion

5.2.1 The visually intrusive cuttings, pylons, foot bridges, noise mitigation barriers, and, especially, the South Heath Tunnel portal and the viaducts, together with the noise impact of trains, especially on leaving a tunnel, will significantly reduce the attractiveness of the area alongside the A413 north of Great Missenden. That area will no longer be suitable for scenic tours but it is part of a route on minor roads to Stratford-upon-Avon and for some tours to Oxford.

5.2.2 Alternatives will be rendered ineffective by congestion in Great Missenden arising from non-construction traffic seeking to avoid the Link Road roundabout.

5.2.3 Thus, the choice of suitable itineraries will be restricted and my freelance activities adversely affected.

6 The Solution

6.1 Your Petitioner draws your Lordships' attention to the fact that HS2 Ltd did not include alternative routes in their Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment before putting forward the proposal contained in the Bill.

6.2 Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of a tunnel based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Ltd, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel.

6.3 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.
6.4 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.

6.5 Your petitioner recognises that it is necessary to compare the costs of the solution he is proposing with those inherent in the proposals in the Bill favoured by HS2 Ltd. However, your petitioner observes that while there is not as yet sufficient information to do so with certainty, all the indications are that in the light of the recommendations made by the House of Commons Select Committee, coupled with the cost of mitigation of safety concerns recently outlined by relevant experts, the difference in costs is likely to be minimal and could even emerge as being in favour of the solution your petitioner seeks. These recommendations and concerns are outlined below.

(a) It has been recommended that consideration should be given to proposals made for amendment of the haul road, provided the cost thereof is no more than that of the haul road proposed by HS2 Ltd.

Your petitioner believes that this is not reasonable in that costs of mitigating the traffic problems caused by the proposals of the Bill should be met by HS2 Ltd, even if they exceed the costs of their own proposal, a proposal that fails to mitigate those problems caused by the proposals in the Bill.

(b) Moreover, the House of Commons Select Committee has recommended that the Government should provide extra funds to the Department of Transport for highway schemes in areas receiving no economic benefit from HS2. Thus, even if not specifically attributed to the haul road, the resultant costs can be expected to represent additional public expenditure.

(c) The House of Commons Select Committee has recommended specific increases to the Community and Environment Funds.

(d) All the costs mentioned above would be reduced if there were a bored tunnel through the whole of the Chilterns AONB.

(e) Thus, the difference in cost between the proposals in the Bill and those envisaged in the solution suggested by your petitioner is reduced.

(f) Your petitioner asks your Lordships to recognise that any difference in cost that may remain is a reasonable cost of ensuring that the community generally, and the relevant statutory bodies in particular, can meet the recognised responsibility to conserve and enhance the nation’s Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as embodied in The Countryside and Rights of

(g) Attention has recently been drawn to the result of research commissioned by HS2 Ltd which suggests that unless the proposed speeds of HS2 are to be reduced and any business case for the railway thus reduced, significant extra costs will need to be incurred for much of the line. One relevant part of the line is where the line emerges from the “Green” tunnel, south of Wendover. Trains are scheduled to be at maximum speed at that point.

(h) The extra costs would arise from making the ground stiffer by the injection of concrete. However, if it were in a tunnel, the track would in any case be laid on concrete. Thus, this cost is common to both a bored tunnel and the current proposal. As the cost of the current proposal is increased if it is adopted, the difference between that cost and the cost of a bored tunnel is thereby reduced.

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

(j) Your petitioner therefore asks your Lordships to approve his request for a fully bored tunnel. If your Lordships believe that there is as yet insufficient information to make a decision, or undertake the cost benefit analysis asked for at paragraph 6.5(i) above or bring forward an Additional Provision in respect of an extended tunnel as requested in para 6.2 above, then your petitioner asks that you recommend the refusal of a third reading of the Bill until such time as the required information is available.

7 Secondary Mitigation

7.1 Your Petitioner 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 6.2 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs below would, in large measure, be unnecessary, 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
envisioned 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.

7.2 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 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.
8 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 your Petitioner remains, etc.

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

[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 CHRISTOPHER PRIDEAUX AND DAVID PRIDEAUX

Declares that:
1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill including the Clauses enabling the Secretary of State to take additional land and authorise Transport Works Orders.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioners are Christopher Prideaux and David Prideaux who are specially and directly affected by the Hybrid Bill and HS2 Additional Provisions and by work and actions still not released to your petitioners by HS2/DFT/Secretary of State. Your petitioners are resident and freeholders and trust members of Doddershall Estate and their properties and interests. They have neighbours also impacted specially and directly by the Hybrid Bill. Their properties include a Grade 2 Star House within estate of land used for farming which included farm homes and a lodge.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioners are concerned the issue of cultural and architectural heritage has been largely ignored by HS2 and its consultants for the heritage location of Doddershall.

Your petitioners are concerned about the impacts on the Grade 2 Star House which has been in single family ownership for 500 years. The house is one of the most important houses on the route and it has been impacted rather than avoided by HS2.

Your petitioners have concerns about the further land take for the current Aylesbury to Calvert freight line at the side of the Estate, the land take for the East West Route spur that is to be built with the HS2 route. There is no public or private details for all these railway changes. The public is hearing that there will shortly be a master plan by HS2 for the Aylesbury spur of East West Route and also the detailed route by Sheep House Wood at Calvert. In addition an access road along another side will impact the safe guarded road from the A41 to the Calvert FCC incinerator. These will create environmental impacts and issues and cause problems with local and other waste delivery whilst the East West spur is realigned and waste moves by road.
Your petitioners need assurances that there will not be an HS2 station and rail stop at Calvert as otherwise the HS2 Route will need to be not 2 but 4 railway tracks and more land will be taken from the estate and neighbouring farms. In all these cases there will be important issues and impacts which must be resolved before petitioning in the Quainton/Calvert area can be completed meaningful.

Your petitioners are concerned how the additional provisions to be issued by HS2 will be petitioned through the House of Commons and the House of Lords.

The House of Commons Select Committee did not address a number of issues that affect the petitioners' property. The HS2 line traverses and crosses 2.3km of the Doddershall Estate property and the loss of land is significant.

Your petitioners achieved a reduction in land to be lost from farming to the biodiversity status and ask that this land can be all returned to farmed and farming land. The number of acres required for Bio Diversity Offset is still too high, since HS2's metric published in December 15 is a questionable assessment of the problem for an estate practicing stewardship of the environment and ecology.

Your petitioners ask that the location of the National Grid and HS2 power feeders are revisited to change the locations. Their current location is unnecessarily and unhelpful to the local farms and agricultural use. There is a viable site for these power feeders and substation/switching near Wendover along the HS2 route. The current location can be reassessed. The HS2 and National Grid have been accepted without a full review with the petitioners and Quainton Parish council and community.

Your petitioners are communicating with HS2 about realignment of the main estate drive raised with the Parliamentary House of Commons Select Committee. Similarly the petitioners are in discussion with HS2 to modify the shape of the Bunds to reduce the footprint base width and shape to increase the noise mitigation for the Doddershall House Grade 2 Star and Upper South Farm House and the occupants.

HS2 have refused to pay for the professional acoustic advice needed to achieve better noise mitigation. Your petitioners ask to raise this issue if it can be shown that the HS2 proposal is not in accordance with NPPF to obtain reimbursement for the advice.

Your petitioners consider the location of balancing ponds has been mainly a desktop exercise by HS2 and there is need for further hydrological study to demonstrate the better location and size to not take additional land from the estate for route run-off.

Your petitioners are concerned about the impacts of taxes from the HS2 impact. On 23rd July 2014 the Rt Hon John Bercow wrote to Mr Robert Syms MP chairman High Speed Rail Bill Select Committee on Tax Issues. Similarly on 23rd July 2014 he wrote to Andrea Leadson MP Economic Secretary to the Treasury about inheritance tax and Capital Gains Tax. No supportive answers have been received as confirmed on a subsequent occasion by Mr Syms when this was presented within the AP4 petition.

Your petitioners await the terms of reference for the House of Lords Select Committee which the petitioners hope will be wider than those of the House of
Commons Select Committee. There are many differences between the prevailing circumstances in 2010 and 2016. It has been shown that speed is not the prime driver for reasons of flexibility of route alignment and to reduce Carbon Emissions, apart from its cost. In 2010 Cross Rail 2 and the Trans Pennine improvement were not on the table. Furthermore over the years there has been a substantial deterioration in the current account deficit and the National Debt.

Your petitioners asks is the House of Lords can obtain the answers to the significant questions raised by Lord Lawson in their Lordships Economic Affairs Committee.

Your petitioners understand there are other feasible routes with savings to the IIS2 Route 3 for Phase 1 and other alignments that can provide more passenger demand. Your petitioners ask that the House of Lords will recommend a reappraisal and allow further time before the House of Lords report from the hearing of petitioners is concluded for example to enable a further petition to be submitted on the impact of the East West Route Aylesbury spur, the freight line and siding and the HS2 route land takes.

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:

Printed Name: Christopher Prideaux

Signed:

Printed Name David Prideaux

Date: 14th April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF MR JEREMY SEABORN And MRS JENNIFER SEABORN.

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

   The HS2 route is currently planned to run in tunnel from Euston to the West Ruislip Portal where it emerges and runs overground until it reaches the Chiltern Tunnel South Portal. Through this overground section of the works, the scheme requires the construction of the large, 1.6 million cubic metres, earthworks excavation of the Copthall and Brackenberry cuttings, the repositioning of the 275KV overhead power line, the repositioning of the National Grid High Pressure pipeline and the construction of the 3.4km long Colne Valley Viaduct. In addition there is a large requirement for imported fill material for the West Ruislip Retained Embankment, the Gatemead Embankment and the Harvil Road Realignment works. These works make this one of the more complex and challenging sections of the proposed line. The Bill includes powers for the Promoter of the Bill and the Nominated Undertaker to do the construction works which are estimated to take 10 years to complete.

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioners are a retired couple who live in Sharps Lane, a residential area of Ruislip in the London Borough of Hillingdon, Middlesex, where they have lived since 1977. Their social and family life requires them to travel around and throughout the area, including access to the M25 and M40 motorways and Ruislip High Street, across and along roads designated for the use of construction traffic.

   In the CFA6 Environmental Statement clause 12.3.5, it clearly states that “the main local roads affected by the Proposed Scheme are Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South which both lead to the A40 via B467 Swakeleys Road, High Road Ickenham, Ickenham Road, High Street (Ruislip), Breakspear Road and Ladygate Lane”. Your Petitioners live within this circle of roads and will have to cross, or travel along, these roads when moving about or leaving the area.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

   Due to the vastly increased congestion due to the HS2 HGV traffic on the construction routes and on the local roads of Ruislip and Ickenham, this will lead to an increase in journey times for motorists, increased difficulty in crossing local roads for pedestrians, the creation of dust, noise and mud on the road, and an increase in poor air quality, which, as noted by the House of Commons Select Committee, already exceeds the European limits in some places in the Borough. HS2 have stated in the House of Commons Select Committee hearings, that
Ruislip High Street will be used as a construction route “under exceptional circumstances only”, without qualifying the criteria for these “circumstances”. Sharps Lane is used as a short cut to avoid Ruislip High Street and your petitioners are concerned that construction traffic will be re-routed down Sharps Lane, should the High Street be required to be used as a construction route and is congested, notwithstanding any HS2 assurances to the contrary, as we have no confidence in any of HS2 assurances at this stage.

Your petitioners walk along Ruislip High Street for shopping and access to Ruislip Tube Station, and along Ickenham Road for access to West Ruislip Tube Station. Construction traffic using Ruislip High Street will also use Ickenham Road and cause your petitioners the problems noted above.

Under the Additional Provisions AP4, HS2 provided a haul road from the Harvil Road main works area to a signalised Swakeleys Roundabout. Your petitioners do not believe this signalisation is a suitable solution, and will only lead to increased congestion at Swakeleys Roundabout, and this will impact on your petitioners travelling about the area.

4. Your petitioners remedies

Your Petitioners request the section of line between the West Ruislip portal and the Chiltern Tunnel South Portal, to be either entirely constructed in tunnel, or the tunnel works extended from the West Ruislip Portal to Harvil Road. These options have been assessed in the past but, with it now confirmed that the provision of turnouts for the Heathrow Spur being no longer required, your petitioners request an independent review of the construction methods, cost and environmental benefits of these two options. The costs should be fully inclusive of acquiring the land, the cost of moving the Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre, any haul roads and other temporary works, all compensation packages, the cost to the local economy, the long-term costs of maintaining ecological mitigation sites, and of any other necessary mitigation measures.

Should your honourable House not find in favour of either of the tunnel options, your Petitioners would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker, and his contractors, to be fully bound by the CoCP section 14.2.5 “use of internal haul roads for construction vehicles to minimise the need to use public roads”. A previous scheme to have a haul road from West Ruislip Portal to the Harvil Road main site area, was shown at a meeting between HS2 Ltd. and Ruislip Residents Association on 20th February 2013. This showed a 9 metre wide access road from Harvil Road to the West Ruislip Portal, with no access from this haul road onto the local roads. Your Petitioners would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker to reinstate and implement this scheme in full.

There has been considerable correspondence between your petitioners and HS2 on this subject. It is clear to your petitioners that HS2 are able to implement the scheme outlined in the clause above in full, but it will require an additional provision for extra land take for the haul road from Harvil Road to Breakspear Road South, and some minor additional land take from Breakspear Road South to the West Ruislip Portal.

Your petitioners request that to resolve the problems of the AP4 Uxbridge Golf Course haul road connecting to Swakeleys roundabout the Nominated Undertaker be required to only have the outbound HGV traffic exiting the works through Swakeleys roundabout.
HGV traffic is to be brought onto site by leaving both the M40 and M25 at the Denham roundabout and taking the A40 eastbound slip road, leave the A40 at the exit ramp just after the lay-by between the Grand Union Canal and the Frays River. An additional provision will be required for the haul road to be extended to connect with this exit ramp.

With full implementation of the haul road system from the A40 to West Ruislip, your petitioners request your Honourable House require the Nominated Undertaker to remove all construction traffic from the local roads and run the HGV traffic only on the haul roads. This will remove all the problems associated with the current analysis of HGV traffic being undertaken between HS2 and London Borough of Hillingdon. Also by having a complete haul road system, this would have the additional benefit to the Nominated Undertaker and his contractors, that this isolation would allow HGV traffic to run without stopping due to the congested nature of local traffic. In addition, it would keep the creation of dust, noise, and mud off the roads and prevent any increase in poor air quality.

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

Jeremy Seaborn

Jennifer Seaborn

13th April 2016.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Tingewick Pottery at Chetwode Ltd

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

   The petitioner is Tingewick Pottery at Chetwode Ltd, the occupier of Chetwode Grange, Buckingham MK18 4LE (“the Property”) with a manufacturing workshop located at Manthorne Farm, Chetwode, Buckingham MK18 4LE. Your petitioner’s business has been located at these addresses for eight years. Your petitioner’s business is the manufacture of ceramic lamps and accessories. There are two directors plus two employees all working for the business, and clients and delivery vehicles come to the properties on a daily basis. Your petitioner’s property is accessed via The Green, a public highway which is proposed to be realigned during construction period. Your petitioner’s property is also accessed via the road to Manthorne Farm which is proposed to be replaced by an Overbridge. Your petitioner uses the The Green and the road to Manthorne Farm daily. Your petitioner is also a regular user of School End which is liable to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill.

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. Chetwode is a very tranquil parish. High noise levels from the operation of HS2 are predicted for a high percentage of properties in Chetwode after the mitigation currently proposed by the Promoter. 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.

   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.

Your petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of the Chetwode autotransformer station and overhead power lines, which introduce new infrastructure into a very rural landscape. Your petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that there will be no above ground wires or cables to the autotransformer Station, and that the future operator of the autotransformer Station will be required to place underground any future wires or cables to the autotransformer Station. Your petitioner also requests that a sensitive design and screening is used for the autotransformer station building to fit in with the character of the area.

Your petitioner proposes to your honourable House that the Promoter should be required to undertake that it will seek to agree with your petitioner adequate provision for continuous electricity and telephone supply to Manthorne Farm and Chetwode Grange while the major utility works are underway.

Your petitioner is extremely concerned that noise barriers are not proposed by the Promoter for both sides of the proposed railway which cuts through the middle of Chetwode Parish. Very high noise levels from the operation of HS2 are predicted for the buildings at Manthorne Farm, Chetwode after the mitigation currently proposed by the Promoter. This is a workplace, and people work both indoors and outdoors on the premises. There is also planning permission for residential property at this location. Current proposed mitigation of earthworks, with noise barriers only on the other side of the line is not sufficient. Although the railway would largely be in a cutting, it is critical that there is further mitigation because of the closeness of the proposed railway to properties including your petitioner’s workshop at Manthorne Farm. 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 which carry public roads over HS2 at The Green and School End, and which will be clearly visible from rights of way and residential properties in Chetwode. These overbridges 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.

Belinda Carey Naylor, Director, Tingewick Pottery at Chetwode Ltd

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF
Mr Colin Victor Bryant and Julie Anne Bryant

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners are residents of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Their home is in Hale Road Wendover and is forty yards to the east of Wendover School and St Mary's Church. They will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

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

3. Your petitioner's concerns

The Petitioners concerns during the construction phase can be summarised as:

the adverse impact on the local road network causing delays in travelling to work and accessing emergency services; the reduction in customers and other visitors wanting to come to Wendover businesses causing local unemployment; the reduction in property values for owners seeking to realise investments in their homes; and the noise and dirt. Public Right of Way disruption will be generated by the works causing considerable loss of amenity in terms of loss of footpath access throughout this popular area of the Chilterns much used by your petitioners.

The Petitioners concerns during the operational phase can be summarised as:

the disruption to sleep caused by obtrusive noise generated by passing trains in late evenings and early mornings; the visual impact of the proposed Small Dean Viaduct and associated embankments with noise barriers will considerably reduce the appeal of this part of the AONB as an amenity to be enjoyed by everybody; and associated impact on property values and local businesses for current and future generations. Petitioners have additional concerns about the construction of the Green Tunnel, and the associated impact on the Coombe Hill aquifer that feeds the Grand Union Canal and Weston Turville Reservoir SSSI. The key concern relates to currently undefined requirement to add reservoirs, pipelines and a pumping station to mitigate
the damage caused by extensive interception of the aquifer; and the associated extension of the construction costs and timescale in the Wendover area which could be avoided by redesign.

The petitioners propose that a fully bored tunnel through the AONB and running underneath the Coombe Hill aquifer would be an effective solution to all the construction and subsequent phase impacts.

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.

\[\text{COUN BRYANT} \]
12 April 2016

\[\text{JULIE BRYANT} \]
12-4-2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Frances Christine Cutler trading as Frances Cutler Soft Furnishings  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

   The petitioner is a sole trader working as a Soft Furnisher from my home address of 7 Lappetts Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, HP16 0RA  

   This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located 500 metres from the portal cutting and 800 metres from the train exit/entrance at the portal as outlined under deposited plans Vol 2.1 Replacement sheet 2.25.  

   Your petitioner lives and works 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 8 years of construction traffic will create enormous difficulties for your petitioner. I hold large stocks of sample fabrics and curtain poles in my workshop at the above address and my clients visit on a regular basis to view, borrow and return these. They also visit the premises to drop off fabric and collect finished items. My business relies almost exclusively on delivered materials such as poles, blind mechanisms, linings, interlinings and clients' chosen fabrics. In addition to numerous visits and deliveries each week, I also need to access haberdashery shops in Great Missenden, Chesham, Aylesbury, High Wycombe and Amersham on a regular basis, as well as visit new clients and deliver and fit finished commissioned work. Time is money. Clients will not wish to spend hours in traffic jams to visit my workroom and my visits to them will take considerably longer during the 8 year construction period. This will inevitably lead to loss of earnings due to time lost and may also put clients off visiting my workroom in the first place.

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 beyond the Mobwell junction1 hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts and lessening the impact and visual blight of the haul road on residents 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

---

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
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 particularly concerned about dust during the 8 year construction period. I have to pre-wash many fabrics before making them up – they must be hung outside to dry on a line to minimise creasing. This will be impossible if there is dust in the air. Also my workroom has to be kept spotless at all times. In the summer the windows are always open but I cannot let dust ruin expensive fabrics.

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: The dysfunctional housing market clearly has a direct effect on my business as fewer people are moving and/or redecorating.

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. Health and Wellbeing: Your Petitioner has already had cause to consult a Hypnotherapist/Cognitive Behavioural Therapist due to stress caused by HS2 and the worry of what may happen to my business as well as to the value of my home. As this therapy is not readily available on the NHS your petitioner has had to seek private assistance so the adverse consequences have been financial as well as health related.

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.

12. **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.

22 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 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

Frances Christine Cutler
Frances Cutler Soft Furnishings

11th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF  Anita Janet Hiscock

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your petitioner is the owner of the freehold property at 2, 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 but is located 450 metres from the portal cutting and 700 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 junction1 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 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 Chiltem 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
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.

22 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

Anita Janet Hiscock
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF David Street, Cassandra Street, Daniel Street, Emily Street and Sophie Street

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioners are resident at Chiltern Hill House, Hale Lane, Wendover, in the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. They will be specially and directly affected by the whole Bill, both during construction and after completion of the project.

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 a number of 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.

David Street  Cassandra Street  Daniel Street  Emily Street  Sophie Street

10th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Richard Naylor  

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 lives at Chetwode Grange, Buckingham MK18 4LE (“your petitioner’s property”). Your petitioner’s property is accessed by The Green which is proposed to be rerouted under the Bill during construction. Your petitioner uses the The Green daily when commuting to and from work and to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. Your petitioner is also a regular user of the farm road to School End, School End and the School End overbridge which are liable to be used by construction traffic during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner is likely to suffer inconvenience from the closure and diversion of roads, farm 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 such as muntjac, roe deer, barn owls and badger.

Very 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.

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.

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 consider this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Richard Naylor

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CAROLINE SARAH PERKINS

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Caroline Sarah Perkins who resides at 40 Lionel Ave, Wendover. Bucks who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in Wendover adjacent to 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 Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is 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.

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 reputation, social,
extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

Hierarchy of Mitigation

a. That possible further extension of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover by boring or mining 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 improved mitigation 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 replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydro geological problems.

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 the highest quality design and the 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
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 given the traffic congestion that will on the main emergency routes.

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 timely manner.

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.

CAROLINE SARAH PERKINS
9th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Brian and Carole Wiltshire

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 Hermitage ("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.

Brian Leonard Wiltshire and Carole Cotterill Wiltshire

11/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Neil Beddall

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioner is resident at Little Beddington, Hale Lane, Wendover, in the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, where he has lived for over 8 years. He will be specially and directly affected by the whole Bill, both during construction and after completion of the project.

He has been the recipient of letters and information in the post from HS2 Ltd, which indicates that it considers that he is affected by the Bill.

3. The petitioner objects 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 petitioner 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 his property, which has already suffered blight for over six years.

i) Damage to the local aquifer, with a serious effect on local water supplies.

j) The disruptions to his household 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 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 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.

5. Following completion of the proposed works the petitioner will be affected by:

a) the permanent scarring of his 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 his view by the passing of trains up to 400 metres long every 100 seconds.

c) Noise.

d) Reduction in value of his property.

e) Damage to local heritage and facilities

f) Continuing damage to the aquifer.

6. The petitioner proposes that a fully-bored tunnel be built throughout the length of the AONB, thus reducing most of his concerns in paragraph 4 above and all of his concerns in paragraph 5 above. It accepted by all parties that such a tunnel is feasible. In his view the benefits of such a tunnel have not been fully evaluated and the costs have been exaggerated. The petitioner would accept the opinion of a fully independent costing. In the absence of one he considers the case for a fully-bored tunnel is overwhelming.
7. The petitioner 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 petitioner remain, etc.

Neil Beddall

12th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF The members of the Regents Park Estate Tenants and Residents Association

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioners are the members of the Regents Park Estate Tenants and Residents Association (TRA). The TRA has existed since the construction of the estate and represents the interests of its 210 members and the wider 6,000 residents who live on the Regents Park Estate. The TRA is being relocated as part of the HS2 replacement homes resulting from the proposals in this Bill. The new location will place the TRA on Robert Street 250m from the main works compound in Hampstead Rd and 40 m from the main construction route through the estate. The building is also adjacent to minor construction route and utilities diversion works.

3. Whilst many members of the TRA are young parents with young children others are older or disabled, many having lived on the estate since its construction. The TRA provides typical community facilities of a village hall, crèche facilities, mothers clubs, afternoon and evening activities for the elderly as well as being available for hire for functions by local residents. It organises events and day trips out of the area for both children and older residents.

4. The Bill and its proposers introduce demolition, construction and development resulting in ten years of substantial and unprecedented noise, pollution and reduction in habitability and personal safety to your petitioners. The TRA and its membership's rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill to which your petitioners object. Your petitioners' primary request is for reasonable access to the community fund provided for in the Bill to help mitigate these impacts. Other requests and amendments are sought as follows;

6. Request to remove the increase in Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV's) and replace with rail.
Request to provide direct access to Hampstead Rd for the Granby Terrace Bridge Compound.
Request to amend the Code of Construction Practice (COCP) to better deal with road maintenance on residential roads and ensure ‘best practice’ from Local and National Authorities.

The impact of the construction and utilities works in combination for the ten year period 2017–2027, especially when all the construction site compounds around the Regents Park Estate are
accessed via Stanhope Street, will affect your petitioners' health and safety severely and injuriously. Having a construction route running past the new hall and crèche facilities and through the middle of the estate without mitigations is of grave concern to your petitioners.

The nominated undertaker proposes to increase HGV flow along Stanhope St and Robert Street from the occasional one a day currently to a maximum flow of 210 a day and an average flow over six years of 100-150 a day. This is a direct and specific impact on your petitioners and your petitioners request the following remedies;

a) Maintain a direct access from Granby Terrace Compound onto Hampstead Rd for construction traffic. Much of this HGV traffic should reassign to Granby Terrace Bridge once that is opened in 2021. The AP3 report indicates continued use of estate roads through to 2024.

b) Amend the COCP to include best practice from Local and National Authorities. The current low level of HGVs, and traffic calming generally, contributes to the relative quietness of Stanhope St, Varndell St and to a lesser extent Robert St. When an occasional HGV goes over a hump on Robert St for example it is clearly audible and felt from inside homes along and nearby this road. Whilst double glazing goes some way to supressing the general noise of traffic from the surrounding roads it does little to alleviate the sudden jolts when a HGV goes over the road humps on these roads.

c) Your petitioners request consideration of more options to use rail to transport most of the materials arising from and needed for the proposals in the Bill. The cost of not using rail for such transport is to burden your petitioners directly and substantially with harmful pollutants, noise nuisance, vibration and an increased risk of personal injury accident on street.

d) Your petitioners respectfully request compensatory measures including access to the HS2 community and environment fund to undertake respite days for the most vulnerable residents on the estate.

7. Request for further monitoring of noise and air quality and the application of COCP safety and pollution measures to cover construction routes.

Your petitioners are directly and substantially affected by noise and dust from demolition and construction works for the new rail line, Euston HS2 station and Hampstead Rd Bridge works, and by noise, dust and vibration from both utilities works and construction traffic. Much of these works are 24hr. Your petitioners are concerned that there is no modelling of changes to PM2.5 particulates as these are the more dangerous pollutants for many of the TRA members. The COCP measures do not appear to address noise and safety issues from HGV’s once they leave the compounds.

8. Request for assurance that the proposals do not reduce the ability of residents to cross Hampstead Rd and Robert St junction safely and without lengthy detours. Request to monitor traffic accident rates during construction.

