To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF John Jeremy Cameron  

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 Overdale, Ballinger Road, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9QJ, which the Bill may specially and directly affect.  

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located just under one kilometre from the portal cutting 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 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 Outdoor 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 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 about one kilometre from 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 GML/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 14 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF THE HAMPTON-IN-ARDEN SOCIETY

Declares that:

1. The Petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the Bill Clauses 1 to 36 in relation to the construction and operation of the railway and specifically 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. The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill are specified in clauses 1 and 2 of and Schedules 1 and 2 to the Bill and in subsequent Amendments to the Bill listed as Additional Provision 2 (Clauses 5.10-13) and Additional Provision 4 in Supplementary Environmental Statement 3.

2. The Petitioners are the Hampton-in-Arden Society. The Hampton-in-Arden Society is an association of local residents established in 1966 whose objectives include the promotion of high standards of planning and architecture in the Civil Parish of Hampton-in-Arden and its surroundings. It represents the interests of the residents who are directly or indirectly affected by the works. Their rights, interests, and in some cases property are injuriously affected by the Bill either directly or indirectly, by the works stated above. Your Petitioners have worked assiduously and tirelessly over 4 years to secure the best possible mitigation for the village, its residents, businesses, environment and wildlife through discussion and negotiation with Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council and HS2 Ltd. To this end, Your Petitioners participated in all six meetings of the High Speed Rail Community Forum meetings arranged by HS2 Ltd between March 2012 and September 2013 and in the meetings of the Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council HS2 Working Party which met at intervals of a month or so from June 2012 onwards, and in its subsequent Scrutiny Boards. Your Petitioners have also had local meetings with Solihull MBC, Hampton-in-Arden Parish Councillors and Staff, the Member of Parliament for Meriden and with HS2 representatives.

3. Diddington Lane Realignment (AP2)

The Promoters original proposal in the Hybrid Bill was to close Diddington Lane to through traffic whilst allowing access from either end to accommodate farm and railway maintenance access. It enabled the provision of a safe ‘Green Route’ for cyclists, walkers and equestrians. This proposal was supported by the Parish Council, the Hampton Society and residents of Diddington Lane.
One day before the Petitioners appeared in front of the Commons Select Committee in December 2014, we were informed that the Promoter had made an agreement with Packington Estates, a large landowner in the Parish, to keep the lane open to through traffic. No consultation with the community-Parish Council, Hampton Society or residents had been undertaken. We advised the Commons Select Committee of our concern and we reserved the right to Petition at a later stage.

In spring 2015 we were informed by HS2 that a substantial realignment of the road from a point just beyond Diddington Lane residences was proposed. This was not acceptable to the Petitioners, the Hampton Society or Packington Estates and following a joint meeting of all three parties a letter, signed by all, was sent to HS2 which emphasised our wish to retain the current alignment. However, the realignment appeared in AP2 in July 2015, showing a diversion to full DMRB standards and HS2 Rural Road Design Criteria across fields to the west with the loss of some 13 hectares of good quality arable land. This would be inconsistent with the character of this quiet rural lane with very low traffic volumes and road width of between 5.5 and 6 metres-and encourage the development of a rat-run to the nearby Interchange station, affecting the whole of the village. We have contested HS2 estimates of a 5% increase in traffic volumes through the village to the Interchange station-a figure, given a 7000 space car park-we find grossly under-estimated.

We are very concerned not only because of the danger that Diddington Lane will be used as a ‘rat-run’ to the new station but particularly in respect of the northern junction of the lane with the A452. This junction is located only 70 metres from the A452/A45 Stonebridge Roundabout which is being modified as part of the HS2 works. These modifications include the provision of a dedicated left turning lane for northbound A452 traffic wished to turn west onto the A45 which starts immediately north of the unchanged Diddington lane junction. As detailed at our last Commons Select Committee appearance in January 2016 we have serious safety concerns with this junction in its current state. Indeed there was a serious collision in October last year resulting in serious injuries. The new provisions will only increase safety concerns as extra traffic tries to exit the lane if it is kept open to through traffic. We have requested a copy of the Stage 1 Safety Audit for the A452/A45 junction but have yet to receive it.

The village has restricted road width, narrow pavements, dangerous bends, no pedestrian crossings, and no effective traffic calming which leads to persistent and excessive speed. In February 2016 the Parish Council submitted its Neighbourhood Plan to Solihull for approval and adoption. This included (Para 3.3.15, Key Action TRA6) action to develop a safe cycle and pedestrian route through the village- action supported by the Police with whom we had meetings in 2015. The Parish Council has subsequently developed detailed traffic management proposals which have been submitted to Solihull MBC. We await any formal response.

In October 2015 your Petitioners presented alternative proposals to HS2 at a meeting that was also attended by Caroline Spelman MP. This included cogent argument to move the crossovers to allow a reduced structural depth and the full headroom for traffic of 5.3
metres or, if the lane were closed to through traffic as originally proposed, a reduced
headroom of some 4.8 metres still allowing farm and maintenance vehicle access. This
reduced clearance would satisfy the flood criteria but would be unacceptable to HS2 as it
would put the bridge at risk from vehicle strikes. At the same meeting we also presented
two other diverted routes that would reduce land take and offer cost savings compared to
the AP2 solution.

Also in October 2015 Caroline Spelman presented to Parliament a 742 signature Petition
from the village seeking the provision of a ‘Green Route’ solution to Diddington Lane
whereby the lane would be restricted to agricultural, maintenance and emergency vehicles
only together with pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. We believe that this solution would
meet the original objection of Packington Estates relating to road closure, reduce the loss of
arable land, and retain access to farm holdings. Construction and land acquisition costs
would be reduced and all stakeholders would benefit. We await a response to this petition.

Your Petitioners preference is for options that result in the closure of Diddington Lane to
through traffic. The closure of the lane is also supported by a large number of residents of
Diddington Lane who we understand, have petitioned separately. If however keeping the
lane open to all road users is the ultimate conclusion then the aim must be to provide a
more sympathetic design that is more in character with the existing conditions, whilst
meeting the appropriate design standards.

We understand that HS2 Ltd have given an assurance to SMBC regarding Diddington Lane by
placing an obligation upon those undertaking detailed design to take into account measures
proposed by SMBC, prior to then submitting their designs for approval. These should
include design standards, traffic calming measures and traffic restrictions.

Your Petitioners therefore seek a firm undertaking from the Promoter that options for
Diddington Lane be investigated in detail, in conjunction with us and others, to find a
preferred solution that meets the needs of all stakeholders. As we have demonstrated in
our various discussions with HS2 there are other options out there and we believe that there
is a real need to ‘think outside the box’ during this design and review process.

4. Construction Camps

The Petitioners have been concerned that the amendments proposed by the Promoter for
Diddington Lane would result in a significant increase in construction times, spoil and haul
traffic at considerable detriment to the residents. Despite our recommendations which
would have avoided significant and regular flooding of work camps no changes have been
made to locations for the two Construction Compounds proposed for the River Blythe
viaduct and the Shadowbrook under-bridge. Both compounds are shown to the west side of
the new railway. We have serious safety concerns because all material deliveries to these
sites are likely to be from the A452 to the east and traffic movements will therefore need to
cross live construction sites in order to reach their respective compounds.
Having been invited, by the Chair Mr Robert Sym, to return to the Commons Select Committee should we be unsatisfied by any responses from HS2, we duly included this and other outstanding items in our Petition on AP2, as instructed by the Commons Bill Office. Regrettably, HS2 refused to respond since they insisted they were only required to respond to AP2 issues - a position we felt was an insult to the integrity of both the Select Committee and ourselves-and a denial of legitimate due process. The site of these compounds is located within the flood plain of the river and was flooded on 4 occasions during 2013/14 and twice during 2015/16.

We therefore respectfully suggest that the Promoter be instructed to take account of our safety concerns and local knowledge of the area and move these compounds to more suitable locations to east of the railway.

5. Spoil Dumps

The Petitioners note that there appears only one minor change to the locations for material stockpiles with the removal of one part of the stockpile immediately behind houses in Diddington Lane. We find this to be an unacceptable and a minimalist response to a legitimate concern. There remains an increased flood risk, with water-logging to gardens where natural drainage is impeded, unacceptable visual intrusion, potential health risks and property blight. There are also large areas of land adjacent to the rear of Diddington Lane properties identified as ‘land potentially required during construction’. We question the need for this large area of land now that a full length viaduct over the river Blythe has been agreed and the subsequent flood risk reduced. The Promoter again declined to respond at our earlier appearance before the Commons Select Committee.

The Petitioners therefore seek an undertaking that the proposed material stockpiles will be removed from areas adjacent to residential properties and that the Promoter update drawings to take account of latest development which allow the removal of safeguarded areas no longer required.

6. Haul Routes

As described in our Petition to the Commons Select Committee both Meriden Road and Diddington Lane are narrow, with the Patricks Bridge on Meriden Road requiring single lane crossing. Each is frequently used by pedestrians, cyclist and horse riders. No footpath exists on Diddington Lane, and on but one side of Meriden Road. There are inherent safety concerns. Your Petitioners believe that construction traffic should be able to use a combination of both the nearby A452 dual carriageway and the Trace of the new rail line as adequate routes, thereby removing the need to use residential roads except in very exceptional circumstances.

Although the Promoter refused to respond as outlined earlier, the Petitioners now seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the use of residential roads will be restricted to the absolute minimum.
7. Relocation of Bickenhill Waste Recycling Centre (AP4)

Supplementary Environmental Statement 3 and Additional Provision 4 Environmental Statement relate to the proposed relocation and construction of a new Waste Recycling Centre (BWRC) on land approximately 200 metres to the east of the existing site on land originally earmarked for the A45/A45 Service Road over-bridges satellite compound and temporary stockpiles. The compound will be relocated and combined with the East Way loop satellite compound. A new Diddington Lane over-bridge satellite compound will be provided to the south-east of the existing Waste recycling Centre.

Neither the Promoter nor SMBC had engaged in any consultation with the Society, Parish Council, community organisations or residents of the Parish about the proposed relocation. Indeed the announcement came as a shock and revelation only upon publication of the AP4 documentation. No mention of this proposal was made by the Promoter even though they held an AP2 ‘exhibition’ in the village on the 19th September—just one month before AP4 was published.

It is clear from the proposals that the new BWRC is to be a permanent location. The southern boundary of the site juxtaposes with the proposed realignment of Diddington Lane. Residents are of the view that this poses an additional threat to the existing rural and generally tranquil character of the lane in that a new access off Diddington Lane would be both feasible and arguably desirable to SMBC should the A45 become so congested as to make access from the A45 difficult and an alternative access be sought. This would be entirely unacceptable to residents of Hampton-in-Arden.

We understand that an alternative brown field site has already been offered by the landowners, Packington Estates, barely one mile from the existing site, and on land already used for material recycling. We consider that this—or any other brown field site—would be an acceptable and appropriate alternative. A number of brown field sites are available nearby including north of the A45.

The petitioners respectfully ask that HS2 and Solihull MBC give an undertaking that a review of access arrangements at the current site will be undertaken so that the Petitioners can be re-assured that a decision to relocate was not taken as the ‘easy option’, or indeed to provide ‘betterment’ of the current facility at the expense of the enjoyment by the local community of its heritage and environment. Should relocation prove the only viable option we seek an undertaking that a more suitable brown field site will be chosen using the guidelines set out by Solihull MBC in its Solihull Local Plan.
8. 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

Mrs Sarah Foster-Ogg
Chair and Trustee of the Hampton-in-Arden Society

Mr Kenneth Blanch
Trustee of the Hampton-in-Arden Society

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 Martin Nelson

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

2. Your petitioner
Martin Nelson
Flat 2, 31 Princess Road
London NW18JR

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioner is MARTIN NELSON, (hereinafter referred to as "the Petitioner"), of 31 Princess Road, London NW18JR, born and bred in Camden and resident in Princess Road for 40 years. Your Petitioner is directly affected by the Bill as it affects my community, neighbourhood, borough and city; also as leaseholder and freeholder, your Petitioner has been served a compulsory purchase notice by HS2 Ltd (hereinafter referred to as "the Proposer"), which is understood to be for ancillary works, though the precise nature and scope of these is unclear. Your Petitioner is passionate about sustainable transport issues, having designed London’s first dedicated and official cycle route in 1977, to and from Primrose Hill, and more recently EQ-equalunderthesun, a web platform to promote ideas of global interdependence, sustainability, innovation and stewardship. Your Petitioner believes in developing the national rail infrastructure, but that HS2 critically lacks the connectivity and flexibility to take on the transport needs of future generations, and may very well add to the current dangerously centripetal trend of a London-based national economy. The UK’s natural
rail transport trunk is the Mi/Midland Railway corridor, rooted (sic) directly via HS1 into Europe with key dendritic branch points at Stratford, Cricklewood and above all near Rugby, where branches to the Midlands, East Anglia, the North East and North West would intersect and connect.

Air Quality

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

Your Petitioner fears construction will impact air quality in Primrose Hill Village from:

1. Construction traffic on Adelaide Road, 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.

To prevent damage to the health and lives of your Petitioners, your Petitioner prays your honourable House to ensure measures to protect him and his community:

1. Your Petitioner requests 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 Petitioner submits that thresholds for air quality and an air quality mitigation plan should be produced for the London Borough of Camden, to apply both during the construction and the operation of HS2.

2. Your Petitioner requests 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 Petitioner submits 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.

3. Your Petitioner requests 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 spoil and the provision of material by rail rather than road.

4. Your Petitioner requests that that vehicles used in construction should meet the latest European emission standard.
5. Your Petitioner requests that you ensure, so as to avoid additional air pollution, construction does not lead to traffic congestion in Princess Road, in Primrose Hill Village or in Camden as a whole.

In common with my co-petitioners in December 2015, I believe my concerns have not been addressed by either HS2 or the House of Commons.

We are subject to injustice. We have not been heard.

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.

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

MARTIN NELSON
14th April 2016
The Petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

Your Petitioner is Alison Weir, resident at Cymba, 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 the 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 emphasizes 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 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 Andrew Martin Burnett and Jacqueline Mary Burnett  

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

2. Your petitioner  
The Petitioners are Mr Andrew Martin Burnett and Mrs Jacqueline Mary Burnett, owners of property at 66 Perry Street, Wendover, Aylesbury HP22 6DJ, who the Bill will specially and directly affect as a result of the proposed HS2 line, both during construction and after completion. The Petitioners live at the edge of that part of theChilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect. 

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1 Noise from the proposed route.  
The northern portal of the currently proposed Wendover green tunnel is close to the residential housing in the north-west of Wendover, and some 500m from the petitioners’ house. The petitioners are concerned that they will suffer from the adverse effects of the noise as trains enter and leave the tunnel. This will affect the value of their property and their ability to enjoy their life at the property.  

At the time of the original Bill, HS2 Ltd published a series of noise estimates by location. The figures for peak noise at the north-west of Wendover were up to 64/67db (depending on the type of train). In addition, up to 3 db must be added to all these figures to allow for façade effects.  

In the autumn of 2015, HS2 Ltd. published a report “P8161 Wendover Further Noise Mitigation” which proposed “An additional noise fence barrier located from the northern portal of the Wendover green tunnel extending to the access track leading to the portal buildings, approximately 300m in length, along the eastern side of the railway. A noise fence barrier of 6m above rail level has been assessed”. They also stated that this “Reduces
maximum noise levels at properties in northern Wendover to below the lowest adverse effect threshold” which the petitioners understand refers to the LOAEL figure of 60 db for peak noise. They also stated “all properties in Wendover are forecast to experience levels from HS2 trains at or below the same threshold” (with 20 specific exceptions which did not include the petitioners’ property). The detailed figures showed the highest peak noise in the north-west of Wendover (again ignoring façade effects) as 60/64 db. Noise figures throughout the north-west of Wendover were reduced by 3-4 db.

This was followed up by the publication of a Supplementary Environmental Statement 4 and Additional Provision 5 (SES4/AP5) to the Bill, which was to implement this report and which included a similar description of the noise barrier at the northern tunnel portal. However, the detailed figures for the north-west of Wendover no longer showed the 3-4 db noise reduction – they were in most cases identical to the noise figures in the original bill and in one case higher. The new noise figures quoted in the SES4/AP5 report show peak noise levels of 63 db close to the petitioner’s property, and up to 67 db at some receptors in the north-west Wendover residential area.

Although there was nothing in the published documents to indicate the reason for this, there was a brief reference to it during the House of Commons Select Committee hearings, when it was stated that the design of noise barrier at the north-west of Wendover had been changed, and it would now be tapered as a compromise between visual intrusion and noise reduction.

However the design we now have appears to offer the north-west of Wendover a noise barrier which achieves no noise reduction. This is unacceptable, and indeed seems a strange ‘compromise’. Furthermore, it no longer “reduces maximum noise levels at properties in northern Wendover to below the lowest adverse effect threshold” as previously promised.

In response to petitions against SES4/AP5, HS2 Ltd. published a further document “Promoter’s response to Chilterns Additional Provision 5 issues”. This made no reference to the problem of noise in the north-west of Wendover, despite this being the subject of petitions, and stated “The Lowest Observable Adverse Effects Levels (LOAEs) set by the Promoter include […] 60 dB for the LpAFmax (façade) to assess the impact of airborne noise caused by the operation of the Proposed Scheme on permanent residential buildings. […] As required by Government noise policy all reasonable steps will be taken to design, construct, operate and maintain the Proposed Scheme so that these levels are not exceeded.” It is clear that with the present proposals, these figures are exceeded. And given that the autumn 2015 figures met these levels, it is clearly possible to do so, and therefore the petitioners assert that all reasonable steps have not been taken.

HS2 Ltd. have stated that the provision of noise barriers on the A413 will offset the noise from the line and that residents will not experience any reduction in property values as a result. The petitioners welcome this, but according to HS2 Ltd. ‘s own figures, there is no resulting reduction in average noise at the petitioners’ property, whereas there is a significant additional peak noise as a result of the trains. This argument is therefore not valid as far as the petitioners are concerned.
3.2 Other concerns

The Petitioners contend that building HS2 on the surface in the AONB and with viaducts as proposed 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.

The 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. The prevailing wind is from the west and so dust is likely to be carried to where the petitioners live.

3.3 Requested Remedies

The petitioners request that the presently proposed bored tunnel be extended to beyond the proposed north-west portal of the Wendover green tunnel, by 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.

If a long tunnel is not recommended, the petitioners fully support the proposals made by the Wendover Society and others for a short bored tunnel past Wendover. Again, the tunnel portal at the north-west of Wendover would be further away from residential development and so the noise would be reduced.

If neither a long tunnel nor a short bored tunnel is recommended, the petitioners request that the northern portal for the green tunnel be moved further away from the north-west corner of Wendover. The petitioners understand that there are no fundamental technical reasons why this cannot be done, and feel that the additional cost is amply justified by the benefits which will be obtained.

If even a green tunnel extension is not recommended, the petitioners request that the design of the noise barriers at the northern tunnel portal be modified to restore the noise benefits promised by HS2 Ltd. in the autumn of 2015. Although visual intrusion is undesirable, noise barriers can be hidden quite easily, for example by the planting of trees.
which will grow to a height greater than the height of the noise barriers. On the other hand, the noise effects on the residents of north-west Wendover cannot be avoided if the necessary steps are not taken when the line is built.

Whatever approach is adopted, the Petitioners request that the maximum peak noise level be kept below 60 db for all properties at the north-west of Wendover as was originally intended in "P8161 Wendover Further Noise Mitigation (September 2015)" but which is no longer the case.

In view of the wide discrepancies between the costs of tunnelling put forward by HS2 Ltd. and those suggested by other independent parties, the petitioners request an independent assessment of costs in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis in relation to the AONB area before finalising recommendations on a bored tunnel.

The petitioners also request other measures which will reduce the impact of the proposal:

a) 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.

b) The pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

c) 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.

d) 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.

e) 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.

3.4 Conclusion

The petitioners are specially and directly affected by the Bill, principally as a result of the noise which will be generated at their property. The petitioners are specifically concerned that despite HS2’s promise in the autumn of 2015 to reduce noise at their property, the proposals published in SES4/AP5 reversed these promises. The petitioners’ preferred solution is a Chilterns long tunnel, but request that the northern portal of any tunnel past Wendover should be farther away from their property, and that whatever solution is adopted, noise levels in the north-west of Wendover should be no higher than those promised in autumn 2015.
The petitioners assert that the specific arguments presented here relating to the petitioners’ interests would not be adequately brought out in other petitions. Indeed, it has been the petitioners’ experience that HS2 Ltd. quote noise figures across the whole of Wendover to illustrate the benefits of their proposals, from which it is not at all obvious unless one looks closely at the figures that all the benefits claimed relate to other parts of Wendover and no effective mitigation at all has been provided for the north-west of Wendover.

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.

Andrew Martin Burnett

Jacqueline Mary Burnett

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 Kevin Tearle  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by aspects of “the whole Bill”.  

2. Your petitioner  
   The petitioner is Mr Kevin Tearle of 1, Fleet Marston Farm Cottages, Fleet Marston, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire. HP18 0PZ which the Bill will “specially and directly affect”. The petitioner is concerned about matters which relate to the construction work and in particular the proposed location of a construction compound in Fleet Marston, Buckinghamshire.  

3. i) Your Petitioner does not consider the provisions of the Bill, and in particular Schedules 16 and 17, provide your Petitioner with sufficient control over their location and how they will operate.  
   ii) Your Petitioner is concerned about the effects of the construction and operation of High Speed 2 accommodation compound on the value of his property. Property values are depressed in the areas near to the line and a number of communities will suffer additional blight when construction works begin, and in particular with the accommodation compound in operation. This is a very great cause of concern, stress and anxiety to your Petitioner who wishes to sell his property, yet to date finds himself unable to do so.  
   iii) Your Petitioner requests that the construction compound development ought to, and could reasonably be carried out elsewhere within the HS2 development’s permitted limits and requests that alternative site locations be considered.  
   iv) Your Petitioner politely requests that he is extended the courtesy of a meeting with HS2 representatives to discuss the findings should the alternative site(s) location not be an option.  

4. Should an alternative not be found, your Petitioner requests;  
   i) that the Bill should be amended to ensure your Petitioner and other persons outside the safeguarding area who are injuriously affected and adversely affected by loss of value should be entitled to claim compensation.  
   ii) that the compensation provisions in relation to property that is not compulsory acquired and other matters are not sufficient to compensate your Petitioner adequately for the loss and damage they may incur as a result of construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development.  
   iii) that the proposed ‘Need to Sell’ scheme, as set out in the Government’s property compensation package, acknowledge the extent of the blight the High Speed 2 accommodation compound will cause.  
   iv) that the Government should remove the requirement that applicants to this scheme must demonstrate financial hardship in order to qualify. A further scheme
should be introduced to compensate those suffering from generalised property blight as a result of HS2 who wish to move home, before HS2 is operational.

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.

Mr Kevin Tearle

25 March 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF ICKENHAM RESIDENTS’ ASSOCIATION

Declares that:

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

2 Your Petitioner is the Ickenham Residents’ Association established in 1924. The association represents 3235 households in the Ickenham ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Your petitioner and its members submitted 2617 responses to the HS2 Phase One Environmental Statement Consultation – together with Harefield our neighbouring ward we represented 25% of the responses to the Consultation which demonstrates the great concerns your petitioner and its members have.

3 Your petitioner alleges 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 is petitioning to try and secure the best possible mitigation for the members and Ickenham. They accordingly object to the Bill for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Introductory

4 Your petitioner opposes the Bill in principle. Whilst your petitioner acknowledges that the principle of the Bill is established at third reading, your petitioner’s views on the subject are so strong, they must be recorded in this petition.

5 Your petitioner considers that the Environmental Statement did not adequately assess the impacts on Ickenham roads, schools, employment, ecology, air quality, local services, emergency services, drainage and flooding. It was prepared with great haste and the most adverse effects were never discussed at Community Forums.

6 HS2 Ltd refused to engage in discussion with your petitioner and its members to mitigate the adverse impacts on Ickenham. Even with the intervention of your petitioner’s local MP in September 2013, HS2 Ltd refused to meet with your petitioner to discuss extending the tunnel beyond West Ruislip.
7 Your petitioner alleges that the Government should have carried out a Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment prior to its decision to proceed with the HS2 Scheme in January 2012. Furthermore, your petitioner considers that the Environmental Statement fails to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, the HS2 proposal will cause harm to the open countryside and Green Belt land, which is arguably contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Insufficient time has been allowed for comprehensive consideration of the Environmental Statement consultation responses and there has been a wholly inadequate summary of these responses which has overtly omitted vast amounts of very significant information which should have been included.

General Concerns

8 Your petitioner has identified several specific significant concerns which are set out below. This list is by no means exhaustive, and due to the inadequacy and inaccuracies of the Environmental Statement prepared by HS2, it is inevitable that that the construction of HS2 will disrupt the lives of your petitioner and its members in ways which are not yet known.

Tunnel Extensions

9 Your petitioner respectfully submits that the proposal to carry the railway overground through the area between Ruislip and the M25 will give rise to many community, health, business and environmental impacts. In your petitioner's 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.

10 Given all the concerns and issues arising from the overland route in Ickenham and the Colne Valley your petitioner believes that the additional costs, if any, of an extension of the London tunnelling would be justified.

11 The following paragraphs set out in more details your petitioner's justification for a tunnel.

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

12 The following paragraphs explain the remedies that your petitioner seeks as a minimum in respect of the matters that are covered, should your honourable House not find in favour of the tunnel being extended.
Specific Concerns

Construction Works

13 Your petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and its associated development including but not limited to the siting of three constructions sites in the area of Ickenham, heavy volumes of construction traffic, the dumping of spoil on green belt land, a construction compound on ancient farmland with a concrete factory, decontamination plant, lorry parks and storage of fuel.

14 Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require that the nominated undertaker is subject to binding site specific mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of these works. These binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to restrictions on noise, dust and vibration, restricting HGV movements to trunk roads and prohibiting HGV movements through Ickenham.

15 The nominated undertaker should also mitigate the impacts on visual amenity through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, dust dampening, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.

Noise

16 Your petitioner understands from the Environmental Statement that there will be significant adverse noise impacts as a direct result of the over ground high speed railway in Ickenham and during the construction of the works. Your petitioner and its members will suffer adverse effects from construction traffic and sites in Harvil Road, Breakspear Road South and Ickenham High Road for a period of up to ten years.

17 Your petitioner is concerned that the noise thresholds chosen by HS2 Ltd do not reflect current World Health Organisation standards nor the latest research which shows adverse health impacts from prolonged exposure to noise above World Health Organisation limits.

18 Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require the nominated undertaker to ensure that operation of the high speed railway does not exceed 40dB, the threshold identified by the World Health Organisation as appropriate for ensuring no long term health issues for persons living nearby.

19 Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require the nominated undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that no noise can be felt in the residential dwellings and that there are no other adverse effects.

20 Your petitioner also requests your honourable House to require that there should be binding mitigation measures on the nominated undertaker including effective noise mitigation and monitoring system in place before commencement and during construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development together with the provision of adequate compensation measures.
Construction Traffic

21 Your petitioner is gravely concerned about the inadequacy of measures proposed to mitigate the effects of construction traffic throughout Ickenham. The siting of three construction sites in Ickenham for up to 10 years with other constructions sites in nearby Harefield and site signalisation will cause significant disruption and congestion to Ickenham suburban roads by HGV traffic. These roads are already heavily congested by local traffic and through traffic from commuters across north west London. Breakspear Road South, Harvil Road, Swakeleys Road, Ickenham High Road, Ickenham Road are already heavily congested during morning and evening peak times. A number of side roads such as Copthall Road West, St Georges Drive, Greenacres Avenue, Thornhill Road, Ivy House Road, Warren Road are already affected by 'rat running'. Your petitioner and its constituents are concerned that they will be adversely affected in travelling to their jobs, taking children to schools and the safety of their children walking to school.

Your petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the adverse effects of the heavy volume and its congestion, site signalisation and the adverse effects of air pollution, noise, and vibration by re-evaluating the construction plans and amending the Code of Construction Practice to strictly enforce the measures such as but not restricted to the following:

(a) Devise and implement a plan whereby HS2 HGV traffic should only use haul roads and not have access to our local roads.

(b) Construction of the viaduct across the Colne Valley first and use the viaduct as road access to the site via Moor Hall Road which provides a direct short link to the North Orbital Road. This would protect both Ickenham and South Harefield.

(c) Restricting HGV movements inside peak hours throughout Ickenham and prohibiting HGV movements near school routes for 30 minutes before and after the start and end of the school day (during term time).

(d) Ensuring that the school communities and the local community have safe access to their education institution and local facilities by ensuring the Pedestrian crossings in Swakeleys Road and across Swakeleys A40 roundabout are accessible, not restricted and kept in full working order. The Nominated Undertaker should ensure that in the event of any of the existing crossings being temporarily closed, that an alternative safe replacement crossing is provided.

(e) Operating a low emissions shuttle bus system for construction workers from key public transport interchanges to restrict the need to provide car parking for contractors at the construction compounds.

(f) Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from Ickenham by rail, so avoiding the creation of the spoil dumps between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South.

Health and Welfare

4
Your petitioner is gravely concerned that the emergency services will be unable to provide timely support to their members' families and property due to road congestion during the construction period. The roads in Ickenham provide access to Mount Vernon Hospital and to Harefield Hospital which has a dedicated Heart Attack Centre used for emergencies from outer north-west London; according to the Trust speed of treatment has shown to be crucial to survival in these cases. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require that the nominated undertaker will at all times during the construction works maintain adequate access through Ickenham for emergency services.