The AP3 suggests a doubling of HGV traffic at the Hampstead Rd/Robert St/Compound junction and south in the peak of construction traffic. This is a huge impact and a severe barrier to your petitioners compounded by the extra taxi traffic using it during stage A of construction.
Access to bus stops, the hospital, the station itself and Somers Town will be much more precarious for your petitioners. The extra delays to buses will compound the delays already expected by your petitioners with the Hampstead Rd Bridge works and loss of bus lanes.

The removal of the banned right turn from the Regents Park Estate onto Hampstead Rd needed to allow the construction route will have a serious impact on road safety here and generally on the estate as detailed below.

9. Request to maintain existing road safety measures on the Regents Park Estate and prevent diverted commuter traffic through the estate.

The Bill and its proposers require the removal of essential road safety measures on the Regents Park Estate. Within the Estate boundaries Estate there has been 1 serious injury accident in the five years 2011-2014 and no fatalities. This is quite a good record and perhaps reflects the benefit of the 20mph zone and road humps on the estate. It also demonstrates the very real risks of introducing the large flows of HGV’s onto the estate as described earlier together with the utilities works and consequent disruption. In addition the removal of banned turns to accommodate the construction traffic will allow general commuter traffic to enter the estate. Your petitioners are seriously concerned at the increased risk of negotiating all this whilst going about their daily business.

Your petitioners are seriously concerned at the increased risk of negotiating the additional HGV traffic on Albany Street and Hampstead Road. Albany St forms part of the shopping and commercial centre of the estate. The local post office and chemist are on the west side as well as food shops and bus stop. The need to negotiate Hampstead Rd for bus stops etc. has already been mentioned above.

10. Request for funding to local community to mitigate loss of open spaces and increased construction traffic/activities and to help prevent an increase in road casualties, health problems and potential increase in crime.

The replacement housing and extensive utilities works arising from the Bill and provisions allow the proposer to remove 54 mature trees and remove or render hazardous 10,000m2 of public open space, ornamental gardens and lawns on the Regents Park Estate, making up almost half such space on the estate. Replacement trees will take at least 10 years to grow back to anything approaching their current form and your petitioners maintain it is unreasonable to view the loss of these trees as temporary particularly the mature willows between Robert St and Vamdell St junctions. These are a local landmark and the impact of these losses on the Estate is a severe and tragic outcome.

Residents cannot all squeeze up into an ever reducing space like this without repercussions on mental and physical health and an increase in traffic accidents and crime rates from increased density and loss of young persons’ amenities. The AP3 suggests some existing open spaces within the Estate could become new public areas. These are already public spaces with upgraded play areas and benches. The increase in construction lorries on Albany St and the estate generally will increase the barrier this road has (crossing points notwithstanding) to
reaching Regents Park, particularly for children. The barrier on east side of the estate produced by the raising of Hampstead Rd has already been mentioned.

The RPTRA requests an assurance that it will have a reasonable contribution from the community fund provided for in the Bill in order to provide extra trips for children and older residents out of the estate for respite during major construction periods and the heaviest HGV flows.

11. Assurance that maintenance of right of way footpath through Ampthill Estate during construction works.

A right of way has always existed between Regents Park Estate and Somers Town that runs between Hampstead Rd and Barnby St to Eversholt St along the north of the rail tracks. It is well used to access shops, buses, friends and the local schools. This is a cut through, avoiding a lengthy detour along main roads and is available during the day. It is the main route for children from the estate accessing the Regent High School in Somers Town.

12. Assurance that parking losses will be no greater than 20% of spaces on Regents Park Estate. Parking provision be re-provided in the vicinity.

The AP3 describe a loss of over 200 parking bays within the estate during the construction period. These are well used by residents and visitors/family members and their loss will place substantial pressure on the remaining bays on the Regents Park Estate. This is compounded with other vehicles displaced by the loss of up to 300 bays at Euston Station and the surrounding area.

13. Request for the rebalancing of burdens and costs of the Bill more equitably and fairly by removing the proposal to raise Hampstead Rd overbridge by 15ft.

Your petitioner are very concerned with the Bill’s proposals to raise Hampstead Rd overbridge and approaches by up to 15ft at its maximum. Your petitioner maintain this will create a visual and physical barrier between the Regents Park Estate and the rest of the borough.

Your petitioners commend other petitioners to this Bill who have come forward with alternative bridge proposals which do not require such a major change for the worse to the local environment. The reinstatement of just one pillar at the bridge should mean it and the approaches need not be raised in such a harmful way. Your petitioners ask for an amendment to the Bill that effects this and so better trades possible future capacity on the approaches to Euston Station with a physical barrier of such a scale on your petitioners and the local community.

14. Request for alterations to deregulation clauses S. 4 and S. 24-36 of the Bill. An Assurance that the local authority Statement of Community Involvement applies to works in Schedule 16 of the Bill. Representation of the RPTRA on working groups covering works in this Bill where they relate directly to the Regents Park Estate.

The Bill allows the Local Authority to have a say as to whether the loss of a tree or open space is strictly necessary, or if an alternative construction route is needed to ensure road safety and
reduce pollution, within the limits of the works application process however there is no requirement to consult the community under Schedule 16 to the Bill. The Bill removes any mechanism to establish what the local community thinks is an important amenity, e.g. open space. A clarification of the Bill stating that Camden Councils Statement of Community Involvement is part of the application process for Schedule 16 works would allay your petitioners concerns.

15. Concluding remark

Your petitioners maintain the costs to the local community of the proposals in the Bill are severe and injurious. It is already becoming increasingly difficult for your petitioners to negotiate the existing HS2 works on the estate, it will soon become impossible. A summary of the mitigations requested, which may alleviate some or all of the preceding impacts and injuries to your petitioners is listed below;

17. Summary of Mitigations Requests and Assurances.

- Funding from Community & Environment fund to mitigate potential increase in crime/reduction in amenity and personal safety through respite trips for vulnerable residents.
- Reduce the increase in Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV’s) and replace with rail.
- Provide direct access onto Hampstead Rd for Granby Terrace Bridge Compound.
- Amend the COCP to ensure 'best practice' from Local and National Authorities.
- COCP noise and pollution measures to cover construction routes.
- Maintain existing road safety measures on and around the Regents Park Estate and monitor diverted traffic and road accident rates during construction.
- Maintain Ampthill Estate pedestrian ‘right of way’.
- Assurance that parking losses are not more than 20% of existing remaining spaces within Regents Park Estate.
- Reduce the height of Hampstead Rd bridge and approaches.
- Assurance Schedule 16 works are subject to local authority SCI.
- Representation of the TRA on working groups for works proposed by the Bill directly affecting the Regents Park Estate.
- Further surveys on community impacts, noise and pollution.

21. The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that 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 Steven Christofi. Agent for The Regents Park Estate Tenants and Residents Association

14th April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

Petition against the

High Speed Rail (London to West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF PROFESSOR TERRY PAYNE, ROBERT WETHERALL,
ROBERT KIMBER AND DIANA LOTEN

Declares that:

1. Your Petitioners are specially and directly affected by the whole bill.

2. The first Petitioner is the owner of Mill House, Little Missenden; the second Petitioner is the owner of Hollydyke, Little Missenden, the third Petitioner is the owner of Missenden Lodge, Little Missenden and the fourth Petitioner is the owner of Chalk House, Little Missenden. All these properties are within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB), and are relatively close to the route of the proposed railway and the site of the proposed Little Missenden Vent Shaft and Auto-transformer Station.

3. Your Petitioners’ concerns are that they would be adversely affected by the provisions within the Bill by reason of:
a. The adverse effects upon the AONB in the area, resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed railway and the failure of HS2 Ltd to make any adequate provision for the reasonable and proper mitigation of those adverse effects. The AONB is an area of countryside which has been designated by the Government for conservation. Due to its significant landscape value, it is in the nations interest, as well as the petitioners, to safeguard this area for future generations.

b. The potential risk, at present unquantified, that the construction of the proposed railway may or will result in the pollution and/or loss of flow in the River Misbourne, a rare chalk stream that flows through the gardens of the first three of the above-mentioned properties and through the Mill House occupied and owned by Professor Terry Payne.

c. The failure of HS2 Ltd to adequately assess the extent and consequences of the additional traffic congestion upon local roads, which would be generated by the construction of the proposed railway and to take this factor into account sufficiently or at all when assessing the arguments for the alternative provision of a long fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB. Three of the aforementioned properties are situated on the village
road that passes through Little Missenden and the fourth on the A413 itself. All your Petitioners are regular users of the A413 road. Both roads would be adversely affected by the additional traffic and considerable delays, danger and inconvenience to your Petitioners would be inevitable.

d. The failure of HS2 Ltd to plan for appropriate and safe vehicular access to and from the site of the proposed Little Missenden Vent Shaft and Auto-Transformer Station.

4. In relation to the matters set out in paragraph 3 above, your Petitioners aver as follows:

   a. We consider the arguments and proposals for a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB have not been properly examined or adequately addressed by HS2 Ltd. No detailed costings have been produced to justify the claim that such a tunnel would cost more than the extensive civil engineering works, viaducts, bridges, embankments and construction works necessary to build the currently planned surface rail route.

   b. **Remedy:** - We call upon the House of Lords to require the Promoter to put these figures into the public domain, or else to commission an independent review of the alternative schemes and their costs, which can be accepted by all parties prior to any decision.
c. Insufficient account has been taken of the disruption and destruction of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or the adverse effect on villages, local businesses, tourism, schools, children, residents or emergency services, which would result from a surface route through the AONB of the railway.

d. **Remedy:** - Your Petitioners call upon the House of Lords to require the Promoters to commission a full and proper review of the impact of the current plans, by an independent body to properly evaluate the full the impact of the construction and operation of the proposed railway upon the designated AONB and to submit their recommendations in relation thereto, before the Select Committee makes a decision.

e. The protection of the **River Misbourne** has not been properly or adequately addressed. This river is one of a small number of chalk streams in the UK in which rainbow and brown trout breed naturally and its destruction would be a disaster. The river and its aquifers are also a significant source of drinking water to the Home Counties and London area.

f. No adequate proposals have been made by HS2 Ltd, to ascertain and maintain the quality of the river water or its purity, or to protect it from pollution by construction activities. The provisions and safeguards which are included in the draft Code of Construction Practice are in our opinion inadequate and
insufficient and fail to provide proper protection. Enforceable requirements must be placed on the Promotor to pre-determine and maintain the purity and quality of the river water, so as to ensure its long term protection.

**g. Remedy:** - Your Petitioners call upon the House of Lords to seek the appointment of a truly independent and expert body to carry out a ‘Risk Assessment’ on the river and set out what steps are required in advance of work, to provide proper protection from pollution and loss of flow, before, during and after the construction period and to put forward proposals which will protect the river and the immediate environment and include mechanisms under which all its recommendations will be implemented.

**h. HS2 Ltd accepts that no hydrological or geological** surveys of the Little Missenden area have been carried out and they do not plan to complete such surveys before the Bill completes its passage through Parliament. Your Petitioners assert that this is not a satisfactory or proper state of affairs. Matters of such importance, your Petitioners aver, should be resolved before they are beyond Parliamentary control. Your petitioners are very conscious of the fact that local knowledge of this area indicates a high likelihood of active aquifers, which feed the River Misbourne but this view has
been dismissed by HS2 Ltd, who say their designs are based on calculations on ground water information from 1900 surveys, i.e., about 100 years old. They do not consider there is any risk of high water tables in the area. We consider this approach irresponsible and highly dangerous.

i. **Remedy:**- We call upon the House of Lords to insist that the Promotor carry out such necessary Hydrological and ground surveys with immediate effect and before any decisions are made regarding construction activities in the Chilterns area and to ensure their findings are made public.

j. The proposals for vehicular access to and egress from the **Little Missenden Vent Shaft** site contained in the documents published by HS2 Ltd are considered inappropriate and potentially dangerous. Slow moving vehicles turning into or emerging from the site during the construction period directly onto a dual-carriageway upon which traffic travels at typically at more than 70 miles per hour would be a potential source of considerable danger to other road users, including your Petitioners.

k. A 3-month construction period as advised by HS2 Ltd is considered unrealistic and misleading, due to the absence of knowledge of the groundwater table or ground conditions. Our own perception of the possible
engineering difficulties would mean a more likely 9-month excavation period.

I. We prepared an alternative ‘Site Layout’ as attached with accompanying notes, which were presented to Mr Martin Wells of HS2 Ltd and his colleagues at a site meeting on the 12th February 2016. This plan shows an alternative access off Pipers Wood Lane, which would be demonstrably safer and would enable ‘wheel washers’ to be installed, which would not be possible with HS2’s current plans. To date, we have not received any confirmation of these proposals. Even if our suggestions were accepted, there are no current proposals from HS2 Ltd to show how any waste water arising from the site, can be adequately decontaminated to prevent such polluted water re-entering the river, aquifers or present water courses.

m. **Remedy:** Your Petitioners call upon the House of Lords to instruct HS2 Ltd to prepare a fully detailed ‘Construction Study’, in respect of the work to be carried out at this site, taking into account all the issues that have not been resolved but have been previously raised and expressed both by the current petitioners and villagers of Little Missenden and indeed by the Chairman of the Commons Select Committee in his final Report to the Commons and thereafter, implement its recommendations.
5. 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 the issues raised in this petition, to the Select Committee which considers the Bill.

AND your Petitioners remain, etc.: -

Dated 13th April 2016

Signed

Professor Terry Payne

Signed

Robert Kimber

Signed

Robert James Wetherall

Signed

Diana Loten
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Victoria Messenger

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 Stable Yard, Chetwode Grange, MK18 4LE. 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 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 minimise 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.

Victoria Messenger

11/04/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Michael Douglas Messenger

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 Stable Yard, Chetwode Grange, MK18 4LE. 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.

Michael Douglas Messenger

11/04/16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF MALCOLM GRIFFITHS

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill and particularly by clauses 38, 39, 60, 62, and Schedules 1, 26, 28.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is an engineer with particular experience and concern for matters of personal, individual and public safety. The petitioner’s home is located approximately 400m from the track and would be adversely affected by any accident in the vicinity.

3. Your petitioner is concerned about the safety of the railway due to the speed, the curvatures, the profile of cuttings and embankments and the lack of research and experience of ballasted track at 360-400km/hr specifically the risk that ballast flight might cause train derailment. The petitioner is also concerned by the proposed braking regime and is particularly concerned and adversely affected by the risk and consequence of terrorist attack. These risks are high in the close vicinity of the petitioner’s property and his concerns are specifically due to his past experience of the consequence of public safety failures.

4. Your petitioner is also concerned about noise, property blight, traffic disruption and community and landscape degradation caused by the proposals at his property location.

5. Your petitioner requests that a clause be added to the Bill to require the promoter to commission and publish a fully independent assessment of the safety of the proposed scheme prior to construction commencing and that this assessment is updated and published annually to reflect the latest design status, operating experience and research knowledge. Following this assessment, if required, speed restrictions be placed on sections of the line where the risk and consequence of derailment exceeds predetermined acceptable limits.

6. Your petitioner also requests the Chilterns tunnel be extended approximately 8km to beyond Wendover as proposed by the Chilterns councils group and failing this by 1.5km to Leather Lane. Failing any tunnel extension your petitioner requests enhanced noise mitigation at the Chilterns tunnel north portal.

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.

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

THE PETITION OF QAINTON RAILWAY SOCIETY LTD.

Declares that:

1. The Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed new railway embankment to bridge 2/67 at the road 2/68 junction, thus blocking the track bed of the former Aylesbury & Buckingham closed railway line. HS2 are refusing either to extend the proposed bridge or to construct a further bridge span over the trackbed, as there is currently no track in place. See attached HS2 letter dated 09/03/2016.

No petition was lodged with the House of Commons Select Committee as the Society believed that its requests to HS2 would be met as the additional cost would be minimal. The subsequent announcement by Network Rail that they were going to relay a double track main line for 95mph trains, has changed the position of Quainton Railway Society Ltd due to the knock-on effects of this decision, and has significantly increased the importance of our need to run the new extension line.

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is the Quainton Railway Society Ltd, which trades as the Buckinghamshire Railway Centre, and are the landowners of the aforementioned section of track bed.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioner has been in discussions with the Promoter since the 4th January 2011 with regard to the route of the HS2 tracks passing across the entrance to the access road into the Down Side (Waddesdon) of our site, and the effect of the HS2 proposals on the amended local rural road pattern.

The HS2 proposals now before Quainton Railway Society Ltd have resolved 4 out of 5 of the local issues, following much discussion between the Promoter and the Quainton Railway Society Ltd, who understood that all the Quainton Railway Society Ltd concerns had been agreed in principle.

Quainton Railway Society Ltd were dismayed to find that their request to extend the bridge 2/67 from its clearance over the Network Rail, Claydon to Aylesbury line, to also clear over the route of the former...
Aylesbury & Buckingham line, from Quainton Road Station to Verney Junction, had been refused by HS2, the given reason being on cost grounds. These should be marginal, but we have seen no verifiable figures.

Quainton Railway Society Ltd operates a working railway museum which only offers very short (approx ¼ mile) passenger rides, which disappoints many visitors. It has long held aspirations to extend the running line over part of the Aylesbury & Buckingham route to give their visitors a longer train ride, when funds become available.

Options that Quainton Railway Society Ltd have explored for a track extension have now all been potentially frustrated by Network Rail’s proposed re-opening of a double track main line through Quainton Road Station to passenger traffic. They may need to take back some of the land that Quainton Railway Society Ltd, purchased from British Railways in the 1960’s and early 1970’s, on either or both sides of their lines, to accommodate current clearance regulations for trains running at up to 95mph.

Quainton Railway Society Ltd have had several discussions with Network Rail/EastWest Rail, and the new EWR Alliance, and are awaiting the results of a survey and decision by Network Rail/EastWest Rail, on their final proposals for modernising the route through Quainton. This is expected by the end of April 2016.

HS2 will cut off any possibility of access to the former Brill Tramway, and the Network Rail upgrading, and doubling of their tracks significantly changes Quainton Railway Society Ltd options for improving their visitors experience, and the proposed use of the former Aylesbury & Buckingham track bed represents the last opportunity for Quainton Railway Society Ltd to extend their railway line.

4. The prayer

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

AND the Petitioner remains yours faithfully,

For and on behalf of Quainton Railway Society Ltd (Exempt Charity 19171R)

Lance Adlam ATP RIBA,
Chartered Architect and a Trustee of Quainton Railway Society Ltd

12th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Chris Bannister

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner
   Your Petitioner Chris 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 concerned that currently the A413 is currently operating at maximum capacity during peak hours in the mornings and afternoons and additional construction traffic will make the road even more dangerous during the morning school run and will force frustrated road users into the narrow lanes surrounding the A413 which adds further danger including pedestrians walking to school.

The narrow lanes are a characteristic feature of the AONB and they are unsuitable for construction traffic.

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
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

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] 12.4.16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Anne Margaret Ling

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Anne Margaret Ling is the freehold owner and sole occupier of 11 Lower Road, Higher Denham, UB9 5EA. Your Petitioner is a pensioner who has worked hard to earn the privilege of living in this idyllic, unique and delicate natural haven less than 20 miles from central London. Your Petitioner's property overlooks Green Belt land and is immediately adjacent to the River Misbourne, a globally rare chalk stream which your Petitioner and several experts believe could be endangered by the Promoter's project. In retirement, your Petitioner's life revolves around volunteering and raising funds to protect the local environment, and she is able to achieve this by using the excellent existing local network of public transport.

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

Your Petitioner's property is in close proximity to the A412 North Orbital road, which will be used intensively by heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) from the major construction compound adjacent to Old Shire Lane. Although some HGVs will go directly onto the M25 when it is not blocked, the remainder when added to that of the satellite compounds in Denham and Harefield, is likely to cause severe traffic congestion. In addition, works traffic from Martin-Baker, the engineering company, sited at the dead end of Lower Road, Higher Denham, already backs up Lower Road and Old Rectory Lane leading from the factory to the pinch-point junction with the A412, necessitating traffic lights at peak periods. Your Petitioner uses the 581 bus most days. This service will be subject to severe delays caused by the congestion at the above pinch-point junction and again at the junction of the A412 and Tilehouse Way. Your Petitioner also makes frequent use of the 331 bus service, which is highly likely to be caught in congestion twice at Denham and Harefield. Suffering from osteoporosis, a progressive fragile bone disease, your Petitioner's health will be at risk from waiting around in the cold, given the inevitable diminution of local bus services on which her daily life depends.

Your Petitioner therefore requests that the Promoter provides a free, circular shuttle bus service from its major construction compound to transport its staff and local residents to medical centres, hospitals, supermarkets, churches, charity events and possibly the proposed new Hillingdon Outdoor Activities Centre and the Colne Valley Park Visitors Centre. In paragraph 188 of his Final Report, the
House of Commons Select Committee chairman Robert Syms supported your Petitioner's request by writing: 'The Promoter should be open to the idea of a shuttle bus service from Denham to important locations such as hospitals.'

Mr Syms goes on to write in paragraph 189 of his report: 'On the issue of the Lower Road factory ingress and egress to the Martin Baker premises, existing congestion may well become a matter for the Secretary of State' and that 'benefits would clearly flow from a new access road were the relevant authorities to pursue it'. As a resident of Lower Road and in common with other residents, your Petitioner feels extremely unsafe as a pedestrian. There has already been one fatality on this road and a number of near misses. A large proportion of Higher Denham residents (273) recently signed a petition and handed it in to Martin-Baker supporting the company's proposal of an alternative access road to the A413.

Your Petitioner, in the name of safety, requests that a decision in favour of a contribution to the alternative access be given by the Secretary of State before the Promoter is allowed to proceed.

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.

Anne Margaret Ling

Dated: 13th April, 2010
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Derek James Arnott and Audrey Tucker Arnott
Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioners are joint owners and occupants of a freehold property at 3 Lappetts Lane, South Heath, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0RA.

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located 540 metres from the portal cutting and 700 metres from the train exit/entrance at the portal as outlined under deposited plans Vol 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 beyond the Mobwell junction¹ hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts and lessening the impact and visual blight of the haul road on residents 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.

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
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 700 metres from the trains exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel and 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

---
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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 visitors 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.

22 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 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.

Derek J Arnott  Audrey T Arnott

10th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Ann Pummell

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner Ann Pummell

The petitioner Ann Pummell is the sole freehold owner of the property at 5 Lappetts Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire. HP16 0RA.

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located 450 metres from the portal cutting and 750 metres from the train exit/entrance at the portal as outlined under deposited plans Vol 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

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.

1. 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.

2. The adverse effects of the Bill with which your petitioner is concerned and to which
she 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.

3. 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.

4. 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 her and to which she objects, and the (additional) mitigation that would be required for each, if the fully bored tunnel proposals are rejected, below.

5. Your petitioner moved to South Heath in 2001 precisely to enjoy the peace and tranquillity of a garden and home in a village in an AONB which she values so highly. Your petitioner is now retired and she walks her dog twice a day along the footpaths and through the beautiful woods and fields that surround the whole of South Heath and Potter Row on all sides. This area, along with The Lee, Ballinger, Swan Bottom, Kings Ash and the landscape in and around Wendover form an integral part of the quintessential Chiltern hilltop landscape so beloved by residents and visitors. Your petitioner is strongly of the view that the preservation of this irreplaceable AONB, the closest to London and therefore essential for the quality of life of not only its residents but also the 55 million annual visitors, must be maintained for posterity.

6. **Traffic Congestion**: Your petitioner is greatly concerned about the disruption over eight years of access to and from Great Missenden for your petitioner travelling to the shops, banks, post office, medical and veterinary 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 beyond the Mobwell junction hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts and lessening the impact and visual blight of the haul road on residents 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 issues 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 has considerable concerns about noise and dust relating both to the construction and operation of the railway as a result of the wide cuttings at the South Heath portal and the cuttings beyond towards Wendover. The dust 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, however this will not lessen noise. Your petitioner strongly disagrees with the assertion of the promoter that the AP4 proposals would result in South Heath no longer experiencing any serious adverse effects regarding noise. The promoter has, in the opinion of the petitioner, seriously underestimated the level and effect of prolonged noise in this tranquil setting of both the construction and the very long daily operating hours of the proposed railway. In particular the promoter seeks to ignore the fact that noise travels great distances across the hilltop fields, woods and villages as evidenced by residents of Chartridge who complained they were awoken one night even though their windows were closed by music from a concert in Great Missenden which had travelled up from the valley and some 4 miles over the hilltop villages and fields to

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.
Chartridge. By situating the tunnel portal of the railway within and not beyond the community of South Heath and Potter Row, the promoter is ignoring the fact that the railway would emerge not alongside a motorway or into a cityscape or industrial area, but into AONB countryside with little ambient noise where it will cause maximum intrusion. The further assertion that people would get used to the noise is not acceptable in an AONB where the special designation is given precisely to preserve the peace, tranquillity and beauty of the landscape.

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 750 metres from the railway’s exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel and the value of her property is blighted. Your petitioner strongly disagrees with the assertion made by the promoter after the publication of AP4 in the summer of 2015 that the promoter regards Lappetts Lane in South Heath as no longer blighted and that house prices would quickly recover. In November 2015 your petitioner asked a local experienced estate agent to value her property. The agent was fully cognisant of AP4 but informed your petitioner that her property was still worth £100,000 or 20% less than it would be worth if HS2 were not being constructed. This means that her property is worth no more than at the last valuation over 6 years ago, while prices in the HP16 area away from the line have risen by between 20% and 23%. Furthermore the agent advised that once construction starts the blight will worsen when prospective buyers see the extent of the construction works and realise how many years construction will take. Your petitioner will shortly need to downsize and she is extremely concerned that she will be unable to sell in what has become a dysfunctional housing market. She feels that she is trapped for 10 or more years and she knows that the ‘Need to Sell scheme’ (NTS) is complex and 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 petitioner is 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) Noise of this level causes stress and is completely out of keeping with the status and purpose of an AONB. In addition to the noise every 100 seconds of the train travelling above ground your petitioner is greatly concerned and
not reassured by the promoter that the porous portal at the tunnel head will be able to
dissipate completely any additional booming effect resulting from the sudden
entrance to and exit from the tunnel of trains travelling at such unprecedented speed.

12. **Safety and Carbon emissions:** Experts have expressed serious reservations about the
safety of trains travelling at such high speeds particularly regarding the formation of
Rayleigh waves in parts of Buckinghamshire and other parts of the HS2 route because
of the ground structure, which could result in instability and derailment of trains with
possible catastrophic consequences. Your petitioner is at a loss to understand why in a
small country where distances between major cities are relatively short it is necessary
to run this railway at such high speeds. Running the railway at reduced speeds will
also lower carbon emissions which is an important environmental factor.

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.

13. **Health and Wellbeing:** Your petitioner is concerned that her health and 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. The number of cases of depression
    and anxiety caused by HS2 recorded by local GPs has increased and your petitioner
    has experienced this herself whilst having to deal with serious illness. 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.

14. **Business impact:** Your petitioner is aware that businesses in the area will be
    specifically affected by a reduction in tourists and in customer 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. In South Heath, for example, deliveries are made by articulated
    lorries 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 visitors 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.

16. **Chilterns AONB:** The proposed line which cuts through the central part of the Chilterns AONB 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, as will 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. Visually unattractive noise barriers are planned for parts of the A413 and barriers within barriers have been proposed for buildings such as St Mary’s church in Wendover. None of these proposals are in keeping with an AONB.

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 far less attractive to all visitors to this area of the AONB whether they are ardent walkers/hikers, horse riders, bird watchers or part of the many groups taking the Duke of Edinburgh Award so frequently seen in and around South Heath. Cyclists make much use of the area as it is Route 57 on the National Cycle Network. Families come for a day-out from London to enjoy the countryside as do many foreign visitors coming to London who wish to see the beauty and experience the peace of the nearest countryside to our capital city.

It is beyond dispute that AONBs play a pivotal role in physical and mental health. They contribute greatly to quality of life. Forecasts suggest that we may be the most densely populated country in Europe by 2050. The greater the population, the more important it becomes to protect all AONBs from inappropriate intrusive development which will damage them for ever. It is therefore incumbent on each generation to preserve the status of AONBs for all future generations. What the promoter of HS2 is putting forward goes only half way towards protecting this AONB from the worst damage. The Chilterns AONB at present faces years of construction work and disruption with no satisfactory outcome at the finish. In 100 years from now your petitioner fears that people will look back and ask why this generation thought it was right to deliberately and wantonly destroy a peaceful beautiful landscape, when the technology existed not to do so.

The implications of decisions taken now are enormous and mistakes made regarding our countryside cannot be undone. What happens to the Chiltern AONB will extend far beyond the Chilterns and will set a precedent for all future development in any other AONB. Your petitioner fervently hopes that your honourable house will do all in its power to preserve our green and pleasant land.

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 minimized either by tunneling 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 to be buried.

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

17. **Code of Construction Practice**: Your petitioner has considerable misgivings about The Code of Construction as it is a draft; hence 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 the very 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 strongly 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 your petitioner supports 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.

22 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 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.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Christopher Wilson  

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner  
   Christopher Wilson has been a volunteer driver for the British Red Cross Transport and Escort Service for the past 6 years, averaging 7000 miles p.a. escorting patients to and from hospital appointments throughout the Chilterns in Buckinghamshire.

3. Your petitioner's concerns  
   I escort clients that are invariably elderly, infirm and/or mobility compromised, to their appointments at Wexham Park, Stoke Mandeville, High Wycombe, Amersham, Chalfont St Peter and Harefield hospitals.  
   The main roads A413, A355, A404 and local lanes I use to drive my clients to these hospitals will be severely affected by HS2 construction traffic for several years which will inevitably result in longer journey times.  
   The medical profession acknowledges the beneficial effect that the Red Cross Transport and Escort one to one service can have on reducing patient stress and anxiety, which would be completely negated by having to sit and wait my turn in traffic congestion.  
   I therefore seek an assurance from The Promoter, and its contractors that the management of HS2 generated traffic will not cause congestion and/or delay on main roads, and that HS2 Ltd/Constructors traffic will not use local lanes in the area.  
   I ask that the House of Lords also consider the fact that much of the congestion on the A413 caused by construction work at the north portal of the Chilterns tunnel could be mitigated by extending the tunnel beyond Wendover, which is the main route to Stoke Mandeville Hospital.  
   I support the proposal by The Right Honourable Cheryl Gillan, MP for Chesham and Amersham, and local groups for an independent body to oversee and ensure HS2 construction traffic complies with the Draft Code of Practice.  
   Furthermore, this independent body should be easily accessed by local people so that they may report any flouting of said Draft Code of Practice or 'rat running'. This request has so far been denied.
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

Christopher Wilson  
12\textsuperscript{th} April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Ian A F Campbell

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Ian A. F. Campbell, resident at Beeway, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LT 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.

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. This is the second highest level of statutory protection given to the countryside after the National Parks.

Your Petitioner moved to the Chilterns some 38 years ago to take advantage of its special status and its tranquil and rural setting. He made a financial sacrifice to live in protected countryside yet within easy commuter distance of London. Your petitioner
contends that by reason of the construction and operation of the railway the value of his property will be seriously affected, the peace and tranquillity of the area will be lost and that many of the outdoor activities he currently enjoys including walking, cycling and bird watching, will be seriously curtailed. Local footpaths will be closed or diverted, ancient woodland and hedgerows lost and ugly man made structures will blight the landscape. The close knit community of which he is part will fracture and never be replaced.

Your petitioner lives in a detached brick and flint cottage constructed about 150 years ago situated on a narrow rural lane. It is approx. 280m from the trace, 450m from the tunnel portal site at South Heath and 750m from the proposed spoil dump at Hunts Green. He will suffer constant noise, light and airborne pollution from the seven years of construction activity from these major construction sites as well as increased noise levels from the operation of the railway. The property is extremely close to the carriageway of Potter Row and any increase in traffic brought about during construction will have a severe adverse effect on the enjoyment of his property and its value.

Your petitioner requires daily access to Great Missenden and the A413 towards both Amersham and Aylesbury. Traffic congestion during peak hours is already at saturation point. Construction of HS2 will result in a substantial increase of HGV traffic using the A413 thus exacerbating this congestion. The effects of this will also be felt along the B485 from Chesham, through Great Missenden and towards Prestwood where there are already considerable delays accessing the two A413 roundabouts outside Great Missenden. Your petitioner has little confidence that any traffic management scheme can be effective in view of the large numbers of additional HGVs and the fact that there is no alternative routing for this traffic. The proposed junction improvement works currently under discussion with HS2 will themselves add to this congestion during their construction.

Your petitioner is concerned that displaced traffic will find its way onto local roads including Potter Row and doubts that any traffic management scheme can prevent these roads from developing into Rat Runs. The narrowness of the local roads and the speed of commuter traffic is a concern for your petitioner’s safety whether as motorist, cyclist or pedestrian.

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 paragraph 3.2. 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:-

3.2.1 That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath to Leather Lane be adopted, the REPA solution, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits to Potter Row residents and is near cost neutral.

3.2.2 That the proposed haul road to the roundabout at Great Missenden is relocated further to the north in the vicinity of Leather Lane close to the proposed spoil dump.

3.2.3 That the strip of land between the A413 and the Railway will become an isolated sterile zone for wildlife. Roe and Muntjac deer, foxes and badgers currently frequent this area. Before completing the fencing to HS2 it should be “swept” to ensure that all larger wildlife moves to a safer area.

3.2.4 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.

3.2.5 That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially scaled down 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.

3.2.6 That an independent traffic management consultancy is appointed out to review the likely effects of traffic congestion on the A413 and other local roads having regard to the proposed junction improvements and that the conclusions of their report are made public and reported to this committee before they finish sitting.
3.2.7 That no construction traffic of any description including LGVs and private motor cars belonging to construction workers be permitted to use Potter Row and other minor roads other than on designated routes.

3.2.8 That the promoters should provide the highest level of mitigation to protect the countryside from further damage. This should include the burying of the overhead power lines between South Heath and Wendover, sensitive treatment to the design, landscaping and screening of surface structures, the planting of semi-mature trees at an early stage in the programme and the reinstatement of all local roads to their pre-construction width and condition.

3.2.9 That a hotline is set up to investigate any areas of concern to residents during construction including issues relating to the use and condition of local roads.

3.2.10 Your petitioner has recently been widowed and is now in his late 60's. He will wish to downsize in the near future. The qualifying criteria for need to sell should provide for all those who have reached retirement age and wish to sell irrespective of their financial circumstances or having to provide a compelling need to sell.

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.

........................................

Ian. A. F. Campbell

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 THE GLOUCESTER AVENUE ASSOCIATION

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners are The Gloucester Avenue Association (hereinafter referred to as “the Petitioners”), an association representing the residents of Gloucester Avenue, London NW1, and the residents of Primrose Hill Village, London NW1 and NW3, which includes the following streets: Ainger Road, Albert Terrace, Albert Terrace Mews, Auden Place, Berkley Road, Bridge Approach, Chalcot Crescent, Chalcot Road, Chalcot Square, Chamberlain Street, Darwin Court, Dumpton Place, Edis Street, Egbert Street, Erskine Road, Fitzroy Road, Gloucester Avenue, King Henry’s Road, Kingstown Street, Manley Street, Meadowbank, Oppidans Road, Primrose Hill Road, Prince Albert Road, Princess Road, Regal Lane, Regent’s Park Road, Rothwell Street, St George’s Mews, St George’s Terrace, St Mark’s Crescent, St Mark’s Square and Sharpleshall Street.

Your Petitioners are a long-established association representing the residents of Gloucester Avenue on community matters, including housing developments and the prevention of flash flooding to basements in the street. Your Petitioners have played an active role in responding to consultations on HS2, including submitting a substantial response to the initial consultation in July 2011. In this, and at numerous meetings with HS2 Ltd, your Petitioners have represented the interests
of both Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village. Your Petitioners have also organised meetings to discuss the question of HS2 at Cecil Sharp House, NW1, which have attracted large numbers of local residents to hear speakers including Frank Dobson MP; Sarah Hayward, the Leader of Camden Council; Natalie Bennett, the National Leader of the Green Party; Murad Qureshi of the Greater London Authority; and Richard De Cani of Transport for London.

The Chairman of the Gloucester Avenue Association is Martin Sheppard of 102 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8HX. The Secretary is Rosamond Miskin. Other committee members are Councillor Pat Callaghan, Peter Darley, Ronwen Emerson, Robert Englehart QC, James Kennedy, Annabel Leventon, Richard Millett QC, Caroline Moorehead OBE, Marilyn Panayi, Councillor Lazzaro Pietragnoli and Jeff Travers. At a meeting on 10 April 2014, the committee of the Gloucester Avenue Association approved the petition which had been prepared and passed a resolution to give authority to Martin Sheppard to present the petition in their name to the honourable House of Lords.

3. Your Petitioner's Concerns are set out in the clauses which follow.

4. Our legitimate and reasonable concerns about the impact of HS2 on Primrose Hill and Camden have not been addressed by HS2 or by the House of Commons Select Committee.

5. We are subject to a gross injustice and have been denied a fair hearing by HS2. Other safeguards of property and personal rights have failed to protect our interests. The process by which HS2 is being imposed by power on us and on the citizens of Camden is undemocratic and arbitrary. It is a breach of the legitimate rights of citizens.

6. 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 and of those of the citizens of Camden as a whole.

7. HS2's plans to remove spoil using the carriage sidings alongside Gloucester Avenue were introduced too late, and with inadequate information, for them to be
digested before the House of Commons Select Committee hearings. They are still uncertain. It is an injustice if the Bill is allowed to go ahead with major areas of its operation, including Euston, being still unknown and undefined.

8. No proper Air Quality measurement has been carried out by HS2. Air Quality measurements on a proven scientific basis, acceptable to HS2, Camden Council and petitioners in Camden, are an absolute necessity to protect the health of those in Camden. HS2 should be told by your committee to buy a mobile Air Quality measuring vehicle to provide this.

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 2013, 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:

1 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.

2 Traffic congestion due to road closures and additional construction traffic.

3 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:

4 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.

5 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.

6 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.

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

8 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.

9. 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.

9. Consultation

Your Petitioners believe that the Environmental Statement, including the additional information provided in the Environmental Statement issued with Additional Provision 3, fails to provide sufficient information on the Promoter’s plans for Gloucester Avenue, for Primrose Hill Village and for Camden as a whole. The lack of clear information in the Environmental Statement, and the problems involved in navigating the document, make it extremely difficult to understand the relationship between the very many individual proposals; or to assess to cumulative effect of all of them when taken together rather than, as in most instances in the Environmental Statement, individually.

1 The ES contains no realistic assessment of the traffic consequences of these plans.

2 The ES contains no up to date readings for existing NO2 and particulate pollution in Camden.
3 The ES contains no plans to ensure that HS2’s construction does not increase these levels.

4 Although compulsory purchase orders (“land owner notices”) were issued to property-holders in Berkley Road, Chalcot Road, Chalcot Square, Gloucester Avenue, Princess Road and Regent’s Park Road, the ES contains no information about HS2’s plans for work in these streets.

5 The ES contains very many errors and omissions, as listed by the HS2 Action Alliance, particularly in the areas of road congestion and air pollution.

Your Petitioners therefore pray your honourable House:

6 To provide an independent analysis of the effect of the Promoter’s plans on traffic in Camden, based on scientifically monitored traffic readings rather than on the unscientific assumptions characteristic of the Environmental Statement, including the information issued with Additional Provision 3.

7 To provide up to date readings for existing NO2 and particulate air pollution in Camden.

8 To provide plans to ensure that the Promoter’s plans do not increase the already illegal levels of NO2 in Camden.

9 To provide plans for the works for which compulsory purchase orders have been issued in Berkley Road, Chalcot Road, Chalcot Square, Gloucester Avenue, Princess Road and Regent’s Park Road.

10 To instruct the Promoter to write to all those who are in receipt of these compulsory purchase orders (“land owner notices”) in order to clarify the scope and intentions of these orders.

10. Traffic
Your Petitioners fear that the Promoter’s construction plans in Camden will lead to prolonged traffic chaos and to gridlock. The Promoter is seeking powers to make traffic orders, despite being neither a long-established nor an experienced highway authority. The Promoter has no understanding of the reasons behind the current pattern of traffic flow in Camden; including the environmental reasons behind many local regulations. The successful management of traffic in Camden can only be assured by a considered and complementary system. The closures and diversions proposed by the Promoter, taken together with the very large number of additional lorry journeys, are an almost certain recipe for chaos.

Your Petitioners’ specific fears are as follows:

1. Your Petitioners are deeply concerned that the powers contained in Clause 3 and Schedule 4 of the Bill concerning highways may seriously affect the ability of the highway authorities to manage their own network.

2. Your Petitioners are dismayed that the Environmental Statement contains no traffic management plan to demonstrate how traffic can be managed during construction without destroying the life of the community in Gloucester Avenue, in Primrose Hill Village and in Camden in general.

3. Your Petitioners are astonished at the Promoter’s failure to give adequate attention to the need to prevent construction causing traffic chaos in Camden. They draw your honourable House’s attention to the Promoter’s lack of experience in traffic management and to the assumption in the Bill that the needs of construction should be allowed to override all other traffic priorities in Camden.

4. Your Petitioners draw to your attention the huge personal, social, business, economic, health, educational, cultural and other costs of prolonged traffic chaos and gridlock in Camden.
5 Your Petitioners fear that construction traffic and road closures in Camden will have a significant detrimental impact on Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village.

6 Your Petitioners fear that construction traffic and road closures will lead to congestion at the series of junctions at Gloucester Gate and the top of Parkway. These complex junctions are of extreme importance to the inhabitants of Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill, being their main link to central London. They also used extensively by non-local traffic, both from north to south and from east to west.

From the Outer Circle, Parkway has junctions, in the space of a very short distance, with Albany Street, Park Village East, Prince Albert Road, Gloucester Avenue and Oval Road, and Delancey Street. These junctions are easily blocked and already experience frequent congestion. The threatened closures of Park Village and Prince Albert Road, and the extra traffic predicted from the closure of Adelaide Road, are likely to cause heavy congestion and even gridlock, a problem made much worse by the large numbers of the Promoter's HGV vehicles entering and exiting the Zoo Car Park.

There is no recognition of this problem in the traffic plans supplied in Additional Provision 3, where only the considerably less important questions of the junctions of Parkway and Arlington Road; and of Gloucester Avenue and Oval Road (Transport Assessment, pp. 427-28 and 429-30) are considered.

7 Your Petitioners fear that the building of the vent shaft on Adelaide Road, with the closure of Adelaide Road and an increase in construction traffic, threatens major disruption not only to Adelaide Road itself but to England's Lane, Haverstock Hill and Primrose Hill Road. They point out the significant mitigation to the traffic problem available by moving this vent shaft to Juniper Crescent.
Your Petitioners fear that construction traffic will cause congestion on Haverstock Hill, the principal road leading north from Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village.

Your Petitioners fear that, while the immediate impact on Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village will be severe, the threat posed to it by the Promoter's plans cannot be limited to their immediate area. The Promoter's plans for Camden as a whole threaten to cause traffic chaos throughout the borough of Camden and beyond. Gloucester Avenue, the area around it and Camden as a whole will all suffer.

Your Petitioners are concerned about the transportation of hazardous material near Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village, and in Camden as a whole.

Your Petitioners oppose, as a general principle, the use of cycle routes for construction traffic. Gloucester Avenue is a marked and much-used cycle route.

Your Petitioners are concerned about the risk to the vulnerable (cyclists and pedestrians) at junctions affected by construction works or where there are significant increases in traffic.

Your Petitioners fear that many bus routes, including the C2, 31, 168 and 274, on which residents in Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village, especially the elderly, are heavily dependent, will be diverted and delayed; that commutes and school runs will become much more difficult and time-consuming; that the emergency services will struggle to get through; and that traffic chaos, including gridlock, will cause significant loss of time and profitability to many thousands of people. They also fear that the Promoter's plans will bring huge inconvenience and massive economic loss not only to Camden but to surrounding boroughs, including Islington and Westminster.

Your Petitioners, who have examined the traffic proposals in the Environmental Statement issued with Additional Provision 3 closely, observe that the interpretation of these documents, especially that on road traffic in the
Transport Assessment is very difficult. The documents contain a very large number of lists, details and figures, but extremely little in the way of reasoned argument. In particular, they contain no convincing treatment of the **CUMULATIVE EFFECT** on Camden’s roads of the thousands of individual effects noted.

15 Your Petitioners draw to the attention of your honourable House the extremely short period allowed to Petitioners for the analysis and understanding of the information set out in Additional Provision 3. The very great length of the information provided in this Additional Provision, amounting to 4500 pages of complicated and technical matter, makes it almost impossible for any Petitioner, or indeed anyone, to have read all the information in the time provided.

16 Your Petitioners further observe that the interpretation of much the two volumes of appendices to the Transport Assessment is to all intents and purposes impossible. Part One has large numbers of tables, prepared by ‘Intelligent Data Collection’, which are too small to be read without a magnifying glass. Part Two has a large number of pages showing unintelligible, seemingly random, figures. This volume has no page numbers, making it impossible for the reader to navigate.

17 The overall impression of these documents on your Petitioners is that they represent a desk-top model, rather than a considered plan for traffic management. In particular, they show the great majority of HGVs arriving at and leaving Euston via the Euston Road itself. The great likelihood is that this model has been presented so as to show fewer HGVs using other roads in Camden, in an attempt to get the Promoter’s plans past the Select Committee. The likely pattern of HGV travel, in reality, using contractors and without a strict system of control and enforcement, would be a far larger numbers of lorries than predicted using the lesser roads of Camden.

18 Your Petitioners draw to the attention of your honourable House the fact that, even if the Promoter’s HGVs nearly all arrive and depart via Euston Road, as
proposed in the model contained in the Transport Assessment, this itself is unacceptable because of the certain increase in NO2 levels this will inflict on one of the most polluted roads in England and, indeed, Europe. They strongly oppose plans by the Promoter for dedicated HGV lanes on the Euston Road.

19 Your Petitioners are clear that while the Transport Assessment, in its four parts and nearly two thousand pages, looks at first sight to be comprehensive, an examination of almost any of the detail in it shows it to be highly speculative. The level of information about each individual road is poor and impressionistic, begging numerous questions.

20 Your Petitioners believe that it is wrong for the Select Committee to rely solely on Promoter’s own data and predictions to do with traffic in Camden. It is equally wrong for the Select Committee to rely on the Promoter’s advice when interpreting this data. They point out that the Presenter has a strong vested interest in presenting a best-case scenario.

To address these fears, your Petitioners pray your honourable House to ensure the following:

21 Your Petitioners request you to look very closely at the Promoter’s plans under Clause 3 and Schedule 4 of the Bill to make traffic orders. They ask you to examine the experience, and therefore competence, of the Promoter in traffic management. They ask you to place clear limits on the general powers of the Promoter to make traffic orders.

22 Your Petitioners request you to ensure that the Promoter provides a full traffic management plan for the period of construction, in place before the beginning of any construction. This needs to show that the legitimate entitlement of your Petitioners, in Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill Village and Camden as a whole, to a functioning traffic management system can be reconciled with the wholesale interference with the current system set out in the Bill.
23 Your Petitioners ask your honourable House to look very closely at the traffic flow at Gloucester Gate, and at the series of junctions there with Parkway (the Outer Circle, Albany Street, Park Village East, Prince Albert Road, Gloucester Avenue and Oval Road, and Delancey Street).

Your Petitioners ask your honourable House to understand the extreme importance of these junctions to the residents of Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill. They ask you to give the need for these junctions to function, without constant, long-term congestion, a high priority when considering the Promoter’s plans to take over the whole of the Zoo Car Park for the use of its HGVs; its plans to route very large numbers of HGVs up and down Albany Street; and its plans to close both Park Village East and Prince Albert Road.

24 Your Petitioners request you to limit the scale of development at Euston and the area around it, reducing the construction traffic associated with it. A double-deck station provides the obvious benefit of maintaining or even reducing the footprint of Euston Station rather than enlarging it.

25 Your Petitioners request that you instruct the Promoter to remove all spoil from demolition at Euston by rail and bring in as much construction material as possible by rail rather than by road. A platform at Euston dedicated to spoil removal would mean far fewer HGV vehicles on the streets of Camden.

26 Your Petitioners request that you examine closely any scheme which does not require surface rail construction through Camden and also proposes to remove spoil by rail.

27 Your Petitioners ask you to provide a full assessment of the Promoter’s plans to transport hazardous waste through Camden prior to any work starting.

28 Your Petitioners request that you prohibit construction traffic from using Gloucester Avenue, a marked cycle route. They also request that you prohibit construction traffic from using marked cycle routes anywhere in Camden. If the Promoter wishes to use any marked cycle route, it must provide an alternative, temporary cycle route.
29 Your Petitioners request that you instruct the Promoter to put in place measures to assure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians at junctions affected by construction works or where there are significant increases in traffic.

30 Your Petitioners request that you use the now redundant HS1/HS2 Link main compound at Juniper Crescent for the vent shaft currently planned for Adelaide Road, removing the need to close Adelaide Road during the construction of the vent shaft.

31 Your Petitioners submit that your honourable House cannot endorse the very lengthy, complex and questionable statements about traffic contained in the Transport Assessment in Additional Provision 3 on the sole authority of the Promoter’s own information and without a review of this information by an independent, expert assessor.

32 Your Petitioners draw strongly to the attention of your honourable House the great uncertainty in and over many of the Promoter’s traffic plans. This uncertainty entails very great risk that the impact on Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill, Camden and London of the Promoter’s traffic plans will be far more severe than the worst case envisaged in the Environmental Statement, including the information issued with Additional Provision 3.

33 Your Petitioners believe that such a level of uncertainty and risk must be unacceptable to your honourable House.

34 To reduce this uncertainty and risk, your Petitioners request your honourable House to ensure that all spoil from Euston is removed by rail.

35 Your Petitioners draw strongly to the attention of your honourable House the combined effect of (1) difficulty of interpretation; (2) failure to provide a convincing account of the cumulative effect of the traffic plans; (3) reliance on a model rather than the likely reality; (4) preparation of the information by the Promoter, an interested party under intense pressure; and (5) lack of any
independent scrutiny. These shortcomings, taken together, mean that the traffic plans presented in these documents are marked by **EXTREME UNCERTAINTY**.

36 Your Petitioners ask your honourable House to recognise that HS2’s Traffic Assessment must be considered neither as a neutral document, nor as something on which there is any certainty, but as the presentation of a best-case scenario. Although the effects described in it are horrific enough, in causing chaos in Camden for twenty or more years, the actual effects may be **FAR WORSE**.

37 Your Petitioners conclude that the combination of extreme uncertainty, and the reasonable fear that the actual effect on Camden will be far worse than predicted in HS2’s own plans, means that for the Select Committee to endorse these plans would be to incur **HUGE RISK**. This must surely be unacceptable not only to the people of Camden, and of London, but to the Select Committee and to your honourable House.

11. **Old Oak Common**

1 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. They consider that the plans presented in Additional Provision 3 are yet another failure by the Promoter to produce a workable scheme.

2 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.
3 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.

12. The Adelaide Road Vent Shaft

1 Your Petitioners are concerned about the proposals for the Adelaide Road vent shaft. The proposed location of the vent shaft is adjacent to Adelaide Road, a major thoroughfare providing access between Camden Town and Swiss Cottage. Adelaide Road also crosses Primrose Hill Road, which is the main point of access to the Primrose Hill area for vehicles, including emergency services, from north London. Adelaide Road also carries a well-used and frequent bus service, Route 31, which is relied on by many of your Petitioners.

2 Your Petitioners are concerned that the construction of the Adelaide Road vent shaft will cause major disruption to residents, visitors and businesses in terms of access. According to the Environmental Statement, the construction period will be longer than five years, in two phases. Construction is likely to require the complete closure of Adelaide Road for a period of approximately four months during construction of the shaft, during which traffic, including the Route 31 buses, emergency services and local residents will be diverted along England's Lane and Haverstock Hill.

3 Your Petitioners fear that the road closures and diversions required to accommodate the construction of the Adelaide Road vent shaft will lead to a significant increase in "rat running" through the area, which has a cycle route through it and contains a primary school.

4 Your Petitioners are pleased to note the withdrawal of the proposals in the Bill for a link between the proposed railway and HS1 ("the Link"). They observe that the removal of the provisions for the Link will release areas of land previously required in connection with the Link.
5 Your Petitioners respectfully suggest that most of the adverse effects of the siting of the Adelaide Road vent shaft can be mitigated by its relocation to Juniper Crescent. Your Petitioners therefore pray your honourable House to instruct the Promoter to use Juniper Crescent for this purpose.

6 Your Petitioners point out that the housing development also known as Juniper Crescent is sufficiently far away from the alternative site of the vent shaft, in what was formerly the location for the main HS1 Link compound, as to cause the residents of Juniper Crescent little disturbance from additional traffic, as the access road to the site runs past rather than through the housing; or from the construction of the vent shaft itself.

7 Your Petitioners strongly oppose the areas reserved for construction compounds under plans for the now-abandoned HS1-HS2 Link being used for other purposes by the Promoter, with the exception of the suggested use for a vent shaft at Juniper Crescent. They note that moving the vent shaft from Adelaide Road will prevent damage to the nearby Adelaide Road Nature Reserve.

13. The Alignment of Tunnels

1 Your Petitioners point out the very great extent of existing railway land to the north and east of Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill. It is most desirable that the Promoter's tunnels should run centrally beneath existing railway land rather than beneath your Petitioners' houses.

2 While they were pleased by the minor realignment of the Promoter's tunnels away from Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village, agreed by the Gloucester Avenue Association and the Promoter in 2013, your Petitioners believe that an alignment running beneath the centre of existing railway land would be greatly preferable in protecting their interests, reducing the blight and risk of settlement caused by the Promoter's works on your Petitioners' houses.
3 Your Petitioners point out that the Promoter’s decision to locate a vent shaft near the Nature Reserve on Adelaide Road was based in part on the need for it to service the now-abandoned HS1/HS2 Link tunnel, as well as the twin tunnels running towards Euston. Your Petitioners point out that this is no longer the case, following the abandonment of the HS1/HS2 Link.

4 Your Petitioners believe that it is possible to site the vent shaft for the Euston tunnels on existing railway land, rather than next to Adelaide Road. They respectfully observe that the removal of the provisions for the Link has released a substantial area of land at Juniper Crescent, which could be used for the vent shaft instead of Adelaide Road. The site is within the “red lining” of the Bill, and is fewer than 2000 metres from the site of the next vent shaft on the proposed railway at Alexandra Place. Your Petitioners understand that this is the principal engineering constraint affecting the spacing of vent shafts.