Road Safety

Junctions on Swakeleys and Ickenham High Roads are already identified as accident black spots with multiple accidents per year. There are 4 schools in Ickenham and cycle paths on Ickenham High Road. There are elderly care homes on Ickenham High Road and Ickenham Road. West Ruislip station used by many thousands of persons per day is a highly congested area of commuter traffic and cyclists. Your petitioner is seriously concerned that the addition of HS2 HGV construction traffic on the local roads will further jeopardise the safety of all road users. HS2 HGV traffic should only use haul roads and not have access to our local roads.

Environment

Your petitioner and its members make extensive use of the recreational facilities afforded by the London Borough of Hillingdon and the Colne Valley and are very concerned about the following impacts of the high speed railway:

a) Diversions of public rights of way will restrict their use and in some cases these are diverted onto busy roads, e.g. Breakspear Road South, with no footways thereby representing a danger to the walkers' lives.

b) The impacts on Uxbridge and Ruislip Golf courses which may require their temporary or permanent closure.

c) The loss of HOAC given that there are significant planning risks associated with the proposals at Denham, with no planning application yet submitted, and therefore no guarantee that HOAC can be satisfactorily relocated

d) Adverse effects on the ecology, in particular on the bat and owl populations.

e) The use of the green belt areas of Ickenham between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South as spoil dumps.

The only practicable mitigation for all these impacts is the full tunnel as requested above.

Should your honourable House not find in favour of such a tunnel, your petitioners request that your nominated undertaker be required to construct such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from Ickenham by rail.
Air Pollution

28 Your petitioner is concerned that unless the railway is constructed in a tunnel a significant amount of HGV traffic arising from 3 major construction sites will be directed through Ickenham and will converge on Swakeleys Road, a roadway already exceeding minimum EU standards for health and used by the petitioner and its members' school children, walking to Vyners School. The latest Bill provisions recognise that the HS2 traffic on Ickenham High Road will cause air pollution to exceed minimum EU standards. Scientific research shows that diesel pollutants – particulate matter and NOx emissions – cause long term harm to health. HS2 HGV traffic should only use haul roads and not have access to our local roads.

Vibration

29 Your petitioner is concerned about the effects of vibration arising from the operation and construction of the high speed railway and associated development including heavy construction traffic. In addition to your petitioner and its members' concerns for their properties the ward of Ickenham includes ancient buildings and structures which are situated close to proposed construction routes and do not have substantial foundations. HS2 HGV traffic should only use haul roads and not have access to our local roads.

Drainage and flooding

30 Your petitioner is also concerned that there is an increased risk of surface water flooding from placement of excavated material and construction of works between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South. Your petitioner believes that the Bill as it stands makes no provision to safeguard your petitioners and its members' roads and properties from flooding and groundwater contamination and the provisions necessary for their protection have been omitted from it. Your petitioner requires the nominated undertaker to commission a detailed independent assessment of the risks of surface water flooding or the implications on groundwater contamination which can form the basis of comprehensive mitigation proposals.

Proposed Railhead at Ickenham

31 Your petitioner would request your honourable House to require the nominated undertaker to ensure that the proposed railhead at Ickenham be operational as soon as possible and well in advance of any tunnelling works, in order to minimise the transportation of spoil and materials by roads and the dumping of spoil in green belt areas of Ickenham between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South.
‘Sustainable Placement Areas’

32 Your petitioner is concerned about the vast quantity of spoil that is to be dispersed in Ickenham. Your petitioner considers that the areas that have been selected for the ‘Sustainable Placement’ of material have not been properly assessed. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require that the nominated undertaker re-evaluate the areas identified for the deposit of spoil in terms of their suitability and prepare alternative proposals for consultation.

Local Transport Services

33 Your petitioner is concerned that the proposals for HS2 will cause significant disruption to existing bus, rail and underground services. The U1, U9 and U10 bus routes are vital links for many of your petitioner’s older members and these services will be greatly impacted by the increased traffic congestion levels. The extensive construction works and railhead required at West Ruislip are a particular cause for concern as the LT Central Line and Chiltern railway are used by your petitioner and its members to travel to their places of work. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require assurances from the nominated undertaker that your petitioner’s transport services will not be disrupted during construction works.

The Community and Environment Fund and the Local Economy Fund

34 Given the wider social, environmental and economic impacts of HS2 in Ickenham, the Petitioner is concerned that its residents will not be able to satisfactorily access the funds that have been set aside on a route-wide basis (i.e. the Community and Environment Fund and the Local Economy Fund). The petitioner has concerns a) that the size of the these funds (£40 million) may not be sufficient to cover the number of bids and b) that the funds may go to those less impacted by HS2 because the Promoter has not accepted the recommendation of the Commons Select Committee to ring fence the funds on a geographical basis.

Landscape

35 Your petitioner understands from the Environmental Statement that there will be significant adverse impacts on the landscape in Ickenham both during the ten year construction phase and from the dumping of excavated materials. Your petitioner believes that as the Bill stands makes no provision to protect the landscape character of Ickenham and requests your honourable House to amend the Bill so as to provide protection to your petitioners.
Compensation

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

37 Your Petitioner requests your honourable House to amend the Bill to ensure your petitioner and its members outside the safeguarded area who are injuriously affected and adversely affected by loss of value to their properties should be entitled to claim compensation.

Heathrow Spurs

38 Your petitioner is of the view that there is no business case for the Heathrow spurs and there is no positive cost benefit case for the disruption during construction or operation as part of Phase Two of the HS2 project. Your petitioner requests that the Bill be amended so that the passive provision for the spurs is removed. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require that the nominated undertaker takes the opportunity to use the costs savings from the dismissal of the Heathrow spurs to build the Colne Valley tunnel as requested.

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

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.

On behalf of Ickenham Residents Association
To the House of Lords

Session 2015 - 16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL [LONDON-WEST MIDLANDS] BILL

THE PETITION OF JOHN DONOVAN

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner is the freehold owner of 122 Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham, UB10 8JG, which is located in the London Borough of Hillingdon. Your petitioner has owned this property since 1993.

3. Your petitioner alleges that he is specially and directly affected by the Bill and his 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 he accordingly objects to the Bill for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

4. Your petitioner opposes the Bill in principle. Whilst your petitioner acknowledges that the principle of the Bill is established at third reading, your petitioner's views on the subject are so strong, they must be recorded in this petition.

5. As a resident of Ickenham your petitioner has 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 Ltd, it is inevitable that the construction of HS2 will severely disrupt the life of the petitioner and his wife in ways which are not yet known.

6. Your petitioner respectfully submits that the proposal to carry the railway over ground through the area between West Ruislip and the M25 will give rise to many community, health, business and environmental impacts. In your petitioners respectful submission the cumulative effects of all these adverse impacts requires that a bored tunnel should be constructed instead of an overland route across Ickenham and the Colne Valley which would immediately solve all the problems caused by the proposed overland route, land purchase, compensation, property blight, mitigation costs, pollution, noise, traffic congestion, cost to the local economy, disruption to local people's lives and the saving of the Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre at its present site.

Your petitioner believes in that in fairness and justice for local people there must be a fully detailed and independent comparison of costs and benefits between the current overland route and a bored tunnel.
7. The following paragraphs set out in more detail your petitioners justification for a tunnel extension and they also explain the remedies that your petitioner seeks as a minimum in respect of the matters that are covered, should your honourable House not find in favour of a tunnel extension through Ickenham to the M25.

8. Your petitioner's property is separated from the existing Chiltern line railway and the proposed high speed railway line by a narrow stretch of land known as King George V Playing Field.

9. Your petitioner is very concerned that his property and the well being of his wife and himself will be adversely impacted by the noise, vibration, light pollution and poor air quality caused by the planned construction works in Ickenham, much of which will be close to his home and is proposed to take place 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, giving no respite from the above.

10. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require that the nominated undertaker ensures that the hours during which the construction works take place in Ickenham are uniform and restricted to 8am. – 5pm. operation only between Mondays to Friday.

11. The consequences of these extensive construction works which will severely affect your petitioners health and well being, particularly the conveyor system operating between West Ruislip and Breakspear Road South 7 days a week, 24 hours a day for up to 10 years and the high speed trains, 18 an hour in each direction, 36 an hour in total when fully operational will inevitably disrupt your petitioners home environment including his and his family's enjoyment of their garden and their house due to noise, vibration, pollution and the visual impact of HS2 as it starts to rise on a viaduct to clear the river Pinn and Breakspear Road South with the overhead gantries being visible. At the present time a line of mature trees are between the Chiltern line and the proposed HS2 line, in addition to any noise or screening barrier put in place, your petitioner requests these be kept as they would help to obscure the visual impact of HS2 and any earth embankment that maybe erected.

12. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to ensure that the nominated undertaker only uses proven effective measures of mitigation and to include, binding mitigation measures including vibration and resultant damage mitigation and monitoring systems are in place before commencement and during construction and operation. Binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to an express obligation to undertake specific measures to limit structural and other damage to the property and are implemented so that he can continue to enjoy the peace and quiet of his garden and also not be affected when inside by noise, vibration and visual impact from the construction and operation of HS2.

13. Your petitioner and his wife consider the noise from the construction and operation of the proposed high speed rail will adversely affect their sleep, way of life and consequently their health.

14. Your petitioner contends that he will not derive any benefit from the project as the trains will not stop at West Ruislip station, his nearest station operating a service to Birmingham. For your petitioner to use the high speed line he will have to travel to central London, actually doubling his journey time.

15. Your petitioner considers the compensation offered is unsatisfactory. His home, which he considered to be part of his retirement plan, to be used when the time came to down size and provide a small income from the balance left from the sale of his home is now in doubt due to the loss in value as a result of its proximity to the HS2 line. Therefore your petitioner believes that the compensation zones are arbitrary and should extended, and based on the effects of noise not
simply on distance from the line, especially as so many homes will be affected by property blight in what is a heavily populated area, but under current proposals are not even covered.

16. Your petitioner would contend that traffic congestion will be further increased in Ickenham by the closure of the West London Waste Centre in South Ruislip in May 2014, resulting in the Harefield site in Harvil Road being the only site available to residents in the north of the borough of Hillingdon. This will result in major traffic problems in Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South.

17. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require the nominated undertaker to ensure that all mitigation measures are fully funded, regularly inspected and maintained in order to ensure they remain effective for the period of time the line is operational.

18. Your petitioner humbly submits that the proposed route was chosen purely to provide a link to Heathrow and was not the original proffered route. As the future of Heathrow as the main hub airport now is in doubt, it is unreasonable and unjust that your petitioner will suffer personal and financial hardship as a result of the route being chosen for a reason that in all probability will never happen.

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.

12.04.2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Diana Caudery

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner lives in Whielden Street, Amersham. Your Petitioner is a Walk Leader for Simply Walk, part of Walking for Health.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioner is specifically and directly affected by the Bill in the following ways:

i. The vent shaft construction site at the south end of Whielden Street and approximately 500 yards from your Petitioner’s home, will have a detrimental affect on The Petitioner’s daily life. There will be increased traffic on Whielden Street, both due to construction workers accessing the vent shaft construction site, and by other road users avoiding hold ups on the main roads caused by HS2 construction. There will be increased noise, particularly outside commuting hours, and increased air pollution.

ii. Your Petitioner’s house is over 400 years old, Grade 2 listed, built of wattle and daub and has no foundations. The Grade 2 listing requires Your Petitioner to maintain the house in good repair using original materials. Your Petitioner may incur costs for repairs if heavy construction traffic accesses the vent shaft site from the north end of Whielden Street. Words such as “target” and “encourage” in the Draft Code of Construction Practice give no confidence that construction vehicles will not access the Whielden Street vent shaft construction site from the north end of Whielden Street (passing your Petitioner’s house), when there are likely to be traffic delays on the by-pass round the town.

iii. Many of the houses on Whielden Street, including Your Petitioner’s house, have no off-street parking and rely on the unrestricted parking on Whielden Street. Parking by construction workers in Whielden Street, and the potential removal of some of the parking spaces close to the vent shaft site, will put additional pressure on the available parking and may result in residents of Whielden Street having to use the pay and display public car park.
iv. The bus route which runs past the vent shaft site along Whielden Street may be delayed or rerouted. It is a lifeline for some of the residents of Old Amersham, including Your Petitioner.

v. The Whielden Street vent shaft construction site extends north along Whielden Street, and also west along the A413 beyond the junction of the A404/A413. There are various footpaths and a cycle path which cross the Whielden Street construction site, including two which cross the A413 and one which runs along the side of the A413 before crossing it in a tunnel. If these are not passable at any time, they will force walkers and cyclists to take a longer and potentially more hazardous route.

vi. The A413 is the major route which links Amersham with the Chalfonts and beyond to London, and to Little and Great Missenden, Wendover and Aylesbury. Construction of the Whielden Street vent shaft, together with other major works on the A413 (tunnel portal, viaducts, haul routes, compounds and other vent shafts) will lead to traffic jams and increase journey times for Your Petitioner, both in and around her home, disrupting her daily life for at least 8.5 years.

vii. Your Petitioner enjoys the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, both as a leisure cyclist and as a walker. This area will be permanently spoilt from the tunnel portal northwards through the AONB. There will be noise from the trains, and visually it will be spoilt by the track, viaducts, security fencing, pylons and other structures.

viii. Your Petitioner has already, and will continue to be, affected by the financial burden of the whole Bill on her Local Authorities. 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 Petitioner will suffer from corresponding reductions in vital services, such as social services, provided by the county and district councils until these additional burdens are met. As HS2 brings no benefits to Your Petitioner whatsoever, these burdens are unfair and unacceptable.

4. Your Petitioner therefore asks that:

i. The Bill be amended to provide a continuous tunnel under the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, to exit at a portal north of Wendover. This avoids the permanent degradation of the AONB, and also reduces the impacts of the construction period relating to such features as tunnel portals, viaducts, cuttings, bridges, and construction compounds.

ii. The Draft Code of Construction Practice be amended to incorporate firm and clear assurances on traffic movements, traffic routes, and requirements of construction workers routes to work in the Amersham
area, plus assurances of how these working practices, agreed with local stakeholders, will be monitored and what redress will be readily and easily available to Your Petitioner 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. Whielden Street residents be provided with parking permits for the Pay and Display car park off The Broadway in Old Amersham. These permits must be valid 24 hours a day, 365 days per year, for the whole period of construction and fitting out of the Whielden Street vent shaft, including all associated utility work. Funding of these parking permits to be provided from the HS2 budget.

iv. Junction assessments are on-going relating to traffic flows on the A413. These must be publicised within a timeframe which allows for further Petitioning and for any necessary amendments to be made to the Bill.

v. All footpaths in the Amersham area (including those that cross the A413 and the one that runs alongside the A413) and the cycle path along the A404 south of Whielden Street must be maintained without interruption, either on the current route or rerouted. New footpaths, and any footpaths which are temporarily rerouted, must be provided in a safe state for walkers, for example any clay should be covered with shale or something similar which prevents slipping.

vi. The Community and Environment Fund be increased from the present derisory level, to enable Your Petitioner to receive adequate compensation for the disruption to her daily life 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.

vii. The funding of Local Authority Additional Burdens be increased to include all activities relating to HS2, to ensure that no further costs or service reductions fall on Your Petitioner.

5. 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.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16 and 2016-17

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF GARETH JOHN EASTMAN

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioner is a resident of the village of Twyford, near Buckingham and lives in a Grade 2 mediaeval hall house which is situated about 210m from the line of the proposed railway. The petitioner’s house dates back to the early 15th century and has no double glazing and very thin walls so there is no protection to adverse noise levels.
   The petitioner’s property is specifically and directly affected by both loss of value and by the increase in sound levels from the proposed new line.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

   The Petitioner has lived in St Mary’s House, Church Street, Twyford, with his wife since they purchased the property freehold in February 1987. The property is Grade 2 listed and very unique in character, dating from the 15th century and comprising unusually of two mediaeval hall houses joined together. The property is essentially a timber framed structure throughout although some walls have been brick clad and many other improvements have been carried out over the years including the recent construction of an oak framed garage and a barn.

   In 2012, the house was surveyed by the Bucks Archaeological Society, Historic Buildings Group, and a report prepared and published. Following their visit, the Group recommended that the property’s listing be amended to Grade 2* due to the unique nature of the double mediaeval hall configuration.

   It is situated at the end of Church Street, which is a cul de sac, and occupies a plot of land of about one acre. Bordered by the Church of St Mary’s to the South, it has unobstructed views to the North and East onto open, flat, farmland.
   There is no passing traffic and hence a very low ambient noise level – in fact it is extremely quiet, especially at night.

   The property is a very large family home of about 450m2 of accommodation and it consists of 5 bedrooms, living room, library, dining room and an office.
   When the Petitioner purchased the property, it was in a state of extreme disrepair and together with his wife, they have carried out a total renovation of the structure taking great care to be sympathetic to the age of the building and to maintain the mediaeval features wherever possible. Almost all the work was carried out by themselves.
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. The Petitioner’s property will not be demolished as a result of the Bill but it is located within 210 metres of the line.

The Petitioner’s property is more fully described in cl 4.3.25 and 4.3.26 of Volume 5, Cultural Heritage.

Loss of Value
The Petitioner and his wife are now retired and aged nearly 70 and their three children have now left home. It was always their intention to sell the property at a suitable time to allow them to free up a significant amount of capital to fund a comfortable retirement. The property has a current unblighted market value of between £1.2 and £1.4 million. In addition, as they get older, they are finding it extremely difficult to maintain the standards of repair necessary for such an important listed structure and to keep the large garden under control.

The petitioner has obtained several valuations of the blighted property all of which are about 40% less than the 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 repeated this statement in Parliament.

The Petitioner 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 petitioner objects to the terms of the current “Need to Sell” scheme in that it takes no account of making a lifestyle choice or the recognition of the unique nature of this type of property. The “Age and Stage” of petitioners who do not necessarily have a compelling need to sell has not been addressed. The petitioner states that contrary to the statements made by Philip Hammond in Parliament, as amongst those most seriously affected, they have clearly not been treated fairly.

Increase in sound levels
The petitioner objects to the significant increase in sound levels that are likely to be experienced in an extremely quiet and tranquil setting.

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

Appendix SV002-013 Table I, lists the results of this survey with the daytime noise level as 50.4dB and night as 39.9dB, with the highest level of 71.9dB.
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 St Mary’s House 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 certainly is not.

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 of L night outside the residential property during that part of the night when most people are in bed.

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

12 April 2016
To the House of Lords

SESSION 2015-2016

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF JOHN AND JACQUELINE BEARD

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are John and Jacqueline Beard, owners of a property at 61 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 7BA. We have lived in this house for 29 years, and raised a family here. We are both self-employed designers, with our working lives based in the property. The HS2 railway line was proposed to run directly beneath our property, as notified by Winckworth Sherwood on 25 November 2013, and it is specified in Schedules A B and E for compulsory acquisition. However the course of the line has since moved a few feet further away, to run under the road outside. Your Petitioners property is on a road to be used for construction traffic during the construction of the Scheme, and opposite an existing Network Rail entrance to Camden Carriage Sidings satellite compound, proposed to be used for approximately 1 year from 2017 for works to extend the sidings, to be carried out at night, weekends and bank holidays.

3. Your Petitioners Concerns are set out in the clauses which follow.

4. Your Petitioners are alarmed that the Bill gives the Secretary of state and the Nominated Undertaker the power to subject Camden and it’s residents to at least 15 years of misery through noise and air pollution, road closures and excessive HGV traffic through it’s streets, caused by the proposed demolition and rebuilding of Euston Station and the surrounding area, and the construction of the tunnels to accommodate HS2. These concerns over the impact of HS2 on Camden, and Primrose Hill in particular, have not been addressed by HS2 or by the House of Commons Select Committee.

5. Your Petitioners are particularly concerned about the excessive HGV traffic and noise levels we are likely to experience in the immediate vicinity of our property, in particular due to the works to be carried out at Camden Carriage Sidings. These works were originally planned for 1 year from the end of 2015, with work carried out mainly at night, weekends and bank holidays. This has since been delayed to start at the beginning
of 2017, but still as far as we know to last for 1 year. The exact nature of these works has never been made clear, but we have had confirmation from HS2 that the access point to the tracks for these works, whatever they might be, will be through the existing Network Rail gates opposite our property. These are the hours that Network Rail’s track maintenance crews currently work, and which we know from experience, are already intolerable. Despite constant reassurances that they are considerate in their working practices and that they keep noise levels to a minimum, we know this is not the case. We have had to contact Network Rail on numerous occasions to complain about the noise levels at night, and lack of consideration for the residents nearby. Unfortunately our experience doesn’t give us any confidence for the works associated with HS2, and we need reassurances and commitment that noise levels, at night in particular, will be kept to a minimum, and monitored.

6. Just before your Petitioners appearance before the House of Commons Select Committee, it was announced that it was planned to remove spoil from the development of Euston Station by rail. A conveyor belt for the removal of the spoil, with the possibility of transfer to trains at Camden Carriage Sidings was proposed. This new development came too late to be addressed at the Select Committee hearing, but is of considerable concern to us. Since all movements on both the mainline tracks and the track to Camden Carriage Sidings are both visible and audible from our property, this is a particularly alarming aspect of the proposed blight on our property and our lives in general, for many years to come.

7. Your Petitioners are also concerned about the lack of consideration or compensation currently being offered to the owners of affected properties, which must have their value and saleability affected by the proposed Bill. We will be at the age and stage in our lives during the construction of HS2, when we will want to sell our property, to fund our retirement. What will be the effect on our ability to sell for the correct market price that would have been realised prior to the implementation of the Bill? Whilst construction works are being carried out, the negative impacts would be both visible and audible to prospective purchasers. What effect would the Schedule A B and D Notices have? There is also the long term question over how the property and its stability might be affected, and whether noise and vibration from tunnelling or trains will ever be noticeable, and become a problem. We have yet to receive reassurances that our concerns will be dealt with, and compensation offered, in the same way as has been proposed in rural areas affected by the Bill.

8. Your Petitioners property adjoins the Grand Union Canal, and any rupture to the framework of the Canal caused by utility or tunnelling works beneath, could cause water to leak into our grounds or property. We notice in the Environmental Statement November 2013, 13.4.7 that there are measures in place to ‘reduce’ the risk of accidental discharge where utility or other construction work is being carried out in the vicinity of the Grand Union Canal. Reducing risk doesn’t give us much confidence, and we need reassurances that any property will not be affected by any leakage from the canal, or that if it is, measures will be in place to deal with any damage caused. We have never experienced any leakage in the past and our buildings insurance reflects this, even though we live in close proximity to water.

10. Some of your petitioners concerns could be alleviated the tunnels were re-aligned to run under the existing rail lines.
11. 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 to be given that HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must review the construction strategy for the project and give more thought to, and consideration for the residents, businesses, and community as a whole, that is about to be destroyed for ever, and come forward with necessary changes, and compensation proposals arising from that review, before works packages design and tendering strategies have been finalised. The proposal from The London Borough of Camden, that the Bill should be amended to allow for a temporary London terminus station at Old Oak Common, should also be given serious consideration, to enable construction works to commence in some areas, allowing more time to be given to develop and design the right Terminus and development at Euston, and it’s surrounding area.

12. 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.

13. 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 the opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers the Bill.

AND the Petitioners remain, etc

John Beard  
Jacqueline Beard

13th April 2016
To the House of Lords
SESSION 2015-2016

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION of CHIPPING WARDEN AND EDGCOTE PARISH COUNCIL

Declares that:-

1. The petitioners Chipping Warden and Edgcote Parish Council are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. The petitioners are Chipping Warden and Edgcote Parish Council. Chipping Warden and Edgcote parishes enclose the villages of Chipping Warden and Edgcote and sit at the western boundary of the District of South Northamptonshire which is predominately rural in character with two historic market towns Towcester and Brackley. The district wraps partly around the Borough of Northampton on its eastern boundary. Residents of the parish have a high quality of life surrounded by beautiful countryside which attracts people to live, work and visit the area.

3. Chipping Warden and Edgcote parishes have been designated as part of the South Northamptonshire Special Landscape Area.

4. The village of Chipping Warden has a remarkably tranquil feel in spite of the A361 that runs through the village centre. The historic centre of the village is designated a Conservation Area by South Northants Planning and contains many listed buildings and the 13th century church. The conservation area surrounds the village public houses and adjoins the village hall and playing fields where there are weekly cricket and football fixtures throughout the year. This represents the heart of the community.

5. The village of Chipping Warden has historically had high house prices and strong pressure for further development outside the village confines which has been resisted by the Parish Council with support from South Northamptonshire District Council. The village is defined as a restricted infill village in the local structure plan.

6. Properties in Edgcote village are mainly owned by the Edgcote Estate. The Parish Council of Chipping Warden took over the duties of the Edgcote Parish meeting in 2008 when the parishes were combined for administration purposes.

7. The Bill would authorise the compulsory acquisition of land belonging to the constituents of the Parishes, to which they object and some are Petitioning separately. Parishioners will be subject to constant disruption from noise, dust, construction traffic and suffer total disruption of the enjoyment of daily life throughout the six year construction period.

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

9. Your Petitioners have listed below their very serious concerns regarding the construction and operation of the rail line and its impact on Chipping Warden and Edgcote parishes under the following headings: Construction impacts and suggested solutions; your Petitioners scheme design objections and the operational impacts with suggested solutions. Your Petitioners also have some general observations on the overall scheme that we would like your Honourable House to consider.
Construction Impacts

10. Your Petitioners are extremely concerned about the substantial interference from noise, road traffic safety, vibration, subsidence, dust and dirt, hours of work, change of character of the village, loss of property value and ability to sell property that the construction of the line will have on Chipping Warden and Edgcote parishes and the subsequent loss of quality of life for individuals and the community of both parishes. Your Petitioners are particularly concerned as this directly affects the village school and the conservation area of the historic village centre. The proposed Main Construction Compound and associated construction traffic may have a major impact on village life.

Impacts on Chipping Warden Primary School and Kindergarten

11. Your Petitioners are extremely concerned about the impact of construction on the safety and health of the children of Chipping Warden Primary School and Kindergarten.

12. The Chipping Warden Primary School and Kindergarten are located in the World War II airfield hospital buildings to the north of the village on the east of the A361. The Promoters have acknowledged that there will be impacts on the school and have proposed a bypass to remove the construction vehicles from passing the front of the building.

13. These construction vehicles will be moving soil from sites further along the line at Greatworth and Turweston using the A361 from the M40 junction at Banbury. Following changes proposed in the Additional Provisions the number of these vehicles was calculated (based on 30 Tonne vehicles) at 2280 trips per day to move the volume of soil within the proposed construction period. This has now been limited to a maximum of 500 trips per day each way along the A361 under an assurance given by the Secretary of State. Also there is now proposed to be a mass haul route along the route of the line to further reduce the requirement for such vehicles to use the A361.

14. Whilst the your petitioners fully support this we have, at this time, received no clear indication of the effects of the mass haul route on the environment and its presence close to the school is concerning. Also we are concerned that the restriction on vehicle volumes could serve to prolong the construction period but we have not been given any new construction phasing timings other than that which was originally published.

Impacts of the Main Construction Compound

15. Your Petitioners are concerned over the siting of a 'main construction compound' north of the village on the airfield by the A361 just beyond the school and would like to request that there is no on-site accommodation. We feel a rural village environment is most unsuited to a large influx of outside workers.

16. Your Petitioners request that the nominated undertaker provides sophisticated low impact lighting solutions at the compound, to be activated only when the compound is in use; similarly the auto transformer installation should only be lit during necessary inspection and maintenance visits. This will minimise the adverse environmental impact of such lighting.

Impacts on Chipping Warden Village Conservation Area

17. Your Petitioners are particularly concerned that in spite of constructing a bypass of the village conservation area the current railway design still requires construction vehicles to pass through the heart of the village conservation area and along Culworth Road to arrive at the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel (South Portal) Satellite Compound.

18. Your Petitioners have repeatedly requested that the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel (South Portal) Satellite Compound and material stockpiles along with the portal building and concrete hardstanding area to the south of the proposed railway be relocated to the north side of the railway and accessed from Welsh Road.
19. Our pleas for a modest change to the plans that could have a major impact on the quality of life in the village have been ignored whereas a similar request by our neighbouring Parish Council of Aston-Le-Walls to relocate the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel (North Portal) Satellite Compound from the north to the south of the railway and removing ANY construction traffic from passing through the centre of their village has been granted. This change to the North Portal alignment means that access for construction traffic, fitting out and maintenance will now be from the south along Appletree Road and Appletree Lane causing a greater impact on the residents of our parish.

20. Culworth Road is quite restricted outside the Griffin public house so it would be impossible for two HGVs to pass. This situation is exacerbated by on street parking throughout the area.

21. This is the heart of the conservation area and any additional traffic will destroy what is the key local amenity of the village including the local pub, the village hall, the cricket pitch (used by adults and children, and which also doubles as a football pitch in winter), the children’s playground, footpaths and bridleways.

22. Also the majority of village children that walk to school use the east side pavement of the A361 (i.e. the school side) which means that they cross the Culworth Road at its existing junction with the A361

**Impacts on the residents of Allens Orchard and Arbury Banks**

23. Whilst we fully support the construction of the bypass around the conservation area we are concerned that with the proposed traffic volumes there still will be a large negative impact on the quality of life of the residents of Allens Orchard which fronts on to the A361 in the southern end of the village before the start of the bypass.

24. There is also concern that the junction with Hogg End and the bus stop at Arbury Banks will become unsafe for users.

**Construction Impacts – Suggested Solutions**

25. Your Petitioners have considered the possible alternatives to the proposed scheme and whilst we possess limited resources and technical expertise there seem to be several straightforward adjustments that are recommended for consideration.