5 Your Petitioners draw the attention of your honourable House to the Promoter’s report, “Relocation of Adelaide Road Shaft to Juniper Crescent: Options Report” (March 2015). The conclusion of this report was that the construction of a vent shaft at Juniper Crescent was not only possible but, in terms of ease of construction and of the mitigation of damage to Adelaide Road and the area around it, desirable. The Promoter’s decision, following the completion of the report, not to move its vent shaft to Juniper Crescent was based only on (1) marginally greater expense; and (2) an extremely small reduction in the speed of the Promoter’s trains. Your Petitioners are persuaded by neither of these arguments.

6 Your Petitioners note that, in the Promoter’s report on the relocation of the Adelaide Road vent shaft to Juniper Crescent, only the alignment of the line further from Gloucester Avenue is shown as changed. Leaving the alignment of the line nearer Gloucester Avenue in its existing place provides no mitigation to Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill.

7 Your Petitioners believe that a very small adjustment of the angle of the portals south of Parkway will assist the realignment of the Promoter’s tunnels. They note that the design of Euston, including the tunnel portals, in Additional Provision 3 has been made without consideration of the interests of those north of the portal.
(This was made clear in the letter from Rupert Walker to Martin Sheppard of 10 April 2015.) They also note that the portal is the dividing line between two sets of consultants, Arup for Euston and CFA1; and Mott MacDonald for Primrose Hill and CFA3. Arup and Mott MacDonald have failed to consult to find a mutually beneficial solution to the question of the angle of the portals.

Your Petitioners therefore respectfully pray your honourable House as follows:

8 Your Petitioners request you to ensure that both the Promoter’s tunnels run centrally under existing railway land between Parkway and the Chalk Farm Bridge.

9 Your Petitioners ask you to take the opportunity provided by the abandonment of the HS1/HS2 Link to realign the Promoter’s tunnels to run to a vent shaft situated at Juniper Crescent.

10 Your Petitioners pray your honourable House to examine the beneficial effect on Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill of a very small alteration in the angle of the portals south of Parkway.

11 Your Petitioners pray that in considering the Promoter’s plans for Euston, including those expressed in Additional Provision 3, the loss or saving of a few seconds during the operation of the line should not be allowed to outweigh the interests of the residents of Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill Village and Camden. They draw your honourable House’s attention to the fact that capacity rather than speed is now the Promoter’s argument for the necessity of building the line.

15. Ecology

1. 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.

2 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.

3 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.

16. Euston Station

1 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 it will be used to enforce large-scale development without the interests of your Petitioners or of the residents of Camden being taken into account. 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
have no wish for Euston to be turned into another Canary Wharf. They point out to your honourable House that the aim of the Bill is for improving transport and not for massive enforced building development in an inner city area. Your Petitioners also point out that such a major change in Government powers should not be introduced surreptitiously and by stealth in a Bill on another matter.

2 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.

3 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.

4 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.

5 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:
6 Your Petitioners request that the powers granted under Clause 47 be removed from the Bill.

7 Your Petitioners ask you to ensure that the interests of Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village are taken fully into account in examining and approving any new plans for Euston Station.

8 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.

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

17. Darwin Court

1 Your Petitioners fully endorse the petition presented by the Darwin Court Residents' and Leaseholders’ Association.

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

3 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.

4 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.

5 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.
6 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.

7 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.

8 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:

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

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

11 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.

12 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.

13 Your Petitioners ask you to ensure that the trees with preservation orders in the grounds of Darwin Court are fully protected during construction.
18. **North Bridge House School**

Your Petitioners express strong support for the petition of North Bridge House School. They believe that the Promoter’s plans threaten the viability of this major educational body. In particular, they are concerned about the effects of excess traffic and air pollution on the lives and health of the children attending the school.

19. **Cecil Sharp House**

Your Petitioners express strong support for the petition of the English Folk Dance and Song Society, based at Cecil Sharp House. They ask your honourable House to recognise the importance of Cecil Sharp House as the national headquarters of folk music by ensuring that the Promoter’s plans do not have an adverse effect on its activities. They also ask you to instruct the Provider to specify that the highest possible standards of sound and vibration insulation are used to ensure to limit interference by the Promoter’s works in these activities.

20. **The Adelaide Road Nature Reserve Association**

Your Petitioners express strong support for the petition of the Adelaide Road Nature Reserve Association. They fully endorse the ecological importance and educational value of the nature reserve, which is a rare and important section of green corridor near to the centre of London, and deplore the harm threatened to the reserve, including the land nearby known as the ‘Private Nature Reserve’, where the Promoter plans to build a vent shaft. They draw your honourable House’s attention to the Promoter’s plans to commandeer and destroy valued green space throughout Camden. They point out that harm to the Adelaide Nature
Reserve and the nearby ‘Private Nature Reserve’ can be avoided by moving the vent shaft planned immediately next to them to Juniper Crescent.

21. The Friends of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill

Your Petitioners express strong support for the petition of the Friends of Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill. They deplore the Promoter’s plan to take over the Zoo Car Park for many years as a holding area for its HGV vehicles. They are deeply concerned at the threat the Promoter poses to the hedgehog population there. They oppose any other part of Regent’s Park being turned into a substitute car park for Zoo visitors.

22. Camden Cutting and Park Village

1 Your Petitioners express strong support for the petition of the Camden Cutting Group and for the petition of the Park Village. They believe that the Promoter’s current plans for massive and hugely disruptive works without compensation in the areas represented by these two groups are monstrous and completely unjust.

2 Your Petitioners ask your honourable House to look favourably on the petitions from the Camden Cutting Group and from the Park Village and to provide protection and compensation for the residents of Camden Cutting and the Park Village.

23. Compensation

1 Your Petitioners believe that the Promoter’s refusal to accept that its plans are hugely damaging to Camden is a deliberate denial of the obvious. Whether or not HS2 is justifiable in the national interest, the damage done
by the implementation of the Promoter’s plans in Camden will massively outweigh any benefit these plans will bring to those living or working in the borough. While the operation of a high-speed line may bring a limited benefit to the people of Camden in twenty years’ time, its construction over this period will impose huge personal, social, business, economic, health, educational and other costs on them. This is long-term, not short-term, blight.

2 Your Petitioners deplore the Promoter’s refusal to accept that Camden is the principal victim of HS2; and its denial that its plans will bring far more damage to the borough and to its people than benefit. The Promoter’s characterisation of its plans as having some benefits and some costs in Camden, without weighing which is the greater, hides the fact that the damage will be very much greater than the benefit.

3 Your Petitioners recognise with deep apprehension that the Promoter’s works will create the biggest inner-city construction site in Europe, with two million tons of spoil being removed by HGV vehicles. The Promoter’s wholesale interference with Camden’s traffic system will at the same time create chaos on its roads, and increase the already illegal and lethal levels of NO2. Noise pollution will make many people’s lives unbearable. The health of the young, the already ill and the elderly will be badly affected, with unnecessary deaths being caused by increased air pollution. Children will spend their entire school careers in the middle of a toxic building site. Property and businesses will be badly blighted, green spaces removed, and public transport disrupted. Nor will this damage be limited to the area immediately around Euston. Traffic chaos, air pollution and major blight will cripple much of the borough, including Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill.

4 Despite these horrific effects on the lives and rights of those in Camden, no realistic mitigation or compensation is currently on offer for the very great range of adverse impacts described in the Environmental Statement. Yet,
because of the uncertainty of much of the ES, above all about traffic, the effect on Camden risks being far worse than that predicted in the ES.

5 It is completely unjust that those badly affected by the Promoter’s plans should not be compensated, including all those whose lives, businesses or property have been or will be blighted.

6 Your Petitioners ask your honourable House as a matter of the utmost importance to recognise that the immediate and then long-term damage caused by the Promoter’s plans to Camden will greatly outweigh any long-delayed benefit to its citizens and their interests. They draw your attention to the letter from Martin Sheppard, written on behalf of the Gloucester Avenue Association, setting out the main points of this argument, sent to the Chairman of the Select Committee on 24 August 2015. They respectfully ask you to give the case made out in this letter your closest attention.

7 Your Petitioners also record the repeated refusal of the Promoter address the points made in Martin Sheppard’s letter of 24 August 2015, in general or specifically, either by letter or in meetings with the Gloucester Avenue Association. They draw your attention to the Promoter’s failure to answer a further letter on the subject, sent by Martin Sheppard on behalf of the Gloucester Avenue Association on 16 September 2015, other than by an irrelevant form response. They also record the refusal of the Promoter to answer specific questions on the subject at a meeting between the Gloucester Avenue Association and HS2 on 20 October.

8 In your Petitioners’ judgement, the deliberate, repeated and consistent refusal of the Promoter to answer questions on this matter of very great importance to the residents of Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill and Camden is a clear and very serious failure of consultation. The Promoter’s stock response of referring those affected by its plans to the Government’s schemes on compensation is a denial of consultation.
While your Petitioners record their own experience of being denied an appropriate response on the question of compensation by the Promoter, they are clear that all other individuals and community groups in Camden have over the last five years met with a similar, repeated and deliberate, refusal by the Promoter to engage on, or even to recognise, the question of compensation. Your Petitioners are certain that your honourable House will hear confirmation of this from very many other Camden petitioners.

Your Petitioners believe that Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village have already been damaged by blight caused by HS2. The threat of tunnelling under or near to their houses has caused uncertainty amongst potential buyers.

Your Petitioners believe that the many compulsory purchase orders ("land owner notices") issued in Primrose Hill Village, for works whose nature is unspecified, have blighted property in Berkley Road, Chalcot Road, Chalcot Square, Gloucester Avenue, Princess Road and Regent's Park Road.

Your Petitioners believe that, although construction threatens to inflict huge damage on Camden, there is no recognition in the Bill of the principle that polluters must pay for the pollution they cause.

Your Petitioners fear that the Bill expects Camden and its residents to shoulder the heavy cost of the damage, offering compensation to no more than a handful of those affected. Your Petitioners draw your attention, in particular, to the disastrous effect the Bill will have on very many businesses, large, medium and small.

Your Petitioners believe that it is unjust that no compensation is available to holders of property above or near the Promoter’s tunnels.

Your Petitioners are convinced that the Need to Sell scheme is completely inadequate to meet the blight caused by the Promoter’s plans. The restrictions on eligibility for this scheme are unreasonably narrow and the terms of the scheme require even those accepted under it to accept a blighted price of up
to 15 per cent of true market value. This requirement is both unreasonable and unjust.

16 Your Petitioners fear that HS2’s plans will cause traffic chaos and NO2 pollution in Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill Village and Camden as a whole, making them less attractive places in which to live. It is unjust that there should be no compensation for the loss of amenity, threat to health and property blight resulting from the Promoter’s plans.

Your Petitioners pray your honourable House to ensure measures providing fair compensation:

1 Your Petitioners request that there should be full 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.

2 Your Petitioners request that you should widen the compensation zone in Camden to match that outside London, treating all areas equally.

3 Your Petitioners request compensation for loss of property values in areas above or near to HS2’s tunnels. This compensation should be extended to leaseholders as well as freeholders. Your Petitioners draw to your attention in particular the case of the residents and leaseholders of Darwin Court.

4 Your Petitioners request that you provide compensation for the residents represented by the Camden Cutting Group and the Park Village.

5 Your Petitioners request the acceptance of proposals for a property bond scheme made by the HS2 Action Alliance.

6 Your Petitioners request that you provide a scheme, to replace the “Need to Sell Scheme”, which allows any property-owner affected by the
Promoter’s plans to be fully compensated should they wish to move for whatever reason.

24. Mitigation

Given the great uncertainty and risk inherent in the Promoter’s plans, and the danger of very large-scale damage to Camden, including Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill, your Petitioners ask your honourable House to grant two measures of mitigation:

1. Your Petitioners ask you to instruct the Promoter to remove all spoil from Euston by rail and to bring in as much building material by rail as possible. They are confident that this request will be endorsed by all your other Camden petitioners. They are aware of several carefully considered schemes which would allow this to be achieved.

   This measure of mitigation is the most important one available to the Select Committee along the whole length of the route, with the exception of the use of Old Oak Common as the main London hub, which your Petitioners also strongly support.

2. Your Petitioners ask you to instruct the Promoter to move the vent shaft at Adelaide Road to Juniper Crescent, for the many reasons set out in sections 13 and 14 above. This mitigation would be of major benefit in protecting Adelaide Road, Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill, and the areas around them, from unnecessary damage.

25. Other Damage

There are other clauses and provisions in AP3 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

26. 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.

MARTIN SHEPPARD, Chairman

12 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Stanley Mason  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  
   Stanley Mason of Holmer Green Bucks.  

   Holmer Green is located 1.5 miles from Little Missenden and 3 miles from Great Missenden, in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).  

3. In particular objection is taken to the works to be undertaken within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and in particular to works 2.1 and 2.12 to 2.27 (listed in Schedule 1 of the bill) in the parishes of Amersham, Little Missenden, Great Missenden, Chartridge and The Lee, and to the clauses of the bill which would authorise these works.  

4. Your Petitioner and his rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

   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 attract over 50 million visits a year - many from London residents,  
   • have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the area during and for a period after its construction,  
   • Permanently and seriously impair the Petitioner’s ability to enjoy the natural benefits of this AONB.  

5. The petitioner understands that the Landscape value of this area is of the order of £500 million to £750 million. The value of the damage to this national asset as a result of the construction of HS2 through it will be enormous.  

6. Your Petitioner requests that the AONB be protected from the effects of this grave and destructive planning error by directing HS2 Ltd to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel beyond that specified in Additional Provision 4 to the Bill, such as the proposal in the CRAG T2 Tunnel, or the subsequent Bucks CC proposal; the former having been accepted by HS2 Ltd in the Environmental Statement as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This would substantially mitigate the adverse effects complained of in this petition, and remove the need for the less effective
remedies proposed below.

**Water Supply**

7 Your Petitioner is gravely concerned that the Environmental Statement does not rule out the possibility of contamination to his water supply as a result of tunneling in the Chilterns. Your Petitioner requests that an independent scientific investigation into the likely effects of such serious disruption be carried out immediately. Your Petitioner would also draw your attention to the possibility that a longer tunnel could be realigned to avoid the aquifer under the Lower Misbourne Valley, thus eliminating or substantially reducing the risk to the water supply which serves this area and much of NW London.

**Construction Traffic**

8 Your Petitioner is also gravely concerned about the inadequacy of measures proposed to mitigate the effects of construction traffic throughout the AONB, and in the Misbourne Valley in particular. Your Petitioner regularly drives through the AONB to access his community group locations, shops, healthcare facilities and recreational facilities, and so will be directly impacted by traffic congestion throughout the area (and on the A413 in particular) for the duration of the construction works over a 10 year period. Your Petitioner regularly uses the network of Lanes in the AONB for recreation, and regards these as a characteristic feature of the area which should be protected in accordance with the CROW Act (2000). Many of these cross the proposed route and will be diverted or interrupted during construction.

9 As a resident of an area in the vicinity of the construction zone, your Petitioner is also concerned that traffic seeking to avoid congestion will place a further burden on the roads in his community, and so further aggravate the impact on his freedom of movement.

10 Your Petitioner notes that the projected traffic on the narrower sections of the A413 and the A355 will exceed 100% of road capacity during peak hours (calculated according to the DfT “Design Manual for Roads and Bridges TA46/97). On this basis you petitioner so requests that the fully bored tunnel options be implemented.

11 Your Petitioner also requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by amending the Draft Code of Construction Practice to strictly enforce the following measures –

1. Restricting HGV movements to the period 09:30 – 15:30 throughout the AONB, and prohibiting HGV Movements along school routes for 30 minutes before and after the start and end of the school day (during term time).

2. Constructing new roads to access the trace directly from the A413, and prohibiting the use of all existing minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

3. Operating a ‘Park and Ride’ scheme to transport construction workers along the trace, and enforcing this by not providing parking for contractors on or near the construction compounds.

**Health and Welfare**

12 Your Petitioner is gravely concerned that the emergency services will be unable to provide timely support to him and his family and property due to road congestion during the construction period, and would remind the committee that both the A413 and the A404 carry ambulances to the local Accident & Emergency department at Stoke Mandeville Hospital, as well as all HS2 traffic to and from the AONB.

13 Your Petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd provide mitigation in respect of the above through provision of an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to
ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response. The committee might also consider that with 11 construction sites operating in the area, it would be criminally irresponsible not to be so prepared for any industrial accidents.

Operational Safety

14 Your Petitioner is concerned that the HS2 Safety Case has not yet been published and specifically that there are on-going issues regarding the stability of High Speed trains operating on ballast tracks and particularly on viaducts constructed on soft soil. This raises the potential for derailments. (Report for HS2 Ltd by Professor Peter Woodward and Dr David Conolly, Heriot-Watt University Edinburgh). This may necessitate future highly expensive construction changes that could cause increased noise, with no consultation, after the Bill has been passed. Furthermore HS2 Ltd engineers have been unable to state how long, in time and distance it would take to stop a train in an emergency. Your petitioner therefore requests that until these safety issues are resolved and any resulting consultation requirements are undertaken, work on HS2 construction should cease.

Environment

15 Your Petitioner makes extensive use of the recreational facilities afforded by the AONB, and strongly objects to the following impacts of the project—
1. Diversions of public rights of way, and reinstatement of some PROWs to run alongside the line.
2. Destruction of woodland and in particular of Ancient Woodland represents an irreplaceable resource (as stated by HS2 Ltd); there is no evidence suggesting that translocation of Ancient Woodland is successful.
3. Adverse effects on the ecology of the AONB, in particular on the bat and owl populations and rare plants.
4. Continuing audible and visual intrusion of the railway in operation. No mitigation has been proposed to address the impact on walkers, cyclists or horse riders, and their needs are hardly mentioned in the ES (Vol2) reports covering the AONB (parts 7 to 10). These AONB users are both AONB residents and part of the 50 Million AONB visitors each year, and their absence will affect the shops and businesses which rely on this trade to survive. Their closure would also affect your petitioner’s ability to use these facilities and thus reduce availability of services currently enjoyed.

The only practicable mitigation for all these impacts is the full tunnel throughout the AONB as requested above. This tunnel would reach the surface beyond the town of Wendover.

16 Your Petitioner notes that HS2 have identified land 'potentially required' for construction at the Amersham Vent shaft which will block the entrance to the Amersham Hospital. Furthermore, traffic to the materials store on the North side of the A404 will delay access to the adjacent Chilterns Crematorium. Your Petitioner therefore requests that the site plan is revised to remove these features.

17 Your Petitioner notes that access to Amersham Old Town will be curtailed as a result of the increase in traffic congestion on the main access routes (A413, A404, A355) and that this will deter the visitors on which this town depends for survival. This may lead to the closure of businesses patronised by your petitioner, who will then be forced to travel further to alternative suppliers.

18 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.

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 Gilbert Michael Nockles and Sally Ann Nockles.

Declares that:

1. The petitioners (‘Your Petitioners’) are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioners are Gilbert Michael Nockles and Sally Ann Nockles of Mapleton, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire HP16 9LT who are owners of the property at this address. The property is a detached house built in 1905 in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioners were served with notices by Parliamentary Agents acting on behalf of High Speed Two (HS2) Limited on the 25th November 2013 advising that their property was directly affected if the Bill passed into law.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1 The route alignment

Your petitioners are concerned about the serous and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals for HS2 in the area between South Heath and Leather Lane where it passes less than 200 metres from their home through a shallow cutting. 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).

Your petitioners contend that the current proposals will destroy their home life; their property will suffer a catastrophic decline in value, as well as damaging environmental consequences.
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.

Your petitioners are also seriously concerned about the disruptions to their 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 request that their property and the Chilterns AONB be 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 adoption of this proposal would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in this petition.

3.2 Property Blight

Your petitioner's home is located in Potter Row 600 metres from the North Portal of the Chiltern Tunnel, 160 metres from the HS2 railway, 60 metres from the boundary of Mulberry Parkhill which is to be demolished and 25 metres from land at Park Farm required for the project.

The construction compound is approximately 120 metres distant and is visible from the property.

The construction route, compound traffic route and haul route are located approximately 80 metres from the property.

The promoters have issued a safeguarding directive over the sole access to the property. This effectively renders the property unsellable on the open market at the unblighted value.

The catastrophic effect that this has on the property should entitle your petitioners to serve and have accepted a statutory blight notice so that they can move to a property more suited to their circumstances and age and stage in life.

3.3 Compensation

Your petitioners are gravely concerned that they cannot sell their property at the full unblighted value.

The “Need to Sell” scheme introduced in January 2015 is intended to allow successful applicants to sell their properties to HS2 at the full unblighted value. The current valuation arrangements do not achieve this objective.
Your petitioners request the following amendments to the valuation arrangements to ensure fairness to both the property owner and the promoters.

a) The panel of valuers should only include suitably qualified professionals with direct experience of the area where a property is located and who are employed by firms with successful experience of selling comparable properties in that area.
b) The process should require two valuations with the property owner having the option of accepting a valuation based on the average of the two valuations.
c) If the valuations are more than 10% apart the property owner should have the option of requesting a third valuation. The price at which HS2 offer to purchase the property should be the average of the two highest valuations.

3.4 Other Mitigation Measures

Your petitioners request that if the Bill is not amended to include further tunnelling as set out in para 3.1 the following measures are required:

a. The line along the section of the track passing the Petitioners property 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.
b. The power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. The temporary construction road is squeezed in between the petitioner’s property and the trace of the railway. This will generate a substantial increase in noise and dust during the construction period. The petitioners will not be able to enjoy their garden and will suffer continual disturbance inside the house. The remedy is to re-route the temporary construction route to run between the trace of the railway and the A413.

3.5 Construction Matters – Code of Construction Practice

Your petitioners further request that the Code of Construction Practice is given legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your petitioners request the Code or requirements in the Bill is amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 in the AONB.
b. Prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and 15:00 and 15:30.
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 provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure medical emergencies receive a prompt response
f. 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
g. A 24/7 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.

Gilbert Michael Nockles    Sally Ann Nockles

13th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF ELAINE HARVEY

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Elaine Harvey, resident at Laurel House, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9JP, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

Your Petitioner is specially and directly 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’s property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioners enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then 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 further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social 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 provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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.

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 for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular 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 for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is 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 and by your Petitioner. 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.
3.3 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests 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. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In 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.
d. 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 temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. 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.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

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.

COLIN REGINALD SULLY (Agent) \\
13TH APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF COLIN REGINALD SULLY  

 Declares that:  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

Your Petitioner is Colin Reginald Sully, resident and freeholder at Fairleigh, Swan Bottom, The Lee, Bucks, HP16 9NG, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.  

Your Petitioner is specially and directly 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’s property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner’s enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.  

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.  

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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. 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 for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular 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 for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is 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 and by your Petitioner. 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.**
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then 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 further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social 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 provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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.

j. 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 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests 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. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In 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.
d. 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 temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. 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.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

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.

COLIN REGINALD SULLY
13th APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF STEWART VAUGHAN

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Stewart Vaughan, resident and freeholder at Birches, Sly Corner, Lee Common, Gt Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9LD, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

Your Petitioner is specially and directly 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’s property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner's enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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.

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 for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular 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 for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is 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 and by your Petitioner. 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.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then 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 further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social 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 provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests 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. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In 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.
d. 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 temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. 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.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

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.

.........................................................
COLIN REGINALD SULLY (Agent)
13th APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF JANE VAUGHAN

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Jane Vaughan, resident and freeholder at Birches, Sly Corner, Lee Common, Gt Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9LD, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

Your Petitioner is specially and directly 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’s property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner’s enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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.

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 for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular 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 for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is 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 and by your Petitioner. 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.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then 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 further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social 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 provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests 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. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In 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.
d. 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 temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. 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.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

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.

..........................................................

COLIN REGINALD STILLY (Agent)
13th APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF ANTHEA HARTLEY  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

Your Petitioner is Anthea Hartley, resident at Lower Bassibones Farm, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9LA, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.  

Your Petitioner is specially and directly 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’s property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes Lee Common, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner’s enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.  

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.  

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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.

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 for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular 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 for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is 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 and by your Petitioner. 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.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then 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 further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social 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 provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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.

j. 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 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests 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. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In 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.
d. 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 temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. 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.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

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.

JOHN SIMON MORRIS (Agent)
13th APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF GEOFFREY HARTLEY

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Geoffrey Hartley, resident at Lower Bassibones Farm, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9LA, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

Your Petitioner is specially and directly 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’s property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes Lee Common, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioners enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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.

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 for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular 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 for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is 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 and by your Petitioner. 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.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then 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 further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social 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 provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests 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. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes.
c. In 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.
d. 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 temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. 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.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

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.

JOHN SIMON MORRIS (Agent)
13th APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF REINA FREE  

Declarations that:  

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

2. **Your Petitioner**  

Your Petitioner is Reina Free, resident at Kings Ransom, Kings Ash, Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9NP, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.  

Your Petitioner is specially and directly 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's property is located less than 800 m from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes Kings Ash Common, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner's enjoyment of the property, its surroundings and its value. Your Petitioner is also concerned about the noise impact as the trains pass by on large and high viaducts.  

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.  

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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.

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 for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular 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 for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is 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 and by your Petitioner. 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.
3.2. **Alternative Mitigation**

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then 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 further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social 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 provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests 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. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In 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.
d. 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 temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. 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.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

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.

JOHN SIMON MORRIS (Agent)
13th APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF JAMES NORTON

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is James Norton, resident at Mulberry House, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9JP, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

Your Petitioner is specially and directly 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's property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner's enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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.

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 for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular 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 for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is 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 and by your Petitioner. 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.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then 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 further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social 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 provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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.

j. 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 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests 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. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In 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.
d. 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 temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. 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.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

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.

Colin Reginald Sully (Agent)
13th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF GLYN THOMAS

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Glyn Thomas, resident at Laurel House, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9JP, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

Your Petitioner is specially and directly 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’s property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner’s enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.

   Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.

   Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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.

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 for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular 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 for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is 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 and by your Petitioner. 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.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then 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 further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social 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 provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests 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. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

c. In 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.

d. 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 temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.

e. 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.

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

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.

COLIN REGINALD SULLY (Agent)
13th APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Wendover Choral Society Charity no. 1107449.

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill by virtue of the fact that the chosen route is elevated on the surface 280m from St Mary's Church with the result that the noise inside the building is at an unacceptable level leading to the demise of your petitioner.

2. Your petitioner

Your petitioner is Wendover Choral Society, a charity which has been in existence for 50 years which makes a large contribution to the local music arts scene. Your petitioner has a loyal following in the Wendover area and provides artistic performance opportunities to its members and enjoyment to a regular and large audience. Your petitioner uses the building every week for rehearsal in preparation for 3-4 concerts per annum and organises additional concerts by local artists to raise funds to subsidise your petitioner's activities.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Due to the fact that the proposed route of the train is 280m from St Mary's Church with "line of sight" between the tracks and building, the church is adversely affected by the noise generated up to 36 times per hour. This will seriously impact on the use by your petitioner of the building as the concert venue for its performances. It should be noted that it is the peak noise level 36 times an hour always at the same high level that is the concern. Average noise predictions are irrelevant in relation to your petitioner's activities since the existing background noise level is very low at the time of our concerts.

The train noise will be clearly audible during the silences and quiet passages of a performance and importantly with greater frequency and volume than the current ambient/background noise. As a result the building will become unusable for your petitioner's activities and since there is no alternative suitable venue your petitioner will be forced to cease its activities which will be a very significant loss to the local community.

In addition, as a result of the demise of your petitioner the church will lose the financial benefit if currently enjoys from the Petitioner's use of the building.