**Relocation of the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel (South Portal) Satellite Compound and portal buildings**

26. Your Petitioners suggest that by moving the portal building and associated concrete hardstanding along with the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel (South Portal) Satellite Compound from the south west to the north east of the railway and providing the access southwards from Welsh Road rather than northwards from Culworth Road the site can be accessed from the Main Construction Compound without entering the village, not passing the school, and preserving the conservation area. Any deliveries to or from the roadhead would also avoid the conservation area.

27. This would also have the advantage of maintaining access to the businesses based in the Calves Close Spinney throughout the construction without requiring them to cross the construction workings.

**Realignment of the southern end of the Chipping Warden bypass**

28. Moving the southern end of the bypass further to the north-west and rejoining the A361 beyond the junction with Hogg End would result in an effective bypass of the whole village and reduce the construction impacts on the residents of Allens Orchard.

29. This would require very little additional landtake and may remove the need for the creation of a costly and unsightly acoustic barrier fence.
Scheme Design Objections

Drainage of the airfield and surrounding area

30. From your Petitioners earliest meeting with the Promoters we have strongly urged concern over the drainage issues and we have particular concern over the stormwater runoff from the Airfield site.

31. At present ALL this rainwater from the entire complex is routed via two WWII drainage channels across the airfield to the receiving stream which now lies directly on the other side of the line of the railway. This outlet is in the brook just south of the pond which is referred to as ‘Unnamed pond at Calves Close Spinney’ in the Environmental Statement Water Resource Appendix WR-002-015.

32. After raising this issue repeatedly in site meetings with the Promoters, all consultations, at the Community Forums and in the Select Committee of the Commons there has been an on-site investigation of the issue and we were to receive a copy of the report. The engineers who carried out the investigation have confirmed that there is an issue and whilst we have now been informed by the Promoter that there is a proposed solution we have received no details of the solution and we have concerns that it may not address all our issues. We would like to reserve our right to present any such issues before the Select Committee.

Visual impact of rail infrastructure

33. Your Petitioners are gravely concerned about the visual impacts of the anticipated urban design nature of infrastructure such as road bridges, viaducts, culverts, green tunnel mouths and vents. These structures will be clearly visible from local properties in an unspoilt ancient landscape. The designs shown the Promoter’s own visual interpretations will not fit in with the surrounding environment. This will have a significant negative impact on the landscape, and ruin the aesthetics of the local environment. Your Petitioners do not support the use of white concrete structures of the type used on HS1 in Kent and would request a green dye be added wherever such concrete structures are absolutely required.

34. In order to minimise the impact of the proposal, your Petitioners request that prior to construction, your Petitioners and local residents should be consulted meaningfully on the detailed drawings and plans for bridges, viaducts, culverts and green tunnel mouths and vents. It must be designed to fit in with the surrounding environment, respect the local vernacular and be maintained to a high standard. Visual screening must be put in place, and this must also be maintained to a high standard.

35. Your Petitioners request that the design of infrastructure should be appropriate to a rural setting, in that the structures, construction materials and surface finishes are ones that complement the surroundings. In other words, the design of infrastructure in urban and rural areas must, by definition, be different.

Operational Impacts

Impact of liquefaction of boulder clay

36. Your Petitioners are gravely concerned that no work has been carried out on the possible effects of vibration from the high speed trains on the local topography – more specifically the underlying Boulder Clay in the Northamptonshire Uplands which covers much of the area between Radstone and Lower Boddington.

37. More specifically, your Petitioners are concerned that where deep cuttings are in place, specifically at Chipping Warden South Tunnel Portal and Aston Le Walls Portal, they should be designed in such a way as to completely avoid the risk of landslip due to this phenomenon of liquefaction. Furthermore, your Petitioners are concerned that vibration from the Green Tunnel may cause issues at Chipping Warden village particularly at the nearby primary school, buildings
which may have little, if any, foundations due to their construction in WWII. Wherever liquefaction of ground may occur, works may be required to stabilise historic buildings, which will almost certainly have an impact on their significance.

38. There has been a report commissioned and produced by Professor Woodford that has been purported to state that the Rayleigh Waves produced by a high speed train at Hs2 proposed speeds may create instability in the subsoil. This report is currently not available to the public and should be published to avoid unnecessary public alarm.

39. Your Petitioners also request that the Promoters acknowledge that mitigation may be required for properties that lie outside the Limits within which protective works can be carried out under the Bill.

Operational Impacts – Suggested Solutions

Flood Risk

40. Your Petitioners are concerned that discharge of surface water and possible diverted water courses from the rail line will increase the flooding risk and affect the operation of the water treatment plant for the village.

41. Your Petitioners seek reassurance that all precautionary measures are included in the proposals.

General observations for consideration

42. The implementation of High Speed 2 will result in permanent impacts for which mitigation to ‘nil detriment’ is not possible. For example, the railway will have a permanent adverse affect on the character of the deep rural nature through which the route passes by introducing a predominantly raised, linear, urbanising feature, the screening of which through tree planting is also out of character with the local area. As such, the character of rural South Northamptonshire will be permanently and negatively affected.

General process concerns

43. Your Petitioners have serious concerns over the provision of information supplied by the promoter of the Bill, both prior to the deposit of the Bill and up to the date of the deposit of this petition. This has meant that thorough and detailed assessments of the proposed project, its impacts and benefits have been impossible to compile. Your Petitioners are concerned that requests for further information and responses to specific requests remain outstanding. In particular, your Petitioners are still to be satisfied about the adequacy of the Environmental Statement. Your Petitioners believe baseline assumptions made over a number of generic issues have still to be substantiated. Ancillary documentation such as the proposed Code of Construction Practice remains in a draft form which is neither acceptable in principle, nor in its presumptions, proposals and extent of detail.

Conclusion

44. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless those clauses of the Bill referring to the proposed construction of High Speed 2 as it affects Chipping Warden and Edgcote Parishes are removed or amended, then the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

45. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
The Petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that Chipping Warden and Edgcote Parish Council, 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.

Nigel J. Gallehy  
Chair, Chipping Warden and Edgcote Parish Council  
ON behalf of the Chipping Warden and Edgcote Parish Council
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF GRAHAM PEARCE

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Graham Pearce, resident at Chapel House, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9NB, 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 approx. 1,500m 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 the 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 tranquility 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 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.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF LINDSEY and DAVID PEACE

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Lindsey and David Peace, residents and freeholders at Little Orchard, 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.
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.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF DEAN TURNER & LITA ALBRECHT-TURNER  

Declares that:  

1. The Petitioners (‘Your Petitioner’) are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.  

2. Your Petitioner  

Your Petitioner is Dean Turner and Lita Albrecht-Turner, resident at Thornlea, Swan Bottom, The Lee, 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 the 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.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF SARAH DUBUS

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Sarah Dubus, resident at Fernhurst, Sly Corner, Lee Common, 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 the 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:

- 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
- Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
- 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.
- 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.
- That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
- That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

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 ROGER LONGDIN

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Roger Longdin, owner of Broomfield Farm, Rignall Road, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9PE and Chairman of Agripower Ltd, based at the same address. Agripower Ltd also leases agricultural land near Bury Farm, South Heath; land which is now the property of HS2 Ltd and the intended location of the northern portal to the Chiltern Tunnel and the construction access road.

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

Your Petitioner's concerns

3. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioner will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner has requested (and continues to request) that the presently proposed Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the AONB. This will address most, if not all, of these specific adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner, and will reduce the impact on the AONB.

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.

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 4 to 6 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated.

CONSTRUCTION

4. Traffic impact on access to/from hilltop villages and along the A413.

Your Petitioner remains very concerned about the effect of the Proposed Route on access to/from hilltop villages to/from Great Missenden, along the A413 between the B485 junction at Great Missenden and Wendover (i.e. through the Wendover Gap) and the knock-on effect on local road in Gt Missenden, including Station Road and Rignall Road. Your petitioner uses all these roads as a regular part of his work and is concerned to see that, HS2 Ltds’ own assessment of the proposals is that it will result in major adverse effects on the A413 at the Link Road and Frith Hill roundabouts and at the junction with Rocky Lane, and that these junctions that will exceed their capacity. Your Petitioner is also specifically 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.

Remedies:

(a) Move more spoil down the trace (and using viaduct when built). Reduce the amount of spoil that then requires transporting by use of retained cuttings or a bored tunnel extension.

(b) Reduce the road transportation of spoil by taking it all along the trace, by rail.

(c) A fully developed, approved and consulted on Traffic Management Plan. The plan to be approved by Bucks County Council before the House of Lords Select Committee stops sitting.

(d) All costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd for monitoring and enforcement.

(d) Slip lanes/roads at the Link Road and Frith Hill roundabouts to facilitate traffic flow.

(e) Re-route the temporary north portal access road along the line of GM1/12 providing the opportunity to join the A413 further north hence reducing traffic congestion at the A413 (and knock-on to B485) roundabouts.

(b) Traffic signals to control construction traffic where it joins the A413.
LEASED LAND

5. Impact on the environment and landscape.

Your Petitioner farms approx. 65 acres of agricultural land near Bury Farm, South Heath, under a leasing arrangement originally with Paul Gillett, the previous owner, but now with HS2 Ltd, who have acquired the land for the building and operation of the railway. Whilst some of this land was required in any case under the original Proposed Scheme, significantly more land in this area will now be needed under the amendments introduced in Additional Provisions 4 (AP-4). Your petitioner is concerned as to his ability to continue to profitably farm any of this land and the adverse effects this will have on his business.

Remedies:

(a) Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB; thereby saving local farm land.

(b) Short (1.5 km) tunnel extension (the Residents’ Environmental Protection Association (REPA) tunnel) to Leather Lane.

OTHER CONCERNS


Your Petitioner also remains concerned about the impact of AP-4 on the local landscape in particular about:

- Diversion of footpath GMI/13
- Inadequate footbridge at GMI/12
- Inadequate and diversion of footpath GMI/2
- Two pylons replaced by obtrusive 11m higher pylon;
- Visual impacts to the whole immediate landscape

Remedies:

(a) Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB.

(b) Green foot-bridges at GMI/12 and GMI/2

(c) Bury power lines

(d) Placement of the high security fence within the cutting and not at the top of the cutting.
7. 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.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF SALLY KNOWLES

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Sally Knowles, of 1, Manor Cottages, The Lee, Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9NA, 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 1,000 m 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 the 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.

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 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 undertaking.
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.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF RICHARD STEWART-LIBERTY

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Richard Stewart-Liberty, of Field End Grange, Hawthorn Lane, The Lee, Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9LZ, 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 1,000 m 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 the 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.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF MARY CAMPBELL

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Mary Campbell, resident at Rushmere, The Lee Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9LZ, 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 1,000 m 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 enjoyment of the 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 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.

Culm Reginald Solly (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 Paula Wilson
Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner - The Petitioner is a residents of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). She will be specially and directly affected by the whole Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

3. The Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons here detailed

Your petitioner is freehold owner of “Greenhill” Dunsmore HP22 6QH. Dunsmore is a settlement on the Chiltern Ridge 800 feet above sea level, and west of the proposed HS2 line. It is immediately South of Wendover and the highest settlement in The Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is surrounded by Beech woods and agricultural land. There are two spring fed ponds and many footpaths and bridleways. The single-track Dunsmore lane reaches the settlement from the A413, the lane then runs west to the Rignall Road. It is unique place and characterized by beauty, peace, and tranquility. Your Petitioner is currently, and will be, seriously and adversely affected now and during both the construction phase and then during operation. Dunsmore has been included by HS2 Ltd in bilateral and forum meetings in recognition of the local impacts of the HS2 proposal and line. It will all negatively impact on your Petitioner.

The Petitioner is a nurse by training and now the mother of 3 children. Her youngest child is 11 years old. Because of the rural nature of Dunsmore there is no public transport and no school in the settlement. No pubs shops or etc.

Property devaluation as a result of the HS2 Proposal.
The value of my property has been detrimentally affected by HS2. This value will not recover fully when the line is operational despite Government statements. The reason for the devaluation is not only the prospect of
living through the desecration of a protected landscape but also the additional uncertainties arising from the operational features. This uncertainty is compounded by the inadequacy of the ES. The destruction of this unique landscape, the proposed line on two 500 metre viaducts joined by a high embankment, with balancing ponds, feeder station, spoil dumps otherwise known as sustainable placement areas is nothing short of vandalism. Hardly any wonder that my property has reduced in value.

Traffic congestion
She will be badly affected by the serious disruption of traffic and substantial delays caused by the daily addition of 300 HGV’s envisaged by HS2 Ltd using the A413, B4009 and the A41 during construction. The proposed closure of Smalldene Lane will mean that all vehicles will have to use the Dunsmore Lane junction with the A413 and the prospect of a right turn into the lane across oncoming traffic. This junction was not given special analysis by HS2 Ltd during the Environmental Statement despite comments in response that the traffic flows asserted by them are completely wrong. Your Petitioner will be adversely affected as daily she has to take and collect her son from school and after school and social activities. She runs a thrift shop at the RAF camp in Halton and needs to drive to local shops etc. She will suffer many long delays as a result of the construction of HS2.

Emergency Services
The congestion will have a detrimental effect on the access of Emergency Services to Dunsmore, fire, medical, and police. No account appears to have been taken of this by HS2 Ltd.

Noise and Light Pollution - from construction noise will destroy the tranquility of the Dunsmore and its environment. The unique position of the settlement, on the ridge overlooking the proposed line, make it particularly vulnerable. HS2 Ltd, noise assessment has not taken into account the topography of the valley or the tranquility levels. HS2 have repeatedly ignored requests to assess baseline noise levels, and although acknowledging that noise will be an issue in the valley have chosen to ignore it. There will be intrusive noise from the construction and from the trains the noise will be every 90 seconds and will vary according to the trains position either on a viaducts or passing along the embankment. This fluctuation has been shown in studies to present more annoyance and associated health risks than a constant loud noise. The detrimental impact of this noise is greater as it is such a tranquil area. Your Petitioner has currently very little light pollution. The need for powerful lighting on the construction site and the construction camps will have a negative impact on her enjoyment of “dark skies”.

- 2 -
Environmental damage- The Chilterns AONB south of Wendover would be permanently and irrevocably scarred by the construction of two 500 metre long viaducts with a height, with the associated catenary up to 26 metres. And an adjoining embankment. CPRE described this part of HS2 line as” the iconic scar on The Chilterns”. The line would be visible from many viewpoints around Dunsmore and environs. The cumulative effect would be overpowering and would destroy what is a Nationally Protected landscape and the area we are in will be irrevocably vandalised. Your Petitioner will be adversely affected in her recreational gardening, walking her dog etc. It will no longer be a quiet healthy relaxing pursuit as one will overlook one enormous construction site As mentioned above Dunsmore enjoys relatively high levels of tranquility and it is a matter for regret, that, despite requests to HS2Ltd they chosen not to undertake any sound surveys here, this, despite us having a private study done to establish a baseline level of noise. HS2Ltd have admitted that, as our settlement is located above the line we would experience serious aural and visual disturbance yet have not produced any solution to this problem. The issue of night-time maintenance and track grinding is also an area of great concern to your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is concerned that another injurious factor of construction is air quality pollution caused by dust, impact on purity of drinking water etc. The impact on the Dunsmore settlement has not been acknowledged, or properly assessed in the ES. There has been a failure to comprehend the topographical nature of the Misbourne valley.

Remedial Measures:

• Your Petitioner requests that a fully bored tunnel through the whole of the AONB can best remedy the above. Currently only the Southern section of the AoNB has received tunnelling by way of mitigation. This protection has been denied to the Northern section. There have been constant misrepresentations of the Proposed line and mitigation through The Chilterns AONB. The Green Tunnel” is an attempt to ‘disguise the nature of a trench and with a roof on it!

• Failing a fully bored tunnel an enclosed structure similar to the Arup concept enclosure would be required on the 2 viaducts, Wendover Dene, and Smalldean, and on the embankment, to ensure people would neither see nor hear the trains. At the same time the electricity
supply should be buried and pylons should be got rid of. Every crossing point should be designed as green bridges and we need world-class design for viaducts etc for this specific setting.

- The Code of Construction Practice should be legally binding with an independent overseer.

- Compensation Scheme is not fit for purpose and is not fair. It needs to be made fit for purpose and to fully compensate everyone, who has lost out, regardless of distance from proposed line, taking full account of their losses, this should include a figure for amenity loss not simply property value loss.

The Petitioner has 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 petitioner again proposes 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 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

Date 13-04-16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF Adrian Wilson
Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner - The Petitioner is a resident of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). He will be specially and directly affected by the whole Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

3. The Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons here detailed

Your petitioner is freehold owner of "Greenhill" Dunsmore HP22 6QH. Dunsmore is a settlement on the Chiltern Ridge, 800 feet above sea level, and west of the proposed HS2 line. It is immediately South of Wendover and is the highest settlement in The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is surrounded by Beech woods and agricultural land. There are two spring fed ponds and many footpaths and bridleways. The single-track Dunsmore lane reaches the settlement from the A413, the lane then runs west to the Rignall Road. It is a unique place and is characterized by beauty, peace, and tranquility. Your Petitioner is currently, and will be, seriously and adversely affected now and during both the construction phase and then during operation. Dunsmore has been included by HS2 Ltd in bilateral and forum meetings in recognition of the local impacts of the HS2 proposal and line. This will all negatively impact on your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is a Physician by training, he is an examiner for the Royal Colleges of London and Edinburgh, an overseas Professor of Medicine, and a company Director. He is the father of 3 children. His youngest child is 11 years old. Because of the rural nature of Dunsmore there is no public transport, and no school exists in the settlement. No pubs, shops or public facilities exist. Access to all public amenities involves road travel.

Property devaluation as a result of the HS2 Proposal.
The value of your petitioner's property has been detrimentally affected by HS2. This value will not recover fully when the line is operational despite Government statements. The reason for the devaluation is not only the prospect of living through the desecration of a protected landscape but also the additional uncertainties arising from the project's operational features. This uncertainty is compounded by the inadequacy of the Environmental Statement. The destruction of this unique landscape, the proposed line on two 500 metre viaducts joined by a high embankment, with balancing ponds, feeder station, spoil dumps otherwise known as sustainable placement areas is nothing short of vandalism in an AONB. Your petitioner's property has reduced in value.
Traffic congestion
Your petitioner will be badly affected by the serious disruption of traffic and substantial delays caused by the daily addition of 300 HGV's envisaged by HS2 Ltd using the A413, B4009 and the A.41 during construction. The proposed closure of Smalldean Lane will mean that all vehicles will have to use the Dunsmore Lane junction with the A413 and face the prospect of a right turn into the lane across oncoming traffic. This junction was not given special analysis by HS2 Ltd during the Environmental Statement despite comments in response that the traffic flows asserted by them are completely wrong. Your Petitioner will be adversely affected as daily he has to undertake professional, family, and social activities. His professional activities will suffer disruption and many long delays as a result of the construction of HS2.

Emergency Services
The congestion will have a detrimental effect on the access of all Emergency Services to Dunsmore. No account appears to have been taken of this by HS2 Ltd.

Noise and Light Pollution
Construction noise and the subsequent passing of trains every 90 seconds train will destroy the tranquility of Dunsmore and its environment. The unique position of the settlement, on the ridge overlooking the proposed line, make it particularly vulnerable. The HS2 Ltd noise assessment has not taken into account the topography of the valley or the ambient tranquility levels. HS2 has repeatedly ignored my requests to assess baseline noise levels, and to model the noise impact of 250mph trains on habitation 400 to 500 feet above the viaduct; although acknowledging that noise will be an issue in the valley they have chosen not to address the impact at heights above. That there will certainly be intrusive noise from the construction and from the subsequent trains is confirmed by the fact that already traffic, music, and military exercises are currently audible at your petitioners Dunsmore location from as far as five miles distant. Yet HS2 has refused to explore this concern. Train noise will be every 90 seconds and will vary according to the trains position either on the viaducts or passing along the embankment. Noise fluctuations have been shown in studies to present more annoyance and associated health risks than a constant loud noise. The detrimental impact of noise is greater as it is such a tranquil area. Further, Your Petitioner has currently very little light pollution. The need for powerful lighting on the construction site and the construction camps will have a negative impact on the availability of "dark skies" which are now recognised together with low ambient noise as being significant determinants of well-being.

Environmental damage
The Chilterns AONB south of Wendover would be permanently and irrevocably scarred by the construction of two 500 metre long viaducts with a height, with the associated catenary up to 26 metres and an adjoining embankment. CPRE described this part of HS2 line as"the iconic scar on The Chilterns". The line would be visible from many viewpoints around Dunsmore and environs. The cumulative effect would be overpowering and would destroy what is a Nationally Protected landscape and the area we are in will be irrevocably vandalised. Your Petitioner will be adversely affected in his recreational bird watching, walking, gardening etc. It will no longer be quiet healthy or relaxing as one will overlook an enormous construction site in the Valley below Dunsmore.
As mentioned above Dunsmore enjoys relatively high levels of tranquility and it is a matter for regret, that, despite requests to HS2 Ltd they have chosen not to undertake any sound surveys here. HS2 Ltd has admitted that, as our settlement is located above the line we would experience serious aural and visual disturbance yet have not produced any solution to this problem. The issue of night-time maintenance and track grinding is also an area of great concern to your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is concerned that another injurious factor of construction is air quality pollution caused by dust, impact on purity of drinking water etc. The impact on the Dunsmore settlement has not been acknowledged, or properly assessed in the ES. There has been a failure to comprehend the topographical nature of the Misbourne valley.

Remedial Measures:

- Your Petitioner requests that a fully bored tunnel through the whole of the AONB can best remedy the above. Currently only the Southern section of the AONB has received tunnelling by way of mitigation. This protection has been denied to the Northern section, accompanied by constant misrepresentations of the impact of the proposed line and of mitigation through The Chilterns AONB. The “Green Tunnel” is an attempt to disguise the nature of a trench.

- Failing a fully bored tunnel, an enclosed structure similar to the Arup concept enclosure would be required on the 2 viaducts, Wendover Dean, and Smalldean, and on the embankment, to ensure people would neither see nor hear the trains. At the same time the electricity supply should be buried and pylons eliminated. Every crossing point should be designed as green bridges and we need world-class design for viaducts etc for this specific setting.

- The Code of Construction Practice should be legally binding with an independent overseer.

- The Compensation Scheme is not fit for purpose and is not fair. It needs to be made fit for purpose and to fully compensate everyone experiencing blight, regardless of distance from proposed line, taking full account of their losses. This compensation should include a figure for amenity loss; not simply property value loss.

Your Petitioner has 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.
Your petitioner again proposes 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 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.

Professor Adrian Wilson

14/04/2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Frances Morgan

Declarations 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 35, Kings Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QY, which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location but is located 500 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. 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 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.

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 GM/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 ANTHONY HERMAN KAY  

Declares that:  

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

2. The petitioner is together with his wife, who are both in their early seventies, living since 2003 at 26 Crossfield Road London NW3 4NT which is just off Eton Avenue, and about 100 metres to the north from the line of the proposed tunnel between Fellows Road and Adelaide Road. Prior to that your Petitioner and his wife lived in a flat nearby in Eton Avenue, in the case of your Petitioner since 1974. In 1996 Your Petitioner when he was aged 50 had a heart attack. Subsequent investigations indicated that of the two arteries serving the heart, one was fully blocked and the other half blocked, and following further deterioration in that artery a stent was fitted in 2008. Following the heart attack your Petitioner, in order to preserve his health, took early retirement from his full time occupation as a solicitor in the City of London, and since then takes as much exercise as possible whenever weather permits by walking several days during the week in Regents Park, which is within walking distance of his home. Also your Petitioner frequently goes walking in the Chilterns, often every weekend in summer, it being easy to reach in little over an hour from his home by train from either Finchley Road Underground or South Hampstead stations which are both only five minutes walk away, or from Marylebone which is a bit further. The trains from the latter two stations run on the same lines as those serving Birmingham at present from Euston and Marylebone respectively. 

3. The proposal envisages Adelaide Road, which is a heavily used link between the roads to the north through Hampstead via Camden Town and the major road to the north along the Finchley Road via Swiss Cottage being closed for upto six months while a vent shaft head house is constructed in Adelaide Road, very near where your Petitioner lives and which he has to cross to walk to Regents Park. This will cause gridlock throughout the area with serious impact on the air quality, noise, and traffic throughout the area. Even if this were limited to six months that would be bad enough, but it is intended that the area will suffer throughout the ten year construction phase as it is likely
that considerable numbers of HGVs will be travelling through the area every
day transporting rubble from the tunnelling and construction works, even if the
promises form High Speed Rail to make more use of transport by rail
materialise. It is intended that the existing car park in the Outer Circle of
Regents Park nearby the Zoo will be taken over during the 10 year
construction as a lorry park for HGVs, thus increasing the amount of traffic in
the Outer Circle every day both from the HGVs and visitors to the Zoo trying
to find parking spaces. The increased heavy traffic and resulting extra noise
dust and pollution, will significantly adversely affect the air quality, which
will be a significant extra health risk for individuals such as Your Petitioner, in
view of his heart condition described in the above paragraph; the levels of
nitrogen dioxide per cubic metre very frequently being in excess of the legal
limit of 40 micrograms already.

Similarly the loss of the Chilterns, which is one of the finest recreation and
walking regions of the country, is again of particular concern to your
Petitioner. The proposed line will have the effect of severing the Chiltern
footpath network not just during the long construction phase which would be
bad enough but permanently. Especially when the line from Finchley Road
Underground station is closed for weekend repair works, the Petitioner
frequently travels to another part of the Chilterns in the region of Tring and
Berkhampstead using South Hampstead station, making use of the London
Overground service and then the main commuter line from Euston. However
the use of that station as well will be badly affected by the proposals. Firstly it
is likely to be closed during the construction of the nearby vent shaft head
house. Secondly it has been reported that during the construction the number
of platforms at Euston for the existing conventional services and the number
of approach tracks will both be cut by a third. The Overground service is often
closed for repair works already at weekends, and with the likely great
constraints on capacity at Euston, South Hampstead station is likely to be a
target for long term closure.

The following Amendments to the Scheme should be considered which would
materially lessen the impact of the adverse health risks, particularly the
impairment of air quality both in Central London and the Chilterns. A double
deck down construction of any new station in Euston should be considered,
which would minimise the destruction of homes and property in the Euston
area, thus lessening the amount of debris to be carried away through the streets
where your Petitioner lives, and which also should be able to be transported
away through the existing tunnels and rail network. Other terminals apart from
Euston should be considered such as Old Oak Common, which will have a
good connection to Crossrail; or if a central London terminal is really needed
then both Paddington and even Waterloo may be better choices as tunnelling
would not be required, and both have better internal London train links. The
possibilities of using the existing tunnels out of Kings Cross should be fully
investigated, as it has also been suggested that there is in fact space there to
accommodate any new platforms, so the mammoth tunnelling and destruction
of homes and businesses around Euston would then be avoided, and a further
advantage is that there would be a link automatically with HS1. Consideration
should be given to upgrading the existing West Coast main line which would
involve improvements at three pinch points, lengthening of trains and
platforms, and conversion of a few first class carriages per train estimated to
cost £2 billion as compared with the minimum of £50 billion for HS2, with incidental other advantages such as it will be completed much sooner, without the wholesale irreversible damage to the environment and health etc., and will serve the existing main stations in the town centres, rather than being principally out of town, so of much more use and convenience to the majority of train passengers. So far as improving links and capacity on services to other parts of the North such as Sheffield and Leeds are concerned, this may be achievable much quicker, cheaper and with less damage to the environment and health etc. by reinstating the Great Central route, which had been designed in the first place to a higher standard than the rest of the network. Finally so as to preserve the Chilterns as much as possible as an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and recreation and walking area, then any new line should be routed as much as possible to the south to run adjacent to the M40

4. The petitioner therefore asks that 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.

Anthony Herman Kay

14th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF MRS ROSAMUND WALL  

Declares that:  

1. Mrs Rosamund Wall and her family are specially and directly adversely affected by:  
   Scheduled Work No. 2/11 in the parish of Chalfont St Giles - A realignment of Bottom House Farm Lane commencing at a point 48 metres north-east of Hobbs Hole Cottage and terminating at the junction of that lane with Amersham Road.  

2. Your petitioner Mrs Rosamund Wall is an owner and resident of Elm Tree Cottage, Bottom House Farm Lane, the house nearest to the junction with Amersham Road. Elm Tree Cottage is a property which the above Bill may specially and directly affect.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns are as follows:  

   Mrs Wall is primarily concerned about the massive increase in HGV construction traffic very close to her house, as a result of the use of Bottom House Farm Lane as an access route to the Chalfont St Giles ventilation shaft compound. She believes this will adversely affect her family’s quality of life, pose a risk to the health particularly of her young son who suffers from asthma, and blight her home for at least the decade during which HS2 construction is expected to take place.  

   The petitioner Mrs Wall is above all concerned about noise and pollution from what is predicted to be at least a seven-fold increase in the volume of traffic using Bottom House Farm Lane. She feels this single-track lane - in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - is a totally inappropriate access route to the ventilation shaft compound. Mrs Wall urges HS2 to reconsider the construction of a dedicated haul road across fields from the A335 Beaconsfield Road.  

   Mrs Wall is also concerned about a massive increase in congestion on the A413 Amersham Road, caused by HS2 HGV traffic, especially as it tries to turn into Bottom House Farm Lane. Lorries turning right into the lane will hold up London-bound traffic, as there is no room for a feeder lane or roundabout. This increase in local congestion will itself add to local noise and traffic pollution.  

   If Bottom House Farm Lane must be used for HS2 construction traffic, Mrs Wall is calling for a strict speed limit. The lane is currently a single track farm lane, requiring all traffic using it to travel slowly, due to the risk of meeting another vehicle. Planned widening of the lane to 5.5 metres will allow construction vehicles to turn off the A413 at a much higher speed, posing a risk to Mrs Wall, her husband, young children and pets.
Mrs Wall is concerned that if Bottom House Farm Lane is widened, it will become attractive as a so-called “rat run” alternative route for traffic trying to avoid congestion on the A413 Amersham Road and A335. She would like assurances that through traffic will be prohibited from using Bottom House Farm Lane. Mrs Wall would also like a guarantee from HS2 that Bottom House Farm Lane will be restored to a single track lane with passing places, following the completion of HS2 construction.

If Bottom House Farm Lane must be used as an HGV access route to the Chalfont St Giles ventilation shaft compound, Mrs Wall would like to be fairly compensated by HS2 for the detrimental impact to the value of her home.

In addition, the petitioner Mrs Wall is fearful about depression of the water table in the Misbourne Valley, resulting in the total loss of surface flow in the Misbourne River, a few hundred yards from Elm Tree Cottage. This would lead to the destruction of adjacent habitats and potentially the permanent loss of this chalk stream.

Mrs Wall is also concerned about potential long term damage to the chalk aquifer system as a result of tunnelling below the River Misbourne and possible pollution of the main water supply system. She would like a full environmental assessment to be undertaken.

4. The prayer

Mrs Rosamund Wall therefore asks the House of Lords that she 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 Mrs Rosamund Wall remains,

Mrs Rosamund Wall

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 Ruth and Darren Jackson

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioners are the owners of an affected property (Stonegate, Red Lane) within the Parish of Burton Green. They have lived in Burton Green in their current property since April 1988. The property resides 160m from the centre of the line and was extended in the summer of 2009 at a significant cost which would not have been made had they known HS2 would be announced the following year. The petitioners are in their fifties and looking to retire and downsize in due course but are now unable to consider this as there is no possibility of being able to sell their home at the true market value (without the blight of HS2). They require the true market value in order to finance their retirement plans. They have now been living under the threat of HS2 for 6 years and their plans have been on hold for that time and the foreseeable future.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Noise

a) Your petitioners originally petitioned for a deep bore tunnel through Burton Green which they consider to have been unfairly rejected by the promoter. In view of this they believe that further improvements need to be made to the ‘cut and cover’ tunnel through Burton Green in order to mitigate the effect of noise on their property.

b) Your petitioners believe that the original base sound readings were taken in an area which is significantly noisier than experienced noise levels at their property. This has therefore diluted the projected noise level impact once HS2 is operational.

c) At the tunnel south portal where the line runs behind their property your petitioners believe that the 50m extension to the cut and cover tunnel is not long enough to mitigate the noise impact. They request the cut and cover tunnel be extended by 400-500m. This will provide further mitigation to the noise they will experience as well as for residents of 'Le Van' park homes, the Village Hall, 'Two Oaks' Day nursery and other residents on Red Lane.

d) However their preferred solution would still be a deep bored tunnel as this addresses many more issues than just noise impact.
Compensation

a) Your Petitioners are one of 14 homes on the edge of Burton Green that fall just outside the Rural Support Zone. They believe that they will be similarly affected as those properties which are closer to the line, due to proximity of the southern portal to their home. Should HS2 go ahead they want to be able to sell their house at a fair market value with compensation for the costs of moving.

b) Your Petitioners are petitioning that their property should be covered within the Rural Support Zone, which would allow them to be adequately compensated.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Signature of Petitioners

Ruth Jackson
Darren Jackson

18th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF POLLY BUSTON

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly affected by the whole Bill, particularly those parts of the Bill authorizing 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.

2. Polly Buston is the owner and occupier of 3 Mill End Cottages, Little Missenden, Amersham, Buckinghamshire, HP7 0RG, which is within the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and lies within 300 metres of the route of the proposed railway and 400 metres of the proposed Vent Shaft and Auto-transformer Station.

3. Your petitioner is very concerned that the vibration from the construction of the tunnel and the Vent Shaft and Transformer Station at Little Missenden would cause settlement to her house. Her house is a sixteenth century grade II listed brick and timber cottage, which has no foundations, but contains wall paintings dated 1598 which are of national importance. Your petitioner requests that her house be given a conditions report before and after any construction work carried out by HS2, She is strongly of the opinion that HS2 should be constructed well away from Little Missenden with its very many listed buildings.

As one of many riparian owners of the river Misbourne in Little Missenden which runs at the bottom of her garden, your petitioner is appalled by the knowledge that the river will inevitably be polluted by construction work at the Vent Shaft and Transformer Station at Piper’s Wood, as blatantly admitted in the draft environment report. This is utterly unacceptable. The River Misbourne is one of only five chalk rivers in England where rainbow trout breed naturally, and is therefore of national importance. Simply monitoring the state of the river, as
proposed by HS2, is utterly inadequate. Prevention of pollution to the river must be undertaken, whatever the cost. HS2 should ideally be constructed well away from this rare river, which is fed by aquifers which would also be polluted and disturbed by the proposed construction work.

Your petitioner, who has lived in Little Missenden for 42 years, suffers from bronchiectasis and is a patient of Professor Robert Wilson of the Brompton Hospital. Your petitioner would be adversely affected by the dust and pollution which would be caused by construction work at the Vent Shaft at Piper’s wood, work on which is scheduled to last for four years.

Your petitioner wishes to complain about the poor provision of information. She has written repeatedly to HS2, receiving either anodyne replies or no replies at all. She sent a letter, signed by all the riparian owners of the river Misbourne where it runs through village gardens, to 24 recipients, asking how the river would be protected, and received only 2 acknowledgements and absolutely no information. She has written letters requesting reassurance about her house and has received no reply.

Your petitioner is concerned about the design of the proposed Ventilation Shaft and Transformer Station at Little Missenden which will ruin the view from the village for its inhabitants and for the hundreds of walkers who enjoy walking along the Misbourne valley and up the surrounding lanes. The solution is for the design of the Vent Shaft to be sympathetic to the surrounding countryside, or, preferably, for it to be resited elsewhere.

Your petitioner feels very strongly that the Chiltern AONB should be protected at all costs, and that a tunnel should be bored through its entire length. This beautiful valley has been inhabited since the Stone Age. It would be a tragedy if this generation should be responsible for its destruction.

4. 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 the Bill.

AND Polly Buston remains etc.

Polly Buston
14th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF MICHAEL ALLEN and JANE ALLEN

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners

The petitioners are owners of a freehold property at 39 Lappetts Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0RA which the Bill may “specially and directly affect”.

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located 550 metres from the portal cutting and 800 metres from the train exit/entrance at the portal as outlined under deposited plans 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.

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

3. Your petitioners’ 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 they object 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 them and to which they object, and the (additional) mitigation that would be required for each, if its fully bored tunnel proposals are rejected, below. Your petitioners chose to live in this area specifically because it is designated by Act of Parliament an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposed Bill will locate the route above ground for a significant part of the AONB. As a result, its nature, attraction and beauty will be permanently destroyed.

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 petitioners who need 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 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.

---

1 HS2 Ltd had given Bucks CC in January 2016 an assurance that it would relocate this haul road but the conditions placed upon the County Council to achieve this were unrealistic
2. The amount of spoil requiring transport by road can be reduced by moving more spoil down the trace.

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

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

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

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

10. **Dysfunctional Housing market:** Your Petitioners are 800 metres from the train's exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel and are the finding their house price is blighted. They are concerned that they are unable to sell at an unblighted price 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. Your petitioners consider, if anything, the NTS scheme to be more complicated and demanding than the EHS scheme which it replaced. As pensioners in their 70s, there is insufficient time to wait for the housing market to return to some normality.

**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. This is of especial significance and concern to your Petitioners in view of their age.

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:** It is a concern for your Petitioners, although not in business themselves, that 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.

Your Petitioners wish to emphasise that failure to acknowledge and recognise the enormous value of AONBs throughout the country for future generations is a mockery of the environmental philosophy and criteria that contribute to their creation by Parliament.

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. Moreover, as your Petitioners stated to the House of Commons Select Committee following their earlier petition, the Code of Construction Practice is not legally binding and any infringements during construction by The Promoters or their agents cannot be followed up in law.

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 request your honourable House to modify the Bill, and/or require undertakings of the Promoter, to remove these adverse effects, primarily through a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at least to Leather Lane.

17 **Secondary Mitigation**

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

18 **Other Matters**

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

**Conclusion**

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore asks the House of Lords that the petitioners, 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: ___________________________________________________________

(MICHAEL ALLEN)

Signed: ___________________________________________________________

(JANE ALLEN)

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 NICKI HAWKINS

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner Nicki Hawkins lives at Granary Cottage, Potter Row, Great Missenden is 275 metres from the HS2 track and Portal. From this property which consists of a cottage, 3 acres, stabling, outbuildings and an enclosed dog area she runs a dog day care business licensed by Chiltern District Council for 10 dogs.

Your Petitioner lives within an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that will be forever blighted by HS2. It is an area of ancient woodlands, footpaths, hedgerows, wildlife, and a rich cultural and archaeological heritage. Jenkins Wood is directly behind our property.

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 cause major problems for our customers who bring and collect their dogs in the rush hour, many of them work in London and use Great Missenden Station. Our concern is that with the extra traffic delays on the A413 many will find alternative day care for their dogs on the other side of the valley. We have already lost two of our very good customers who have made the decision to leave the area due to HS2.

Your Petitioner’s 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 a mile extension (from South Heath to Leather Lane) which would address most of your Petitioner’s concerns. The construction works alone will adversely affect us both personally and our dog day care business which we have worked hard to build up over the last 6 years. The dogs are walked behind our property along the footpaths that once the works start will no longer be available for us to enjoy. Our visiting dogs thrive in the relaxed and tranquil environment within our premises, with the construction noise, disruption and eventually the train, this will change dramatically causing stress to some of our visitors. Customers bring their dogs to us for our facilities and the peacefulness.
3.1 Noise

Our home from which we run our business from consists of a cottage, 3 acres and stabling will be subjected to injurious levels of operational noise from HS2 (as proposed with AP4). It is now clear from the proceedings of the House of Commons Select Committee 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 us 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
  - Potter Row is especially affected which will have a detrimental effect on the welfare of our horses and visiting dogs

- In adopting the same thresholds route-wide there is no special provision for the protection of relatively quiet places in rural areas such as Potter Row.
  - 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.
    - Currently assumed mitigations may be subsequently removed on the basis that they are not ‘reasonably practicable’
  - We are living within 275 metres of the tunnel portal at South Heath and 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) we would still endure noise
  levels above the night-time peak LOAEL ie above the level injurious to health and wellbeing of our
  animals.

The impact of noise and dust during construction will affect us 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.

Your Petitioner lives on the east side of the A413 and depends on herself, husband and more
importantly her customers 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 us.

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 problematic for years
- It would delay access for emergency vehicles
- 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. Potter
  Row is already used as a rat run for some at rush hour times. This would increase dramatically and
  would endanger walkers, cyclists and resident road users
- It would generate substantial delays for users of the A413, which is already heavily used, and
  threaten the livelihood of your petitioner who depend on it for business reasons

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 Department for Transport’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.

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 us
should we walk or cycle to Great Missenden. 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 has grave concerns about our community that will be disrupted, torn apart and altered forever by HS2. Potter Row is a close-knit community of nearly 80 people with all of us looking out and helping each other. As homes are sold to HS2 this is changing. Proximity to a massive construction site for between 7 and 8 years with works along its entire length within 500m of people’s 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 road will become a rat run. It is hard to see how the community can survive the changes being thrust upon it.

3.4 Historic landscape and archaeology

The whole of Potter Row, some 1.5km 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 on which we live and its moat.

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 heritage, in the Chilterns AONB.

These 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

With the AP4 changes our property is even more severely affected and despite being on the market for over 6 months, nobody is prepared to even make an offer on our property. The agents have advised us we would need to discount our property by at least 30% to even raise some interest. We feel trapped and disillusioned. We have worked hard all our lives to realise our dream property and lifestyle only for this to be taken away from us through no fault of our own. This would be avoided if the Chilterns Tunnel were extended.

As construction draws nearer, the worry and anxiety intensifies as this is not only our home affected but our business.

3.6 Compensation

Your Petitioner’s property which are blighted by HS2 is not on land required for constructing HS2, nor are we within the 120m rural support zone. So the only form of compensation for which we 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 House of Commons Select Committee 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 Department for Transport have already attracted considerable official criticism for their behaviour and treatment of applicants. 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 your Petitioner, see 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.

- 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.

Given the demographics of Potter Row a large number of our neighbours homes may end up being bought by HS2 Ltd under the NtS scheme. This sadly will change our whole community but could be prevented should we have the extended tunnel.

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, 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:

- 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 provided analyses by HS2 Ltd are insufficiently detailed to permit independent validation, as the assumptions on which they are based are not provided.

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 ANOB 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.

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 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 ombudsman 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 we will suffer 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 extended another mile (1.5km) to Leather Lane. This would protect our home and business 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

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 ombudsman.

4. The prayer

The petitioner, Nicki Hawkins 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, Nicki Hawkins remains, etc.

Signatory

Nicki Hawkins

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: VYNERS SCHOOL

Declares that:-

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

2. Your petitioner is Vyners School, Warren Road, Ickenham, UB10 8AB in the London Borough of Hillingdon. The school represents the interests of its community which consist of students, staff, parents, governors and local residents.

Introductory:

3. The school has 1121 students between the ages of 11 -- 18 years, and 160 members of staff.

   The school is located within the CFA6 area of the proposed route of HS2 - South Ruislip to Ickenham, in the school catchment area of Ruislip, Ickenham, Hillingdon and Uxbridge. This area and the wider school catchment areas are linked to several major road systems, including Swakeleys Road, which are designated in the HS2 Environmental Statement as being adversely affected by construction HGVs up to 10 years from the construction work for the tunnelling operations at West Ruislip and construction sites in Harvil Road, Breakspear Road South and Harefield.

4. Your petitioners allege that the rights and interests of the school’s community 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.

5. Your petitioners oppose the Bill in principle. Whilst your petitioners acknowledge the principle of the Bill is established at third reading, your petitioners' views on the subject are so strong, they must be recorded in this petition.
6. There are a number of matters which cause great concern to your petitioners, arising from the proposals in the Bill. Most of the points are specific to the area within your petitioner’s catchment area and some of the points apply to areas affecting the wider learning environment or activities areas of the school communities.

General Concerns

7. Your petitioner has identified several specific significant concerns which are set out below. This list is by no means exhaustive, and due to the inadequacy and inaccuracies of the Environmental Statement prepared by HS2, it is inevitable that the construction of HS2 will disrupt the lives of your petitioner in ways which have not yet been considered.

Specific Concerns

Construction Traffic

8. Your petitioner is gravely concerned about the inadequacy of measures proposed to mitigate the effects of construction traffic throughout Ickenham. The siting of three construction sites in Ickenham up to 10 years with other constructions sites in nearby Harefield will cause significant disruption and congestion to Ickenham suburban roads by HGV traffic; these roads are already heavily congested by local traffic and through traffic from commuters across North West London. The school is located off Swakeleys Road, which is already heavily congested during morning and evening peak times and has been identified as being adversely affected in the Environmental Statement. Your petitioner is concerned that there will be adverse effects to school staff travelling to the school, parents taking children to the school and pupils using local bus services, U1, U9 and U10. This will have a direct impact on the learning of students at school if they or their teachers are late to school as a result of the increased congestion.

Air Pollution

9. Your petitioner is concerned that the HGV traffic from the 3 major construction sites in Ickenham up to 10 years will create additional toxic emissions on Swakeleys Road, a roadway already exceeding minimum EU standards for health. Vyners school children use this road to walk to school and the sports fields located across the A40, a roadway that already exceeds the minimum EU standards for Health and Safety, and used by our pupils on a daily basis. The latest Bill provisions recognise that the HS2 traffic will add to the existing high levels of diesel pollutants - carbon pollutants and NO2, especially with the additional HS2 traffic which should not have access to our local roads.

10. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require that HS2 re evaluate the use of Ickenham roads by HGV traffic and prepare alternative proposals for consultation.
11. Should your honourable House not find in favour of eliminating HGV traffic from Ickenham your petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate by amending the Code of Construction Practice to strictly enforce the measures such as but not restricted to the following:–

Restricting HGV movements inside peak hours throughout Ickenham and prohibiting HGV movements near school routes for 40 minutes before and after the start and end of the school day (during term time).

Ensuring that the school communities and the local community have safe access to their education institution and local facilities by ensuring the Pedestrian crossings in Swakeleys Road and across Swakeleys A40 roundabout are improved so that they are safer and accessible for students. In their current state they are not fit for purpose and we have grave concerns on the safety of our students with the addition of a significant increase in HGV traffic.

12. The Nominated Undertaker to ensure that in the event of any of the existing crossings being temporary closed that an alternative safe replacement crossing is provided.

Environment

13. Your petitioner' staff and pupils make extensive use of the recreational and educational facilities afforded by the London Borough of Hillingdon and the Colne Valley and are very concerned about the following impacts of the high speed railway:

The loss of the Hillingdon Outdoor activity Centre which provides leisure and educational facilities to our students, in particular those that attend our Hearing Impaired Resource Base, a specialist provision.

Adverse effects on the local landscape by the dumping of materials

14. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require that HS2 re evaluate the extension of the tunnel beyond the Colne Valley.

15. If the Hillingdon Outdoor Activities Centre (HOAC) is forced to close, your petitioners wish to ensure that the Nominated Undertaker will identify and implement an equivalent site for HOAC within an area of five miles of its existing location in Harefield,

16. 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 and interests and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
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 the Bill

AND the Petitioners remain, etc.

Signed:

William Henry Gardner

On behalf of Vyners School

11th April 2016.
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr. Terence Henry Conlon, Mrs Margaret Conlon & Mr. John Conlon

Declares that:

1) The Conlon Family are specially and directly adversely affected by The Whole Bill.

2) This petition is from the Conlon family, who live and work at The Dublin Castle, public House and music venue at 94 Parkway, Camden Town and Terence Henry Conlon who works at this Small family business. The family have been publicans and resided here for 42 years. The pub is of national importance, having gained an iconic status having been a contributing Venue during the “Brit-Pop era” through to this present day. It has a proven history of offering the venue and it’s facility to unknown, fledgling bands and musicians to perform infront of an audience (often for the first time).
3) These musicians upon occasion springboard into the United Kingdom music Industry and often demonstrate that The United Kingdoms provides the best songwriters and performers for the World to enjoy.

The Dublin Castle is Camden Town’s original ‘small music venue’. We are recognised as a true ‘grassroots’ source of musical talent in this country.

Our small family operated business and home in Parkway is part of a wonderful London community in Camden Town that coexists with the railway. The area is a real vibrant neighborhood, surprisingly quiet in places,

The Dublin Castle enjoys being surrounded by a vibrant mix of cultures, communities, two Conservation Areas, historic buildings and social housing.

We are located on Parkway, also known as the A4201 is currently a tranquil area after midnight with relatively little through-traffic at night, benefiting from the space and light and air that the railway cutting creates while accepting the limited intermittent noise the trains produce during the daytime.

Your Petitioners and their small family business, known as, The Dublin Castle, are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

How the Dublin Castle and The Conlon family are Directly and Specially affected by HS2

The Dublin Castle public house is our main source of family income. This small family business provides for our livelihoods and supported family members. Our immediate neighborhood is threatened by heavy construction for ten years (2016-2025) and the wider community for at least eighteen years (2016-2033).

We fear that our business will not survive such a disruption and that the customers may not return once the habits of visiting the venue have disappeared. The customers will drink at quieter and less polluted hostelries.

The HS2 proposals make little effort to recognise that this
community exists and offer few proposals to mitigate against, or offer compensation for, the effects of noisy, disruptive and round-the-clock construction.

There Railway presently has open railway cutting leading to Euston is approximately 200 meters away from our premises in Parkway, Camden Town.

The work that will be happening just a few hundred meters from our pub, as described in the SES & AP3 ES, includes:

(a) Demolition of 12 metre high Park Village East (PVE) retaining walls

(b) Reconstruction of PVE retaining walls at a height of 35 metres high above HS2 track level plus 15 metres below existing track level

c) Deep excavation and construction of new retaining walls within the Cutting

d) Construction of a high speed rail dive under box about 30m deep

e) Demolition and reconstruction of the existing Line X conventional rail cross-over

(f) Phased demolition and reconstruction over eight years of Hampstead Road Bridge 4.8 metres higher and about 220 metres long (about twice the existing length)

(g) Demolition and reconstruction of Mornington Street Bridge

(h) Demolition and reconstruction of Granby Terrace Bridge

(i) Construction of two concrete portal boxes

(j) Reception of tunnel boring machines

(k) Construction of three ventilation/intervention buildings adjacent to the Cutting

(l) Works on the classic railway tracks, signaling and other systems

(m) Installation of new tracks, gantries, signals etc
(n) Construction compounds throughout the neighbourhood

(o) Demolition of the central retaining wall at the Parkway portal

(p) Utility works in many neighbourhood streets

(q) HGV construction traffic along both residential streets and main roads for years

(r) HGV holding area in the Zoo car park

(s) Years of ‘significant noise’ and months of ‘significant vibration’

**Diversion of Utilities** – Section 2.4.21 and Table 21 identify Parkway as one street that “may” be used for the “diversion of utilities”. Clarification of these works has not been provided and should be forthcoming. Where disruption to Parkway may be caused by the diversion of utilities this should be avoided and only allowed where other alternatives have been fully explored and rationally discounted. In any event, night-time working for these utilities works should not be permitted under any circumstances.

4. Parkway is also shown as a “Construction traffic route”. Our customers are not going to enjoy their drinks and listen to the live music as they will instead be listening to lorries laden with rubble, hammering past the bar for the best part of the day and probably the night also. The Musicians are not going to be able to play at their best as the noise of heavy traffic rumbles past and shakes the building. Ultimately The United Kingdom Creative Industry will suffer as a result. In the past, Coldplay, The Darkness, Amy Winehouse, The Killers, Snow Patrol, Madness, Blur, The Arctic Monkeys and The Libertines have all cut their teeth by performing at our venue. The Dublin Castle plays an essential part in British Musical History and had an essential role during the ‘Brit Pop Era’.

The construction route and cessation of pedestrian access along parts of Parkway will result in a loss of passing trade and promotion of the venue.
We as for assurance that there shall be no cessation of pedestrian access to the Dublin Castle or beyond.

5. Most of this work will take place in the 750 metre length of the Cutting, making it an incredibly intense work site for many years. The works documented in AP3 are more extensive and longer than described in the Hybrid Bill and call for greater controls and mitigation.

6. We have little doubt that Parkway will be utilised extensively by construction traffic to the peril of our continuity of running a business at The Dublin Castle.

7. Work at Euston Station (18 years approximately) and possible redevelopment of the conventional rail side of the station (beyond 2033?) and possible oversite development (further decades of work?) will also impact our neighborhood. It will discourage customers from wanting to visit the Dublin Castle as it is so very close to a huge construction site.

8. The ES Vol 5 Draft Code of Construction Practice CT-003-000 sections 5.2.6 to 5.2.10 allow much of the work in the Cutting, close to Parkway, to be exempt from normal working hour restrictions and to take place 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Much of the construction work will take place within a few meters of our pub and family home, yet there is little compensation on offer and inadequate mitigation.

9. The Dublin Castle public house and our family home is within a few meters of the proposed works and there is nothing shielding us from the construction works. The Cutting is a large open area with hard sound reflective surfaces; works anywhere in the Cutting will create impacts for a great distance. Mornington Terrace, Clarkson Row, half of Mornington Crescent, Park Village East and part of Parkway are completely exposed across the open Cutting to the full brunt of the works. The adjoining cross streets of
Mornington Street, Mornington Place and Granby Terrace are almost as exposed as are parts of Delancey Street. A wider area will be affected by construction traffic with heavy lorries on quiet residential streets and about 900 HGVs a day (450 ‘two way trips’) on the local High Street A400 (SES2 & AP3 ES 3.2.1.1 Vol 2 Table 26). These impacts will include air pollution as well as noise and vibration. The neighbourhood will be a construction site for a decade. This will have an negative cumulative effect of potential customers wishing to visit our business premises.

10. Parkway will suffer a permanent increase in traffic and pollution as a result of HS2 (SES2 & AP3 ES 3.2.1.1 Vol 2 Tables 36 & 43).

11. The human cost of the HS2 construction has not been considered seriously by HS2. If you are working or residing in Parkway, life will be seriously disturbed. Potential customers will be unable to enjoy a quiet drink and the live music performed at our nightly events will be disturbed by noise and vibration. It is unrealistic to think that life goes on as normal while a 12 metre high 3 metre thick retaining wall is being demolished near our business and home. Also a 35 metre high wall will be being built in its place (this is just one example). The basic human right to the peaceful enjoyment of property is being removed by ten years of disruptive construction in the Camden Cutting and in Parkway.

12. HS2 do not recognise the immediacy which this neighbourhood and The Dublin Castle Pub has to the works and that ten years of construction is not a temporary disturbance.

13. The Construction Programme in SES2 & AP3 ES 3.2.1.1 Vol 2 Figure 9a and the Construction Phasing Maps in the Vol 2 Map book SES2 & AP3 ES 3.2.2.1 CT-20-005 to 010) clearly show ten continuous years of construction 2016 to 2025. Table 19 in the AP3 ES predicts periods of up to 36 months where the ‘significance criteria’ will be exceeded in the Camden Cutting neighbourhood. The actual length of time that we as residents and as a successful family business are expected to put up with
serious disruption may be longer.

14. The SES & AP3 ES Section 14 describes some of the noise and vibration that Parkway residents and our customers to the Dublin Castle will experience and includes the statement in 14.3.14 that ‘The mitigation measures, including noise insulation where necessary in the affected parts of these buildings, will reduce noise inside all dwellings to a level where it should not significantly affect residents.’ Evidence is not given to support this and the idea that a bit of secondary glazing is going to make everything okay given the scale and duration of the works is not credible.

15. The night time noise during the construction phase will be a particular issue for Parkway. There are no comparable projects in the UK where such a level and duration of night-time noise has been created at night time in a well populated residential area. The Environmental Statement takes inadequate account of the duration, level, and nature of the noise that will be created, and mitigation that is therefore proposed is inadequate.

16. Vibration will exceed the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level for periods of up to three months for some Parkway households (SES & AP3 D ES14.3.15 & Volume 5 Technical appendices Sound, noise and vibration SV-002-001) but no proposals are made for mitigation or temporary rehousing.

17. The SES & AP3 ES recognises ‘residual’ significant negative impacts on our neighbourhood but does not propose solutions, implying that we are to put up with them without mitigation or compensation. We do not know how we will be able to operate our business in these circumstances.

18. With a limited time to read and understand over 4000 pages of AP3 documentation (about 100 pages during the petitioning period) there may be other impacts on Parkway and in our neighbourhood that we have yet to discover.
19. There are omissions and inaccuracies in the AP3 documents that limit our understanding of the impacts.

20. The design of the HS2 works in the Camden Cutting and at Euston is not complete and there may be impacts not anticipated in AP3.

**The Relief Sought by your Petitioners**

21. The impacts on Parkway of HS2 are many and varied and there is no single measure that will stop serious detriment to the community, our business and individuals.

This public house is an iconic music venue, it is not possible to pack up and leave. Many modifications are required to the HS2 proposals to make the neighbourhood livable and to keep Parkway attractive for business customers to visit during the years of construction and fair compensation is required for those who need to or choose to leave the neighbourhood. Fair compensation is required for this family operated business.

The Conlon family have traded for decades at this same property inside The Dublin Castle. My family may require to close up home and business as the disruption will made it unviable to operate.

22. For the reasons given in this petition, your Petitioners respectfully ask that the proposed scheme be varied in the following respects and that appropriate amendments to the Bill be made accordingly:

a) The design of the approach to Euston and of the Station should address the needs of the local residential community and the local business community not just those of HS2. The unique qualities of Parkway and it’s Historic music venue, The Dublin Castle and it’s neighbourhood must be preserved.

b) Working Hours should be more closely controlled than proposed by HS2.

(c) Noise, Vibration and Air Pollution should be more closely controlled and mitigated than proposed by HS2. (d) Rail should be used instead of road for transport of spoil and construction materials.
(e) Where construction traffic must use roads it should be more closely controlled than proposed by HS2 and increases in permanent traffic on residential roads should be reduced.

(f) Mitigation, temporary rehousing or compensation should be provided to properties that are made uninhabitable by London Borough of Camden (LBC) standards and compensation should be paid to businesses that have suffered financially as the effects of the HS2 take their toll on trade.

(g) Construction Compounds should be limited on Parkway as. This is because to reduce the chances of disruption to customers and Musicians performing. A quieter ambience is very necessary. where the public come to enjoy ‘LIVE’ Music.

(h) Old Oak Common should developed as the principal or temporary London terminus for the high speed section of the line to allow time for a comprehensive and well considered design to be done for Euston and its approach and for many of the issues raised in this petition to be resolved.

(i) Fair compensation must be available to the residents of Parkway and the business owners, such as The Dublin Castle. who have invested their money and livelihoods into their homes, properties and businesses. Each of these issues is addressed separately below. **Design of the Approach to Euston and the Station**

The proposed track layout in the Camden Cutting requires the demolition of the Hampstead Road Bridge, the Granby Terrace Bridge, the Mornington Street Bridge, the Park Village East Retaining Wall and the Central Retaining Wall at Parkway. It also requires the construction of a rail dive-under in a large excavated cut and cover concrete structure with new deep retaining walls. Line X for conventional trains will be demolished and reconstructed.