4. Proposed mitigation- your petitioner's "ask"

The importance of the church as a venue was identified in the ES. However, HS2 in the Hybrid Bill was shown to ignore the importance of the venue. As a result of representations to HS2 and the House of Commons Select Committee additional mitigation is included in AP5. However your
petitioners own analysis and tests come to the conclusion that this is still not sufficient to protect the internal acoustic of the building without sound attenuation of the fabric of the building.

The need for sound attenuation of the building is supported by Steve Summers MSc CEng MIOA of ACCON UK whose report will be presented to the Committee in evidence.

The scope of sound attenuation works that is acceptable both technically and from a heritage view which is also supported St Mary’s PCC and the Oxford Diocese will cost £670,000 including irrecoverable VAT at today’s prices. This is based on a professionally prepared independent cost estimate. While HS2 have agreed the elements of the building that need attenuation in principle they have only offered a contribution of £250,000. Therefore your Petitioner asks that the House of Lords instruct HS2 to increase their contribution to £670,000 with this amount adjusted following the application of the BCIS All-in TPI once the timing of the works can be established.

This will secure for the long term your petitioner's activities for the benefit of the local community.

5. 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

William N Avery
Agent on behalf of Wendover Choral Society
14th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Lappetts Lane (South Heath) Neighbourhood Watch Scheme

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner
   2.1 Your Petitioner is the Lappetts Lane (South Heath) Neighbourhood Watch Scheme (LLNWS) and covers Lappetts Lane in South Heath which is a close of 24 dwellings opening at each end onto Kings Lane and a further 9 dwellings on Kings Lane backing onto Lappetts Lane
   2.2 Your Petitioner’s members’ properties within Lappetts Lane and Kings Lane are in a safe and tranquil location which will be specially and directly affected as they are between 400 and 600 metres from the portal cutting at the north portal to the Chiltern Tunnel and between 650 and 850 metres from the train exit at that portal.
   2.3 Your Petitioner’s residents 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 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 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 and will reduce the impact on the AONB.
   3.2 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 around 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 2-26
   3.3 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.
3.4 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact arising from Construction</th>
<th>Mitigation sought (If the further Chiltern Tunnel extension is not adopted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Petitioner is concerned and objects to</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Congestion: The disruption over eight years of access to and from Great Missenden and Prestwood for residents 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 residents travelling along the A413 to and from Wendover and Stoke Mandeville Hospital and will lead to rat-runs through Great Missenden and the hilltop villages and delays to emergency services, especially from the Fire Station in Great Missenden.</td>
<td>2. The daily movements of HGVs to be restricted to between 09.30 and 15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Haul Road: 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 its children using the 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.</td>
<td>3. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. HS2 to work with Buckinghamshire County Council to facilitate traffic flow at the congestion points and consider slip roads, road widening etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The construction haul road should be relocated further north, distant from the larger settlements of Great Missenden and Prestwood, and beyond the Monkwell 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 visitors and customers to businesses in Great Missenden. Traffic signals can be implemented on the junction with the A413 to control the flow of construction traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to be monitored and enforced by Buckinghamshire County Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
- **Noise and Dust**: Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of construction noise and dust (and operational noise) as a result of the deep, wide cuttings at the 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.

7. **A tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB, or at minimum to Leather Lane** will obviate the need for wider cuttings. Other remedies would be retained sides for the cutting and higher trackside noise barriers with barriers on the east side (as well as west) towards Leather Lane.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact arising from Operation</th>
<th>Mitigation sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Road</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Petitioner is concerned and objects to</td>
<td>(If the further Chiltern Tunnel extension is not adopted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise and Dust</strong>: Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of construction noise and dust (and operational noise) as a result of the deep, wide cuttings at the 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.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Road</strong>: 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.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong>: The residents within LLNWS are close enough to the surface line to suffer operational noise at night close to the peak WHO target LOAEL of 60dBmax and may be exposed to tunnel boom which the Promoter will not guarantee.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vent Shaft</strong>: The proposed scheme requires an additional Vent Shaft and Auto-transformer station at Chesham Road and your Petitioner is concerned that there will be additional construction and operational noise from the vent shaft and it associated equipment. The vent shaft could be obtrusive on the landscape.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact arising from Operation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Road</strong>: 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.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong>: The residents within LLNWS are close enough to the surface line to suffer operational noise at night close to the peak WHO target LOAEL of 60dBmax and may be exposed to tunnel boom which the Promoter will not guarantee.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vent Shaft</strong>: The proposed scheme requires an additional Vent Shaft and Auto-transformer station at Chesham Road and your Petitioner is concerned that there will be additional construction and operational noise from the vent shaft and it associated equipment. The vent shaft could be obtrusive on the landscape.</td>
<td><strong>Mitigation sought</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Construction traffic should not use of the maintenance access road during construction.**
   - Any temporary construction contractors should park their white vans at the main construction compound at Wendover and be bussed onto the site. The relocated construction access road mentioned above could be retained so that access to Frith Hill (SHL) will no longer be required.

9. **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 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.

10. **Ensure adequate landscaping to mask the sight of vent shaft buildings and mitigate any noise.**
General Impact

Your Petitioner is concerned and object to

-Dysfunctional Housing market: Your Petitioner’s residents are between 400 and 600 metres from line on the surface and 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. Residents 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.

-Health and Wellbeing: Residents within the LLNWS 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.

Mitigation sought
(If the further Chiltern Tunnel extension is not adopted)

11. 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. 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 and with more stringent rules to ensure reasonable un-blighted valuations.

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

13. A further tunnel extension 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 are sought.

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

Impact on the AONB

Your Petitioner is concerned and objects to

- Visual Blight: Your Petitioner is concerned with the impact on tourism and enjoyment of the AONB from the 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.

- 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

Mitigation sought
(If the further Chiltern Tunnel extension is not adopted)

15. 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 over bridges. The contractor should not be empowered to raise the line by up to 3 metres on the AONB section.

16. 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
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.

buildings erected by HS2 Ltd to be in-keeping with the surrounding area.

17. 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 footpaths should cross the line via green bridges in the AONB, not via a footpath overbridge or diverted via an accommodation bridges.

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
6.1 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 residents would be affected).

6.2 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.

6.3 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.

6.4 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner their rights, interests, property and your Petitioner’s area and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
6. 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.
Signatory

Thomas Michael Johnstone
Co-ordinator Lappetts Lane (South Heath)
Neighbourhood Watch Scheme

And agent

Date 13 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL  

PETITION  

THE PETITION OF Clive & Margaret Higgins  

Declares that  

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Alterations & Modifications to Addison Road from Steeple Claydon to Calvert, Bridleway & Footpath diversions in the area around Steeple Claydon & Calvert  

2. The Petitioners are Clive & Margaret Higgins of Rosehill Farm, Steeple Claydon, Buckinghamshire, MK18 2HH  

3. Your petitioners concerns are: 

Your Petitioners have owned, and lived at Rosehill Farm since September 1983. Your Petitioners plans have always been that our two sons and, currently, four grandchildren will inherit and continue Rosehill Farm and its business after our death. When your Petitioners first bought Rosehill it consisted of a semi derelict 18th Century, built in 1710, Grade II Listed house, a picturesque range of oak framed peg-tiled barns and land that had been very badly neglected. In the 33 years of ownership your Petitioners have resurrected the buildings, at huge cost, extended the acreage in our ownership, renovated ponds, and planted hundreds of trees (ironically now shown on both HS2 and Bucks County Council maps as a sign of a green countryside) and approaching a mile of native hedging. Central to your Petitioners ability to continue at Rosehill is the Boarding Kennels & Cattery business your Petitioners have developed over the 33 years. The Charity, The Rhodesian Ridgeback Welfare Trust, of which we are both Trustees, operates from Rosehill Farm. While it is true that your Petitioner’s property will not actually be demolished as a result of the Bill, its viability will be destroyed as it is located at a confluence of the proposed HS2 line, the proposed service depot, the construction footprint and the on-going operation of the line and the maintenance depot. Plus while not within this remit, it is also affected by the East –West rail line and the Bucks County Councils energy from waste incinerator. Your Petitioners’ property is on what is currently a very minor road which will be very heavily used by HS2 construction and operational traffic both throughout the construction of the Scheme and, in both the line and the service depot, throughout their life. Having spent all
these years contributing to the re-creation and protection England's green & pleasant land it appears your Petitioners reward from a grateful society is the wilful destruction of everything they have done.

Your Petitioners and their rights, interests, business, charitable activities and property 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 which are estimated to take at least 10 years to complete the line, plus the depot will operate in perpetuity. This will obviously include a huge number of heavy vehicle movements on roads currently not fit for this purpose in either size or utility. Quite apart from the creation of dust and noise, poor air quality, and 24 hour working, HS2 have in the proposed highway layouts and designs on the roads leading to Rosehill Farm wilfully refused to take into consideration any of the requests your Petitioners have made to mitigate the effects of their design, its construction and subsequent operation.

These changes are needed to lower the future impairment of the health & well-being of your Petitioner and family. They are also needed to protect the well-being and health of the animals, boarded dogs & cats, within your Petitioners commercial kennels, but also that of the Rhodesian Ridgebacks that are housed & trained at Rosehill Farm while their behaviour is assessed prior to being re-homed. Despite my repeated requests HS2 will neither acknowledge the existence of the kennels nor even show the existence of our kennels business on their plans.

In the period from 2009 – 2013 your petitioners expended £500,000 on a new state of the art kennels building. This cost was minimised by the fact that it was built during a recession and your Petitioner designed and managed the entire construction. To repeat the exercise now would cost at least twice that figure.

As part of the Planning Consent granted for the buildings construction considerable concern was expressed by the Bucks County Council over the adequacy of Addison Road and the access to Rosehill Farm. Initially Planning Consent was refused until these issues were addressed. There is a requirement for your Petitioner to double the width of our access road so that it can safely take the ever expanding number of customer's cars. This work is scheduled for the winter of 2015 – 2016.

Reference to HS2's proposals for Addison Road will show that they wish to rebuild the bridge to the north of your Petitioners entrance with a new, higher, bridge on an eastern curve alongside the existing bridge. This design is dangerous and unnecessary as it takes no account of your Petitioners main entrance and its commercial & residential traffic or your Petitioners 2 separate field entrances. The most affected of which will be at the bottom of the slope down from the brow of the new bridge. If this is permitted it is an accident just waiting to happen as high speed vehicles will come over the brow of a bridge and be confronted by slow moving agricultural vehicles turning across the road into your Petitioners fields. HS2 suggested solution was to impose a speed limit over the bridge. I have to ask, will the fact that the driver was subsequently penalised for speeding make me any less dead?
In addition, in to this dangerous mix HS2 are now, in the amended plans, proposing to alter the access road to Shepherds Furze Farm “for use by temporary construction and permanent maintenance vehicles”

This entrance to Shepherds Furze Farm is directly opposite the main entrance to Rosehill Farm, so your Petitioners traffic, and the construction traffic, and the subsequent maintenance traffic will all be competing for one very congested, very small, piece of road, if this is allowed to happen it will only be a matter of time before someone is injured or dies.

Your Petitioner does however have a solution to this dilemma that at the very worst costs no more than HS2’s design, will probably be cheaper, offers improved utility, lessens the damage to Rosehill Farm and its business and will not endanger life & limb.

The solution was presented to the House of Commons Select Committee on 19th January 2016, where the Committee gave what at the time seemed a very clear steer to HS2 that they should amend the design of the Addison Road bridge to fit with our proposals. During the following days presentation by Bucks County Council this was repeated. Observing that if Rosehill Farms entrances did not exist the proposed design of the Addison Road bridge would mean that a proposal to create them would be rejected by the road planning authority, so it cannot be that an unacceptable design can be created in reverse by HS2. However it has become clear in subsequent conversations that HS2 have not the slightest intention of complying with the wishes of the Select Committee and have refused to change the design.

Our proposal does not cost any more, the land take is less and the affected landowner has no objection, so I seek the help and support of the House of Lords to ensure that HS2 are not permitted to just ignore the wishes of the Parliamentary process and that they comply in an irrevocable manner.

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 your Petitioners family, business, the environment and the wider local 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.

If the proposed new bridge, resultant realignment of Addison Road and the desire for a new entrance via Shepherds Furze Farm were redesigned so that the curve starts at the same point as proposed to the South of the existing entrances to Rosehill Farm and be routed instead in a curve to the West that mirrors the proposed curve to the East this would leave Rosehill Farm, the kennels and the field accesses on a cul-de-sac. This simple change would remove the extremely damaging & dangerous situation proposed by the current HS2 design while still leaving exactly the same, probably improved, functionality for HS2 and the depot. It would also create slightly more space for the inclusion of enhanced embankments, bundings & tree planting to provide screening of Rosehill Farm and the kennels from at least
some of environmental damage, noise & light pollution created by the construction and subsequent operation of HS2 and the depot. Additionally this could be the start of an access road to a logical position for a new station on the proposed East – West railway that would make some contribution to mitigating, and compensating for, the wholesale destruction of the environment and quality of life of the villages of Steeple Claydon, Twyford, Calvert & Calvert Green being proposed by HS2, its service depot and enhance the East West railway.

4. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

5. 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 Petitioner.

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 so much of the Bill as affects 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.

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 remains, etc.

Signed

Clive Higgins

Signed

Margaret Higgins
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr & Mrs C Holmes, Ms M James, Mr R Risme, Mr & Mrs F Donnan,
Mr A Brown, Mr F Brown, Ms S Edwards, Ms Wraight, Mr & Mrs Wright, Ms E Moss, Mr P Gillman,
Mr & Mrs A Butler, Mr J Hall, Mr & Mrs Todd, Ms Z King, Ms K Newbold, Mr C Tobin, Mr G Salih, Ms
J Timms, Mr & Mrs R Hurst, T Williams, C A Herbert, Mr & Mrs Sansom,
Ms C Cockerton, Mr T O'Driscoll, Mr & Mrs Fonseca, Mr & Mrs Fowles, Mr & Mrs G Toone,

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioners are all residents of Hillside, South Harefield UB9. Our houses are semi-detached and all situated directly overlooking Harefield Moor (farm land adjacent to our back gardens). The petitioners will be specially and directly adversely affected by multiple construction sites in close proximity to their homes.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Under the current plans for HS2, the field behind your petitioners' homes will be the location for a National Grid Electricity Feeder Station. This will be constructed approximately 400m from your petitioners' houses. Behind the Feeder Station the HS2 viaduct will be constructed to arc around your petitioners' properties at a variable distance of between 620m and 900m. There will be a new access road constructed in the field behind your petitioners' homes. The national grid pylons currently approximately 400m from the properties will be increased in number and rebuilt closer to your petitioners' houses where they will remain for a period of 3-4 years.

Specifically your petitioners will suffer the following special and direct negative effects from the construction and operation of HS2 due to the specific location of their homes. They face three major construction projects less than 900 metres from their homes:

a) Your petitioners are concerned about the construction of a National Grid Feeder station in the field behind their homes. The building will be in direct view from the rear of your petitioners' homes and clearly visible from all the back windows and gardens. The height of this construction is currently unknown to your petitioners but even a low lying building in this field will have a significant negative impact on the local landscape and your petitioners' enjoyment of their gardens and the footpaths beyond. Your petitioners are worried about the noise and pollution during the construction phase and also the permanent impacts with regard to noise and light pollution from the operation of the Feeder Station and new access road which is planned across the field.

b) Your petitioners are worried about the implications of the construction and permanent operation of the viaduct which will curve around their properties at a
distance of 620 metres to the west and 900 metres to the south. Your petitioners consider that this viaduct will have a significant negative impact on the view from their properties and that the noise levels from their homes and gardens during construction and operation will be significantly adverse. Your petitioners are also concerned about the long term light pollution from the operation and maintenance of the viaduct.

c) Your petitioners are worried that the relocation of the national grid pylons closer to their homes for 3-4 years will be yet another impact which will directly negatively affect your petitioners' outlook from their properties.

In addition to the above specific effects, we will also be subject to the general adverse effects of construction which will be suffered by all the residents of Harefield namely:

- A huge increase in HGV traffic on local roads for an estimated 10 years.
- Loss of greenbelt land.
- Loss of Hillingdon Outdoor Activities Centre.
- Loss of woodland (including SSSIs) and habitat.
- Loss of cycle routes and public rights of way.
- Damage to Harefield Marina and the towpath of the Grand Union Canal.

In mitigation of the above negative impacts of HS2 construction and operation on your petitioners, they would like to request consideration of the following alternatives:

1. **Colne Valley Tunnel**
   Your petitioners support Hillingdon Council in its petition for a tunnel under Harefield and the Colne Valley as this would eliminate many of the adverse effects of the project on local communities and the environment, and many of the special and direct effects on your petitioners.

2. **Relocation of Harefield Moor Feeder Station**
   Your petitioners request that in addition to a tunnel under Harefield and the Colne Valley, a more suitable site be found for the Harefield Moor Electricity Feeder Station, ideally on a brown field site further away from residential areas. The current position of HS2 Ltd with regard to difficulties of relocating the Electricity Feeder Station to a more suitable site is unconvincing and unacceptable to your petitioners.

3. **Relocation of Access Road to the Feeder Station**
   Your petitioners request that in the event that an alternative site cannot be found for the Electricity Feeder Station, the planned access road be moved to the south of the Feeder Station out of view of your petitioners' properties.

4. **Conservation /Preservation Fund**
   Your petitioners request that sufficient funds be made available for the preservation and conservation of the remaining area of Harefield Moor. This area is between your petitioners' houses and the Electricity Feeder Station. This will provide a barrier against noise and pollution and will thus help naturally redress the negative visual and environmental effects of multiple construction sites in such a small area. This will also help to compensate for the failure of HS2 Ltd to agree to any of the specific mitigations asked for by the residents of Hillside in their previous petitions to the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee.
5. **Mitigation Planting**

Your petitioners find it unacceptable that the mitigation planting offered by HS2 to shield their homes from the Electricity Feeder Station and viaduct will not commence until after completion of the whole project and that it will then take a further 15 years for the trees to mature enough to provide an effective visual screen.

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.

[each petitioner (or his Agent) **MUST** Sign: (or seal) the petition here! Print Name: the name of the person Signing below each Signature (and add "Agent" if appropriate)]
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To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF: Uxbridge Rovers Angling and Conservation Society (URACS)

1. Declares that: The petitioner URACS is specially and directly affected by the whole Bill.

The Petitioner

2. The petitioner URACS is an Angling and Conservation Society of 77 Beverley Road, Ruislip, Middlesex, HA4 9AN. The Society is one of the oldest in the UK circa 1884. The society is a successful fishing club with over 650 members that are attracted to the Colne Valley from all over the country. The Society’s core membership is from West London. The Society’s membership includes senior citizens, disabled anglers, junior anglers and people joining as a family. It offers free membership for children under the age of 16 and works closely with angling projects such as Get Hooked on Fishing and Hillingdon Council’s family fishing fun days. URACS offer members a variety of waters from lakes to ponds and rivers. The Petitioner’s premier lakes, known to its members as ‘The Golf Course lakes’ are situated at Harefield Place at the bottom of Uxbridge Golf Course (UB10 8AQ). These lakes will be specially and directly affected by the Bill.

The petitioner’s concerns

3. Environmental impacts
   a) The Haul Road and The Northolt tunnel boring machine (TBM) power supply are to be constructed adjacent to the lakes. The Petitioner is concerned about their close proximity and the impact construction and traffic may have on the lake boundaries and fishing areas.
   b) The Petitioner is concerned about the impact that the construction of the Haul Road, the laying of the power cables and the pollution from heavy vehicle traffic such as dust and emissions may have on the lakes
ecosystem through water contamination. This could affect the water quality, fish stocks and the lake's ecosystem.

c) If fishing were to cease, due to loss of access, the Petitioner would be concerned about the potential poaching of fish, vandalism and littering whilst the water is under the control of HS2 Ltd due to the lack of the Petitioner's supervision.

d) The Petitioner is concerned that the landscape and visual aspect of the lakes will significantly alter if vegetation is removed for any proposed short or long term construction. In addition the impact construction will have on the visual aesthetics of the lake and it's surroundings.

4. Impact on members

a) The Environmental Statement ("ES") maps that outline land potentially required for the Haul Road, the Northolt tunnel boring machine (TBM) power supply, the National Grid overhead power line diversion (NG) and the realignment of Harvil Road indicate that the Petitioner's members could have restricted access to the lakes. The members currently access the lakes using the public right of way (PRoW U50) via Uxbridge Golf Course and through the Gravel works access road (Pit Lane) off Harvil Road.

b) The ES SES3 and AP4 ES Volume 2 5.2.5 states a staffed gate will be provided where the haul road crosses PRoW U50 to maintain PRoW access. The Petitioner would like more clarification on this statement such as the times the PRoW would be open as this could impact on the Petitioner's current access arrangements with Hillingdon Council.

c) The ES maps that outline land potentially required for the Haul Road indicate that the Petitioner's Members could lose access to the lakes. Its members currently access the lakes via Uxbridge Golf Course and through the Gravel works access road (Pit Lane). Plans for the Haul road could prevent access from one or both of these entry points.
d) The Uxbridge Golf course lakes are the Petitioner's premier waters and as such play a significant role in retaining its existing members and attracting new ones. The lakes have had a large waiting list for membership for the last five years. The closure of the lakes could significantly affect the club's existing and future membership.

e) The Petitioner is concerned about the potential for decline in infrastructure such as pathways and fishing areas. Nature would take back much of the lake and surrounding land if permission for access and maintenance is not agreed.

f) The noise created by construction and the use of the Haul Road will significantly impact on the tranquillity and leisure time of the Petitioner's members.

g) The landscape and visual aspects of the lake would alter as a result of construction and this will change the view that the Petitioner's members have enjoyed and been attracted to for so many years.

h) The impact on the Petitioner's lease with Hillingdon Borough Council. If HS2 acquire the lakes its lease with Hillingdon Borough could terminate and fishing rights lost.

5. **Mitigation measures required to impact the effect of HS2 on the Petitioner. (The Petitioner's Requests)**

The following recommendations have been put forward by the Petitioner's committee members to mitigate against the impact the planned Haul Road will have on the Petitioner's membership and lakes. The Petitioner therefore asks your right Honourable House to require the Promoter to give it the following assurances:

- a) That access and fishing areas can be agreed to ensure that fishing can continue during the construction phase. This would mean that the Petitioner's lease or rights to fish could continue with Hillingdon Council.

- b) An agreed plan should be put into place by HS2 Ltd prior to construction work starting. The plan should outline all necessary actions that will be required to protect the lakes boundaries, security, water quality and fish welfare.
c) That sound and sight barriers/fences are installed to minimise the noise and view of any proposed construction and traffic. This could double up as a measure against potential pollution and litter and act as a security measure against poaching.

d) That trees and hedgerows are planted in agreed areas to serve as a measure for screening any visual changes to the landscape without impacting on access to current fishing areas.

e) If access cannot be granted during the construction phase that a similar lake be attained locally for the use of the Petitioner's members.

f) If fishing is not permitted during construction, that the lease be returned as a guarantee to the Petitioner on the completion of construction of the Haul Road or after the Haul Road has been disassembled.

g) That HS2 Ltd ensure they have a detailed account of how the lakes and stock were handed to HS2 and also have a plan to compensate or restore the lakes, surrounding land and fish stocks after their control if they have been negatively affected in any way.

h) That regular water checks should be carried out by the Environment Agency on both of the URACS lakes and the water course upstream including pit 3 and pit 2. Any pollution from the main construction of the railway viaduct could impact on the Petitioner's lakes.

i) In the event that access is not allowed to the Petitioner's members, that well trained Fishery wardens are employed by HS2 Ltd or that suitable access for the societies 'fishery managers' is granted to reduce poaching, to maintain infrastructure and to monitor early signs of fish distress.

j) That Fisheries, whose combined memberships run into the thousands, are recognised as important community assets in the Colne Valley.
6. **Conclusion**

a) The ES of the Haul Road does not provide sufficient detail as to the probable impacts of proposed construction and traffic on the lakes used by the Petitioner for fishing.

b) The ES does not detail the impact the Haul Road will have on the lake's fish stocks.

c) The ES does not take into account the impact that construction may have on local fishing clubs in the Colne Valley such as URACS. Many of the clubs including the Petitioner's have existed for tens of years and are considered valuable community assets.

7. **The prayer**

The Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that it, or someone representing 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 David Kent, Roll B Agent for Uxbridge Rovers Angling and Conservation Society

14th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Robert David Craig Sim

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner is Robert David Craig Sim, resident at Hillcroft, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LU, 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 that 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 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.
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.

........................................ .................................

Robert David Craig Sim
Hillcroft, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LU

12 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Debra Sim  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

Your Petitioner is Debra Sim, resident at Hillcroft, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LU, 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 that 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 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:

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.

Debra Sim
Hillcroft, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LU

12 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF RESIDENTS' ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ASSOCIATION (REPA)

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner (also referred to as “REPA”) is an association of local organisations and individuals who live in and around the South Heath Area. The South Heath Area (SHA) is South Heath itself together with Potter Row, Cudsdens Court, Hyde End and Hyde Heath and encompasses about 4kms of HS2’s line of route from Mantle’s Wood (now in a tunnel) to Leather Lane (on the surface for the last 1.5kms). It is entirely within the Chilterns’ Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“the AONB”).

REPA represents well over 800 individuals, including the memberships of the twelve local organisations that are members of the association. Your Petitioner’s membership organisations are broadly grouped as follows:

a. South Heath: Ballinger Road Residents’ Association; Lappetts Lane Neighbourhood Watch Scheme; Marriots Avenue Group; Sibley’s Rise Residents’ Group; South Heath Action Group; Wood Lane Residents’ Association.

b. Potter Row: Potter Row Neighbourhood Watch Scheme

c. Hyde Heath/Hyde End: Hyde Heath Village Society; Hyde End Residents’ Group

d. Others: Barn Management UK (2) Ltd (Cudsdens Court); Grims Dyke (Liberty) Estates Ltd; and The Chesham Society

By reference to the Deposited Plans, Vol.2.1, your Petitioner’s members are concentrated in, or affected by, a 4km stretch starting at Map Sheet 2-22, and continuing to Map Sheet 2-27.

Your Petitioner’s membership is available by writing to the Chair at your Petitioner’s address.

Your Petitioner represents a community and a landscape that will be forever blighted by HS2. Swathes of the SHA will be affected, including an ancient woodland (Jenkins Wood), footpaths, hedgerows, wildlife, and a rich cultural and archaeological heritage; whilst one home with 5 outbuildings will be demolished hundreds more will be blighted as the railway emerges from a bored tunnel at South Heath and scythes its way northwards through this part of the AONB, shadowing the presently peaceful Potter Row community of 40 homes. There will be a vent shaft at South Heath, at least one taller pylon, portal buildings and other railway infrastructure that will permanently disfigure the landscape and is out of keeping with the AONB. The construction works alone will adversely affect the whole SHA for over 7 years, with all your petitioners members specially and directly affected.
Unfortunately the extension to the Chilterns tunnel in 2015/16 (to South Heath) came too late to save the only two community facilities that South Heath had (the pub and the gym). South Heath/Potter Row lies some distance (1.6km) from any appreciable transport corridor (A413). The railway will still shatter this tranquil rural environment.

REPA was established in early 2013 to bring together local groups and individuals with the aim of preserving, protecting and improving the environment and facilities of the AONB for local residents and visitors. This included securing effective mitigation from the impacts of HS2 to preserve the character and amenity of the area. Creating REPA enabled local residents to share resources and more effectively develop and raise issues of common concern with the Bill promoters and in Parliament. This included advancing REPA's fall-back tunnel solution of a 4.1km extension to the Chilterns' tunnel (from Mantles Wood to Leather Lane) that addresses many of the specific local issues caused by the Bill as presently formulated.

Your Petitioner responded in detail to both the Draft and final ES, the AP4 ES and the compensation consultations. HS2 Ltd has engaged with REPA in extensive correspondence and held meetings in October 2013, March 2014 and June 2015 to discuss the fall-back tunnel proposal. Your petitioner also petitioned the House of Commons High Speed Rail Select Committee (HoC SC). While the Promoter agreed to extend the bored tunnel by 2.6kms to the north side of South Heath, this still leaves 1.5km on the surface with the north side of South Heath and all of Potter Row exposed to excessive noise, property blight, a disfigured landscape and unjustifiable community impacts. The proposals for construction, including the haul road will isolate the SHA community from Great Missenden. Cheryl Gillan, the local MP, has also been closely involved.

Your Petitioner's members' rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioner will suffer a range of adverse effects (detailed below) which would be addressed through extending the Chilterns bored tunnel throughout the AONB. Failing that your Petitioner requests at minimum a one mile extension (from South Heath to Leather Lane) which would address most of your Petitioner’s concerns.

3.1 Noise

156 households represented by your petitioner will be subjected to injurious levels of operational noise from HS2 (as proposed with AP4). It is now clear from the proceedings of the HoC SC that:

- The Promoter is not applying World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines as they have set LOAEls and SOAEls for HS2 noise only (and not total noise), permitting greater levels of noise than WHO recommend. It is unjustifiable for a new railway in an affluent country to impose a new source of noise and adopt standards lower than those recommended internationally
- HS2 Ltd will expose many people to injurious levels of peak night-time noise on the basis that it is not ‘reasonably practicable’ to implement measures that reduce noise to harmless levels.
  - Noise above LOAEL will have adverse health effects on at least some people, and this is imposed on them without their consent or compensation or even contour maps to
assist their identification (the maps being confined to ‘average’ HS2 generated noise levels).

- Potter Row is especially affected – with every home at risk and a high proportion of vulnerable people (over 65 years old and suffering ill-health). The other concentration is at South Heath behind the portal eg Sibleys Rise, Frith Hill SHL, and Baileys Hatch.

- In adopting the same thresholds route-wide there is no special provision for the protection of relatively quiet places in rural areas eg such as Potter Row that the ES describes as ‘peaceful’.  
  - Far from providing extra protection to relatively quiet areas (as WHO and NPSE state as objectives), the Promoter’s approach to reducing noise where ‘reasonably practicable’ implies the opposite – the monetary value of reducing noise decreases with the level of noise, and the value is set per household (and there are fewer houses in relatively quiet places).

- In addition, post-AP4, Potter Row was no longer deemed by the Promoter to suffer homes with ‘adverse community noise impacts’ due to the scale of noise increase, partly because they had slipped below the route-wide noise thresholds.

- The Promoter has made the avoidance of exposing people to harmful levels of noise subject to a test of reasonable practicability (which was not the case for previous transport schemes):
  - Reasonable practicability values are based on one old study of property values in Birmingham, which is not robust. This study does not pass the best practice test of currency and it is highly questionable to apply results from a city to the quiet countryside, where people may value relative quiet more highly than in town.
  - The register of undertakings refers to the Information Paper and reasonable practicability – it does not guarantee that the ES noise estimates will not be exceeded. Your Petitioner is concerned that the ES noise estimates are not binding:
    - Estimates may be underestimates – HS2 Ltd have said they have taken the reasonable worst case, yet they have used ballasted track outside tunnels with the decision on whether noisier slab track will be used still outstanding. So more than 156 households may be exposed to injurious levels of noise with slab track, and the noise levels would be more injurious for the 156.
    - Currently assumed mitigations may be subsequently removed on the basis that they are not ‘reasonably practicable’

- The people living near the tunnel portal at South Heath (over 300 homes are within 1km), may be exposed to tunnel boom, which would both be a serious annoyance and have adverse health effects. The Promoter will not give a guarantee that there will be no tunnel boom and their lesser assurances – that boom will not occur – are not enforceable. It is unreasonable that the risk is all carried by the residents, and not HS2 Ltd.

- Even if noise is assessed on the basis of HS2 specification trains (that requires new technology and are assumed to be 3dB quieter than TSI compliant trains) there would still be over 100 homes with noise levels above the night-time peak LOAEL ie above the level injurious to health.

Your Petitioner’s members who have homes near to the vent at Annie Baileys (at the south end of South Heath) are concerned as to the noise when HS2 is operational.
The impact of noise and dust during construction (at the two compounds for the vent and portal, as well as the cuttings alongside Potter Row) affects many of your Petitioner’s members, for many years.

3.2 Transport

Construction works will last 8 years and with the A413 to be used as a major construction route for workers, materials, and spoil removal, your Petitioner considers the traffic impacts unacceptable.

Over 95% of your Petitioner’s members live on the east side of the A413 and depend on accessing it, or crossing it, using the two road junctions at Great Missenden. The Great Missenden Link Road roundabout is also the Promoter’s choice for where the new temporary haul road from the South Heath portal will join the A413, exacerbating the congestion. While HS2 Ltd have agreed to discuss an alternative siting of the haul road further north with Bucks County Council, it is not part of the Bill, and no change has yet been agreed. Your Petitioner requests that the road be relocated adjacent to Leather Lane, however some of the options being suggested by the Promoter may create even worse impacts for those living in South Heath.

The haul road joining the A413 at the Link Road roundabout has numerous disadvantages:

- It would result in severe congestion at peak times (now admitted by the Promoter), making access to Great Missenden Station, schools and workplaces problematic for years
- It would delay access to the SHA for emergency vehicles, endangering lives
- It would dislocate transport along the B485, in particular between Chesham and Great Missenden, making alternative routes on less suited roads to be congested, creating rat runs
- It would generate substantial delays for users of the A413, which is already heavily used, and threaten the livelihoods of your petitioners’ members who depend on it for business reasons
- It would put children using the tennis courts and skate park at Great Missenden at risk, and a recent risk assessment by the Great Missenden Parish Council would recommend its closure.

There has been no assessment of the cost of this congestion for either the local community or for the less local travellers. Such an assessment is required under DfT’s own methodology. Such costs would be saved, were an alternative means of accessing HS2 during construction adopted.

Even if the haul road were moved northwards, the Promoter has said that Frith Hill SHL may then be used for fit-out construction vehicles. This would have a severe adverse effect, in addition to creating a new safety issue for children using the school playing fields and outdoor learning centre at the Frith Hill roundabout.

Your petitioner also has concerns about the siting of the permanent access road for the South Heath portal (off Frith Hill SHL) – it is on a bend where the road narrows and poses a particular risk to children who walk and cycle to Great Missenden from South Heath and Ballinger. Were the access road to also be used for an extensive period during construction (eg for the fit-out traffic if the haul road is moved north) then the portal access road arrangements become wholly inappropriate.
3.3 Community

Your Petitioner represents a community that will be disrupted, torn apart and altered forever by HS2.

Potter Row is a close-knit community of nearly 80 people (most are retired, elderly and many have health issues) where there is dependence on a strong support network, as there are no facilities. As homes are sold to HS2 (eg under Need to Sell) this is changing and it threaten that network. Proximity to a massive construction site for at least 7 years with works along its entire length within 500m of peoples homes will prevent enjoyment of the peace, the clean air, views to the west and even the use of gardens. There is a fear the local Potter Row road will become a rat run.

It is hard to see how the Potter Row community can survive the changes being thrust upon it.

South Heath has a more varied demographic, is much larger, but also has no shops. The two community facilities (Annie Bailey’s pub and the gym) are both closed as a direct result of HS2. The remaining retail business (a nursery) worries about deliveries and lack of customers once construction starts. Property blight is an overwhelming concern for your petitioners members in South Heath due to its proximity to the tunnel portal – many feeling doubly caught, both unable to sell or qualify for compensation.

Your petitioner is concerned about the excessive length of the construction works and impact on the many small local businesses eg in Great Missenden, some who will be unable to weather a long downturn in footfall. No compensation is considered. It will also be likely to deter cyclists, walkers and tourists who visit the attractions.

3.4 Historic landscape and archaeology

The whole of Potter Row, some 1.8km in length, lies in an Archaeological Notification Area, directly adjacent to an historic landscape. The Promoter’s current plan not only cuts directly across this landscape (of ancient coaxial fields, medieval ridge and furrow and pre-18 century enclosures) but damages the archaeology and archaeological setting of important features eg Jenkins Wood and its medieval earthworks; individual heritage assets at Bury Farm and its moat, as well as the irreplaceable loss of part of Grims Ditch (a little further north).

Your Petitioner is concerned that not only are their significance inadequately assessed in the ES currently (including in the most recent AP4 ES), but with the recent widening of the cutting and the siting of the South Heath tunnel portal at Bury Farm (which is now owned by the Promoter) inadequate consideration is being given to protecting your Petitioner’s members’ heritage, in the Chilterns AONB.

These assets would be preserved were the Chilterns Tunnel extended north. Failing that the adverse impact could be reduced (but not avoided) were retained cuttings to be used.
3.5 Blight

Despite the AP4 changes, over 300 homes represented by your Petitioner (REPA) still lie within 1km of the South Heath portal or the open line – much of South Heath and all of Potter Row. Many more homes are blighted by the lengthy construction works. Typically this can wipe 15% to 40% off the value of a property, especially if it is within sight or sound of HS2, as many properties still are.

Your Petitioner has estimated the net present cost of the depression in property values (during construction and permanently) using assumptions taken from Price Waterhouse Coopers study for DfT. This shows a substantial cost that would be avoided if the Chilterns Tunnel were extended.

Property blight is already impacting on the health and wellbeing of your Petitioner’s members, many of whom feel trapped unable to move as and when they wish to. They cannot afford to suffer the losses even if a buyer can be found in this damaged housing market. As construction draws nearer, the worry and anxiety - which began over 6 years ago - worsens.

Your Petitioner is concerned about the visual blight of the exposed section of the railway, the taller pylon(s), the design of the infrastructure and the unsightly railway furniture, which will all be inflicted on an exceptionally attractive landscape – an area of the AONB that attracts many visitors.

3.6 Compensation

Most of your Petitioner’s members’ properties which are blighted by HS2 are not on land required for constructing HS2, nor are they now within the 120m rural support zone. So the only form of compensation for which they are currently eligible is the discretionary compensation scheme, ‘Need to Sell’ (NtS). The NtS scheme (like its predecessor the EHS) has had a bad track record, causing the HoC SC to make several recommendations as well as call for a “more considerate and generous approach”. To date the Promoter has addressed these concerns by adapting its application of the scheme, rather than by formally changing the rules.

A problem is that the NtS rules allow for virtually unfettered discretion with no independent appeals process or auditing of conduct. This is a recipe for arbitrary actions and even maladministration. HS2 Ltd and DfT have already attracted considerable official criticism for their behaviour, including for their treatment of your Petitioner’s members. A major concern is that without clearly expressed and comprehensive rules the Promoter may simply revert to unacceptable behaviour when active parliamentary scrutiny has ended.

Your petitioner is concerned about the fairness of the NtS rules, particularly:

- **Lack of independent appeals process.** The Resident’s Commissioner (employed by HS2 Ltd) is neither organisationally nor personally independent. When parliamentary scrutiny ends in the Lords, the vehicle for airing issues publically will also end.

- **The location rule** (which requires a properties location to be substantially affected by HS2) is unreasonable as an additional rule. It substitutes the panel’s perception of what merits being blighted for the real market’s determination of blight. It is the market’s determination that is the problem from which applicants to NtS are seeking relief. This is a serious issue for South Heath, discussed below.
The ‘compelling reason to sell’ is what the panel and the SoS determine: there is neither a body of case law that can be cited nor is there a clear specification. The examples given imply that it is difficult for the elderly wanting to qualify under ‘age and stage’ unless it is also due to financial hardship. The discretion available to the Promoter may currently be exercised to assist the elderly, but there is nothing written in the rules to which they can appeal, if the Promoter changes their discretion and rejections return to pre-2015 levels.

Complexity and evidence. Successful applicants have often received help in putting their case together. The NTS should however be accessible to all. HS2 Ltd's examination of evidence is often too invasive and onerous, particularly where financial grounds are involved. The NTS has received a reputation for being a stressful process that some people simply cannot face, especially the most vulnerable.

Valuation system (especially for unusual or high value homes) is not robust, due to use of out of area valuers, inconsistencies between RICs valuers on the use and treatment of ‘comparables’ that go unchecked by HS2 Ltd, and the lack of an independent appeal process for complaints.

The HoC SC raised¹ their concern about retrospective compensation for those who had ‘sold and lost’ and reported that the Government agreed that “some exceptional cases might exist... and would be considered on their merits”. But would-be applicants remain unaware as no details have been issued by HS2 Ltd or DfT. Generally they will have moved out of the area, and so not be exposed to HS2 Activists and the information they provide. We are aware of potentially eligible people.

Given the demographics of Potter Row in particular a large number of your petitioners homes may end up being bought by HS2 Ltd under the NTS scheme. Not only does this expose many people to the uncertainties and stress of NTS, but the claimed benefit of maintaining communities is not being delivered. Extending the tunnel would protect the most vulnerable sizeable rural community in the area.

Some parts of South Heath may have only a limited effect from HS2 once the railway is operational. But South Heath as a whole will suffer serious detriment from construction. However, HS2 Ltd are rejecting NTS cases within South Heath on the basis they are insufficiently affected by construction to qualify. They are not accepting that actual blight is the test of this, but using the location rule to impose their judgement of what the market ought to take to be blighted, rather than what is. Your Petitioner feels that such behaviour unfairly denies compensation to those suffering blight from HS2.

3.7 Costs of alternative proposals

Your Petitioner is concerned that the Promoter has not presented the costs of his own preferred scheme and those of alternatives that your Petitioner has commended, on a fair and evidenced basis. This is despite the Promoter accepting that the tunnel alternatives are feasible and environmentally preferable. Detailed questioning by REPA has led to significant errors being exposed (and eventually admitted by the Promoter), justifying your petitioners lack of confidence in their costings. In particular:

¹ “Retrospective compensation” is raised by the High Speed Rail Bill Select Committee, 1st Report (March 2015), para 132; the Government’s commitment is in 2nd Report (Feb 2016), para 271-272.
The spoil balances used by HS2 Ltd for costing purposes are inconsistent with the volumes that they have published.

The unit costs for excavation used by HS2 Ltd for costing extensions to the Chilterns Tunnel are too low for the material and depths at issue.

The unit costs for a bored tunnel extension are grossly inconsistent (too high) compared to benchmark tunnels given in a study cited by HS2 Ltd themselves.

The additional costs included for extending the duration of works are inappropriate.

The rates of tunnelling progress are substantially below those achieved in comparable tunnels, and costs reduce with higher rates of progress.

The analyses provided by HS2 Ltd are insufficiently detailed to permit independent validation, as the assumptions on which they are based are not given.

It is clear that an independent assessment of the relative costs of extending the Chilterns bored tunnel is needed, and your petitioner requests that this is conducted.

3.8 Value of the AONB

South Heath and Potter Row (where the line is on the surface) are in the Chilterns AONB. The footpaths to Potter Row from Great Missenden provide rural access to the Chiltern Ridges and the network of lanes, bridleways and footpaths there. The current proposals would spoil the footpath access, and destroy the tranquillity of the Potter Row area. A growing population and the fact that the Chilterns AONB is the nearest AONB to London mean that the amenity value of the AONB is of large and increasing value.

The Promoter has failed to assess the value society placed on the amenity lost with his proposal, and this value may be significant compared to the costs of more tunnelling that would preserve it. The only assessment of landscape value the Promoter has conducted used an inappropriate methodology based on out-of-date information. Your petitioner requests that an evaluation is done in accordance with the Treasury Green Book and its result be set against any additional cost of extended tunnelling.

3.9 Safety

Your Petitioner is concerned that there are a number of apparently unresolved technical problems with HS2 that mean that there is likely to be some combination of:

- Excessive risk from derailment or train collision, relating to the instability of the track bed, and embankments and the operation of trains without sufficient headway to prevent collisions in the event of a train stopping rapidly
- Additional cost from the installation of slab track outside tunnels with noise prevention features, and track bed and embankment stabilisation
- Lower operational speeds, with a resultant reduction in journey time savings, but with the option for less environmentally damaging routing (as a greater curvature is practicable)
- Additional adverse environmental impacts from the generation of additional noise

With HS2 due to start being constructed within a year, it is likely that additional costs will be incurred to overcome the issues. Your petitioner is concerned that the alternative methods of construction that avoid the need for these additional costs, eg tunnelling, should be assessed against the full cost of HS2 Ltd’s currently preferred method of construction.
There is also a risk of sabotage, as a derailment of a very high speed train would cause catastrophic damage. The risk will be primarily where HS2 operates in the open. Your Petitioner is concerned that HS2 Ltd are not regarding this risk as something that needs to be minimised by design, which would identify additional cost now, if they did so.

Liberty Lane (alongside Potter Row) may be a particularly vulnerable location as the line will be at its maximum speed (400km/hr), the track has the maximum curvature, and the line will be out in the open and so be exposed to outside interference e.g. sabotage and vehicle accidents.

3.10 Independent oversight

There is a clear need for an independent authority to oversee the implementation of HS2.

Under the existing proposals the Minimum Environmental Standards are enforceable, but only via a complaint to Parliament. This is an unrealistic route for your Petitioner’s members, as it is beyond the reach of ordinary citizens, and Parliament is not suited to address the large number of infractions which HS2 Ltd may commit. Collecting the data needed to demonstrate either compliance or non-compliance is a major undertaking, and it is one that should not be left to HS2 Ltd.

HS2 Ltd have a 6-year track record that falls well short of what is expected of a public body regarding both their communications and engagement with those directly affected by the scheme. This was the finding of a recent PACAC report (2016). HS2 Ltd have treated members of the public poorly and in some cases exceptionally badly. Information released has too often been inadequate, unclear, misleading, or simply absent; and sometimes incorrect.

Your Petitioner therefore has no confidence that HS2 Ltd have sufficient integrity to be relied upon to act appropriately. An independent regulatory body is necessary both to ensure that the requirements of the Bill are met and that the Promoter is seen to do so.

3.11 Remedies

Your Petitioner asks that the adverse effects suffered by its members be relieved by the bored tunnel being extended to the full extent of the AONB. The engineering cost should be independently assessed. We believe that if the value of preventing damage to the AONB is taken into account together with construction impacts, that such tunnelling would represent a better solution for the country than the Promoter’s current plans.

If the HoL does not wish to recommend an extended tunnel throughout the AONB, your Petitioner requests that the bored tunnel be at least extended another mile (1.5km) to Leather Lane. This would protect South Heath and Potter Row from the worst effects of HS2. It would also protect the access from Great Missenden to the Chiltern Ridges. We contend that there would no additional cost were the extension built, while there would be material environmental benefits and significant community gains.

Failing any extension of the tunnel, your Petitioner requests a range of mitigations to alleviate some of the adverse effects of HS2 and its construction, including moving the haul road to Leather Lane, re-thinking the permanent portal access road if used extensively during construction, using retained
cuttings, a longer portal, buried power lines, better masking of railway infrastructure (vents, buildings, masts, security fences, placement of barriers), reducing the train speed especially at night, and more effective and extensive use of noise barriers eg at the portal and to the west as well as the east.

Your Petitioner believes that the Promoter should be obliged to change his policy on noise so that:

- The LOAELs adopted for HS2 should correspond to the WHO recommendations
- Lower noise targets should be specified for relatively quiet areas
- Harmful levels of noise should be avoided
- Not reducing noise levels because it is too expensive to be reasonably practicable should not be admissible, and its application should in any event be subject to independent oversight
- There is a cashable assurance for residents on tunnel boom

Your Petitioner believes that the discretionary compensation arrangements be amended so that:

- There are clear and comprehensive rules concerning eligibility, with support arrangements for claimants to improve its accessibility, especially for the more vulnerable
- The rule concerning location should be dropped
- Persons prepared to suffer the costs of moving should automatically be eligible if they can demonstrate that HS2 is blighting their property: NtS should become a ‘right to sell’
- There is an independent appeals process, and that it includes the valuation stage
- South Heath is treated as blighted under NtS where this is the case
- Retrospective compensation arrangements for those who have ‘Sold and Lost’ should be clarified and publicised

Your petitioner believes that the various safety and environmental issues to which HS2 gives rise would be partly alleviated by reducing the maximum speed.

Your Petitioner believes that the achievement of the Minimum Environmental Requirements and implementation of the Construction Code should be enforced by an independent regulatory body.

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.

Signatory

Mrs Beverley Eades Manton
Chair of REPA (and Roll B agent)
Date: 13 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF the Potter Row Neighbourhood Watch Scheme  

Declares that:  

1. The Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by those parts of the Bill that concern the design, construction and operation of HS2 in the Potter Row area. In particular these are addressed by Clauses 1 and Schedules 1 of the Bill and associated powers in the Bill (including the power of compulsory purchase); Schedule 1 Work No. 2/14 (Railway) and 2/18C (Access Road) as detailed on Deposited Plans, AP4 PLN 2.1.1, Replacement Sheets No. 2-24 to 26.  

2. Your Petitioner, Your Petitioner, the Potter Row Neighbourhood Watch Scheme (PRNWS), is an association of local residents who live on Potter Row which lies at the North-West end of South Heath in the Chilterns' Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“the AONB”). South Heath is a community of about 350 properties and lies about 1.6kms east of the A413 (the main road from Amersham to Wendover) and 2km east of Great Missenden (that requires crossing over A413 to reach).  

PRNWS is a longstanding local organisation, founded over 20 years ago, that broadened its scope to include environmental matters, as well as crime. PRNWS has 60 members (residents and business owners) drawn from the Potter Row community of nearly 40 homes and farmsteads, who share resources and co-ordinate activities in response to local plans for HS2. A membership list is available from the Chair, at the Petitioner's address.  

PRNWS is also a founder member of the Residents' Environmental Protection Association (REPA), which was established in 2013. REPA is an association of individuals and groups mainly in the South Heath area (including Potter Row) that has championed the local community in trying to secure more effective mitigation from HS2 Ltd.  

Potter Row is a narrow, quiet and ancient lane, about 1.8km long that runs north-west from South Heath to Leather Lane. For its entire length it is parallel to the HS2 line, between 250m to 350m away. Half the properties are on the west side of Potter Row and so lie between the lane and the open cutting in which HS2 will run at 360km/hr every 2 minutes.  

The PRNWS represents a landscape and a community that is forever blighted by HS2. Your Petitioner’s members, many of whom are elderly (their average age is about 65), retired and in poor health, are in close proximity to the line, and specially and directly affected by HS2:  

a. One home (and five outbuildings) will be subject to compulsory purchase (Mulberry Park Hill), several others will lose land.  

b. Nearly three-quarters of properties in Potter Row are within 300 metres of HS2, the remainder within 500m.
c. Currently Potter Row is "peaceful" with low noise levels. Many properties will suffer a material increase in noise with HS2; and they may experience tunnel boom.

d. Construction noise is also an issue, especially given Potter Row's close proximity to the main portal construction compound and the extensive period it will be in operation.

e. A temporary access road (omitted from the map-book) will run parallel to Potter Row for its entire length on the east side of the trace and to the rear of the Potter Row properties on the west side of Potter Row.

f. Access to Great Missenden and surrounding areas via A413 will be problematic. The queues appear to equate to over 3km of traffic in the morning peak. The cause of the problem is the haul road that sends 50% of the spoil from the portal works and South Heath cutting down to the Great Missenden roundabout joining the A413 at that point, and which will be used to supply the works in this area. While it has been agreed that HS2 Ltd together with BCC will re-examine the siting of the road down to the A413, no change has yet been agreed, and the Bill is not planned to be altered.

h. The landscape, setting and visual impacts will be altered irreparably for the length of Potter Row; with a large portal area, a wider cutting; a taller electricity pylon; the permanent access road highly visible; an intrusive large horseshoe bund south of the portal, and a noise barrier at the top of the cutting on the Potter Row side.

i. There will be an adverse impact on Jenkins Wood (which is an ancient woodland), as construction is adjacent to it so that the new temporary road boarders it.

j. The archaeological and historical setting of Potter Row is compromised by the wide cutting, the bunds, and the noise barrier, as well as from land take for the temporary haul road to the A413 which goes through the coaxial fields.

k. Amenity will be lost, as footpaths are changed, including the one through Potter Row's "own" ancient woodland (Jenkins Wood). Walkers of these footpaths will be exposed to excessive noise. The footpath through Jenkins Wood will be closed during construction, and when it is reinstated it will take a new longer path round the portal, completely destroying its tranquil rural character.

l. The construction site area is now more than half a kilometre long. During the seven year construction period there will be obtrusive light pollution and security. This will be followed by permanent light pollution and injurious levels of noise.

m. Property blight is a serious problem, and people worry how they will survive the years of construction works or cope with what follows - some are too old or too ill to move or go through what is seen as the trauma of the 'Need to Sell' (NtS) scheme.

n. Potter Row is a close knit community that relies on its own support network, and an increasing number apply and qualify under NtS community cohesion is threatened, leaving a fragile community made even more vulnerable.

Your Petitioner 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

Your Petitioner will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner requests that a fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended...
throughout the AONB. Failing that, your Petitioner requests that the Chiltern bored Tunnel is extended at minimum to Leather Lane, another 1.5km, as proposed by REPA, and away from the community of South Heath and Potter Row. Not only do HS2 Ltd agree that this is an engineeringly feasible solution but it need not delay project completion. REPA contend that it is also a cost neutral solution.

If the Chiltern bored tunnel is not further extended then your Petitioner requests a range of further mitigations, set out below. These include binding undertakings from the Promoter.

3.1 Construction site, cutting and portal size.

Your Petitioner is concerned at the land take of the two construction compounds, the wide cutting, the large portal, which all lie immediately adjacent to the west side of Potter Row near its southerly end, creating a wide scar on the landscape:

- The main site is three times larger than originally proposed - being over half a km long (and over twice the size of the previously proposed north portal at Mantles Wood).
- Area adjacent to Jenkins Wood ancient woodland has an inadequate buffer zone.
- Construction is not just over a large area, but for some 7 to 8 years. There will be light pollution and security fencing, equipment and activity in the compound area.
- The construction access and haul road from the portal to the A413 (unless it is moved) requires new land take and traverses currently picturesque rural countryside and two footpaths, that now become severely affected during construction years, and are permanently damaged by loss of setting and noise thereafter.

**Mitigation:** Extending the bored tunnel to well beyond Jenkins Wood and the community of Potter Row, at minimum to Leather Lane. Failing that, moving the access road - see below; and using retained cuttings to reduce the construction area and land take.

3.2 Impact of permanent infrastructure on the surrounding environment.

Other permanent infrastructure features are also highly visually obtrusive:

- There is a noise barrier that runs the length of Potter Row cutting on top of the bunds/embankment on the Potter Row side. This would be less obtrusive were it at the base of the cutting next to the rails. No regard has been taken to the fact this is particularly attractive part of the AONB.
- One new pylon will replace two existing ones but will in a different location, and will be 11m taller. The change involves an extra change of direction which requires a more robust (and obtrusive) pylon. The Bill also permits two taller pylons if required.
- The horseshoe shaped bund south of the portal will have a 3m barrier on top, and is a highly obtrusive structure that is wholly out of place in the AONB.
- Other features out of character with the AONB eg balancing ponds, portal buildings, as well as the gantries and overhead lines.