The design of this infrastructure responds to the needs of HS2 but has little regard to the needs of the local community or the urban fabric of London. It doesn’t take into account the attraction of our business environment to tourists and visitors alike. We rely
on these potential customers. HS2 is being built in a densely populated neighbourhood and tourist and business environment and the design needs to take account of this.

23. We ask that an integrated design is done for all phases of the Euston approach and station. It is unacceptable that the first phase of construction will begin before the design intent for the whole station is known. What should be a great station for a great city is being done in a make-and-mend style. St Pancras International, Kings Cross and the Jubilee Line extension all show what can be achieved yet at Euston we are taking a retrograde step.

24. We ask that HS2 design infrastructure in the Cutting to enhance the urban environment around Parkway and minimise the impact on the residents and businesses of Camden.

**Park Village East Retaining Wall**

25. HS2 propose to demolish and rebuild the 12 metre high, 3 metre thick brick retaining wall along Park Village East that forms the western side of the Camden Cutting. The scale and elegance of this wall contribute positively to the character of the neighbourhood. Demolition of this wall and construction of its replacement will cause severe noise and disruption to businesses and residents in Parkway.

26. We ask that the track layout is revised to allow the Park Village East retaining wall to remain in place. Such schemes have been studied by HS2 and dismissed but we ask that they are reconsidered taking into account the needs of the community as well as those of HS2.

27. The removal of the HS1 link may offer an opportunity for track realignment and we ask that this be considered.

**Landscape**

28. We ask that planting is introduced on PARKWAY with soil to a suitable depth together with trees to enhance the fact that this is the main route from Britannia junction up to Regents park. This should be a tree-lined environment. Continued efforts to enhance the attractiveness of Parkway to enjoy one of it’s many Music
Venues, hostelries and gastronomical delights should be in effect throughout the construction period.

**Working Hours**

29. As described in the ES Vol 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. The work will be noisy, disruptive and go on over 10 years. This means heavy vehicles transporting soil, debris and construction materials all day and all night long. This is unacceptable in a densely populated neighbourhood, it is unacceptable for businesses and their customers, such as those at The Dublin Castle, in Parkway to have to endure this environment. We attempt to attract customers to have a peaceful and relaxing time, this will not be possible with construction traffic.

30. We ask that these exceptions to the Core Working hours are removed from the CoCP and that all exceptions are justified on a case by case basis with LBC following Section 61 procedures.

31. We ask that all work is done during Core Hours except when required for technical, not cost or programme, reasons.

32. We ask that HS2 justify as part of the LEMP process, on a case by case basis, all work outside of the normal working hours. Where a justification cannot be made to the satisfaction of all parties engaged in the LEMP process, the work must take place during normal working hours.

33. We ask that more rail services are diverted to other stations than currently planned by HS2 during the construction of HS2 in order to allow more construction during normal working hours in the approach to Euston. This would also better allow use of rail for transport of spoil and construction materials, and more room for acoustic screening immediately adjacent to the works.

34. We ask that for one full 24 hour period every week, usually Sunday, there will be no work.

**Noise Mitigation Techniques and Screening**
35. We ask that given that the works are in a densely populated environment and go on over many years that HS2 commit to using very quiet plant and construction techniques and that HS2 go beyond ‘Best Practical Means’ in order to minimise impact on residents. ‘Practical’ can mean techniques that can be used without extra inconvenience, time or cost to HS2 and this may not be sufficient.

36. We ask that local acoustic screens are built as close as possible to the works within the Cutting (which is up to about 100m wide) in order to limit breakout of noise at source. These screens will need to be specially designed and will influence how the work is undertaken and we ask that they are made an essential part of the construction requirements and budget.

37. The SES & AP3 ES states that perimeter screening 2.4m high will generally be used at the perimeter of construction sites and 3.6m high in some cases. The design or performance of this screening is not specified. Screens were erected by Railtrack on Mornington Terrace in 1998/99 during track renewal work but had only a marginal benefit on sound reduction.

38. We ask that acoustic screening is designed by acousticians and built specifically for the Camden Cutting. In order that the streets do not feel as if they are in a construction site we ask that the screens are either glazed or planted green walls.

We ask for assurance that acoustic screening is designed by acousticians and built specifically for the Dublin Castle public house in order that the streets do not feel as if they are in a construction site we ask that the screens are either glazed or planted green walls. This will help reduce disturbance to performances and to customers.

39. We ask that the noise thresholds for rehousing should be lower than the limits in the CoCP. These limits are based on BS5228 and are used for typical construction projects where disturbance is temporary, not ten years. Normal life cannot go on during ten years of excessive noise. Normal life includes sleeping,
doing homework or revision, socialising, working or just being at home.

40. Noise levels that exceed the ‘significance criteria’ for periods of up the three years and with typical highest monthly noise levels of 70 to 90 dB are tabulated in Table 19 of the SES2 and ES Vol 2. Note that this means that the highest individual noise events will likely be louder than these figures.

41. Noise limits for obtaining residential Planning

Permission are lower than those proposed by HS2 for ten years of construction. We consider that ten years is not temporary, even if high levels of noise are not present for the entire time, and that noise standards appropriate to permanent conditions are used.

42. Right now the streets around Parkway and in the Camden Cutting are quiet with only local traffic and limited intermittent train noise during the daytime only; years of potential round the clock heavy civil engineering will alter the environment radically for the worse.

43. We ask that since HS2 are bringing a major construction project into a dense shared residential and commercial area they need to take the noise assessment methodology, modeling and mitigation further so that the effects are mitigated.

44. We ask that given the exceptional nature and duration of the HS2 construction project (10 to 18 years or more) that acceptable noise limits follow standards for permanent conditions, not those for typical construction works.

45. We ask that the limits for rehousing are lower in each category listed in Table 1 of the ES Vol 5 Draft Code of Construction Practice CT-003-000 and Information Paper E23. We ask that the limits for temporary rehousing are: • 75 dB during the day 0800-1800 on weekdays (instead of 85 dB) • 70 dB during the day 0700-2200 Sunday (instead of 75 dB) • 65 dB at night 2200-0700 (same as proposed by HS2) • 70 dB at other times (instead of 75-80 dB)

46. For reference: HS2 propose that the daytime limit for rehousing is 85 dB; this is like a very busy road with heavy
lorries one metre from your house. The Health and Safety Executive requires ear defenders to be worn in a place of work which has this level of noise.

47. The ES Vol 5 Draft Code of Construction Practice CT-003-000 requires that the trigger levels are applied when the noise levels predicted or measured by the contractor exceeds the limit in for ten days in any fifteen consecutive days or for 40 days in any six month period. This is a potential 800 days over the ten year length of construction.

48. We ask that these trigger levels are applied when the noise level predicted by the contractors exceeds the limit for five days in any fifteen consecutive days or 20 days in any six month period or 30 days in any 12 month period or 40 days in any two year period. This still gives the potential of 200 days of ear defender levels of noise!

49. In order to predict if rehousing (or insulation) will be necessary we ask that HS2 undertakes accurate construction noise modelling to the satisfaction of LBC. It should take into account the specific nature of the Camden Cutting environment (large open cutting with hard sound reflective retaining walls and no mitigating features), the actual designs and construction techniques, equipment and programme, and also construction traffic.

50. We ask that in addition to the LpAeq dB limits given in the CoCP, LAmax limits are given for the construction phase. These refer to individual noise events (as opposed to averaged noise levels over a period of time) which can be disruptive to sleep even if the average noise is relatively low.

51. We understand by HS2 that limits for LAmax are not feasible but note that the Code of Construction practice for the Thames Tideway Tunnel includes limits for LAmax as does the Draft Camden Local Plan 2015 Appendix 2.

52. If LAmax is not incorporated into the assessment thresholds, then the mitigation will be inappropriate in many cases, and underestimated.

53. We ask that the CoCP is modified to include a commitment to
brief the work force about local issues including noise, as has been done in the Thames Tideway Tunnel CoCP. Without this commitment it is possible that community relations are a 'box ticking exercise' that never influences what actually happens on site.

54. We ask that in addition to external noise monitoring, HS2 monitor noise levels inside properties that have had secondary glazing installed to ensure that noise levels do not exceed responsible standards.

55. We ask that temporary rehousing is within the locality, of an equal standard to residents current housing, is agreed with individual households, that residents are given the choice to make their own arrangements, and that HS2 are to pay all costs associated with rehousing and with the vacant property.

**Noise Thresholds for Insulation**

56. For the same reasons as described for rehousing thresholds above, we ask that the noise thresholds for noise insulation should be lower than the limits in the CoCP and Information Paper E23. We ask that the limits should be:

a) 65 dB during the day 0800-1800 on weekdays (instead of 75 dB)

b) 60 dB during the day 0700-2200 Sunday (instead of 65dB)

c) 55 dB at night 2200 -0700 dB (same as proposed by HS2)

d) 65 dB at other times (instead of 65-70 dB)

**Noise Insulation Package**

57. Our home and business at The Dublin Castle in Parkway neighbourhood are listed and/or have very large sash windows with splayed reveals and internal shutters. This will make secondary glazing, blinds and mechanical ventilation difficult to install without destroying the internal qualities of the property. Secondary glazing on full height windows will be unwieldy to operate. Living with sealed windows, blinds and mechanical ventilation for ten years is an infringement to the quality of life in a house and is not a reasonable mitigation measure for many
properties. It may also reduce the value of properties.

58. We ask that if a noise mitigation proposal suitable to the residents can not be found then HS2 will offer rehousing or suitable alternative mitigation.

59. We ask that all noise insulation packages be designed and installed by specialists with Listed Buildings experience to suit the requirements of each individual property and its inhabitants.

60. We ask that alternatives to secondary glazing, such as fitting sash windows with laminated acoustic glass and brush seals, be considered if appropriate for the building and if their performance is acceptable to residents.

61. We ask that all alterations to properties are reversible and that HS2 commit to restore the properties to their prior condition when the HS2 construction works are complete, if this is asked for by the owners.

62. We ask that, owing to the long timescales of the project, residents are eligible for both noise mitigation packages and temporary rehousing at different times during the ten years of construction.

**Operational Noise**

63. We ask that the design of the new infrastructure in the Cutting allows the initial or future installation of acoustic absorbent material on or in the dive-under box, portal, and retaining walls if it proves necessary.

**Vibration**

64. We ask that HS2 adopt the vibration standards proposed in the Draft Camden Local Plan 2015 Appendix 2 which give a lower limit at night time.

The CoCP offers no commitment to survey or protect The Dublin Castle in Parkway from vibration.

65. Most of the properties adjacent to the Cutting in Parkway do not have proper foundations and are of uncertain robustness. We ask that the Dublin Castle is given structural surveys before
construction commences to assess its vulnerability for damage from the proposed works and that they are actively monitored during the construction works.

66. We understand that the disturbed clay adjacent to railway cuttings can disintegrate over a long period of time and ask that geotechnical monitoring of the ground adjacent to the Cutting and Parkway is undertaken.

67. We ask that HS2 coordinate pre-construction defect surveys and maintain a dialogue with Terence Henry Conlon at The Dublin Castle throughout the duration of the works.

68. There is a need for speed controls on HGVs and other traffic on Parkway as it is one of the construction routes, but there is also a need to reduce vibration which could be exacerbated by speed bumps. We ask that HS2 bring forward an appropriate solution that meets both these requirements and for this solution to be in place before use by any construction traffic.

69. We ask that vibratory piles are not used for the reconstruction of Mornington Street Bridge or elsewhere especially Parkway as the noise of the pile driving will effectively drive our potential customers away.

70. We ask that different construction techniques, mitigation or rehousing is to be offered when vibration is predicted to be above SOAEL thresholds and that residents will not be expected to remain in their homes if limits are exceeded.

Air Pollution

71. Air pollution (NO2, PM10 and PM2.5), predominantly generated by traffic, already has a significant impact on the lives of Camden residents, particularly those who live near main arterial roads as such as Parkway (A4201).

72. Despite the fact that some local roads are noted in the ES as having raised pollution levels during or following construction (e.g. Arlington Road and Delancey Street), no mitigation has been proposed. The cumulative impacts of raised levels have not been taken into account and the fact that levels of Nitrogen Dioxide already exceed European guidelines by a large
amount has not been factored in.

73. We ask that all vehicles and plant are Euro VI compliant for emissions no matter where they are used for the entire project. Using Euro VI lorries only in the Low Emission Zone is not sufficient.

74. We ask that independent monitoring of air quality is done before construction begins.

75. We ask that air quality is monitored continuously during construction and that work is stopped if pollution levels exceed those recommended by European legislation.

76. We ask for NOx and PM10 filters to be installed on ventilation fans provided to those houses with noise insulation packages.

**Rail not Road**

77. HS2 construction traffic will be a major source of pollution, noise, vibration and potential accidents.

78. A construction railhead in or near Euston could reduce construction traffic by a very large amount and have major environmental benefits in Camden and beyond.

79. We ask that HS2 makes a clear commitment to use of rail for all construction traffic (including spoil removal and delivery of materials and plant) and minimise the use of roads.

80. We ask that any use of roads instead of rail is justified to the local authority and to the local community by placing a clear explanation in the Camden New Journal Newspaper.

81. As with other construction work, we ask that spoil removal such as debris and soil by rail is not done at night.

**Construction Traffic**

82. Our Premises at 94, Parkway is an iconic music venue. The musicians often play in groups or bands. The Dublin Castle usually has 3 or more bands playing each evening. Each band usually has a vehicle each, such as a van. The vans need to park outside the pub so that they can unload their equipment such as amplifiers and drum kits. We fear that the ‘Construction traffic
route’ will not allow the unloading of equipment or deliveries of kegs of beer due to a restriction on parking. Please allow provision for Musicians to unload, park their vehicles and also to load vehicles. Beer deliveries are equally important. Please allow a provision for draymen, beer deliveries, wine merchants and food delivery vehicles to be able to drop off and load supplies and returns from The Dublin Castle.

We request Assurance that The Dublin Castle will able to receive unhindered deliveries which will include kegs of beer, sound equipment, band instruments and other materials.

With several bands per day loading and unloading of equipment and allowance to park outside the venue after 6,30pm is of vital importance.

83. We ask that sufficient signage and advertising is provided from Britannia Junction along Parkway to inform music lovers and tourists that The Dublin Castle remains open for business and for the enjoyment of live music.

84. Construction lorry routes are proposed by HS2 on residential streets such as Parkway area. This will cause air pollution and noise & vibration to adjacent properties and increased danger to pedestrians and cyclists. The pollution and noise will discourage potential customers from drinking at The Dublin Castle as they will not be able to enjoy the ambience currently experienced. They will be disturbed by noise and pollution. We ask that there is no transport of materials or waste at night along Parkway.

85. We ask that HS2 provide sufficient funds to LBC for local traffic management and for traffic management schemes to be developed with the community.

86. We ask that the London Zoo car park is not used as a holding area for construction lorries. It would bring years of HGV traffic through Camden Town and be detrimental to Regent’s Park, which should be a place of respite. If a holding area is required it should be closer to the main construction sites and accessible by major roads.

87. We ask that the size of construction vehicles used on Parkway is limited appropriately where vehicles are required for Utility
works or there is no alternative route.

88. We ask that Parkway not used as a construction route.

89. Where HGVs must use Parkway to access specific sites we ask that their numbers be limited. This will lower disturbance to performances and to patrons of The music venue and public house.

90. We ask that HS2 have an enforceable mechanism to ensure that construction vehicles stay on their agreed and designated routes.

91. We ask that HS2 makes proposals to maintain safe cycle routes throughout construction and specifically that North-South designated Route 6A through the Camden Cutting area is kept free from HGVs.

92. We ask that HS2 makes proposals to maintain safe pedestrian crossings to The Dublin Castle throughout construction and construct new ones where there are significant increases in traffic due to HS2 construction.

We specifically ask that HS2 maintains continuous pedestrian access to the Dublin Castle for customers, staff, and musicians who wish to load & unload equipment. The same is requested for beer keg and business deliveries associated with the pub.

It is of particular importance that disruptive utility works should not occur in evenings or weekends where there is peak activity for performances of LIVE Music at the venue.

93. We ask that HGVs going to the concrete batching plant at Kings X do not drive east-west across Camden Town but use the Euston Road.

94. We ask that HS2 report three months before preparatory construction work begins on the measures they have taken to implement their commitments.

95. We ask HS2 to Tunnel instead of removing the Parkway bridge in Camden Town. Ten years of disruption will destroy any community not just ours. The ambience and uniqueness of vibrant Camden Town is a national treasure and needs World Heritage
status.

96. We are Camden Town’s original small music venue. The status of Camden Town as a World Centre for LIVE music performances has enabled the UK economy to grow. British music has been exported throughout the globe. Camden Town’s importance as “the” place for LIVE music has global recognition.

We ask for assurance that the business will receive compensation as diversion of utilities is due to be located along Parkway directly outside the Dublin Castle. This includes works to assist the diversion of the main sewer. The works will include trenches being dug into Parkway. This will prevent beer keg deliveries and musicians from being able to load and unload band equipment.

RECOGNITION AS A SPECIAL CASE

97. We have undoubtedly proved the importance of The Dublin Castle to the British Music Scene. It holds its importance as a public amenity and a jewel in London’s musical heritage upon the World stage. The final death knell for this business will surely be the construction of the High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands). Being unable to receive deliveries and having customers and musicians facing challenges of access to from the venue will ultimately be the demise of this iconic public house.

98. We are lead to believe that the construction will be swift and very straightforward. However little is mentioned about the fact that the Parkway railway cutting incorporates a bridge which contributes to the main sewer which runs through it and then along Parkway where we live and operate our family business, The Dublin Castle.

99. Therefore when Parkway is earmarked as: “Land potentially required during construction”. Then we can take it for granted that PARKWAY and it’s bridge will be one huge construction site.

Diversion of Utilities – Section 2.4.21 and Table 21 identify Parkway as one street that “may” be used for the “diversion of utilities”. Clarification of these works has not been provided and should be forthcoming. Where disruption to Parkway may be
caused by the diversion of utilities this should be avoided and only allowed where other alternatives have been fully explored and rationally discounted. In any event, night-time working for these utilities works should not be permitted under any circumstances.

100. Parkway is also shown as a “Construction traffic route”. Our customers are not going to enjoy their drinks and listen to the live music as they will instead be listening to lorries laden with rubble, hammering past the bar for the best part of the day and probably the night also. The Musicians are not going to be able to play at their best as the noise of heavy traffic rumbles past and shakes the building. Ultimately The United Kingdom Creative Industry will suffer as a result. In the past, Coldplay, The Darkness, Amy Winehouse, The Killers, Snow Patrol, Madness, Blur, The Arctic Monkeys and The Libertines have all cut their teeth by performing at our venue. The Dublin Castle plays an essential part in British Musical History and had an essential role during the ‘Brit Pop Era’.

**We specifically ask The House of Lords for an assurance that The Dublin Castle public house will be recognized as a Special Case whilst construction is being undertaken of High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands).** This assurance will help continuity of this amenity and iconic music venue. It will preserve the proven facility to accommodate fledgling musicians and undiscovered talent. It will also help The Conlon family continue to operate it’s business.

**Increased noise from traffic and construction**

101. The Environmental Statement states that construction traffic is “likely to cause significant noise effects on adjacent residential and non-residential receptors” residents and businesses attracting customers should be respected. Patrons to businesses in Parkway will go elsewhere if excessive day or night time noise is permitted in Parkway.

Our pub is a destination venue. People come along to the Dublin Castle in order to relax, not to hear excessive road traffic and breath in pollution. Parkway is one of the gastronomic centres of
Camden, You can buy almost every type of cuisine on the planet here. However it is unlikely people can enjoy a drink or a meal when the lorries are whistling past you shaking the foundations of the building.

The Use of Parkway by construction traffic identifies a major adverse effect of increased traffic delays caused by construction traffic in Parkway. It should be noted that Parkway already experiences significant traffic delays due to road narrowing from 4 to 2 lanes at Britannia Junction. This already has a major detrimental effect on all traffic including emergency vehicles. Alternative routes for construction traffic should be investigated. Where possible construction materials should be carried by rail. The use of the Parkway to Britannia Junction route should be avoided.

Increases in traffic volumes and resulting vibration damage to Grade 2 listed properties. HS2 predicts increases in local traffic volumes of up to 30% (Table 22). Local roads including Arlington Road (30% major adverse), Parkway, Delancey Street and Albert Street are early Victorian roads and are located in a conservation area. Most properties are Grade 2 listed. The Dublin Castle property was not designed to be exposed to the type of construction traffic required by HS2 and so the use of these roads by construction traffic should not be permitted.

102. Project materials should be confined to rail delivery. If construction traffic is permitted to use Arlington Road, Parkway, Delancey Street and Albert Street, then HS2 should undertake to monitor all properties prior to construction and offer proper compensation to property owners for any repairs made necessary by vibration damage. In any event there should be a no night-time (18:00-08:00) construction traffic in Albert Street, Arlington Road, Delancey Street and Parkway.

103. Closure of parts of Parkway - We fear that Parkway will be closed to pedestrian and vehicular traffic whilst The Parkway bridge is being replaced. I cannot see how Parkway could possibly stay open. This thoroughfare of pedestrian footfall is essential to our business. Parkway is a welcoming tree-lined street which carries people towards Regents Park. This ambience
will be lost for many years whilst the bridge is replaced.

104. The economy of Camden Town and the sustainability of our business, The Dublin Castle, will suffer immensely as the HS2 cuts right through it’s soul. We also have the Camden Town Underground station planned to be redeveloped. This is all terrible news for businesses in Camden Town which rely on visitors and the public alike. The Camden Town reputation for being one of the very best places in the United Kingdom to see Live Music may suffer and it may never be regained.

105. Once the visitors and tourists are aware that Camden Town is one big building site they'll stay away. It’s likely that they may not return. They’ll discover somewhere else and may never come back.

The construction route and cessation of pedestrian access along parts of Parkway will result in a loss of passing trade and promotion of the venue.

We ask for assurance that there shall be no cessation of pedestrian access to the Dublin Castle or beyond.

106. Camden Town is a unique and diverse area because of the people that visit and work here. Camden Lock is the second most popular free tourist attraction in the UK. If you take away the visitors and we will lose the workers together with the jobs. Camden Town will suffer and it’s infamous creative Live music industry may disappear forever.

107. We ask that HS2 supports the profitable sustainability of The Dublin Castle live music venue in Camden Town by taking steps that ensure that the construction will not deter customers nor musicians from visiting these premises.

**We ask for assurance that HS2 will make available financial grants to the Dublin Castle as mentioned within the Bill.**

These grants will cover promotion of the amenity and it’s facility for musicians. The grants will assist the continuity of this iconic music venue. It will assist problem solving which undoubtedly be experienced during construction. The venue and it’s business on a four monthly basis throughout the construction of the London-
West Midlands High Speed link.

108. We ask that HS2 Ltd and others do all they possibly can in order to preserve the business at the Dublin Castle. If only to demonstrate that they understand the reputation of The Dublin Castle and it’s contribution to live music over the years.

It would be a great loss to the British Music Industry if yet another music venue closed due to no fault of it’s own. If the HS2 make business unsustainable and this business does inevitably fail due to the effects of the construction of HS2 then it will have been a pleasure for the last 42 years for this family to have served the people of Camden Town and those beyond who have graced us with their presence inside our family pub and small music venue.

LAND POTENTIALLY REQUIRED DURING CONSTRUCTION

109. The Dublin Castle and Conlon family home is located within an area designated by HS2 Ltd as Land potentially required during construction. If we are unable to fully utilise our business and home we will become financially unviable and the home above the pub will not be enjoyed to it’s fully potential.

Parkway is required for The Provision of worksite and access for construction.

Parkway is required for access to utility works

Parkway is required for diversion or installation of works to utility apparatus

The Conlon family request assurance that they will be financially compensated for loss of income and possibly their home. We have invested and operated the business for over 4 decades. We’ve built the business up and tried to ensure the continuity of the Venue. If this is disrupted business may not return. The Conlon family humbly request that The House of Lords recognizes this fact and grants assurance from HS2 Ltd that we will be suitably compensated.
THE PRAYER

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

AND the petitioners remain,

signed Margaret Conlon

signed Terence Henry Conlon

signed John Aloysius Conlon

Dated: 14th April 2016
To the House of Lords Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF Katherine Pahl and Nicholas Pahl

Declarations that:

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

2. The petitioners are homeowners at 15 Albert Street, London NW1 7LU. The house is very close to the proposed site – only one line of houses and a very small garden lie between 15 Albert Street and the site. The house's residents include 5 children under 16.

3. The Bill will affect us and our five children because of the noise of building works which are very close to my house (tens of metres). Our house is not included in the noise insulation scheme. We believe our terrace of houses are the closest houses to the site which are not included in the scheme. We should be included as we will be strongly affected by the noise from building works and site traffic.

   Our children are already extremely anxious about their secondary schooling being sabotaged by noise pollution from HS2. They are worried they will fail their GCSEs and A levels because they won't be able to work or sleep. If they are unable to sleep we will be forced to move house and will need to be included in the right to sell scheme. The right to sell scheme should not be limited to people who are emigrating/divorcing but should be available to everyone whose lives are seriously adversely affected by HS2.

   We will need to have an independent adjudicator available for redress if HS2 exceed agreed noise limits or fail to implement schemes like right to sell.

If we were in a rural area we would be a distance from the site which would mean we would qualify for noise insulation and the right to sell schemes. We would like these to be extended to urban areas.

We are concerned about increased traffic in the street due to other surrounding streets being narrowed and/or congested due to site traffic. We would like the junction between Mornington Crescent and Mornington Place to be made no entry to stop Albert Street and Arlington Road becoming rat runs.

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask 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.

Katherine Pahl
17/4/16

Nicholas Pahl
17/4/16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

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

THE PETITION OF Francis and Heather Auton  

 Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioners  

   The petitioners are property owners and residents in the village of Coleshill in Buckinghamshire, located in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and also own other property in the AONB (one in Coleshill and one in Old Amersham) which is rented to tenants.  

3. Your petitioners’ concerns  

   The petitioners’ concerns are twofold:  

   i) That such a massive degradation of an AONB, as will result from the construction and operation of HS2, would not only be allowed but positively created by a Parliament which thought the area sufficiently valuable to give it AONB protection. The petitioners derive both physical and emotional benefits by living in and making extensive use of the AONB which will be impaired if the construction of HS2 goes ahead. They are also concerned that the character of the area will be irreparably damaged, the economy of many towns and villages (including Coleshill) negatively affected, and the communities which offer so much to their residents and the wider world, will struggle to maintain their cohesion.  

   ii) That the construction period will be highly damaging to their quality of life: greatly increasing travel times for work, voluntary and leisure activities, causing problems of access to key services such as the railway station, GP and hospitals, and affecting their ability to rent out their properties which provide important streams of income.
The petitioners believe that insufficient consideration has been given to the following:

- alternative solutions to capacity and connectivity needs. Both 51M and HSUK have demonstrated more effective solutions with greater benefits and lower costs and less disruption than HS2.

- slower train speeds. The argument for a design speed of 250mph is unconvincing. For example, at the average running speed of 360km/h, the time saving on a journey from London to Leeds (or more likely vice versa) will be 10 minutes less compared with running at an "unacceptable" 300 km/h (as was claimed in the environmental consultation document). Slower speeds would allow for more flexibility in route selection.

- a fully bored long tunnel under the Chilterns AONB. A new study (Thursday 26 March) proves the viability of a 24.2km tunnel, which would preserve the protected Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The study, produced by Peter Brett Associates, was commissioned by Chiltern District Council, together with Aylesbury Vale District Council, Buckinghamshire County Council and the Chilterns Conservation Board.

- the disruption to traffic caused in the area by construction traffic for the vent shafts and the railway.

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.

Francis David Auton  
April 15th 2016

Heather May Auton  
April 15th 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr Andrew Timbury

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is Andrew Timbury, the freehold owner of Grove Farm, London Rd, Wendover, Aylesbury HP22 6PG, a 27.5 hectare (68 acre) Dairy Farm, with farm house, farm buildings and a milking parlour. The farm runs a prestigious Pedigree Jersey Herd with 200 cows, 250 followers and 50 pedigree beef cattle. The Petitioner and his family has operated the family business since 1982. The Property is located within the safeguarded area and is specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Main Access

The Environmental Statement Plans CT-05-038 and CT-06-038 demonstrate the permanent land take and land required by construction which include the acquisition of the only access from the highway to the Farmhouse and buildings.

The plans detail a replacement HS2 Access Road providing access from the Hale Bridge Roundabout. There has been no correspondence between HS2 Limited or the Nominated Undertaker and The Petitioner regarding access provisions to Grove Farm. Grove Farm currently benefits from its own independent access, and it is not clear what rights of access are granted to the Petitioner to ensure continuity of access to the Farm.

The specification of the current access allows for frequent use of agricultural machinery to include tankers and lorries, and there has been no correspondence with the Petitioner to discuss specifications, turning circles or passing places to ensure unrestricted access remains to the Farm. Rights of both access and maintenance require clarification from HS2.

Secondary Access

Your Petitioner currently accesses the field to the south of Small Dean Lane, and immediately adjoining the western boundary of the existing railway using the gateway entrance from Small Dean Lane.