**Mitigation:** Extending the bored tunnel throughout the AONB or at minimum to Leather Lane. Failing that, putting the noise barriers at the base of the rails; rethinking the pylon changes to eliminate the additional change of direction and the taller pylon(s); providing
better noise mitigation solution for those south of the portal; rethink the access road – see
below; and use retained cuttings to reduce the construction area and land take.

3.3 Operational noise will exceed the WHO peak noise target levels.

Your Petitioner is greatly concerned about the operational noise, and despite the alignment
being 7m lower with 3m barriers proposed the anticipated substantial improvement expected
by the Chairman of the Hoc Select Committee has not been achieved. Even the ES
acknowledges Potter Row is currently a ‘quiet’ and ‘peaceful’ area but inadequate measures
have been proposed to preserve this. The levels of noise expected are unreasonable given:

- It is recognized by noise experts that sleep is disturbed by peak noise and the
  predicted peak noise levels for Potter Row (almost 40 homes) are in excess of the
  World Health Organisation (WHO) Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) (ie
  60dBmax at facade) – which is the same level as that adopted by HS2 Ltd. LOAEL is
defined as the level above which some people will suffer adverse health effects.
- Despite the E20 information paper referring to the 60dB max level, and an admission
  that peak noise matters at night, Hs2 Ltd have produced no peak noise contours.
- The increase in peak noise is 3 to 4 times louder than baseline for most Potter Row
  properties.
- The Promoter improperly relies on it not being ‘reasonably practicable’ to implement
  more effective measures to reduce noise. This assessment is based on defective
  evidence on the value of noise reduction. Even moving and increasing the height of
  the noise barriers could reduce noise.
- Tunnel boom may occur from the bored tunnel portal. HS2 Ltd have stated that it will
  not occur but will not give an undertaking that should it occur it will be eliminated.

Mitigation: The above concerns can be remedied by extending the bored tunnel, at minimum
to Leather Lane, which is not only further from the local community, but does not bring it
close to any other community.

Failing that, the peak LOAEL noise level at night should be a mandatory maximum and not a
design target subject to the costs of its achievement being sufficiently low according to the
Promoter’s own test. In addition:

- Forecast levels of noise exposure should be binding maxima, with a requirement to
  implement whatever measures are needed to stay within them. Measures to contain
  noise (not confined to the Promoter’s notion of reasonably practicable ones) should
  include retained sides to the portal cutting and beyond; a deeper cutting; reducing
  train speed at night; longer porous portal; higher more absorbent noise barriers next
to the rails.
- Lower noise thresholds (eg LOAELs) should apply to quieter areas, such as Potter Row
- A binding undertaking should be given by the Promoter that, if tunnel boom is
  audible, measures will be taken that are sufficient to make it inaudible.

3.4 Traffic, impact on PRNWS access for seven years

Your Petitioner is most concerned about whether residents will be able to continue their daily
lives during the construction period, particularly given the age and the poor health of many:
• Congestion of the A413 caused by the haul road (if it is not moved) joining it at the Great Missenden Link Road roundabout, as this will be a 'major' adverse effect during the lengthy construction period. The associated traffic queues totalling over 3km in the peak will isolate Potter Row. Your Petitioner's members depend on these roads for accessing shops, doctors, dentists, community facilities; collecting grandchildren from school and taking to after-school activities, the tube and rail station.

• Driving amongst HGV lorries hauling spoil is not for the fainthearted and concerns many elderly PRNWS residents. They fear either they must risk their safety, they must stop driving, or they must stop pursuing certain activities, eg taking grandchildren to the swings in the park after school.

• There is a risk that Frith Hill SHL will be used by both local and construction traffic searching for a cut through. Similarly the new permanent access route (off Frith Hill SHL) to the portal may become an unofficial construction route.

• The Promoter has made no assessment of the costs of this congestion to the community, other local communities and longer distance travellers using the A413, which is properly a consideration if more expensive approaches would solve it.

The emergency services cannot avoid the A413 to access Potter Row. This is a great worry to the elderly residents. There appears no plan as to how an adequate service will be maintained that involves no increased delays.

It is hoped that moving the haul road north to Leather lane can be agreed by HS2 Ltd.

**Mitigation:** The above concerns can be remedied by extending the bored tunnel to reduce the amount of spoil that requires transporting. Failing that spoil from the main cuttings should be taken along the trace, as was the original intention for the AONB. Using retained cuttings to reduce the spoil from the South Heath cutting should also be considered.

Failing that necessary works and their costs should be identified now and made the subject of further consultation and petitioning. There should be slip lanes/roads at the Link Road and Frith Hill roundabouts to facilitate traffic flow. This should be a developed with Bucks County Council, with all costs borne by HS2 Ltd for monitoring and enforcement.

There should be cameras on roads vulnerable to becoming rat runs, paid for by HS2 Ltd – all construction traffic should be tagged so movements can be monitored.

3.5 Construction noise and pollution

Your Petitioner is very concerned about construction noise, dust and other air borne pollution on the residents of PRNWS.

Construction noise is predicted to be loudest from the creation of the South Heath cutting, which lies within 300m or so from most properties.

The peak period of works lasts for years, not months or days. It is unacceptable to tread the works as 'temporary' for the purpose of specifying noise requirements. Details are sparse but we are told the new temporary construction road will be at peak activity for 29 months and the works last 5 years before a brief pause and then fit out works last a further 2 years.

**Mitigation:** The above concerns can be addressed by:
• A bored tunnel extension throughout the AONB; or at minimum to Leather Lane
• Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) monitored and enforced by the Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd
• Dedicated and manned phone line where residents can register complaints.
• More information as to the length that the various activities will take

3.6 Permanent portal access road to Frith Hill (SHL). Work No 2/18C.

Your Petitioner notes the permanent access road from the portal onto Frith Hill SHL is at a bend on a narrow part of the road. There is concern that it may be used officially or unofficially by contractors to access the Chiltern north portal during the construction period – especially if the traffic problems are severe at the Great Missenden roundabouts. Frith Hill SHL will already be a potential rat run for traffic and this may increase the impacts.

If the haul road is moved there is concern that the fit-out traffic may use Frith Hill SHL and the access road to reach the portal.

No information is given as to when it is built; how much it will be used when HS2 is operating; whether it will be lit; built from north end, and how it is combined with being a footpath (at the portal end). It will be years before any screening is evident from the west or south side

Mitigation: The above concerns can be remedied by:

• A bored tunnel extension throughout the AONB; or at minimum to Leather Lane.
Failing that, ensuring the permanent access road is built from the portal end and not by using Frith Hill SHL. It should not be lit. It should be screened using mature trees.
• Preventing the use of the permanent access road during construction by contractors

3.7 Continued house price blight.

Your Petitioner is concerned about house price blight; and the inability of residents to sell in the currently dysfunctional market. Since the announcement of the tunnel extension in July 2015 Potter Row remains blighted, as confirmed by estate agents. The CBRE study for HS2 Ltd on blight (2010) noted that blight was worst in the proximity of the portals of bored tunnels. Potter Row is located by a bored tunnel portal, as well as a wide cutting.

Residents feel trapped, having already suffered years of stress, they are faced with an inadequate ‘Need to Sell scheme’ (NTS), with the worry of at least 10 more years of blight until HS2 is even operational. Given the age and ill-health of many of your Petitioners members, this is a source of increasing worry for an exceptionally vulnerable community.

Mitigation: The above concerns can be remedied by

• Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least as far as Leather Lane.
• A Property Compensation scheme that provides full current un-blighted house value to all residents when they wish to sell and cannot due to HS2: A Right to Sell Scheme.
• The Compensation scheme should be open and transparent, with clearer rules, and an appeal mechanism administered by a body independent of HS2 Ltd or the Promoter. The NTS scheme to be made less complex; faster; more accessible; less
onerous to prove qualification. There should be more stringent rules to ensure correct un-blighted valuation, e.g. only using valuers with local knowledge.

- Introduce a Property Bond scheme (as proposed by HS2AA) to not only provide compensation, but help reduce the level of blight in the blighted area, and reduce stress for those who worry about the value of their largest asset. It might also have a less damaging impact on community cohesion than NtS.

3.8 Impact to the archaeological and historical setting.

The current plans for HS2 have impact on the archaeological setting of Potter Row. These impacts have also not been adequately assessed in the SES3 (which assessed HS2’s impacts in this area in its current form) e.g. the setting of Jenkins Wood earthworks (and the ancient woodland) are compromised; the coaxial fields are impacted to a material extent; and the impact of the noise barriers is not considered in this context, neither is the new horseshoe shaped bund by the portal.

**Mitigation:** The above concerns can be remedied by

- Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least as far as Leather Lane. Failing that a retained cutting to reduce the land-take; and moving the construction access road so it does not affect the coaxial fields
- The ES should be amended to review the full impact of AP4 on the archaeological setting of Potter Row, including those aspects that were not covered in the original ES, and measures developed to mitigate these effects.

3.9 Health & wellbeing

Many residents have suffered stress since the announcement of HS2 in 2010 and the tunnel extension has not alleviated the stress for those living on Potter Row, as the fundamental problems remain. It is hard to find any homeowners who do not worry about the value of their house. Everyone worries about their future way of life and access issues especially for emergency services. HS2 Ltd’s admission of the traffic problems confirm people’s fears.

Residents currently live in an attractive area which will have its quality degraded by construction equipment, waste light, out of character railway furniture e.g. gantries; overhead lines, before operations even begin. Furthermore, sleep disturbance may erode their health and quality of life; and excessive noise (both in construction and operation) will rob them of the enjoyment of their garden and walks; dust may trigger respiratory disorders. Your petitioner is anxious about the loss of quality of their environment.

**Mitigation:** The above concerns can be remedied by

- A tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB, or at minimum to Leather lane
- Independent monitoring of environmental performance and powers to halt construction until preventative measures are implemented and verified
- Dedicated and manned phone line where residents can register complaints.
3.10 Impact on the landscape of the AONB.

Your Petitioner’s members enjoy the surrounding landscape and are concerned at the new detriment caused by installing a considerably taller pylon; the impact of the horseshoe shaped bund with 3m barrier on top of it; the 3m barriers on top of the bund (rather than next to the line) to Leather Lane; the introduction of new buildings (eg portal building); the catenary and security fences; new permanent access road; the design of the longer more intrusive porous portal; the changes to the footpaths from Great Missenden to Potter Row - none of which are sympathetic to the surrounding AONB landscape.

The South Heath cutting is now wider and the bridges higher, and hence wholly out of place.

The footpaths from Great Missenden to Potter Row will not be protected from noise, and will cease to be enjoyable to walk them.

Mitigation: The above concerns can be remedied by

- An extension of the bored tunnel so it extends the full width of the Chilterns AONB
- Bury power lines; alternatively retain their original alignment (with an initial temporary move) which avoids an additional change of direction and the need for the replacement pylon being taller; the new pylons should be of a less obtrusive design
- Making new buildings blend into the landscape
- Have more landscaping to hide the horseshoe shaped bund; the buildings; eg mature trees planted early. Security fences should not be at top of bunds.
- Noise barriers should be on west side of South Heath cutting (from South Heath to Leather Lane) as well as on the east side to protect the amenity of the footpaths.

3.11 Remedy

It is hard to see how the Potter Row community can survive the changes being thrust upon it.

Your Petitioner supports the petitions for a longer bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB. Failing that, your Petitioner supports the Residents’ Environmental Protection Association (REPA) petition for a 1.5km extension to Leather Lane, which would remove most of our concerns. Failing that your Petitioner requests the mitigations set out above.

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.

Signature:

Sarah Raffety (chair of PRNWS (and roll B agent)

Date: 14 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Anne Kenyon  

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner lives at Hedgesparrow Cottage, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LT, and the Bill will specially and directly affect her, 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 (the “Area”).  

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, High Wycombe and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and for use of the Chiltern railway, 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 the Department for Transport 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 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
collection and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as
evisaged 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.

............... 

Anne Kenyon

Date: 12 April 2016
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Johanna Free

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner lives at Kings Ransom, Kings Ash, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9NP, and the Bill will specially and directly affect her, 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 (the "Area").

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, High Wycombe and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and for use of the Chiltern railway, 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 the Department for Transport 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 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 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.

............

Johanna Free

Date: 12 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mrs Evelyn Mary Dovey

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner lives at Lee Croft, The Lee, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LZ, and the Bill will specially and directly affect her, 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 (the “Area”).

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.
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.

Evelyn Mary Dovey

Date: 12 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mrs Rosamond Anne Morris

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner lives at Potterfields, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LU, and the Bill will specially and directly affect her, 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 (the "Area").

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, High Wycombe and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and for use of the Chiltern railway, 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 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 the Department for Transport 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 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 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.

Rosamond Anne Morris

Date: 12 April 2016.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Mr John Simon Thrale Morris

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner lives at Potterfields, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LU, and the Bill will specially and directly affect him, 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 (the “Area”).

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, High Wycombe and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and for use of the Chiltern railway, 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 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 the Department for Transport and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and with 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 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 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.

----------------------------------------

John Simon Thrale Morris

Date 17 April 2016.
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF the Harrow Angling Society

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioner is the Harrow Angling Society (established 1937) of Orchard Bungalow, Bucks Hill, Kings Langley, WD4 9AP that has a membership of c. 250. Your petitioner lease two waters for the purpose of fishing from the London Borough of Hillingdon, namely Harefield Lake No 1 located off Moorhall Road, Harefield, Middlesex and Harefield Lake No2 located off Dews Lane, Harefield, Middlesex. Your petitioner has held the fishing rights to these waters since 1937.

The petitioner’s concerns

3. The planned HS2 viaduct across the Colne Valley will pass directly through the petitioner’s Harefield No2 lake and pass very close to its other lake Harefield No1. Your petitioner is concerned that the proposed construction methods used to build the HS2 viaduct and the subsequent operation of High Speed trains running through the Colne Valley will have a detrimental impact on the petitioner’s future by devaluing the angling environment of its two lakes, restricting angling access and impacting on fish welfare.

4. The petitioner objects to the Bill because a 13 meter high viaduct will pass through its Harefield No2 Lake as it crosses the Colne Valley. The construction of the viaduct will require the placement of approximately ten piers within Harefield No2 lake spaced at ~40m intervals.

5. The petitioner is concerned that it will suffer limited access to both Harefield No1 and No 2 Lakes during the construction of the Colne Valley Viaduct which is scheduled to take between 4-5 years. A lack of access to either Lake would impact on the petitioner’s ability to maintain membership numbers, which in turn could result in the petitioner becoming financially non viable. The petitioner is also worried that Harefield No2 Lake is also unlikely to be able to maintain its current angling environment during the construction of the Colne Valley Viaduct due to the impact of construction noise and vibration around the lake.

6. The petitioner is also concerned that a lack of access to either Harefield No1 or No2 lake would hinder the petitioners Bailiffs from discharging their duties, which could result in an increased risk of poaching on the lakes.

7. The petitioner is especially concerned that Harefield Lake No1 and No2 lakes will be subjected to an increased risk of water contamination (note the two lakes are linked) during the construction of the viaduct should the Promoters accidently discharge
contaminated materials or fluids onto nearby land or into the lake itself. Any such contamination could have a detrimental impact on the local wildlife including the petitioner’s fish stock held in Harefield No1 and No2 Lakes.

8. The petitioner strongly objects to the Environmental Statement proposal (7.4.41) to create wetland habitat areas in Harefield No. 2 (approximately 1ha on the northern shore and 2ha on the southern shore) because the wetland areas (as planned) would fundamentally change the recreational use of Harefield No2 lake by severely restricting angling access to the water’s edge.

9. The petitioner has concerns in relation to the noise mitigation proposal for the Colne Valley Viaduct put forward by the Promoters in the Environmental Statement. The Promoters estimate the existing baseline sound level at Harefield No2 Lake to be c. 51.4db. When the HS2 lines becomes operational the Promoters estimate the noise level (with noise mitigation measures in place) to be between 55db and 65db. The forecast increase in noise levels is likely to have an adverse effect on the acoustic character of the Colne Valley area and thus impact on recreational activities, such as angling, on both Harefield No1 and No2 lakes.

The petitioner’s requests

10. The petitioner is requesting your right Honourable House to require the Promoters to provide an assurance that states that during construction of the Colne Valley Viaduct the petitioner will be permitted to maintain full access to Harefield No1 Lake and its two car parks and restricted access (prior written notification to be given) to Harefield No2.

11. The petitioner respectfully requests that the Promoters be required to put in place an independent agency to regularly monitor the water quality of Harefield No1 & No 2 lakes. The independent agency would also be responsible for looking for early signs of fish distress to ensure that any issues of accidental pollution of their waters by the nominated undertaker are identified as early as possible. A “bench mark” of water quality should be established prior to the commencement of construction activities. The independent agency should then take regular water samples from around each lake whilst construction activities are taking place and report results to all interested parties.

12. The petitioner is requesting your Honourable House to require the Promoters to provide an assurance that if they are found to be responsible for contaminating either Harefield No1 or No2 lakes during the construction of the Colne Valley Viaduct they will fully compensate the petitioner for any loss or damage arising from the said contamination.

13. The petitioner respectfully requests that the proposal to create wetland habitat areas on Harefield No. 2 (approximately 1ha on the northern shore and 2ha on the southern shore) as outlined in the Environmental Statement be withdrawn by the Promoters, unless the Promoters can provide assurance that the formation of the wetland areas will not have an adverse impact on angling access around the lake.

14. The petitioner requests your Honourable House to instruct the Promoters to review the noise mitigation measures currently proposed for the Colne Valley to see if they can be
further enhanced, so as to ensure the acoustic impact of HS2 trains operating through the Colne Valley can be further reduced. In particular the petitioner would request that the Promoters are required to provide a 3m high noise fence along both sides of the Colne Valley Viaduct.

15. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that it, or someone representing 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 petitioners remain, etc.

Michael Rees, Roll B Agent for the Harrow Angling Society.

14th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF: Dariusz Dzwigaj

Declare that:

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

2. Your petitioner is an owner-occupier of the house located at 20 Midland Terrace in London, NW10 6DR, which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

   1. Midland Terrace will be in the epicentre of the HS2 Construction site for approximately 10 years, completely surrounded by HS2 compounds, operating 24 hours a day / 7 days a week. We will suffer noise, pollution and visual blight and our ability to rest at night will be greatly compromised. Our nearby green public spaces with its trees and natural environment will be destroyed needlessly. We will not be able to sell our houses and move away as the property values in our area will suffer heavily throughout the years of HS2 construction. There is virtually no mitigation on offer and no compensation. Our lives will be immensely affected for many years. We seek recognition as the ‘most affected residential area along the HS2 line’ and expect an adequate mitigation and compensation package.

   2. Objections are being presented around numerous issues arising from the scheduled works in the Old Oak Common area in the London Boroughs of Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham, the lack of mitigation of effects and the lack of compensation for communities impacted by the construction and operation of HS2.

   3. Your Petitioner is a resident of Midland Terrace whose home and the immediate residential area will be directly affected by the HS2 Old Oak Common interchange construction and operation, and the works described in the HS2 Environmental Statement. His rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill.

   4. Midland Terrace / Shaftesbury Gardens is a small residential pocket of 600+ residents, to be bordered and completely surrounded by the HS2 construction compounds for approximately 10 years. Many people chose to move to Midland Terrace / Shaftesbury Gardens as it is an oasis of peace and quiet (especially after working hours), close to West London and will excellent transport connections. Our residential pocket is to be bordered
and completely surrounded by 24/7 compounds: a) Victoria Road HS2 Crossover Box Construction Site, with its conveyor belt planned 28m from our bedroom windows; b) Old Oak Station Compound; c) Atlas Road Compound with its factories producing concrete tunnel linings. Old Oak Common Lane will be closed for approximately one year with restricted access to vital amenities. All of our (3) tiny public green spaces (including a playground) with mature trees are going to be destroyed despite the need of only 25-30% of its areas required for Victoria Road widening scheme. If this goes ahead we will be left with no green spaces within a mile.

5 In short, Midland Terrace / Shaftesbury Gardens will be in the epicentre of the proposed major HS2 Construction site for approximately 10 years, with much of the work planned 24/7. We will be suffering noise, traffic generated pollution and visual blight. All of our little green public spaces will be destroyed needlessly, with its trees and natural environment. We will not be able to sell our houses and move away as the property values in our area will suffer heavily.

6 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 Petitioner.

**Midland Terrace and Shaftesbury Gardens should be recognised as one of the most heavily affected areas along the HS2 route**

7 Your petitioner believes that in view of immense community impact over a decade, extremely high in terms of adversity, the residents in this area should be classified as ‘sensitive receptors’ and therefore treated as a special case that merits further review and mitigation proposals to better deal with the acknowledged significant impacts.

8 It is generally recognised that Midland Terrace / Shaftesbury Gardens will likely suffer the more adverse impact of any other community along the line. Whilst HS2 Ltd has held a series of community forums and met with our residents verbally recognising our residential area as a ‘special case’ with significant impact from the proposed development. They have not as yet resolved (with minor exceptions) any of the needs of residents regarding mitigation of impact measures and property compensation laid down in our response to the HS2 Environmental Statement consultations.

9 In addition, HS2 Ltd has described the ‘loss of amenity as “significant” in terms of noise, visual effects, construction traffic, loss of access to amenities, air pollution and overall isolation’. However, the community impact ratings are stated from ‘negligible to moderate’ despite the scale and duration of impact on residents. (See Environmental Statement, Volume 5, Technical Appendices CFA4/Kilburn to Old Oak Common point 2.8). It can be assumed that this rating has led to the rejection of being recognised as a ‘special case’ and thus compromised our eligibility for adequate property compensation and impact mitigation measures.
Property compensation

10 Currently, the only compensation available to Midland Terrace residents is via the ‘Need to Sell’ scheme. Under this scheme, as expressed in HS2 ‘Your guide to our new property proposals’ ‘owner-occupiers would be able to ask the government to purchase their home for its full un-blighted market value. An independent panel will consider each application on a case-by-case basis and make a recommendation as to whether the property should be purchased’. It goes on to specify that applicants could be asked to submit evidence against five complex criteria.

11 We believe that this is not adequate in our case and we need a compensation scheme that fits with the special needs of our residents. We are effectively locked into our homes for the ten year duration of the construction and during that time there are likely to be many reasons that people may need or wish to move: they may not be able to put up with the disruption, they may suffer ill-health, they may die and pass their property to family members, or they may simply wish to move to a new home. We believe that the Need To Sell scheme is a complex system that requires an application process with potential hurdles and that a scheme should be put in place with no restrictions on the reason to sell.

12 In addition, it will be hard to establish an ‘un-blighted’ price as the area around Old Oak Common has been devalued for the past decade through the uncertainty of unconfirmed developments in the area. Property owners in Midland Terrace would require almost double the current value of their homes to purchase an equivalent size and style of 3-bedroom Edwardian house elsewhere in the area. On the sale of their home, residents would be looking at trading down to a 1-2 bedroom flat in the area – unsuitable for larger families and a downscale in quality of life for all.

13 Therefore, we believe that it is critical that a scheme is developed that allows residents the choice to stay or leave at any point during the construction process and that those who wish to leave will be offered a similar scheme to home owners in rural areas. We believe that our residents should be offered a Property Bond-style Scheme whereby owners will be offered at the price of a similar property in the area.

14 It should also be noted that the current limit for compensation is for properties that fall within 60 metres of the track. We believe HS2 has the legal right to CPO any property within 500 metres from the track. We would challenge these criteria as unfair and feel that the compensation limit should be extended to distance from construction and construction sites and that HS2’s ability to CPO any property it desires within a wider limit without a valid need.
Impact mitigation / compensation

15 Currently there are few, if any, provisions in the Environmental Statement for providing any mitigation measures against the impact of the construction. Rules for HS2 compensation and mitigation are currently subject to the distance properties are from the track and thus exclude any of the properties in Midland Terrace. We believe this concept should be rejected in the ‘special case’ of our area. In its place, impact should be measured by the close proximity to HS2 construction compounds, conveyor belt 28m outside our windows, Victoria Road widening project meters from our homes, Old Oak Common Lane closure and the overall isolation of our residents. All homes in Midland Terrace surrounded by construction works are considered to suffer ‘exceptional impact‘ and measures to mitigate the effect and compensation should be tailored to these specific needs.

16 We believe that HS2 should provide a scheme to pay for the various impact mitigation requirements required, i.e.: a) sound proofing of homes bordering HS2 compounds with triple glazing; b) effective sound proofing structures around noise emitting sources; c) air filters and air conditioning to mitigate against dust and pollutants resulting from the construction works and increase of road traffic for all homes affected; d) house and garden exterior cleaning.

17 We fear that during the construction of the 8-mile long tunnel, the noise generated by the conveyor belt planned 28 meters from our bedroom windows may be unbearable and some of us will not be able to live or sleep in our homes. There needs to be provision from HS2 to pay for rented accommodation for those residents.

18 Residents’ health is also likely to be compromised by long-term exposure to airborne pollution resulting from the construction works and increase of traffic. The HS2 Limited would need to monitor health and to provide free healthcare, such as private health insurance to residents exposed to these pollutants and toxins, as well as help to counter any psychological damage due to sleep deprivation.

Old Oak Common Lane Closure - traffic and public transport impacts

19 HS2 plans to close Old Oak Common Lane for a 12-month period. We demand a review of these plans and an exploration of options to early construction of alternative road links in the area. Old Oak Common Lane is a major through road used by commuters for access to places of employment in the Park Royal area and as a major West London transit route. Closure will cause huge impact for the economy of Park Royal.

20 The impact of this road closure on surrounding area is significant. Residents are reliant on Old Oak Common Lane to access most of their local amenities and Wormwood Scrubs (the only local large green public space). For those who drive, their journey time would be substantially increased.
Other localised traffic and public transport impacts

21 HS2 Limited plans to widen Victoria Road from a single carriageway to 2 lanes in both directions (between North Acton underground station and Willesden Junction) along the A4000 route, leaving the second half of this busy North-West London link transit route (Old Oak Lane) as a single carriageway. Currently there are notorious traffic jams there during traffic hours. Widening one part of the A4000 link will cause a bottleneck and HS2 construction traffic will worsen it further. The result will be the total of four stationary lanes of polluting traffic outside our homes. This plan without planning alternative road links in the area will further diminish our quality of life.

22 Throughout the 10-year construction period, there is likely to be significant disruption of traffic and transport services. There is currently a lack of detail on how this will be managed. Aside from the Old Oak Common Lane changes and widening of Victoria Road, it should be noted that even a minor incident in the area causes a knock-on effect across West London and along the A40 to Oxford. It is not uncommon to see gridlock up the A40 and around Scrubs Lane and Harlesden for a minor local incident.

Air quality and noise

23 HS2 construction will cause substantial adverse air quality impacts from demolition, construction, HS2 compound operation and traffic resulting in deterioration of the air quality and increase of particulate matter concentration in the air. NOx and other harmful chemicals concentrations will present an increased hazard to our residents' health. Full details are required as to how HS2 plans to mitigate the effects.

24 There will be significant in-combination effects at Midland Terrace and other local residential communities resulting in significant all day and night noise and visual blight for at least seven years. The HS2 environmental statement fails to provide mitigation measures. We require full details as to how the noise, sound and vibration will be assessed, monitored and controlled and what mitigation measures will be provided. We question the assessment methodology used for the sound and vibration. In example, the HS2 exhibits (p13719, p13720 and p13721) fail to provide adequate data because: a) some of the noise baseline readings provided by HS2 are too high. We have monitored the noise using our own equipment and the baseline readings given by HS2 are lower; b) most of the reading points were chosen to close to the noisiest sources around our residential pocket. This results with wrong conclusions in HS2 Environmental Statement and much understated noise impact on our residents.