Plan CT-05-037 shows the northern section of Small Dean Lane as required during construction. There is no correspondence from HS2 to your Petitioner, but your Petitioner assumes this roadway is closed for public access.
Your Petitioner requests assurances that access to his land parcel will continue throughout the construction of the scheme. Alternatively, the Petitioner suggests that an alternative hard surface trackway is created by HS2 from the Farm buildings eastwards to Small Dean Lane to allow direct access to this field.

**Water Supply**

The Petitioner requires confirmation that his water supply will not be affected, and the Farm will have continuity of supply together with rights of access for repairs and maintenance throughout the scheme.

The current water supply to the Field to the east of Small Dean Lane is located adjacent to the southern crossing of Small Dean Bridge, is also located in an area potentially required during construction. The Petitioner requests confirmation this this supply will also be maintained.

Alternatively, the Petitioner requests a new suitable supply is provided.

The Petitioner request further confirmation that the bore-hole, it's water quality and availability located by the farmhouse, will be unaffected by the construction works, or that a suitable alternative is sought.

**Balancing pond and Drainage**

A balancing pond is located immediately to the north of the farmhouse and buildings on the Petitioner’s Property. The Petitioner requests justification from HS2 to its location, and to consider the alternative to site the balancing pond to the east of the farm to reduce the land take on an already modest holding.

**Electricity Pylons**

The Environmental Statement Plans CT-05-037, CT-06-037 CT-05-038 and CT-06-038 show the construction of main utility works comprising a new line of overhead pylons.

A new pylon tower is located to the south east of the balancing pond (Map CT-06-037), located within approximately 40m of the farm buildings. Currently this field contains over sail approximately 100m from the buildings. The Petitioner suggests the proposed pylon is located further to the northern boundary of the Farm to reduce the diminution in value of the freehold.

**Noise**

The Operational Sound Contour Maps and Likely Significant Effects, map reference SV-01-019, show significant noise levels. Your Petitioner is concerned the current mitigation works are inadequate and further works are undertaken.
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.

Andrew Timbury

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr Mervyn Robert Humphrey and Mr Frank Douglas Humphrey of BF Humphrey and Sons, Falcutt Hall Farm, Falcutt, Helmdon, Brackley Northamptonshire NN13 5QD

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner are freeholders of agricultural land and two residential properties at Halse Copse Farm Halse Brackley NN13 6DZ registered at the land registry under title number NN288647 which the Bill specially and directly affects

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Environmental Mitigation

The proposed scheme provides for a significant area within the limits of deviation for the planting of environmental offset areas “woodland habitat creation” and “grassland habitat creation”.

In the case of your petitioners property the estimated land uses are:-

- 4.589ha (11.34ac) Track and embankment (Permanent Acquisition)
- 15.775ha (38.98 ac) “Sustainable placement” of excess spoil to be returned to “agricultural use” (assumed temporary acquisition)
- 10.136 ha (25.04 ac) of “woodland habitat creation” and “grassland habitat creation”

The scheme proposes to remove 0.3ha of Halse Copse an ancient woodland.

Your petitioners are concerned that the objectives of the government to create “no net loss of biodiversity” following the construction of HS2 creates the ability for HS2 to compulsory acquire or use land temporarily in excess of that absolutely necessary to achieve biodiversity mitigation. Of the land which HS2 proposes to take rights over one third is scheduled for environmental offset. Your petitioners feel this is excessive particularly when there no evidence provided in the Environmental Statement that ecological resources (ancient woodland) have been avoided or reduced as the mitigation hierarchy suggests and for which the “compensatory habitat” on your petitioner’s land is being provided. There is also no evidence that the scale or location chosen is appropriate.

Your petitioners feel that the use of productive arable land to environmental use is not only inappropriate for their holding and business it is a permanent loss of an important national resources of farmland.

Your petitioners understand that there is no statutory requirement for seeking “no net loss of biodiversity” and as such it is an aspiration rather than a requirement. Your petitioner’s questions therefore whether the Bill should compel them to provide land for environmental uses.
Proposed Solutions

Without prejudice to your petitioner’s view expressed above they have sought an agreement for the woodland planting to be reduced in area and relocated to a different position which provide both the mitigation for the loss of habitat and reduction of the loss of productive agricultural land.

Your petitioners have, in principle, agreed both a relocation and reduction of land take however a formal and legally binding agreement has yet to be completed.

Your petitioners request that either the Bill is not enacted until a formal legal agreement is completed to mutual satisfaction or that the Bill is changed to reflect the in principle agreement reached.

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 petitioner/s remains, etc.

Mr Mervyn Robert Humphrey       Mr Frank Douglas Humphrey
Date                              Date
To the House of Lords HL:
Session 2015–16
PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr Henry Peter Purser, Mrs Sue Purser and H T Purser Ltd

Declarations that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioners are freeholders and occupiers of Upper Wendover Dean Farm, Wendover Dean Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP22 6QB, an agricultural holding consisting of a Listed Farmhouse, extensive agricultural buildings, 50.586ha (125 acres) of agricultural land in a ring fence and 4 residential bungalows which the Bill may "specially and directly affect"

3. Your petitioner's concerns

The Agricultural Business

Your petitioners run an intensive beef rearing enterprise on the holding. The enterprise consists of 300 head of cattle with purchases and sales taking place throughout the year. The enterprise is one where calves are bought in, mainly beef crosses from the dairy industry, they are kept for 24 months and sold as "store cattle" to other farmers who then fatten them. All the livestock is housed for 365 days. The cattle are fed on home produced grass, barley and maize. There is minimal food purchased in. All of the agricultural land on the holding is fully utilised and any loss will have a significant effect.

Residential Property

The farming business, like many of their type, have a second and essential income stream from the letting of four former agricultural worker bungalows on the holding. It is common to many agricultural businesses to regard income from residential properties as diversification income.

The Land Take

In accordance with the figures published in the Environmental Statement 23.1 ha of the holding are required for the scheme (46% of the holding by area). A significant proportion of the land will be used as temporary stock piles of soil being restored to "landscape earthworks."

Maintaining a viable agricultural unit during and following the works

The scale of the land take is such that it will have a devastating effect on the business. The reduction of stock numbers required to be in balance with the remaining land will be unsustainable as a business model. The only way to maintain the business is to replace the land lost with alternative land close enough to enable the silage and other crops to be hauled onto the holding.

Reclamation of landscape earthworks

Your petitioners understand that the landscape earthworks will be restored to agricultural use. They have grave concerns that the quality and productivity will be significantly affected following
restoration and will almost certainly be unfit for growing of arable and maize crops, an important part of the farms fodder production. Restoration to even modest grass production is likely to take many years. Your petitioners are concerned that the landscape earthworks are to be placed on an existing slope and that the stability of the made up ground is questionable. Your petitioners require reassurance that the landscape earthworks will be stable and will not subsequently slip.

**Drainage**

There will be significant disturbance to the natural landform on the holding which could affect the drainage of the land. Your petitioners require further information on the drainage issues on the holding.

**Existing Electricity Pylons**

The landscape earthworks surround the existing high voltage pylons on the farm. The petitioners see assurances that there will be a clearance below the pylons for safe agricultural operations.

**Severance of the Holding**

The rail line severs the property leaving parts of two fields north of the line. Your petitioners require conformation that access will be maintained throughout the construction period and permanent access is provided on completion.

**Noise and Disturbance**

The holding will be significantly affected by noise during the operation of the railway. It appears that sound will emanate from the viaduct to a significant degree. Your petitioners wish HS2 to confirm that all measures for limiting noise has been undertaken to protect the residential properties and the livestock enterprises. HS2 should also recognise the limitations of the listed house in terms of noise insulation.

**Solutions sought**

1. **Reduction in Land Take**

Your Petitioners are not convinced that such a significant land take is needed for landscape purposes and as such the land take should be reduced to that required for the rail line.

2. **Further engagement with HS2**

If your petitioners are to remain farming the holding during and after the work there will need to be engagement with HS2 to deal with the practical matters of remaining and maintaining the agricultural business. Such discussions should include accommodation works, drainage, ground stability, electrical safety noise and the finding of alternative land to grow fodder for the existing level of stocking.

3. **Purchase of the entire holding and residential bungalows.**

Your petitioners are reaching the conclusion that the agricultural holding will not be viable during the construction period and that the business is unlikely to be sustainable post construction. Your petitioners are reluctantly considering that the sale of the entire property is required to allow them to purchase a replacement farm elsewhere to maintain their business.

Your petitioners are aware of their ability to utilise the statutory blight process and the HS2 Express Purchase Scheme. Your petitioners have informally discussed this process with HS2 in a bilateral
meeting on 9 November 2015. The informal discussions have raised a limitation under the blight rules which would preclude the inclusion of the four bungalows from any Blight Purchase as the bungalows do not form part of the owner occupation. None of the residential properties will qualify for the non-statutory Need to Sell Scheme as this scheme is limited to residential owner-occupier exclusively.

If your petitioners decide to serve a blight notice in advance of construction, they would wish to do so via a “clean break” meaning that they would want to sell and release the capital from the let cottages.

Your petitioners are aware that other petitioners in the House of Commons on the HS2 route have faced similar issues with ancillary let dwellings and the Blight Notice process. Your petitioners seek that the committee compel HS2 to acquire the four bungalows on the basis that a formal Bligh Notice is accepted for the main holding.

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 petitioner/s remains, etc.

Edward Briggs FRICS FAAV

Agent Bidwells

Date
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  
PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Miss Ann Bonham and Mrs Bridget Gill  
Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner  
The petitioners are Miss Ann Bonham and Mrs Bridget Gill. Your Petitioners are the freeholders of Dodds Farm, North Lee Lane, Terrick, Aylesbury HP22 5YA which is a small commercial agricultural holding in the parish of Little Kimble, Buckinghamshire. Your petitioners land extends to approximately 21.8 hectares of agricultural land which comprises 9 fields, 7 of these fields are affected by the proposed scheme. The Property is located within the safeguarded area and is specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  
Extent of Land Take  
Land in the ownership of your Petitioners are 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 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. No information has been supplied by HS2 to confirm the duration of the temporary land take.

Your Petitioners are 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 their land when the nominated undertaker’s requirement is for a temporary use only. Your Petitioners also wish to ensure that they are properly compensated as regards the acquisition and use of their land, and is concerned to note that the compensation regime proposed by the Bill is inadequate and needs to be improved.

Inappropriate mitigation measures on farmland  
Balancing Ponds will be introduced to control the rate, volume and quality of runoff. As detailed within the Environmental Statement, Map CT-06-041-L1 shows that a balancing pond will be constructed on your Petitioners land, with the associated water course linking into the watercourse south west of the holding. The drainage running to the proposed balancing pond would have to cross two existing ditches. These ditches run very high at peak rainfall and merge at a level crossing. Your petitioners have major concerns about the implications of this proposal and the affect that this will have on the water table of Dodds Farm. Your petitioners are concerned that this will result in an increased risk of flooding on the holding. Your Petitioners therefore suggest that the proposed Balancing Pond is relocated away from the holding to a location which is likely to be less of a flooding impact. The current location of this balancing pond is close to the farmstead and farmhouse at Dodds Farm and
any resultant flooding issues would directly affect the farmstead. Your petitioner would also like to raise their concern that putting additional quantities of water into the existing water course is likely to have a flooding impact which would exacerbate the current position and this would also have effect on your petitioners holding. Your Petitioner would further require a detailed hydrology survey and action plan to illustrate the effects of the scheme on the local water table and how this will be protected.

There is underground telephone cable which is connected to your Petitioners dwelling and follows the access route to, and through the proposed Balancing Pond. Your Petitioners is concerned that the construction of the balancing pond is going to have a significant impact on this telephone line and your petitioner’s requirement is that either the Balancing Pond is relocated or if this is not possible then the balancing pond would need to be redesigned and the telephone line relocated with as little disruption as possible.

The proposed culvert across your Petitioners property will also cause significant damage to established trees, hedges, land drainage and water supply in the vicinity. Within the Environmental Statement, map number CT-06-041-L1 does not show that any environmental works will be undertaken to re-establish this damage. Your Petitioners request that for every tree/hedge that is damaged as a result of the scheme then a minimum of three trees are planted in order to assist in replacing them. Your Petitioners request that where compaction of soil occurs due to the construction phase, land drainage is reinstated. Your petitioners will also require an over bridge to be constructed over this culvert which will need to have a weight capacity of 40 tons and a minimum width of 6 metres.

With the land take required for the Satellite Compound and the Balancing Pond as detailed above, the loss of this prime agricultural land will in effect mean that your petitioner's holding will cease to be able to be run as a commercial agricultural unit. Your petitioner will require the promoter to provide further details on the overall impact on the agricultural viability of the holding.

**Maintenance of bunds and made-up ground**

It is clear from the 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. Your Petitioners however, are concerned that map number CT-06-041-L1 does not show any proposed bunds or landscaping, which would mitigate the noise and visual impact of the scheme. Your Petitioners note that this also applies to the south side of the proposed A4010 Stoke Mandeville Bypass. Noise travels long distances in the area, particularly at night, and therefore your Petitioners are concerned that the noise of frequent trains at high speed will impact on Dodds Farm, as well as the houses, farms and small businesses in the local community. Your Petitioners request that significant earth banks are to be created as a natural barrier to the expected noise, from the scheme and the proposed A4010 Stoke Mandeville Bypass.

In your Petitioners submission, the Bill should be amended 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 farm 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 Petitioners. Well-designed accommodation works which meet your Petitioner’s
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 Petitioners. 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 Petitioners propose that your honourable House that HS2 Ltd should be required to undertake that it will, at a very early stage, seek to agree with your Petitioners 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.

Your Petitioner proposes that the design of the over bridge is built to the specification as mentioned above and is capable of transporting agricultural machinery.

**Severance and hedgerows**

The severance of agricultural land by such a long linear scheme will result in some of your Petitioners fields being left in awkward shapes. A common element of a claim for severance is the cost of removing hedges and fences in order to re-shape fields into a sensible layout. Since the introduction of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997, the removal of any hedge which is more than 20 metres long requires the consent of the local planning authority. This will add time, cost and uncertainty for farmers who are affected.

Your Petitioners propose to your honourable House that the Hybrid Bill should be amended to provide that the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 do not apply to hedges which have to be removed to allow the reasonable re-organisation of field boundaries where land has been acquired by HS2.

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.

Miss Ann Bonham and Mrs Bridget Gill

13th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16
PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr Geoffrey Brunt

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is Geoffrey Brunt, the freehold owner of Land Registry Title BM261422, totalling approximately 45 acres (18 hectares), of good quality Grade III arable and pasture land. This land has been farmed by the Petitioner and his family since 1959.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Engineering Earthworks to form footpath ramp

Environmental Statement plans, CT-06-040a and CT-05-040a are the relevant plans showing the proposed scheme and impact during construction.

The land take required for the main line construction of the railway affects only the northern corner of the petitioner's 8 acre (3.25 hectare) grass field, totalling approximately 0.35 hectares (0.86 acres) and this is accepted by the Petitioner who can continue to operate his farming business.

The presence of existing footpath access and location is well established but the principle of ramp access is questioned with only steps being necessary at this point.

Whether steps or ramp are used, either can be constructed within the width of a narrow woodland strip established as a screen to block the view of the railway. Bucks CC footpath officer has been consulted and agrees that even a ramp could be run parallel with the line, thus eliminating the need for any ingress into the field.

The land take proposed by the engineering earthworks for the ramp together with the additional landscape mitigation woodland planting equates to approximately 1.72 hectares (4.25 acres). This land does not need to be taken from the nation's farmland stock and, thus, does not need to be paid for.

No justification from HS2 has been provided to the Petitioner to explain the siting and positioning of the ramp. Your Petitioner considers HS2 should consult with Buckinghamshire County Council to explore the options in relation to the amended design above to ensure this option can provide the required level of access.

This solution will ensure less farmland is taken out of agricultural production and allow the holding to remain an important and viable part of the farm, whilst still maintaining footpath access across the farm and the railway line.
Woodland Mitigation

Environmental Statement plan CT-06-040a details the Landscape mitigation woodland planting proposed on your petitioner’s farm. The level of planting is clearly connected to the footpath ramp proposed above and extends diagonally across the field parcel taking the majority of the parcel out of agricultural production.

The adjoining land parcels to the east and west of the holding simply have woodland strips adjacent to the railway. Your petitioner requests the level of planting is reduced and re-sited along the boundary line to the railway.

Your petitioner’s proposal to eliminate the earth ramp would enable linear woodland planting to screen the constructed ramp and railway along the boundary to the railway.

This option ensures that the quantity of productive land taken for woodland is reduced and it’s positioning along the existing field boundary enables the field parcel to continue to be in agricultural use.

Balancing pond and Drainage

Environmental Statement plan CT-06-040a shows a large balancing pond covering approximately one third of your petitioner’s 20 acre (8 hectare) arable field.

Your petitioner and his family have farmed the land since 1959 and it has never flooded. HS2 have provided your petitioner with little evidence to justify the size and siting of this balancing pond.

Your petitioner does not consider the balancing pond is necessary and has seen no evidence to support its construction.

Your petitioner requests the elimination of the balancing pond from the plan. Drainage of the entire area is easily coped with by the existing Stoke Brook under normal circumstances. In periods of heavy rainfall any surplus is easily coped with by the soakaway/bog area and ‘replacement floodplain storage’ area on the neighbouring land to the north. In the extremely unlikely event (1 in 100 plus years) of a real flood, then the whole of the surrounding farmland area is available to be flooded as it always has been.

The idea of scraping off the topsoil from good arable land to render the area only suitable for grazing is completely unacceptable and will be resisted vigourously.
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 Geoffrey Brunt

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF RICHARD JANKO AND MICHELE HANNOOSH

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners are married couple who have been since October 2002 the freehold owners and occupiers of flat 5A Fellows Road, London NW3 3LR. Every aspect of their daily existence at this property — living, sleeping, shopping, going to libraries at St Pancras and Bloomsbury where they conduct research for their work, using the Adelaide Nature Reserve, Primrose Hill, Regent’s Park and Hampstead Heath for leisure — will be specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed construction of HS2.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioners’ property lies extremely close to the Adelaide Road vent shaft, where there will be a major construction compound for HS2. The road on which their property is located joins Adelaide Rd, one of the roads adjacent to the HS2 line and to be used for major construction traffic and works. Their property is close enough to the tunnelling for HS2 that it is expected to suffer some settlement from the works.

Their property lies on a road in an area for which the Environmental Impact Statement acknowledges a ‘major adverse effect’ (p. 140) of access to all the roads. The road on which their property is located lies within a zone that will be surrounded on all sides by the routes which will be used by construction vehicles and diverted traffic (Adelaide Road, Haverstock Hill, England’s Lane, Primrose Hill Road), estimated by HS2 Ltd to involve 100 HGVs per day.

Your Petitioners’ property lies within the area shown in the Environmental Impact Statement to be within the zone of visibility, and an area which will be affected by noise, dirt, dust, air and light pollution, vibrations, traffic congestion, construction traffic, road closures and traffic rerouting, cranes, hoardings and other elements of urban blight from the construction of HS2.

Your Petitioners’ property lies on a road designated to undergo works for a sewer due to HS2, for which the hybrid bill would allow access from the ground level. Their property lies immediately outside the 60 metre band and is thus not eligible for compensation as the Bill is presently drafted.

Your Petitioners do not own a car and are regular users of roads in which, according to the Environmental Statement, ‘changes in traffic flows will affect non-motorised users, making it
more difficult to cross the road' (p. 143): Adelaide Road, Regent's Park Road, Haverstock Hill, England's Lane, Primrose Hill Road, Fellows Road, Winchester Road, Chalk Farm Road, Bridge Approach, Gloucester Avenue, Prince Albert Road and Avenue Road.

Your Petitioners expect to retire in 2019, from which time they will be at home day and night throughout the period of the construction both of the vent shaft and of the works at Euston, an area which is impossible for them to avoid on the route that they traverse daily in order to use the academic and library resources of Bloomsbury, including the British Library, UCL and the Senate House Libraries.

Accordingly, your Petitioners request (1) that the route of HS2 terminate at Old Oak Common rather than at Euston, in order that it can better be linked with the rest of the rail network and that the London Borough of Camden be spared from devastation.

In the absence of that remedy, your Petitioners request (2) that the proposal known as Euston Express or some similar proposal be adopted, so that the last part of the train journey into Euston be completed at normal speeds and on the existing tracks, as is the standard practice with high-speed trains in other countries.

In the absence of that remedy, your Petitioners request (3) that the Adelaide Road vent shaft be moved to Juniper Crescent, where it will be further away from densely populated areas, including social housing, and will not destroy the Adelaide Road Nature Reserve or disrupt the 'green corridor', (4) that the spoil from the construction of the vent shaft be removed by rail rather than by road, and (5) that the dust, noise, and air pollution from the works be kept within the legal limits, which the air of London already exceeds. Your Petitioners finally request (6) that, should their situation turn out to be so intolerable that they wish to move, but face severe financial loss because of the surrounding blight from the construction of HS2, from damage to their property caused by the construction, or a from combination of the two, they be afforded fair and equitable compensation for the financial loss, damage to their quality of life and for the distress that they will have suffered.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Richard Janko Michèle Hannoosh

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

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

THE PETITION OF DR PATRICIA JACKSON AND DR MATTHEW JACKSON

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners  
Your Petitioners are Dr Patricia Jackson and DR Matthew Jackson, resident at 43, Ellesborough Road, Wendover, 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 Petitioners object for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

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

Your petitioners, are concerned about the noise impact from the construction of the temporary road opposite their house; visual impact from the construction site opposite their house; difficulties in vehicular access to and from their property and the local road network; difficulties in safe pedestrian access to the station and town centre along Ellesborough Road; a reduction in property value restricting retirement planning; dirt and Public Right of Way disruption.

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

the noise impact and disruption to sleep due to trains in late evenings and early mornings; the
visual impact of the railway, embankments and proposed noise barriers.

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.

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

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

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

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

d. 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 petitioners 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.

DR Patricia Jackson                         DR Matthew Jackson

April 14th 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

Petition against the
HIGH SPEED RAIL (London- Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF LYNDA MARGARET COOKE

Declares that

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

2. Your petitioner is Lynda Margaret Cooke, resident at Austyn, Marriots Avenue, South Heath, Great Missenden HP16 9QL, a hamlet within the Chilterns area of outstanding natural beauty who the bill will adversely affect, both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

Your petitioner considers herself to be injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing

3. Your Petitioner is heart broken at the prospect of the utter destruction of the countryside and the habitat of the creatures who live there. This includes the population who live, work, visit, conserve and enjoy the area. Your Petitioner is angry at the broken promises made by a government who in their manifesto pledged to ‘conserve and protect the Green Belt and maintain national protections for areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty’

HS2 have acknowledged that this is possible to achieve by tunnelling through the remaining 8.5 km between where the tunnel currently emerges in South Heath to beyond Wendover which would eliminate the need to
* provide two viaducts;
* remove and replace pylons;
* demolish farms;
* interfere with public rights of way;
* remove hedgerows;
* provide compensation for properties adjacent to the line
* cut down mature trees and hedgerows
* put up visually obtrusive sound barriers.

The provision of a fully bored tunnel would totally mitigate this situation.
4. Your Petitioner objects to the Bill because your Petitioner uses the many PRoW surrounding South Heath on a daily basis both alone and with others. Many will be closed or diverted temporarily or permanently for up to 7 years becoming overgrown due to lack of use. These actions will deprive your Petitioner and the community of a much used and highly regarded amenity. Your Petitioner is a keen rambler, leading walks for several local groups as well as walking for pleasure and to maintain her physical, mental and emotional health.

The footpath along which the haul road will run will deprive your Petitioner of the most direct walking route to the facilities in Great Missenden.

Your Petitioner requests that all PRoW should be reinstated to their pre HS2 condition along all and any length, overgrown and affected by lack of use, at the end of the project. They should follow their original route and with foot bridges over the line of a design in keeping with the AONB environment. There should be world class sound barriers and enforceable noise limits to prevent hearing damage whilst trying to enjoy the (once peaceful) countryside.

5. Currently there is a haul road planned for construction traffic from Potter Row onto the A413 at a roundabout which is a spot already heavily congested during the rush hours and busy most of the day.

Your Petitioner is dependent on uninhibited passage along the A413 road to Great Missenden in order to access doctor; dentist; post office; bank; library; railway station; shops; church; social activities; restaurants; visit friends etc. It is also the main route to access Wendover and the A&E department of Stoke Mandeville hospital; Aylesbury; Amersham and Amersham hospital and the only route to High Wycombe where there is another main hospital. Inevitably local traffic will seek alternative routes on country lanes many of which are narrow with passing places only.

Your Petitioner is concerned that traffic congestion will cause your Petitioner delays and undue anxiety.

Following two recent fires in Marriotts Avenue when fire engines had to attend, your Petitioner is concerned that it is also the route for the police & fire services located in Great Missenden.

Your Petitioner walks daily along the country lanes around South Heath, along which there are no pavements, for health reasons and to access friends; the garden centre and Ballinger War Memorial Hall and playground (the latter with grandchildren) Other users of these lanes include cyclists; school children; horse riders. If construction traffic use these roads (satnav will send them on the shortest route) there could be increased prospect of injury to your Petitioner and decreased enjoyment of the walk.

These roads were never designed to take large lorries, a fact that has been pointed out to HS2 in the community forums.

A fully bored tunnel under the entire AONB would abolish these concerns entirely. Otherwise, your Petitioner would ask that there be large notices on the lanes (Ballinger Road; Hundridge Lane; Rocky Lane; Chartridge Lane) stating that they are prohibited to site traffic at all times. There needs to be somewhere to report those drivers who ignore such notices together with fines and penalties.

6. Your Petitioner has been accustomed to silence and bird song and is concerned at the increase in noise during the 7 year construction period and the increase in noise afterwards due to operation and ongoing maintenance work. Your Petitioner is concerned at the effect on her ability to enjoy the
environment; her garden and to sleep uninterruptedly (with windows open) and the effect of this on her mental, physical and emotional health.

During construction she would request the imposition of enforceable noise limits that preserve the tranquillity of the area and limit hours when work can take place e.g.—not before 7am nor after 6pm nor on Sundays; give grants to residents to install triple glazing. In operation—install world class sound barriers; reduce the speed and frequency of trains.

7. Your Petitioner is concerned at the prospect of increased dust from construction lorries carrying uncovered spoil and the storage of this as a stock pile prior to disposal as your Petitioner suffers from hay fever like symptoms and rhinitis, both aggravated by dust.

Also your Petitioner is concerned at the visual pollution of stock piling the spoil e.g. at Hunts Green and Cudsdens Farm which will affect her enjoyment of the area and is totally out of keeping with the landscape of The Chilterns and with the ethos of the Chiltern Conservation Society of which your petitioner has been a supporting member for many years and by The Woodland Trust.

Your Petitioner requests that spoil should be covered at all times and especially in hot dry weather; and suggests that by providing a fully bored tunnel under the Chilterns AONB, the dust and visual impact of the spoil would be eliminated. Also that there should be easy and consistent access to a complaints procedure with penalties for transgressors and monitoring of solutions.

8. Your Petitioner is concerned over the light pollution which will occur as a consequence of HS2 and in particular the light at the portal in South Heath and feels sympathy for fellow members of the community living adjacent to it.

9. Your Petitioner, who has three members of her family and numerous friends with degrees in Engineering is frustrated at the illogicality of many aspects of the current HS2 plans which are causing her stress. The decision to cease tunnelling at Weights and Measures half way through the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; to extract and decommission the boring machinery then to continue with a series of green tunnels, cuttings and flyovers and to have to mitigate all the many problems caused by this action, seems to be a complete and utter madness.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that your honourable House should pay special attention to the proposals in the Bill so far as they affect the AONB in order to determine whether due regard has been paid to this highly sensitive and precious area where the railway is currently not being constructed under ground.

Your petitioner supports both the Chiltern District Council's and The Chiltern Society's proposal for an extended bored tunnel throughout the AONB, which in your petitioner's opinion would alleviate the detrimental impact that the proposed railway will have on the AONB and those who live, work and visit.

10. Your Petitioner has suffered increased anxiety for which medical treatment has been sought during the four year planning and consultation period in which she has participated to date.

She is concerned at the effects of the stress anticipated during the construction period and subsequent operation and maintenance of the railway in its current form, on her future health and quality of life.
Your Petitioner predicts and is concerned that access to South Heath will become a challenge during the construction period making it difficult for friends/home help/supermarket deliveries/milk man/fish van etc. to continue and fears isolation if these services stop.

Long time residents and friends exploring other places to move to away from HS2, is causing your petitioner to feel unsettled and insecure.

Your Petitioner believes she may, reluctantly, have to move house before completion of the project, due to advancing years and an increased need for help and possible inability to continue driving her car.

She is concerned that her situation does not fulfill the current criteria for compensation for loss of value of property. It is likely that anyone moving to South Heath once construction starts and aware of the daily challenge of the inevitable traffic congestion will offer a reduced sum to purchase her property and indeed this is already happening. Your Petitioner is suffering increased levels of stress on this count.

11. Your Petitioner believes that the Bill be amended to provide a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty both for environmental reasons and to enable the residents of South Heath to carry out the practicalities of day to day living without undue interruption thus enabling your petitioner and residents of South Heath to continue a healthy, stress free, and enjoyable life within a supportive community.

This would satisfy all the concerns and objections of your Petitioner to the Bill. Also, your Petitioner respectfully requests that unless the relevant clauses of the Bill are amended as proposed above, so far as it affects your Petitioner, it should not pass into law.

There are clauses and provisions in the Bill as it now stands which, if they become law, will be exceedingly detrimental to your Petitioner and her rights and interests. Currently, there is no provision within the Bill to protect the rights of your Petitioner.

THE PRAYER

The petitioner Lynda Margaret Cooke 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 Lynda Margaret Cooke remains etc.

Signature of Petitioner.—

Lynda Margaret Cooke

14th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Peter John Milton Hammond

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is John Milton Hammond resident at Lee Clump house, princes lane, Lee common, HP169JW, 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 two viaducts. 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, considerably extra traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve 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 09.30 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.
c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

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

Print the name of the person signing below each signature (and add "Agent" if appropriate)

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

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

THE PETITION OF Keith John and Gillian June RALLS  
of Long Compton Farm, Sandyford, Nr STONE, Staffs. ST15 0QB  

We declare that:

1. We are specially and directly affected by the whole of the Bill but wish to focus here on the subjects of Compensation, Disruption during the Construction phase and, during the Operational phase, the Vulnerability to Terrorism of HS Trains.

2. Your petitioners are 77 and 71 years of age and are retired. From our previous marriages, we have 6 children and 10 grandchildren and thus a huge interest in their future. Our residence is on an acre-site with our nearest neighbours some 500 metres away, in the village of Swynnerton, N Staffs.

3. Compensation: Our property is located within the band (180 to 240 metres) from Centre/Line of proposed HS2 track, which is identified by HS2 Ltd as Zone Green. As a result, we might be eligible for a ‘benefit’ payment from HS2 Ltd of up to £15k. Prior to the announcement of the project in January 2013, we estimated that our property was worth more than £500k and that it has now reduced to about £250k in value. We recognise and respect the desirability to proceed with the project but we consider this approach and this offer reflects an unconscionable act by our Government and we thus seek an equitable solution.

4. Disruption during Construction: The section of the HS2 project between Lichfield and Crewe, which includes Swynnerton, is currently part of HS2 Phase 2 and, we understand, part of a further Hybrid Bill. However, we petitioned and presented to the HoC’s HS2 Select Committee in March 2015, since when HS2 Phase 2A has been rescheduled to coincide with Phase 1 and is thus being carried out to the same time scale. Accordingly, our concerns expressed here need to be addressed with the Hybrid Bill for HS2 Phase 1. This particularly applies to this item 4 and to item 5 below.

   We have seen the impact of upgrading the West Coast Main Line at nearby Norton Bridge (about 2 miles), where £250 Million is being well spent to upgrade the ‘through capacity’ of the line; however, the disruption to traffic for miles around has been significant. HS2 will be on our doorstep for 5 years and any Compensation payment under 3 item above should reflect this inevitable hardship. In Staffordshire, we consider that HS2 is of no value to us; in fact, we expect the impact of HS2 ultimately to result in a worst rail service from Stafford.

5. Vulnerability to Terrorism. HS2 Ltd will surely deliver a ‘bullet-train’ system which will achieve the requirements of their contract. Bullet-trains, however, have more in common with aeroplanes, flying over short distances, than with the Classic Trains of our UK railways. Our concern is therefore that the method of security, adopted at the few HS2 stations planned,
should be as adequate as that adopted for aircraft. We note that this happens with Eurostar where passengers go through both passport-control and security-checks in both London and Paris; the process does however consume significant time.

We have been concerned that a small bomb could be smuggled aboard an HS2 train, be detonated, and cause the train to crash into a train coming in the other direction, when the impact speed could be 500mph and cause much loss of life. In August 2015, however, there was a different but equally frightening incident. A High Speed Train was travelling between Belgium and Paris when a terrorist gunman with an AK-47 rifle and a hand gun was miraculously ‘smothered’ before he could cause loss of life; it could however have easily resulted very differently, with in a train-load of passengers losing their lives (refer: The Economist -29Aug15- Derailed).

We raised this subject of Terrorism with the House of Commons’ HS2 Select Committee when we appeared in March 2015; the SC considered it was beyond their mandate to explore but were intrigued and considered that it might be appropriate for us to raise it with the Intelligence & Security Committee of Parliament.

It had already been raised with the Department for Transport on two occasions; the DfT is not planning to introduce such security measures. It appears to be their ‘Catch-22 problem’. To achieve the capacity requirement at peak times of transferring 18,000 passengers per hour, their HS2 System Design would need to be able to process ‘through security’ 1,100 passengers and baggage, 18 times over in just an hour! Is it possible without an airfield worth of hangars and hundreds of extra staff at each station, and the cost? The DfT’s letter to us of 24 Sept 15 implies solving this problem only at a late stage in the project, and not at the Conceptual Design stage. Because of the lack of an apparent remedy, which would thereby leave an enormous number of would-be HS2 passengers vulnerable to terrorism, we decided that this matter could not be allowed ‘to sleep’.

Accordingly, we have lodged a letter, with the support of our constituency MP Sir William Cash, with the Intelligence & Security Committee of Parliament. We have received a reply letter dated 25 November 2015 advising that our letter has been passed to the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI), which reports to the Director-General of the Security Service (M15). Nearly 5 months later, we are still awaiting a reply.

The Petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that Keith Ralls, on behalf of the 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.

The Petitioners remain, yours faithfully

Keith John RALLS and Gillian June RALLS

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL PAINE

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your petitioner is Christopher Michael Paine who lives at Frith Hill Farm, which is a residential property that will lose some of its land for the construction of HS2. Frith Hill Farm is between Great Missenden and South Heath, close to the northern portal of the HS2 Chiltern tunnel.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Your petitioner is deeply worried about the noise that will be generated by HS2 trains as they progress along the track, and also about the tunnel boom that may be emitted from the portal.

Your petitioner's home is just over 300 meters from the northern tunnel entrance, and his property extends to a mere 160 meters away.

The noise table produced by HS2 Ltd shows that we can expect 67 dBA every 90 seconds that a train passes, even with the mitigation that HS2 Ltd anticipate installing. This is extremely loud, and will completely destroy our peaceful enjoyment of the countryside. It is also enough to cause sleep disturbance until the trains stop running at midnight. HS2 Ltd says that its trains will be quieter than those running in Europe, but the difference is slight, and not guaranteed.

Experience elsewhere of high speed rail shows a spike in sound when trains enter a tunnel at the far portal, and this might be a lot louder than the 67 dBA peak level claimed by HS2 Ltd for the trains passing through the South Heath cutting. While HS2 Ltd claims that the design of HS2 tunnel exits will make the tunnel boom inaudible, it has not been prepared to give an enforceable undertaking that there will not be disruptive noise.

It is necessary to point out that HS2 Ltd is not prepared to guarantee any of its noise estimates will not be exceeded, so we can have no confidence that the situation won’t be a lot worse than claimed.

The only effective mitigation will be to extend the deep Chiltern tunnel to northeast of Wendover, or at the very least to the end of Leather Lane at the end of Potter Row.
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:

Christopher M Paine

Date: 15 April 2016
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF DANIEL STILLIT

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner is Daniel Stillit, resident of 39 Princess Road, Camden, NW1 8JS.

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 30 years. My two children are growing up here. We moved to 39 Princess Road 13 years ago with the intention of making our family home. Prior to that we lived one street away from Princess Road. 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. Alongside 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. These are important local buildings and make a positive contribution to the appearance and character 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 Princess Road. 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 undoubted 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 18.00 and 09.00 and no HGV traffic on Saturdays and Sundays.

11. I appreciate that 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

---

\(^1\) Map CT - 05 - 001 in SES 2 Volume 5
site now planned to be carried by road be very significantly reduced. I support TfL’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 considerate and positive 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.

Daniel Stillit

14th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

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

THE PETITION OF Southam Area Action Group (SAAG) & Southam Town Council  

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

2. Your petitioners  
The petitioners are Southam Town Council and Southam Area Action Group (SAAG) who present the petition on behalf of, and are supported by, the members of SAAG and Southam residents.  

3. Your Petitioners have worked together closely in keeping abreast of HS2 developments and plans and in representing the wishes and views of the local population. SAAG have attended all HS2 meetings in the area throughout the last 6 years with the full support of the Town Council.  

4. SAAG were also invited to, and were active participants in, the Community Forum meetings arranged by HS2 Ltd between March 2012 and September 2013. Moreover, SAAG have attended bilateral meetings with HS2 engineers and other HS2 staff, as well as compensation meetings, and have set up meeting with local farmers, business people and individuals to encourage them to engage with HS2 staff. SAAG’s most recent meeting with HS2 officers was in April 2016.  

5. SAAG and the Town Council both petitioned in the House of Commons and appeared before the Select Committee, together, in January 2015.  

6. The Southam Town Council is the council for the administrative Parish area of Southam.
Southam

7. Southam is an historic Warwickshire market town with a population of six and a half thousand people. A number of planning applications are in the pipeline and, if these are all granted permission, it is possible that the town’s population could increase in the near future to around 10,000.

8. Doctors’ surgeries, schools and fire and police stations are all located in Southam and so the town acts as a hub for surrounding villages for these essential services.

9. Southam is also the focal point for employment and shopping between Banbury, Coventry, Rugby and Leamington Spa.

10. The proposed route of HS2 will have an adverse impact on all these things. In short, it will have a detrimental effect on the commercial, industrial and residential areas of the town.

Impact of the construction phase on Southam

Isolation

11. Southam will be adversely affected by the 6 year construction phase of HS2.

12. In the Environmental Statement, the Promoters describe the impact of the scheme on Southam as a ‘minor adverse effect’ and state the ‘isolation effect on residents is assessed as negligible’. No comment is made about the impact on businesses and employment.

13. In fact, for up to 6 years, Southam could become isolated, causing a severe impact on residents, businesses, and the way in which the community as a whole functions.

14. The isolation will be felt because 5 major roads will have works and diversions, each for up to 2 years, and one road will be closed. All these roads are major commuting and connection routes including the A423, the A425, and the B4451. In addition to these road works, there will be around 1,000 heavy goods vehicle movements per day for up to 6 years.
15. Based on the various planning applications mentioned above, it is also possible that the area will experience the on-going construction of a significant proportion of around 1,000 new homes.

16. As mentioned, Southam has a mix of shops and services which are vital to its catchment area of rural communities. In turn, the businesses rely on this regular custom. It is clear that access to the town will be seriously disrupted by the construction of the railway, resulting in loss of trade.

17. Your petitioners request that a full, detailed and open assessment involving Councils, businesses and individuals, as well as health officials and the emergency services, be carried out as soon as possible, and any detrimental impact should be appropriately mitigated.

18. Moreover, to counter the major construction and operational impacts on Southam and the surrounding villages, we would request that the line be re-aligned so that it passes to the south of Ladbroke. Your petitioners consider that this re-alignment is within the engineering constraints of a High-Speed track, and has the multiple benefits of a probable reduction in costs, a significant reduction in engineering and spoil movement. Costs would be saved because neither the cutting through Windmill hill, nor the tunnel under the Ancient & Site of Special Scientific interest (SSSI) woods at Bascote Heath, would be required.

19. There would also be added benefit to Southam as well as a massive reduction in the risk of isolation and construction movement. Southam would experience a potential reduction in additional flood risk from the change in the flood plain and water table. It should be noted that Southam and the surrounding area experienced significant flooding during March 2016, despite the widely-held belief that the previous serious flooding in 1998 was a once in a century event.

Environmental impacts

20. The construction works will create dust, light and noise pollution for up to 6 years.
21. For instance, the tunnelling work risks damaging businesses, buildings, and a cemetery. It will also impact Long Itchington Wood, a SSSI where a line of trees must be cut down simply for test borings. The impact will be a 10+ metre lane through the woods, which will have to be strengthened to support the equipment. Moreover, the drilling will fracture the lias limestone structure in the ground.

22. The unsympathetic location of construction compounds, auto transformers and holding ponds is already causing distress to local land owners.

23. Jeremy Wright’s office, was recently reported to be spending more than 50% of their time responding to HS2 correspondence.

24. As mentioned, a full, complete & open assessment involving Councils, businesses and individuals, as well as health officials and emergency services, must be carried out as soon as possible, and any impact found should have mitigation implemented.

_Dust_

25. Southam lies in the path of the prevailing winds, and will suffer unless adequate operational controls are put in place and maintained strictly to minimise the impact of dust. Your petitioners understand that during the construction of HS1 a significant amount of productive farm land near to the line was put out of operation by the impact of dust.

26. Your Petitioners are concerned about dust and dirt produced during construction of the railway and associated development and the effects of this on the town, nearby villages and on the environmental quality of the neighbourhood.

27. Your Petitioners are also concerned that airborne dust settling on foliage will be washed into local watercourses during periods of heavy rain, increasing pollution and further threatening local wildlife.

28. Your Petitioners submit that, in relation to dust, there should be a precise, comprehensive and binding management plan. The plan should identify an independent body responsible for monitoring the implementation of, and securing compliance with, the plan.
Impact of the operational phase on Southam

HS2 operating parameters.

29. The operational phase of HS2 is planned to begin in 2026. The speed of trains going past Southam will be around 360 km/h (225 mph).

30. During Phase One it is planned that there will be 20 trains passing per hour, i.e. one train every three minutes.

31. During Phase Two it is planned that there will be 36 trains passing per hour (eighteen each way) i.e. one train every two minutes, approximately, during the six hours per day at peak periods, with eight trains per hour for the remaining 7 hours - a total of 272 trains between 0.700 and 20.00hrs. A further 14 trains per hour (7 each way) will run for 3 hours after 20.00hrs.

32. A number of negative effects will arise from this schedule; for instance:

- These trains will make much more noise than existing trains: they will be travelling at 225 mph, and the predominant noise will be generated by aerodynamic effects.
- The trains will make a distinct noise boom as they exit the Long Itchington Wood tunnel at both ends.
- The vibrations generated by the trains are likely to have damaging consequences.

33. Your petitioners request that ground vibration contour maps be provided to allow us to better understand the effects of ground vibration in our area, including close to the tunnel at Long Itchington wood. These should be provided as soon as possible and, in any event, well in advance of any select committee appearance.

Permanent adverse effects on well-being of people of Southam

34. The HS2 scheme is already having an adverse effect on business. The businesses on the Kineton Road industrial estate are unlikely to be able to expand south westwards because the land is safeguarded for HS2. This is a key employment area for this town and some businesses will either move elsewhere or close.

35. Business leases which were held for ten years are now being renewed for just one year at a time. The Codemaster manufacturing
facility will be moved elsewhere, when a potential 50% increase in staff numbers to 900 was previously planned. These changes are devastating for local employment prospects.

36. Moreover, the Dallas Burston polo ground will stop operating as the noise of the trains will adversely affect the horses, particularly when the trains exit the Long Itchington Wood tunnel. This will also impact on a series of other local equine establishments, and consequently suppliers, as well as the farming community.

37. Many farmers' fields will be bisected by the HS2 route often causing the remaining areas to be less accessible and suitable for future use.

38. In addition, a number of footpaths will be bisected or diverted. Those that are close to the HS2 line will no longer be pleasant places to walk due to the noise of the trains.

39. The HS2 route will visually scar this largely unspoilt rural countryside with deep cuttings, bridges, embankments, vent shafts and ugly overhead gantries.

40. Your petitioners request that the spoil from the Long Itchington Wood tunnels be used to create bunds alongside the track on both the eastern and western ends of the tunnels to reduce noise from the trains.

Property Blight

41. Some homeowners in this area have, as a result of HS2, lost tens or hundreds of thousands of pounds when selling their properties.

42. Many people have found the experience of applying for the Exceptional Hardship Scheme or the Need to Sell Scheme extremely stressful and frustrating.

43. Your petitioners request a review of the Need To Sell compensation scheme with a view to making the application process more straightforward. Your petitioners understand that, on occasion, medical reasons have been given for refusing applications. In such circumstances, your petitioners request that the panel determining the application contains a suitably qualified member of the medical profession.
44. In addition, in the absence of any detailed ground vibration analysis, and in the light of the recent research by Prof. Peter Woodward of Herriot Watt University, and Prof. Victor Krylof of Loughborough University, your petitioners understand it might be necessary to expand the distance from the track for which compensation can be claimed. Your petitioners would welcome the promoter's views on this issue and would be grateful to receive them well in advance of their appearance before the House of Lords select committee.

Noise and Vibration

45. The Southam section of the railway will run through a predominantly quiet rural area and will generate substantial noise and vibration impacts upon the locality. Your Petitioners aver that it is fair and reasonable for the community to expect the highest possible levels of mitigation against these impacts.

46. While the promoter proposes to mitigate these effects by erecting noise barriers, little information is presently known about them. Your petitioners request that information concerning the proposed noise barriers (including, but not limited to, their height and what they will be made of) is provided well in advance of their appearance before the House of Lords Select Committee.

47. Noise during the construction and operational phases of HS2 will affect residents and businesses. Your petitioners wish to restate the considered view of many experts, including the World Health Authority (WHO), on the inappropriate use of dBA levels to assess noise levels.

48. Your petitioners request that the promoter is at least required to ensure that noise levels are maintained at appropriate levels during the construction phase, and that full height noise protection measures are in place to minimise the effects of audible noise as trains pass Southam and its environs at 250mph at up to one every 100 seconds.

49. The Southam area has been designed by the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) as both a 'zone of tranquillity' and an 'area of low light pollution'. These are rare designations and it is essential that the scheme does not imperil them.

50. Your petitioners consider it is fair and reasonable for Southam to receive the highest possible levels of mitigation in respect of the impacts outlined above and request that these be provided.
Ground Borne Vibration & Noise

51. It is well established that ground borne vibration should be considered alongside noise, yet no analysis was included in the Environmental Statement.

52. Your Petitioners are gravely concerned that no work has been carried out on the possible effects of vibration from the high speed trains on the local topography, especially in the light of the prevalent lias limestone clay structure.

53. In research completed last year on behalf of the promoter, Prof Woodward of Herriot Watt University, one of the world’s leading experts in the geo-engineering of railways, found that the speeds proposed by HS2 – faster than any other high-speed line in the world – would create “critical track velocity effects” and “significant issues” with track instability.

54. Another expert in the field, Prof Krylov of Loughborough University, produced an influential paper on the subject and said the danger was of a “ground-vibration boom, similar to a sonic boom”, which causes a sudden and “very large” increase in generated ground vibrations.

55. “What matters is when you cross the [speed] barrier,” he said, “if you do that, ground vibrations can increase twenty, thirty times.” Prof Krylov said the effect, known as a “Rayleigh wave,” was greatest in soft ground and had been observed in trains travelling as slowly as 110mph in Sweden, across alluvial soil.

56. From the HS2 noise maps provided by HS2 Ltd and calculations of ground vibration, it is possible that businesses on the southern side of Southam will have no choice but to close with the loss of hundreds of key local jobs.

57. Ground borne vibration could be a major concern for nearby houses, businesses and livestock units such as the polo fields adjacent to the HS2 track, as well as all the local farmers and equestrian businesses.

58. Your Petitioners request that the Promoter is required to carry out a detailed study of all sections of the route passing across clay areas to ensure that where a risk of vibration and liquefaction is possible, measures are put in place to avoid such an occurrence; alternatively, your petitioners request that the speed of the proposed HS2 trains are reduced to a verifiably safe speed in such areas.
Light Pollution

59. No assessment has been made of the impact of light pollution on Southam, despite repeated requests in meetings with HS2 Ltd and at a number of community and bilateral meetings.

60. Your petitioners request that there should be no impact from light pollution on any area assessed as 'Dark Skies' by the CPRE or the Astronomical Society. This means that light arcing from the pantograph, the internal train lights, any security lighting, and overnight maintenance works lights will need to be controlled strictly. Similarly, light from the nearby maintenance loop will also have to be controlled.

61. Moreover, your petitioners request that an analysis of light pollution and its effects be carried out, and appropriate measures taken to minimise the scheme's effect and to ensure the area's 'Dark Skies' status is maintained.

Micro-pressure waves, Infrasound & low frequency Noise (ILFN)

62. No assessment has been made of the impact of the micro pressure wave burst that will be caused every 100 seconds when a train exits the Long Itchington Wood Tunnel. The impact needs to be considered at both ends of the tunnel and at up to 2,000 metres from the portal, both on livestock and horses, and the inhabitants of Ladbroke, Southam, Ufton and surrounding countryside. Your petitioners have been told by HS2 staff that the forward projection of noise will be up to 2,000 metres, a distance outside the current compensation limit.

63. Infrasound and Low Frequency Noise (ILFN) will also be generated by HS2 trains travelling at the speeds proposed. Your petitioners are deeply concerned about the serious potential adverse health effects of this almost constant noise on people, businesses and animals in the Southam area. No detailed information on any assessment of these effects has been made available by HS2 despite, repeated requests. Your petitioners again request that this information be provided and that monitoring of the ILFN generated by HS2 during operation is a condition for the development of HS2.
64. Your petitioners are concerned about the potential effect of infrasound on people, businesses and animals in the Southam area and request that a detailed assessment be carried out on the likely levels of infrasound and the areas likely to be affected.

*Power & Electrical Engineering & costs*

65. Your petitioners are concerned about the project’s electrical engineering design work, in light of the significant power increase required, and the potential impact on the businesses & residents of Southam. This leads on to the ever increasing costs of this project, and items that have not been included in the analysis so far.

66. Your petitioners request a detailed examination of the possible out of balance issues on the local network due to the 22.5 MW trains passing through our area.

67. We also request a full and independent examination of the costs of HS2.

68. 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.

Dr. [Signature]

WJ Thomas (Agent)

15th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF FLETCHERS BAKERIES (trading as GRAIN D'OR)

Declares that:

1 The Petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the provisions of Clauses 1 to 19 and 48 of the Bill which adversely affect and interfere with their interests in property as set out below.

2 Your Petitioner

2.1 The Petitioners are Fletchers Bakeries Limited, trading as Grain D'Or, part of the Finsbury Food Group Plc. The Petitioner is the Leaseholder under a 10 year lease over 14 of the 16 units on the Townsend Industrial Estate, Waxlow Road, London NW10 7NU ("the Property"). The units are accessed via a private road which forms part of the Property and which will be adversely and injuriously affected by the provisions sought by the Promoter in Additional Provision 2 to the Bill which was deposited by the Promoter on 13 July 2015

2.2 The Petitioners’ Property is proposed to be compulsorily acquired in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, as follows.

2.2.1 Plot number AP2-1 on replacement plan 1-47 will be compulsorily acquired. Compulsory acquisition will be limited to the "acquisition of rights over property" for the purpose of "Provision of access for construction and maintenance" (Clause 5(3) and Schedule 8, row 4; or Clause 5(4) and Schedule 8, row 4 of the current version of the Bill); and

2.2.2 Plot number AP2-2 on replacement plan 1-47 will be compulsorily acquired. Compulsory acquisition will be limited to the "temporary possession of land" for the purposes of "Provision of access for utility works" (Clause 14 and Schedule 15, Part 4, row 2; or Clause 15 and Schedule 16, Part 4, row 2 in the current version of the Bill).

2.3 The "Supplementary Environmental Statement and Additional Provision 2 Environmental Statement" Volume 2, Community forum area report, CFA5, Northolt Corridor (the "ES") states in relation to the Property at paragraph 5.1.4:
"This amendment to Bill powers therefore relates to temporary rights of access over the existing private road and the works required to extend the access into the F-sidings satellite construction compound."

2.4 Neither Additional Provision 2, nor the ES explain what the utility works are in the "provision of access for utility works" referred to in Schedule 15, Part 4, row 2. The Petitioners have sought clarification from the Promoter as to the type of utility works and whether or not the utility works will be in/on/over/under plot AP2-1 or AP2-2. The Promoter has confirmed that it does not intend to undertake utility works within plot AP2-1 but has failed to provide the remainder of the information requested. The Petitioners have assumed that the utility works are in/on/over/under the F-sidings satellite construction compound, but if these works affect or are in/on/over/under plots AP2-2 then such works have not been environmentally assessed and are objected to.

2.5 Additional Provision 2 does not make clear whether the Promoter seeks exclusive use of plots AP2-1 and AP2-2. The Promoter confirmed in its Promoter's Response Document (December 2015) relating to the Petitioner's petition to the House of Commons, that it does not require exclusive use of AP2-2. However, the Promoter has not confirmed whether or not there will be periods when use of AP2-2 may not be available to the Petitioner. This is assumed to be the case, given the utilities works proposed.

2.6 As a result of the likely adverse impacts on the Property arising as a consequence of Additional Provision 2, the Petitioners were required to petition against the Bill in the House of Commons (Petition Number AP2:118). The Petitioners appeared before the House of Commons Select Committee on 26 January 2016. The Petitioners reached an agreement with the Promoter in respect of the petition minutes before their scheduled appearance. The agreement was communicated to the House of Commons Select Committee by Richard Turney, counsel for the Promoter, and is recorded in the uncorrected transcript from the afternoon's hearings. The Petitioner's petition is dealt with at pages 49 – 51 of the transcript. In summary, the Petitioners and the Promoter have agreed to the following terms:

a) The Promoter must produce a report to identify all options for access to the F-sidings satellite construction compound, including but not limited to the options identified in the Petitioners' evidence, and the "Premier Park Road option".

b) The Promoter will assess the impact of each option on the basis of a comparison between those options.

c) In the comparison of the options, the Promoter must not exclude options with reference to the financial cost to the Promoter.

d) The impact criteria in the assessment must include assessment of the impact on businesses.

e) The report must also include an appraisal for the provision of utilities under each option and the impact of those works.

f) The Promoter must provide a draft of the report to all affected parties by close of business on 2 May 2016.
g) Affected parties may make representations on the draft report, and must do so by close of business on 30 May 2016.

h) Those representations must be taken into account by HS2 before the finalisation of the report.

i) The Promoter must decide by 1 August 2016 whether to proceed with the scheme under Additional Provision 2 or another solution on the basis of that report, and with regard to the timely economic delivery of the scheme in relation to the delivery and use of the F-sidings satellite construction compound.

j) The Promoter will not contend that it is not open to the House of Lords to require the Promoter not to exercise the powers in schedule 8 and 15 of the Bill in respect of plots AP2:1 and AP2:2.

2.7 The Petitioners will therefore not know the outcome of the Promoter's report until 1 August 2016.

3 Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1 The Petitioners are supportive of the Bill in principle and seek to work with the Promoter and the Government to facilitate the provision of HS2.

3.2 However, the Petitioners have substantial concerns respecting the works or powers proposed in the Bill as affecting the Petitioners’ property. The Petitioners believe that, without adequate protection and mitigation, the impact of the works may cause the Petitioners to be unable to continue to trade from the Townsend Industrial Estate. For this reason, the Petitioners object to the Bill and its provisions as set out in this Petition.

3.3 The Petitioners also seek to enter into an agreement with the Promoter to address their concerns.

Compulsory purchase and acquisition of airspace, subsoil, rights and related matters

3.4 The Petitioners object to the provisions of Clauses 1 to 19 and 48 of the Bill which adversely affect and interfere with the Property. Under these provisions, the Promoter would be able to acquire compulsorily plots AP2-1 and AP2-2 on replacement plan 1-47 within the limits of deviation, or at least so much of the airspace, subsoil and undersurface or such new rights, under or over the Property as the Promoter may require for the purposes of the construction and maintenance of the scheduled works. In respect of the Property the Petitioners question the need for such extensive powers, fearing that their exercise will result in significant loss and damage to the Petitioners.

3.5 The Petitioners submit that the Promoter should be required to demonstrate:
3.5.1 that interference with private property rights and interests pursuant to the Bill is both necessary for the purposes of the Bill and in the public interest;

3.5.2 that the powers for the compulsory acquisition of land or of interests in land, the power to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the limits of deviation are restricted in relation to the Petitioners' Property to the extent (if any) to which these can be justified so as to minimise or prevent interference with the Property;

3.5.3 that any interest in the Property acquired by the Promoter (in terms of the area over which it is to subsist, the form in which it is to take at law and any express or implied constraints which may be imposed upon the remainder of the Petitioners' Property) is limited only to that which is absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the proposed works.

3.6 The Petitioners have not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting their Property and are not satisfied that it is necessary or expedient for the powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed in relation to the Property.

3.7 The Petitioners submit that Clause 48 of the Bill should be deleted (insofar as it may be exercised against the Property). It is unjustified and without precedent, as the power to acquire land is not limited spatially or by time.

3.8 The Petitioners submit that:

3.8.1 compensation provisions in respect of compulsory acquisition in the Bill are inadequate to compensate the Petitioners for the loss, damage and inconvenience which they are likely to suffer as a result of the construction and subsequent use of the proposed work. Adequate compensation provisions should be included in the Bill.

3.8.2 further provisions should be included in the Bill in relation to the making and assessment of claims for compensation and amendment to the Compensation Code, as well as indemnifying the Petitioners for any loss they might suffer as the result of losses incurred as a result of the HS2 proposals.

Your Petitioners' concerns in relation to the Property

3.9 The Petitioners are concerned that the Bill proposes the acquisition or use of the private access road, car park and premises at Townsend Industrial Estate. It is understood by the Petitioners that the land will be used in order to access the F-Sidings construction compound in the area.

3.10 The Petitioners are a large scale bakery business, daily supplying freshly baked goods on a nationwide basis to a number of UK leading supermarkets. The nature of the business requires strict adherence to hygiene standards. Contamination from dust or other environmental pollutants could severely impact on the ability to trade from the Property. The Petitioners currently use the land designated AP2-1 and AP2-2 for loading and unloading
Heavy Goods Vehicles ("HGVs"). There is an average of 30 HGVs entering the Property per day. These vehicles park up on the estate road and are unloaded, or loaded, by forklift trucks which operate on the access road. Due to the space available on the industrial estate, the HGVs are parked on the private access at all times whilst on Property. There is no suitable separate loading bay available for use. There are at least two HGVs parked on the Property at all times. During busy periods there are likely to be at least six HGVs parked on the access way. The nature of the Petitioners' business means that the Property is in use 24 hours a day and therefore there are HGVs parked on Property around the clock with no suitable alternative parking.