25 Much of the work is planned for 24 hours a day seven days a week. The work the Victoria Road Crossover box compound in operation over many years is not acceptable for our residents. HS2 needs to restrict working hours to daytime and weekdays only. Also,
measures such as soundproofing of homes, soundproofing barriers around sources of noise, etc. are essential.

26 The conveyor belt planned 28m from our bedroom windows in Victoria Road Crossover box compound will be in operation 24/7 for number of years. We cannot even imagine sleeping at night for so many years, especially in the summer when window opening is essential. Knowing the impact on residents living near Crossrail excavation sites and conveyor belts in operation. We demand repositioning of the conveyor as far as possible from rear elevations of Midland Terrace or halting its operation during the night hours. The conveyor system should be fully enclosed and effectively sound proofed.

27 Your petitioner objects strongly to Clean Power Properties Ltd, which petitioned the HS2 Select Committee in 2014 to be allowed to build an energy plant [combining advanced conversion technology (ACT) & anaerobic digestion (AD) technologies on one site for the first time in Britain] even though HS2 has already safeguarded the site for tunnel waste transfer operations. Clean Power's intention to build this ACT & AD plant project will cause pollution for the Old Oak area – Ealing Council's own pollution experts acknowledged this risk during the previous planning application in 2013 while ACT and AD waste treatment sites are unproven in the UK, AD are known to cause maintenance issues and even explosions and feeder lorries supplying Clean Power's proposed plant via the narrow Channel Gate Road access would cause daily particulate and noise pollution from the site. We request that this planned energy site - and any support from Network Rail - must be removed from any consideration of HS2 - and any future use of the Euroterminal yard.

Planned destruction of local public spaces: Victoria Gardens, Cerebos Gardens and the Playground

28 The HS2 planned widening of Victoria Rd requires 25-30% of the land occupied by our local pocket parks of Victoria Gardens, Cerebos Gardens and the Playground. These green areas are small, but its mature trees provide an effective barrier to traffic and pollution from Victoria Road. Also, the trees provide nesting grounds for local birds. The planned take over and destruction of 100%, given that HS2 only requires 25-30% of the land for the works, is unacceptable to our residents. So far HS2 failed to commit to preservation of the trees on parts not needed for the widening of Victoria Rd. HS2 will create a permanent noisy environment around us for many years to come. We demand that HS2 should respect our needs to retain larger sections of these green spaces for us, to survive years of construction in more humane conditions. The trees will be essential to reduce effect of noise and pollution from increased traffic volumes on Victoria Road and the operation of Atlas Rd compound producing concrete tunnel linings on the other side of Victoria Rd., very near residential properties.

29 Our part of London suffers from lack of trees and green public spaces, compared with other areas London. In a process of widening Victoria Road, HS2 plans to destroy a row of 25
mature trees. These sixty years old trees are rare in Park Royal. They are the only barrier protecting the rear side of Midland Terrace from traffic noise and pollution. We believe that the trees could be preserved and easily incorporated into the new road layout, separating the carriageway with the pedestrian path. HS2 should work with LB of Ealing when planning the details.

**Visual impact, light pollution**

30 There is a lack of sufficient mitigation measures against resulting landscape and visual impacts both during and post construction. We need to understand the design of temporary barriers planned to be erected around the compounds. These structures will be in place for at least 10 years, so should be designed: a) to be visually acceptable to reflect the current and future personality of the area; b) to be effective barriers to reduce sound and dust; c) not to take away natural light from homes and gardens.

31 Planting of trees will act as natural sound barriers and capture some of the air pollution. Trees would also soften the harsh construction site environment. Planting of mature/semi mature trees should be in the plans from day one around the construction compounds bordering residential areas.

32 The Environmental Statement fails to mitigate against light pollution and needs to address the need for lighting at night to be directed away from the windows overlooking the compounds. Options should be considered to switch off the site lighting, at least partially to reduce light pollution.

**Overseeing the process and policing mitigation measures**

33 HS2 communications have been very poor, infrequent and inconsistent throughout the consultation period. The Environmental Statement has many flaws and is incomplete. In addition, HS2 detailed plans are a moving target. Based on the experiences of past infrastructure projects, the existing regulations often fail to adequately protect affected residents and businesses. We believe it is critical to set up a funded organization, independent of the HS2 to represent local residents, communities and businesses throughout the process and to act as the main liaison between the community and HS2.

34 Such body should be set up with immediate effect. This would ensure that HS2 is accountable and compliant with the law and responds to local needs quickly and effectively. It is likely that new issues will continue to arise so we need to keep the channels of communications open for on-going consultation and dialogue. Therefore such body should be involved throughout the planning, development and construction period and should run regular community forums and meetings with local representatives. This should include technical advisors and should be actively involved with the community and local/central government representatives on a day-to-day basis.
ADDITIONAL PETITION ITEMS RELATED TO THE HS2 AP2 ES

Atlas Road Satellite Compound to be extended to Victoria Road

1. AP2 worsens the already extreme and long-term impacts on our homes, lives and the community. In AP2, Plantagenet House, an Art Deco icon is to be demolished. Demolition of this building will remove an existing sound barrier separating Midland Terrace/Shaftesbury Gardens from the Atlas Road Compound and its new planned factories. The concrete tunnel lining factories planned on its site will operate 24/7, generating noise and particulate matter pollution closer to our homes. In addition, the compound will now be much closer to Midland Terrace, bordering Victoria Road.

2. Demolition of Plantagenet House and repositioning of the Atlas Road Satellite Compound will result in complete surrounding of Midland Terrace / Shaftesbury Gardens by 24/7 HS2 compounds. To reduce this new hugely negative impact, we request that further mitigation measures are put in place, including but not limited to:
   - Saving the front part (or front elevation) of this Art Deco icon maintaining the separation and natural noise barrier for homes on the opposite side of Victoria Road
   - Preserving all the remaining trees and shrubs in Victoria Park, Cerebos Gardens and the Playground in parts which are not to be taken by the Victoria Road widening scheme (scheduled for destruction by the HS2)
   - Preserving existing mature trees and shrubs on the Plantagenet House site to reduce air pollution, especially along Victoria Road
   - Planting semi-mature trees along the Compound site boundary with Victoria Road (including around the site perimeter) to reduce air pollution and provide sound barrier.

Planned changes to Victoria Road/Atlas Road/Old Oak Common Lane junction

3. Within AP2, there is now a planned signalized junction and removal of roundabout. This will create more congestion and encourage buildup of stationary traffic, especially after HS2 works start. The current roundabout has made significant improvement to traffic flows and reduced congestion dramatically. After decades of problems this junction finally works.

4. Your petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd work with the local highway authority and Transport for London to review this changes and options to retain the roundabout and not change to a signalized junction.

Widening of Victoria Road – during construction and post-construction

5. Within AP2, the A4000 Victoria Road is to be widened from junction with Portal Way to Atlas Road/Old Oak Common Lane to dual carriageway (900 m. approx.). Currently, Victoria Road mainly serves as a main transit route between London Boroughs of Ealing...
and Brent. Widening this short section will only create a 'bottleneck' effect at junction with Atlas Road/OOC Lane at peak times. Two lanes of stationary traffic will form in the vicinity of Midland Terrace. This will adversely affect air quality for our residents. It will slow down traffic flows moving north on OOC Lane affecting the whole of Old Oak area and beyond. HS2 construction traffic will be slow moving (or stationary during peak times) creating more air pollution and noise. It will severely affect local business as well.

6. Your petitioner request that HS2 Ltd works with the LB of Ealing Transport Department and accept their recent proposal to maintain a single carriage way with much wider lanes in each directions plus separate cycle and pedestrian paths. This option will balance the traffic flow and reduce pollution during the HS2 construction works and in the future.

7. Timeline for these works is not mentioned anywhere in the ES or the AP2 ES documents. We do not know if the road will be closed at any time and if pedestrian access to North Acton Station will be maintained during the road widening under the Victoria Road railway bridge. Victoria Road is our only access to the road network and pedestrian access to North Acton/Willesden Junction Stations. It is essential for us to know how and when we would be affected.

Conveyor belt impact

8. AP2 includes the rerouting of the conveyor from Atlas Road to Victoria Road Crossover box away from commercial properties on Chandos Road only. The impacts to residential properties along its route at Midland Terrace have been ignored.

9. Your petitioner requests that whilst the conveyor belt may elevate some highways impacts, full impacts on residents living close by must be assessed and fully mitigated. The document suggests provision of sound proofing only in 2 properties (25 dwellings) at Midland Terrace due to proximity of Atlas Road Satellite Compound. None of the other properties in Shaftesbury Gardens or Midland Terrace were included. Also nothing is mentioned about protection from work site flood lighting during the night (Tunnel Drive Main Compound and other compounds).

10. HS2 exhibit p13776 shows the conveyor belt positioned higher than our bedroom windows (only about 1.2 lower than our roofline. This is unacceptable for us and we demand the design would be changed to fulfill the earlier promise that the conveyor would be low-level. Also, we insist that the conveyor should be fully enclosed and the driving electric motors placed at considerable distance from our homes.
Impacts from construction traffic

11. With AP2 there are now significantly more traffic movements, which affect more roads and residential areas within the Old Oak and Acton area. There will be 700 (350-each way) lorry movements, which is double the original number stated. We do not believe that any mitigation has been proposed for this construction impacts which will affects residents and have possible knock-on impacts including: air pollution, noise and vibrations and congestion.

12. Your petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd:
   - Look at impacts on local junctions in particular around Atlas Road Satellite Compound
   - Rethink the activities which are planned in the many construction compounds close to Midland Terrace and other local residential areas to minimize lorry movements
   - Explore further use of rail and the canal
   - Consider more options for construction of transportation tunnels
   - Mitigate the impacts on residents resulting from the use of the conveyors

Mitigation required for all residents in the Old Oak area

13. Your petitioner would like to re-emphasize that local communities in Midland Terrace / Shaftesbury Gardens, Wells House Road and the North Acton conservation area (TITRA) should be classified as ‘sensitive receptors’ given the widespread and adverse impacts of HS2 works and APs on the community over such a considerable period of time, and treated as a special case, that merits further review and mitigation proposals to better deal with the acknowledged significant impacts.

14. It is essential to strictly monitor the noise, pollution, traffic and other impacts from the HS2 construction compounds. Midland Terrace/Shaftesbury Gardens, Wells House Road and TITRA residents will be the most affected communities by the HS2 works, in the epicentre of huge, decade long national project, employing thousands of workers. The existing legal provisions may not be sufficient to deliver effective means of control over operating times, noise, air pollution and behavior of the workers. To survive this vast construction project local residents need assurances that their wellbeing is protected effectively.

15. Your petitioner would like HS2 Ltd to work with residents groups, local London Boroughs, Transport for London, Greater London Authority and Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation in order:
   - To agree sufficient mitigation for residents in the Old Oak area which reflects impacts arising from the original scheme and AP2 changes.
   - To improve the Code of Construction Practice. We do not consider that the Code has adequate safeguards for local people and request a statutory set of minimum noise / dust / light mitigation measures in the final Bill to allow adequate protection for local residents.
16. Your petitioner requests that an Independent Body responsible for monitoring the Code of Construction Practice is set up. That Body should be easily accessible and contactable by emergency phone number and email. In addition, there should be a provision for setting up portable air quality monitoring stations in the affected residential areas, under the Monitoring Body's control, with its data available to representatives of local residents.

Compensation required for local communities

17. Your petitioner notes that the existing community fund does not go far enough and should be increased. Given the changes in AP2, further compensation should be given to Midland Terrace residents and other communities of Old Oak area hugely affected by surrounding HS2 construction compounds.

18. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended and undertakings given as proposed above, the provisions of the Bill, so far affecting your Petitioner, should not be allowed to pass into law.

19. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their rights (including their human rights), interests and property and for which no provision is made to protect your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

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 petitioner remains:

Dariusz Dzwigaj ..................................................

Date: 12.04.2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-2016

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

THE PETITION OF THE HERTS AND MIDDLESEX WILDLIFE TRUST

Declares that:

1. The Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioner is the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust ("HMWT"), a local, membership-based charity that works to protect and enhance wildlife in Hertfordshire and the London Boroughs of Enfield, Barnet, Harrow and Hillingdon. Established in 1954, your petitioner has over 20,000 members, including 1,500 in the Borough of Hillingdon and Three Rivers District combined, areas which will be directly affected by the construction and operation of the railway authorised by the Bill. Your petitioner promotes wildlife and community engagement throughout its area, with a focus on landscape-scale conservation including the Colne Valley which will be directly affected by works and operations authorised by the Bill.

   Your petitioner manages as a nature reserve land at Broadwater Lake, Harefield Moor Lake and Korda Lake, part of which is within the limits of land to be acquired and used as shown on the plans deposited with the Bill.

   The petitioner has met with representatives of the Promoter on a number of occasions both in bilateral and community forums. The petitioner is a member of the Ecology Technical Group and Colne Valley Regional Park Panel ("CVRPP") and is involved in the development of the Additional Mitigation Plan for this area. Your petitioner recognises that it has received assurances from the Promoter, which are covered in the following sections, but has concerns outstanding.

   The petitioner is represented nationally by the Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

   Your petitioner is gravely concerned about the likely impact of the construction and operation of the railway on the ecological interest and integrity of HMWT’s Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve and the Mid Colne Valley SSSI, including landscape-scale impacts on ecological connectivity and ecosystem functioning and resilience. Your petitioner is concerned about the impact on the ability of local residents, members of HMWT and visitors to access and enjoy the natural environment in the Colne Valley, including HMWT's Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve. This is contrary to your petitioner’s charitable aims and operational objectives in relation to people and wildlife. It threatens to harm our ability to recruit and retain supporters in the area and threatens our income and therefore our ability to manage our nature reserve.
3.1 Net gain for biodiversity

Your petitioner believes that the aim of the Bill, in relation to ecological impacts, should be to result in a 'net gain' for biodiversity in line with paragraph 10 of the recommendations of the Environmental Audit Select Committee in their report on HS2 and the Environment (7th April 2014), rather than the aim of 'no net loss' for biodiversity set out in the Promoter's sustainability policy.

Request: that a clause is added to the Bill requiring a net gain for biodiversity to be secured in perpetuity through the works, mitigation and compensation, including habitat creation or improvement, and that appropriate funding is allocated.

The petitioner also believes that the Bill as drafted will not achieve even the stated aim of 'no net loss' of biodiversity. The petitioner believes that the impacts the proposals would have on biodiversity assets are insufficiently mitigated and compensated for, leading to a significant overall reduction in biodiversity value resulting from the proposals.

The petitioner is concerned that the approach taken by the promoter to assessing their achievement of the 'no net loss' for biodiversity target is flawed in, amongst other things, its failure to consider indirect effects, its consideration of habitat connectivity, its approach to irreplaceable habitats such as Ancient Woodlands and its optimistic view of the time required to create and fully establish habitats.

Request: that an independent review is undertaken of the approach taken to assessing the 'no net loss' calculation of the project's impact. In the event that a review highlights that further mitigation or compensation is required to meet the 'no net loss' target, or a revised 'net gain' target, the petitioner asks that provision is made to secure any further mitigation or compensation, including habitat creation or improvement, and for it to be secured for the full duration of the project.

Request: that suitable mitigation and compensation is provided through securing ecological improvements within the existing boundaries of the limits of land to be acquired, or by incorporating additional land within the limits of land to be acquired.

3.2 Impact on Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve and SSSI – ecology

The nature reserve and SSSI has great importance for wildlife, including a huge number and variety of birds, as well as a regionally important population of Daubentons's bats. Of particular concern is the impact on the nationally important populations of wintering and breeding duck, notably the nationally significant breeding population of pochard. Pochard populations in the UK have declined by 39% since the 1970s, and since 2014 the conservation status of the pochard has changed from AMBER to RED, reflecting the ongoing declines in its population. As this is approximately 1% of the national breeding population, an adverse impact would be significant.

Your petitioner raised concerns with the House of Commons Select Committee about the proposed ecological mitigation and compensation for Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve and SSSI. The creation of rafts would deliver very little for most of the species of the SSSI interest; the creation of a gravel island could be of benefit if correctly designed and located. However HMWT met with the Promoter in March 2015 who confirmed that the area had been chosen due to ease of delivery, rather than a reflection of the ecological need. Your petitioner appreciates that it has received an assurance that the nominated undertaker will engage with HMWT on the detail of the appropriate mitigation plan within the Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve (HOC/1788).
Request: that to ensure that full and proper mitigation of the ecological impacts, in consultation with HMWT, Natural England and other stakeholders, a mitigation plan is prepared which is relevant to the impact and species concerned, and if necessary is delivered on land beyond the current limits of the land acquired. Your petitioner recognises that the Mitigation Fund has been established but strongly believes that this is not, on its own, appropriate to deliver the ecological mitigation. As the Fund is on the basis of landowner permission being granted it means that the mitigation works may be more a reflection of landowner permissions than related to the actual need.

3.3 Impact on Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve and SSSI – visitor access

Your petitioner has received an assurance that 'reasonable pedestrian access by prior appointment' will be granted during the construction phase for HMWT for maintenance and monitoring the Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve (Ref HPC/1788).

However, the Promoter has not recognised that during the construction phase there will be a total loss of access for visitors to the nature reserve. Nor has the Promoter recognised that at the operational stage the experience of visitors to the nature reserve using the current access will be blighted by this being beneath the new viaduct.

Your petitioner proposed a solution to this matter in their first petition such that new visitor access would be provided to the north east part of Broadwater Lake, adjacent to the proposed area of ecological mitigation. This included a visitor centre to enhance community benefits but we understand that the Promoter would not consider this major enhancement as part of the scheme. As a minimum your petitioner believes that the provision of vehicle and pedestrian access, a small car park, footpaths and bird watching hides in the area proposed would be appropriate in order to address the impact on visitors to the nature reserve.

Request: your petitioner requests that suitable alternative access and facilities for visitors to Broadwater Lake is provided throughout the construction phase and remains in place once the railway is operational. Additional land may need to be incorporated within the limits of the land to be acquired to enable this. Your petitioner refers to the earlier statement that whilst the Mitigation Fund is welcome, the mitigation of the community impacts must likewise be delivered.

The British Carp Study Group ("BCSG") uses Korda Lake, Moor Lake and Broadwater Lake and pays HMWT an annual sum for this. There would be severely limited access for anglers during the construction phase and it is believed that the Group would not be viable at the operational phase. The annual payment to HMWT is used to support the costs of managing the nature reserve and its loss would have a significant impact upon HMWT's ability to adequately manage the site.

Request: that compensation for the loss of income be paid to HMWT on the basis of HMWT's ongoing costs of maintaining the nature reserve.
3.4 Viaduct design

Your petitioner is concerned about potential impacts on important populations of birds and bats through collisions with trains and believes that appropriate preventative measures must be put in place. Your petitioner seeks assurance that the membership of the Design Panel for the viaduct includes ecological expertise so that this aspect is fully considered.

Request: assurance that mitigation of ecological impact will be built into the design.

4 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.

Lesley Davies
Agent for Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust

13 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mrs Barbara Dennis

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner lives at Bury Farm Cottage, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LU, and the Bill will specially and directly affect her, 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 (the “Area”).

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, a pensioner, walks along Potter Row and other local narrow lanes and is fearful of the additional traffic which will arise during construction of HS2 when Potter Row will be used as a “rat run”. Living in her small farm workers’ cottage within 250 metres of the planned North Portal of HS2 at South Heath will mean the ruination of her quiet surroundings. One of your Petitioner’s greatest worries is the loss of tranquillity in the AONB – especially in her retirement but also for future generations. Your Petitioner is distressed about the loss of access to the fields and the woods between her home on Potter Row and Great Missenden, where she enjoys pursuing her interests in the environment and its flora and fauna and the special qualities of this supposedly protected area. Only an extended tunnel will provide a solution to these shared worries.

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, High Wycombe and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and for use of the Chiltern railway, 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 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 the Department for Transport 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 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 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.

............

Barbara Dennis

Date: 12.4.2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Mr Donald Stewart Dennis  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

Your Petitioner lives at Bury Farm Cottage, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LU, and the Bill will specially and directly affect him, 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 (the “Area”).  

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 has been working in farms all his working life and his interest in wildlife was one of the main reasons for working in the countryside. Your Petitioner has been working and living in Potter Row for 35 years 250 metres from the proposed North Portal and spends many hours with his binoculars and camera walking from his farm worker’s cottage over his local patch which will be turned into a mega construction site during the best years of his retirement and the only possible mitigation would be an extended tunnel.

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, High Wycombe and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and for use of the Chiltern railway, 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 the Department for Transport 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 this also has acknowledged
   environmental benefits.

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be
   hosed 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.
1. 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 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.

Donald Stewart Dennis

Date: 11 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session  
2015 - 16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF MR A.M. and MRS R.J. HERRING  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

   The Petitioners are Mr and Mrs Herring who live at Merton Cottage, 15, Radstone, Brackley, Northants NN13 5PZ. The Petitioner’s property stands approximately 360m from the centre line of the proposed rail track. The house presently enjoys uninterrupted views across fields in a peaceful and tranquil setting which the Bill will specially and directly affect.  

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

   3.1 The promoters insist that the centre line of the track be used to determine the boundary for compensation. However the extent of the construction works in Radstone will come almost to the boundary of the petitioner’s property since the field in full view of the cottage is to be re-contoured and raised by at least 5 metres in order to accommodate the substantial concrete noise barrier proposed.  

   3.2 Mr and Mrs Herring have already applied for compensation for the loss of value of their property under the Need to Sell Scheme, actively encouraged to do so by the House of Commons Select Committee. However their application has been turned down.  

   3.3 Mr and Mrs Herring have invested all of their money and savings into their home and adjoining office premises which is not covered by any of the HS2 compensation schemes. This was to be their pension provision. Now in their 60’s they are unable to provide for themselves in the way they intended. At their age and stage of life it is impossible to make alternative arrangements. The proposed High Speed Railway has decimated the value of property in the village of Radstone and houses are unsalable. As a result HS2 have already purchased 4 properties in Radstone  

   3.4 Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act imposes an obligation on the state not to interfere with the peaceful enjoyment of property, deprive a person of their possessions or subject a person’s property to control. The HS2 scheme as it stands breaks all of these principles enshrined in the Human Rights legislation  

   3.5 Mr and Mrs Herring ask that Radstone village be considered a special case as was recognised by the House of Commons Select Committee as being severely adversely affected by the proposed High Speed Rail project. Property owners from Radstone
should have the option of selling to HS2 at the full pre blight value of their homes as of right without further wrangling.

3.6 There should be a right of appeal against decisions of the Panel operating the Need to Sell Scheme. The Panel are unelected and appointed by the promoter. There needs to be a system of arbitration when the individual disagrees with the decision of the panel which is available throughout the process.

3.7 The Petitioners also ask that local estate agents and valuers be used by the promoters as the rural property market is significantly different to that of London. There is evidence that even those compensated under the Need to Sell Scheme are having difficulty agreeing a fair price for their property.

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.

Mr Anthony Malcolm Herring

Mrs Rosemary Janthia Herring

12th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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


Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill by virtue of the fact that the chosen route is elevated on the surface 280m from St Mary's Church with the result that the noise inside the building is at an unacceptable level leading to the demise of your petitioner.

2. Your petitioner

Your petitioner is Wendover Music, a charity which has been established in Wendover for over twenty years, to promote, improve, develop, and maintain public education in, and appreciation of the art and science of music in all its aspects by the presentation of public concerts and recitals in St Mary's Church. Your petitioner achieves this by a combination of concerts given by artists at the top of the profession as well as those at the beginning of their careers, for example winners of BBC Young Musician of the Year. Your petitioner's activities are of particular benefit to local people, both young and old, who are unable to travel to the major cultural centres. In other words, your petitioner brings performances of the quality one expects at the Wigmore Hall to Wendover at an affordable price. Most notably it is your petitioner's policy that students pay only £1 to gain entry.

3. Your Petitioners concerns

Due to the fact that the proposed route of the train is 280m from St Mary's Church with "line of sight" between the tracks and building, the church is adversely affected by the noise generated up to 36 times per hour. This will seriously impact on the use by your petitioner of the building as the concert venue for a range of high quality concerts by top international artists. It should be noted that it is the peak noise level 36 times an hour always at the same high level that is the concern. Average noise predications are irrelevant in relation to your petitioner's activities since the existing background noise level is very low at the time of our concerts.

The train noise will be clearly audible during the silences and quiet passages of a performance and importantly with greater frequency and volume than the current ambient/background noise. As a result the building will become unusable for your petitioners activities and since there is no alternative suitable venue your petitioner will be forced to cease its activities which will be a very significant loss to the local community.

In addition, as a result of the demise of your petitioner the church will lose the financial benefit if currently enjoys from the Petitioners use of the building.
4. Proposed mitigation- your petitioners “ask”

The importance of the church as a venue was identified in the ES. However, HS2 in the Hybrid Bill was shown to ignore the importance of the venue. As a result of representations to HS2 and the House of Commons Select Committee additional mitigation is included in AP5. However your petitioners own analysis and tests come to the conclusion that this is still not sufficient to protect the internal acoustic of the building without sound attenuation of the fabric of the building.

The need for sound attenuation of the building is supported by Steve Summers MSc CEng MIOA of ACCON UK whose report will be presented to the Committee in evidence.

The scope of sound attenuation works that is acceptable both technically and from a heritage view which is also supported St Mary’s PCC and the Oxford Diocese will cost £670,000 including irrecoverable VAT at today’s prices. This is based on a professionally prepared independent cost estimate. While HS2 have agreed the elements of the building that need attenuation in principle they have only offered a contribution of £250,000. Therefore your Petitioner asks that the House of Lords instruct HS2 to increase their contribution to £670,000 with this amount adjusted following the application of the BCIS All-in TPI once the timing of the works can be established.

This will secure for the long term your petitioner’s activities for the benefit of the local community.

5. 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

William N Avery
Agent on behalf of Wendover Music
11th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Anne Elizabeth Button

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is the owner of the freehold property at 8, Kings Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QZ, which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location but is located 300 metres from the portal cutting and 550 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 Chiltem Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the Chiltems 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. 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

3. In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltem Tunnel throughout the AONB, which is the primary alteration to the Bill your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the fully bored Chiltem Tunnel is extended to Leather Lane, as it will address, most but not all, of your Petitioner’s concerns.

4. 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.

5. **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.

6. **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 residents, 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.

7. **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 Learning Centre and their playing fields as they are adjacent to the Frith Hill roundabout.

**Remedies:**

---

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.
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.

8. 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 Chiltern AONB, or at minimum to Leather Lane will obviate the need for deep, wide cuttings in the South Heath and Pottery 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.

9. Dysfunctional Housing market: Your Petitioner is 550 metres from the trains exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel and are 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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 congestion 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.

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 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 Chiltern 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.

22 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 - Agent

Date
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF CHARLIE VAN EXTER  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner* Charlie van Exter, lives in this area of natural and outstanding beauty of the Chiltern Hills and the plan of having HS2 run across this exceptionally beautiful part of Buckinghamshire is a travesty.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

The historically important Ridgeway runs along Boswells Farm, where we live, and HS2, in its presently planned elevated position specially and directly affects thousands of walkers and hikers in this beautiful part of the Chiltern Hills.  

The petitioners main concern is to maintain and conserve this area of Outstanding Natural Beauty for our future generations.  

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords to PLEASE consider a fully bored tunnel through this wonderful area of the Chiltern Hills.  

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.  

The petitioner remains most respectfully Charlie van Exter  

12th April 2016