3.11 The Additional Provisions also require the use of a car parking area that is on the Property. This area has two functions for the Petitioners. First it provides 20 parking bays for the Petitioners' staff. These bays are utilised 100% every day. There is no easy alternative parking available to the Petitioners staff. Equally, as the Petitioner operates 24 hours a day, it is not feasible for staff to rely on public transport for travelling to and from the Property. Secondly, the parking area is the only area of the Property with sufficient space to allow for HGVs to turn around. The Petitioners have been served with Improvement Notices by the Health and Safety Executive which requires that they ensure that all HGVs entering the Property make appropriate use of the turning area. If the Petitioners were unable to use the area it would not be possible to comply with the notice. Non-compliance with the Improvement Notices will be a criminal offence.

3.12 This area also provides additional open storage for pallets and bread baskets that are required by the Petitioner. Given the layout of the Property and the way it is utilised by the Petitioner, there is no straightforward alternative for the storage of the pallets and bread baskets, and the availability of this space for the purpose is critical, especially at peak periods.

3.13 The Petitioners are concerned that if the Additional Provisions are implemented, HGV access to the Property for the Petitioners business would be difficult, if not impossible. Equally, parking for staff would be impossible and the Petitioners would be unable to comply with the Improvement Notice relating to HGV movements. This is likely to have a significant impact on the Petitioners ability to trade from the Property as it will no longer be fit for purpose. This has the potential to result in the loss of work for the 350 staff that the Petitioners currently employs at the Property. Furthermore, the Petitioners would not have chosen to continue trading from the Property if the land had not been available on a long term lease which ensured the ability to use the access way for loading and unloading in the way that it is currently used.

3.14 Notwithstanding that the ES (paragraph 5.1.5) indicates that the "F-sidings satellite construction compound ... is expected to be operational for approximately 9 years", Additional Provision 3 and the Supplementary Environmental Statement 2 make clear that the compound is expected to be operational for 17 years. The power to use the Petitioners' access road/parking/turning area (AP2-1 and AP2-2) will cause prolonged disruption to their operational efficiency with a consequential detrimental impact on their ability to compete in a tough economic market.

3.15 It should be noted that despite repeated requests from the Petitioners, the Promoter has not been able to produce a single document setting out the assessment carried out by the
Promoter before it decided to re-route the access to the F-sidings satellite construction compound through the Property. The Promoter has not even been able to confirm whether such an assessment exists. It appears likely that no assessment or no proper assessment was in fact carried out.

3.16 The Promoter has also confirmed that it did not re-appraise its consideration of the use of AP2-1 and AP2-2 prior to its decision to promote Additional Provision 3 and the consequent extension of the duration of use of the compound from 9 to 17 years.

3.17 Moreover, the Promoter failed to consult or engage with the Petitioners about the likely impacts on their business prior to publication of Additional Provision 2. The Petitioners were first made aware of the proposals upon receipt of a notice from HS2 dated 13 July 2015. Consequently, the Promoter does not appear to have understood the nature and operation of the Property when preparing Additional Provision 2.

**Alternative routes**

3.18 The F-sidings satellite construction compound is a linear compound bounded by the A406 North Circular Road to the west, the west coast main line railway to the north, Premier Park Industrial Estate to the south, and the Property to the east. Proximate highways include Abbey Road, Premier Park Road and Waxlow Road. There are a number of internal estate roads leading from these highways giving access to Premier Park, the Property, the A406 North Circular Road and the west coast main line railway.

3.19 In particular, the Petitioners have identified and assessed a suitable alternative access route via Abbey Road to the F-sidings satellite construction compound which has a number of benefits over the current access across the Property. At its western extent, the F-sidings satellite construction compound abuts the A406 North Circular Road and the boundary of the construction compound abuts the line of the footway/cycleway that crosses the A406 on a cable-stayed bridge. Parallel to the footway/cycleway, as it runs south from the bridge, is a redundant section of access road that leads towards the construction compound. An established, but no longer used access, therefore exists that could be re-used as a means of accessing the construction compound. A hard standing continues from this point into the construction compound.

3.20 Moving away from this point, the footway/cycleway continues south and bifurcates. One section continues south to meet the southbound slip road of the A406 while the other section turns south east and passes between two industrial units on the periphery of the Park Royal industrial estate. The section of footway/cycleway, which is 4.5m wide, ends at an extension of Abbey Road (the "Abbey Road Link") that terminates close to the entrances to the two industrial units (currently occupied by D-Link and Bestway).

3.21 This route is not parked and appears to be lightly used and would give direct access from the strategic highway network, which would be of substantial benefit from a construction logistics perspective and otherwise.
3.22 The route could be operated as either a "one-way" or "two-way" system. If a one-way system was adopted, an exit route could be taken via the rear of the Bestway service yard and its access road (that passes along the south side of the Bestway building), to exit on to the Abbey Road Link.

3.23 Alternatively, to avoid the need for an access via the Bestway site, the section of footway/cycleway could be made two-way, by widening the existing route into the landscaped area below the Bestway car park, part of which is within the public highway, with the remainder on land which it is understood already benefits from rights granted in favour of Network Rail.

3.24 The Petitioners submit that this alternative vehicular route to the F-sidings satellite construction compound is superior to that sought to be created on the Petitioners' Property for the following reasons:

3.24.1 The Petitioners' Property is accessed off Waxlow Road. Waxlow Road is a dead end and the Petitioners' Property is almost at the end of meaning the Promoter's traffic would need to traverse almost the entire length of Waxlow Road from its junction with Acton Lane. Waxlow Road has industrial units along both sides for its entire length. The Promoter's traffic could potentially conflict with existing traffic on Waxlow Road serving those units. The Promoter's traffic would need to enter and exit via Waxlow Road; no "one way" operation would be possible.

3.24.2 Waxlow Road is used extensively for parking by employees of the industrial units. This parking reduces the available width of Waxlow Road making access for any large construction vehicles extremely difficult.

3.24.3 The Property's estate road (plot AP2-1) does not lead directly into the F-sidings satellite construction compound, requiring the additional acquisition of plot AP2-2 (on a temporary basis) to allow that connection. No such additional land is required if the alternative access suggested is used, as there is already an existing access into the F-sidings satellite construction compound from the alternative access in question. It is the proposed acquisition of plot AP2-2 that leads to the loss of parking spaces and the storage area for pallets and bread baskets.

3.24.4 Waxlow Road does not have as direct a connection to the strategic highway network as the alternative access suggested meaning a potentially longer route, more vehicle miles and consequently the release of additional atmospheric pollutants.

3.24.5 The F-sidings satellite construction compound is considerably wider at its western end than its eastern end, the alternative access suggested is at the western end and plots AP2-1 and AP2-2 are at its eastern end. The alternative access suggested therefore would offer greater flexibility in relation to vehicle circulation and traffic management within the compound.

3.25 The Petitioners submit that plots AP2-1 and AP2-2 should be removed and appropriate rights sought instead over the alternative access. Not only would the rerouting along Abbey Road avoid the severe adverse impacts on the Property, but establishing an access closer to the
strategic road network would also offer environmental benefits through reduced travel
distances and would remove HGV traffic from Waxlow Road and its environs.

3.26 The Petitioners also consider that the original route of the eastern access across plot 375
should not be dismissed, not least because traffic surveys have indicated that plot 375 is far
less intensively used than the Property and, therefore, its use to provide access from Waxlow
Road to the compound will be much less impactful. The route across plot 375 also leads
directly into the F-sidings satellite construction compound and does not need any additional
land to connect into it such as plot AP2-2.

3.27 Plot 375 comprises effectively a road with parking bays along most of its length on one side of
the road only. The existing access is sufficiently wide enough to allow the passage of an HGV
(and abnormally long loads) past the parking spaces, although it is not wide enough to
accommodate simultaneous two-way operation. To address this, and maintain use of the
parking spaces (by Royal Mail), a simple shuttle working system could be introduced.

3.28 Alternatively, the 55 spaces currently located within plot 375 could be relocated to the existing
car park immediately to the west. A lightweight car park deck could be constructed above the
existing car park to cater for the 55 spaces associated with Royal Mail. These spaces could
be accessed via a ramp taken from plot 375 so that Royal Mail employees could continue to
use Waxlow Road to access their parking spaces. This option would allow plot 375 to be
resurfaced and used as an access road without impacting on the operational requirements of
Royal Mail.

3.29 A further alternative option would be the use of Unit 12A which is located on Waxlow Road to
the south of the Property. Unit 12A is currently occupied by a skip company for the storage of
skips, which use is unauthorised and has been registered as a breach of planning control by
the London Borough of Brent. Unit 12A has been assessed and is considered to represent a
suitable alternative car park to temporarily accommodate the 55 Royal Mail spaces. This
would not fundamentally impact on the location of Royal Mail's operational and staff car
parking and as such would not affect the operation of its business.

3.30 Given that the Property is some distance from the route of Phase 1 of HS2 and in the
absence of any justification for the acquisition of this land, the Petitioners do not believe that
this land is necessary for the construction and operation of Phase One of HS2 and as a result
the Property should be removed from the Bill.

Costs

3.31 As a general matter, the Petitioners submit that provision should be made for the Promoter to
repay to the Petitioners all proper costs, charges and expenses (including the proper fees of
such professional advisers as they may instruct) reasonably incurred in consequence of the
Bill or of any provision made as a result of this Petition.

3.32 This is particularly important given that the Petitioners have already incurred substantial
unnecessary and wasted expense as result of the unreasonable and unfair actions of the
Promoter. As above, despite repeated requests from the Petitioners, the Promoter has not
been able to produce a single document setting out the assessment carried out by the
Promoter before it decided to route the access to the F-sidings satellite construction compound through the Property. The Promoter has not even been able to confirm whether such an assessment exists. It appears likely that no assessment or no proper assessment was in fact carried out. Moreover, the Promoter failed to consult or engage with the Petitioners about the likely impacts on their business prior to publication of AP2. Nor did the Promoter visit the Property prior to the publication of AP2. Following the publication of AP2, the Petitioners sought to actively engage with the Promoter and demonstrated a willingness to reach agreement where possible but their attempts were met only with late, limited, incomplete and ineffectual engagement from the Promoter.

3.33 Had a proper assessment of the route options to access the F-sidings satellite construction compound been carried out, a reasonable person would not have concluded that access across the Property represented an appropriate access route to the construction compound (or a more suitable option than the access proposed in the Bill as originally drafted). Furthermore, even after deciding to promote AP2, a reasonable person would have utilised the ample opportunities offered by the Petitioners to seek to reach a compromise. If these steps had been carried out by the Promoter the Petitioners would not have been forced to incur costs petitioning against AP2, or the costs would have at least been less had the Promoter been more willing to properly engage with the Petitioners to reach agreement.

Other Matters

3.34 The Petitioners are not the only party to be affected by this proposed Additional Provision. The Petitioners' Landlord, BNP Paribas Securities Services Trust Company Limited and BNP Paribas Securities Services Trust Company (Jersey) Limited, is also affected, as are the occupiers of the final two units on Townsend Industrial Estate, Ever Fortune Limited. The Petitioners have approached the other affected parties and understand that their Landlord will also be submitting a petition against the proposals as a result of the impact that it will have on the viability of the continued use of the Industrial Estate.

Conclusion

3.35 In light of the above, the Petitioners reserve the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to the Petitioners' expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to their representation before the Select Committee.

3.36 For the foregoing and connected reasons the Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, so far affecting the Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.
3.37 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect the Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect the Petitioners.

4 The prayer

The Petitioners therefore ask 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.

Clarke Willmott LLP

Agents for the Petitioners

Date 18/4/2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF SILVIA RANAWAKE

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner Silvia Ranawake is a householder of 18 Fitzroy Road, London NW1 8TX.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

1. My concerns about the impact of HS2 on my house and the surrounding areas, 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 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.

3. The House of Commons Select Committee’s overall solution for Camden, that we should rely on HS2’s assurances to Camden Council, is an 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 and petitioners in
Camden (not solely by Camden Council) are an absolute necessity to protect my health and that of others in Camden. Camden Council should be required by your committee to acquire a mobile Air Quality measuring vehicle to provide this.

5. HS2’s plans to remove spoil 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 undefined.

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.

SILVIA RANAWAKE

17 April 2016
HL: 349
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

Declares that:

1. The petitioner(s) is/are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. Your petitioner(s) is/are
   
   as an individual citizen I will be affected
   
   by the traffic
3. Your petitioner’s concerns are

A. Spoil removed by rail not lorries
B. Fair urban compensation and independent adjudicator
C. Mitigation for 20 years construction, agreed and adequately monitored
D. Minimal disruption & duration of every aspect of HS2 construction
E. Enforcement and fines for breaches of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)
F. Local Environment Management Plan (LEMP) actively enforced by officers on the ground
G. No demolition until we have the agreed integrated plan for Euston station
H. An integrated plan for HS2, classic Euston, Crossrail 2 and local transport
I. No temporary or permanent loss of public green/open spaces and trees
J. No worsening of air quality from HS2 pollution – monitor and improve current levels now
K. Independent costings & technical assessment of HS2 & alternative railway schemes
L. Old Oak Common costings to be calculated as per Lords request
M. Timely information from HS2 enabling genuine engagement – HS2 has failed to engage
N. Euston Station including HS2 and Crossrail 2 to be rebuilt in same footprint
O. No additional railway scheme into Euston until local transport has capacity
3. Your petitioner’s concerns are

the loss of green spaces and noise disturbance
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: ................................................ Signature ..................................

Name: ................................................ Signature ..................................

Name: ................................................ Signature ..................................

Name: ................................................ Signature ..................................

Name: ................................................ Signature ..................................

__________________________

House of Lords Private Bill Office
House of Lords
London
SW1A 0PW

phone: 020 7219 2468
fax: 020 7219 2571
email: hlprivatebills@parliament.uk

You can email a pdf scanned copy of your signed petition, and post the original, or just post the original, or take it in person to committee room 2A in the committee room corridor of the main houses of parliament between 10am & 5pm on weekdays. Leave time to get through security.

You can check the information online: http://www.parliament.uk/business/bills-and-legislation/current-bills/hybrid-bills/ Deposit your petition between 10am Thursday 24 March and 5pm Monday 18th April 2016, with a £20 fee.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF Christopher Mathew, Suzanne Mathew, Andrew Ray, Rachel Ray,
Christopher Brownhill, Sian Brownhill, Matthew Blackmore-Squires, Nicola Blackmore-
Squires, Christopher Grohmann and Jane Grohmann.

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

2. Your petitioners
The Petitioners are Mr Christopher Mathew and Mrs Suzanne Mathew, owners of property
at 55 Perry Street, Wendover: Mr Andrew Ray and Mrs Rachel Ray, owners of property at 57
Perry Street, Wendover: Mr Christopher Brownhill and Mrs Sian Brownhill, owners of
property at 53 Perry Street, Wendover: Mr Matthew Blackmore-Squires and Mrs Nicola
Blackmore-Squires, owners of 51 Perry Street, Wendover, and Christopher Grohmann and
Jane Grohmann, owners of property at 61 Perry Street, Wendover who the Bill will specially
and directly affect as a result of the proposed HS2 line, both during construction and after
completion. Your Petitioners live at the edge of that part of the Chilterns Area of
Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.
Your Petitioners are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for
reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1 Impact on AONB

The Chilterns AONB is enjoyed by your petitioners and their families for walking, running,
cycling and other recreational activities including orienteering. The town of Wendover itself
is situated between two of the highest points in the Chilterns: (Haddington Hill to the north
and Coombe Hill to the south) and the AONB contributes significantly to the character of the
town, its setting and community.

An AONB is a national / statutory designation which has a profound purpose: it is to
recognise and then protect the special character of an area of natural beauty for the benefit
of all who live in the United Kingdom. In its current form, your petitioners contend that the
Bill would inflict terrible damage on a large part of the AONB with the building of the railway
on the surface and on viaducts causing permanent damage to the tranquillity of the area
and the beauty of its landscapes. Your petitioners are not reassured by the Select
Committee’s conclusions in paragraph 143 of its report (Second Special Report of Session and dated 22 February 2016) and believe that if the railway is constructed as currently proposed in the Bill that this would set a very poor precedent that would impact on all AONBs. Protection of AONBs should not be equivocal when, as in this case, there are alternative engineering solutions which are capable of implementation at a relatively modest additional cost within the overall scale of the project.

3.2 The process – a lack of independent assessment and testing of engineering assumptions

Your petitioners are concerned that the process to date has lacked proper independent scrutiny by experts in certain important areas. Your petitioners feel this is relevant to the concerns they have highlighted in 3.1 in relation to the AONB and later in this petition (see 3.3).

The members of the Select Committee listened with great patience to the very many petitioners who appeared before it, often accompanied by experts. In certain important areas your petitioners are of the opinion that the Select Committee did not call for independent assessments that would have helped to inform its decisions, particularly in relation to the engineering solutions that would have minimised impact on the AONB and Wendover. When balancing the arguments of a well-funded promoter armed with a seemingly definitive project (which it has little appetite to amend), against the alternative proposals put forward by petitioners, the Select Committee seemed usually to favour the former.

From the perspective of petitioners, the process has felt unfairly skewed in favour of the Promoter and your petitioners would point to the Select Committee’s conclusions in paragraphs 113 – 125 of its report illustrate this. Paragraph 122 especially notes the Select Committee’s scepticism of the costings provided by all parties, but it seemed to have reached its conclusions without seeking some form of independent clarification. Given the impact of the Bill on the AONB and Wendover, your petitioners contend that this was a deeply unfortunate oversight and ask that this is reconsidered.

3.3 Operational Noise

HS2 Ltd have stated that the provision of noise barriers on the A413 will offset the noise from the line and that residents will not experience any reduction in property values as a result. However, according to HS2’s own figures, there is no resulting reduction in average noise at the petitioners’ property, whereas there is a significant additional peak noise as a result of the trains. Your petitioners are concerned about the disruption to sleep caused by excessive noise generated by trains in late evenings and early mornings and would ask that this is argument is therefore not valid as far as your petitioners are concerned.

3.4 Impact of Construction

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. The prevailing wind is from the west and so dust is likely to be carried to where your petitioners live.

Your petitioners are also concerned 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.

4. Conclusion

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.

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.

Christopher Mathew   Suzanne Mathew

Andrew Ray   Rachel Ray

Christopher Brownhill   Siân Brownhill

Matthew Blackmore-Squires   Nicola Blackmore-Squires

Christopher Grohmann   Jané Grohmann

17th April 2016
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF MICHELLE HELEN CARRICK

Declares that:

1. The petitioner(s) is/are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. Your petitioner(s) is/are

I LIVE IN MORNINGTON CRESCENT IN A SHARED FREEHOLD FLAT I WILL BE IMPACTED BY THE DEMOLITION OF GRANGY TERRACE, THE REBUILD OF HAMPSTEAD ROAD BRIDGE & ALL THE DEMOLITION & CONSTRUCTION OF THE CUTTING FOR THE NEXT TWENTY YEARS.
3. Your petitioner's concerns are

CAMDEN COUNCIL HAS RECEIVED ASSURANCES FROM HS2 THAT IN YOUR PETITIONERS VIEW THEY DO NOT GO FAR ENOUGH AND ARE NOT WORTH THE PAPER THEY ARE WRITTEN ON.

* THE AMOUNT OF CLOSURE & TRAFFIC ON MY ROAD MEANS TAXIS OR EMERGENCY VEHICLES WILL NOT BE ABLE TO PULL UP TO COLLECT ME & I WILL BE A PRISONER IN MY OWN HOME WITH NO FRESH AIR.

* THE MITIGATION SUGGESTIONS FROM HS2, EVEN THEY ADMIT STILL LEAVE ME SERIOUSLY ADVERSELY AFFECTED; I CANNOT BE EXPECTED TO LIVE LIKE THIS FOR TWENTY YEARS.

* WE NEED AN INDEPENDENT PROJUDICATOR SO RESIDENTS HAVE SOMEWHERE TO TURN IMMEDIATELY WHEN HS2 LTD IS UNFAIR IN IMPLEMENTING AGREEMENTS SUCH AS NEED TO SELL, OR EXCEEDS THE AGREED NOISE LIMITS.

* SPoil REMOVED BY RAIL NOT LORRIES, MATERIALS IN BY RAIL-SUPPORT THE SOLUTION THAT HAS THE LEAST IMPACT ON RESIDENTS AND ENVIRONMENT.

* FOR URBAN COMPENSATION ON A PAR WITH RURAL COMPENSATION

* MINIMAL DISRUPTION AND DURATION OF EVERY ASPECT OF HS2 CONSTRUCTION

* NO TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT LOSS OF PUBLIC (GREEN) OPEN SPACES AND TREES.

* NO WORSENSING OF AIR QUALITY FROM HS2 POLLUTION - IMPROVE CURRENT LEVELS

* INDEPENDENT COSTINGS & COMPARATIVE TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT OF HS2 & ALTERNATIVE RAILWAY SCHEMES.

* OLD OAK COMMON COSTINGS TO BE CALCULATED AS PER LORDS REQUEST.

* ELSTON STATION, INCLUDING HS2 AND CROSSRAIL 2 REBUILT IN SAME FOOTPRINT

* NO ADDITIONAL SCHEME INTO ELSTON UNTIL LOCAL TRANSPORT HAS CAPACITY
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................
To the House of Lords Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF Pan Camden HS2 Alliance

Declarations that:

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

2. Your petitioners

The petitioners are a volunteer and non party-political group of Camden residents. The group was formed in May 2010 after a public meeting called by local Councillors. It has some 1200 affiliates. The group aims to ensure that should the routing of HS2 through Camden continue to be favoured then the interests and quality of life of residents in the Borough are preserved and enhanced.

Over the past six years Pan Camden has organised a number of public meetings. It has presented at many other discussions arranged by various political parties and community organisations in Camden and has been interviewed on radio and television about the likely impacts of the projects on the Borough.

The group has researched various aspects of HS2 and has developed and submitted a number of written proposals to HS2 Limited suggesting how the project could be improved and the massive disruption to Camden reduced.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Background

Britain’s Transport Infrastructure: High Speed Two (January 2009) describes the background to the formation of HS2 Limited. It was part of a set of Department for Transport (DfT) documents on Transport Infrastructure Decisions (ISBN 978 1 906581 80 0).

In a letter to the Minister of State for Transport (Lord Adonis) on 13th February 2009 Sir David Rowlands outlined his views on the “objectives and remit” of HS2 Limited. He suggested a broad set of general principles that should guide the development of the project. In his 9th March 2009 response the Minister of State authorised Sir David to proceed as he had outlined.

Analysis of options followed in private over the next nine months, much of the work undertaken by consultants for DfT. The conclusions were contained in High Speed Rail London to the West Midlands and Beyond (ISBN: 978-1-84864-072-6, December 2009) A Report to Government by High Speed Two Limited.

This work resulted in one route being publicly announced in March 2010. This was put up as the only feasible route seemingly on the basis of an arbitrary 400-kph design speed. Such a high speed requires a very straight line that precludes for example following an existing transport corridor such as the M1.

HS2’s design speed was justified on the basis of the monetised value of time saved. When this rationale was ridiculed by leading economists other reasons were advanced for HS2 including environmental improvement and the need for additional capacity. Latterly government has claimed that HS2 is vital for “closing the North-South divide”.
Pan Camden’s concerns

Throughout the past six years our group has sought to follow the development of the HS2 project, to understand the twists and turns of the arguments and to propose alternatives and improvements that would, at a minimum be of benefit to Camden.

DfT’s promotion of HS2 over the last six years has been characterised by a dogged defence of its one route through endless assertions accompanied by a charade of “consultation” or “engagement”. DfT/HS2 has glossed over problems and ignored alternatives.

Indeed the ignoring of real alternatives is an inevitable and corrosive consequence flowing from both the initial narrow brief and from the closed analysis of options. So far however Parliament has overwhelmingly accepted HS2’s assertions over alternative views.

Our criticisms of the HS2 project are manifold, at various levels and include:

- The absence of a national strategy considering all modes of transport against which HS2 could be positioned.

- The wrong brief: prioritising, without any public discussion a new railway between London and Birmingham over any alternative scheme or schemes.

- The opportunity cost of investment in HS2.

- Adopting an infeasible design speed and establishing the route without any public discussion of alternatives.

- Failing to follow Treasury cost benefit rules in evaluating the worth of the project. That worth is being steadily undermined by expansion of the project budget.

- Dismissing Sir David Rowlands’ recommendation for four-track provision ab initio. (Such provision providing for future growth, resilience, intermediate stations and for freight.)

- Failing to integrate with existing rail network.

- Failing to benefit most of the districts through which HS2 passes.

- Risking obsolescence before entry to service (19th century technology of steel wheels on steel rails).

- Very high environmental impacts throughout the route.

- Excessive construction period exceeding 20 years in a densely populated urban area with chronic effects upon the well being of the surrounding population.

- No comprehensive scheme available for Euston Station. HS2 only provides for high-speed lines at Euston thus leaving the existing station in a worse mess than now.
• Crossrail Two (£33 bn) would be essential to cope with Euston passenger numbers projected by HS2 but no part of its provision is comprehended in HS2 costs.

• No direct links to London airports or to HS1.

• Anachronistic insistence on a terminal rather than a through station in central London - an extraordinarily poor use of prime real estate.

The November / December 2015 hearing of Camden petitions by the House of Commons Select Committee came across as a most unsatisfactory exercise. The impression was of a Committee desperate to finish its business, rushing petitioners through their submissions and generally preferring the assertions of HS2 Limited to the word of petitioners. For many in Camden the last straw was the Committee concluding that petitioners' concerns were addressed by undertakings "agreed" between London Borough of Camden and HS2 Limited.

In May 2015 a group of eminent civil engineers and economists wrote to the Prime Minister recommending that before pressing ahead there should be pause to review the HS2 project, to ensure its correct formulation. Their carefully reasoned letter received a supercilious, perfunctory reply from a junior transport minister.

This determination to ignore sound external advice bodes ill for the project. As UCL's OMEGA study has clearly shown the successful "megaprojects" are those that assimilate views other than of their proponents.

With key members of HS2's leadership team having transferred from the financially compromised Network Rail it is surprising that alarm bells aren't sounding across Whitehall.

Pan Camden's specific requests to the House of Lords

A. To avoid the real risks of a monumental debacle we ask the House of Lords to require that a comprehensive, thorough, objective and independent examination of HS2 takes place before the project goes any further.

B. At a Camden level we consider it is fundamentally wrong in the 21st Century even to consider inserting a vast terminus station in a settled, densely populated urban community. If there is to be a new high-speed railway in London then it would be far more effective and enduring to construct one or more compact through stations along a tunnelled link.

We ask the House of Lords to insist upon a full evaluation both of this approach as well as the alternatives proposed by other Camden groups such as redeveloping Euston within its present footprint and having the primary London station at Old Oak Common. (HS2 Limited asserted to the House of Commons Select Committee (without demonstrating its case) that such alternatives are infeasible.)

The full evaluation should include a proper cost / benefit analysis of HS2's proposals for Euston which currently take no account of the interests of the residents and businesses of Camden.

C. We further ask the House of Lords to consider the implications of "Clause 47" of the Hybrid Bill. This gives the Secretary of State for Transport sweeping powers that could have iniquitous effects upon Camden.

D. Finally whatever form HS2 ultimately takes we ask that the House of Lords requires that an independent ombudsman be appointed to uphold the interests of affected people for the
duration of the project. Such an independent authority is vital to ensure that the interests of those “travelled over” are given equal weight to the interests of those travelling and of the rail operating companies. The ombudsman would have the authority to insist that HS2 Limited adheres strictly to its obligations in regards to such factors as noise and air pollution.

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.
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF  HUMAYUN MOHSIN

Declares that:

1. The petitioner(s) is/are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. Your petitioner(s) is/are

A FAMILY MEMBER OF A LEASEHOLD FLAT IN A RESIDENTIAL BLOCK 'SCAFFELL' ON THE REGENTS PARK ESTATE, WHERE SOME OF THE BLOCKS OFF HAMPSTEAD ROAD, WILL BE DEMOLISHED TO MAKE WAY FOR HS2.
3. Your petitioner's concerns are

**ENVIRONMENT & CONSTRUCTION**

My concern is that HS2 will mean at least twenty years of excess levels of noise, pollution and heavy use of roads by lorries etc. that have not been designed for such usage.

We live on the Regents Park Estate, and heavy use of Stanmore will affect our lives adversely.

We ask the Select Committee to ensure that HS2 promoter does everything in their power to minimize noise, pollution and heavy usage of roads in our area; and that spoil should be removed by rail, not lorries, materials in and by rail.

We also ask that Euston Station, including HS2 and Crossrail 2 be rebuilt in the same footprint as already exists, so as to avoid a land grab from Camden residents who are on these council estates and are relatively poor.

We also request that there should be mitigatory action taken by the promoter of HS2 for the benefit of the local residents affected adversely by the construction and pollution; for example noise insulation should be provided, as well as fixed and reasonable hours of working should be set so that residents can plan their lives around the twenty years of disruption.
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................

Name:................................................ Signature.............................
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Ms Jo Hurford

Declares that:

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

Your petitioner is Jo Hurford, an artist who works from home. Your petitioners building 30-40 Grafton Way is directly above the traffic, not set back from the side of the road so fumes come inside even with the single-glazed windows shut. When there are problems on roads nearby traffic queues below your petitioners windows, impatient drivers sound their horns creating a cacophony of sound in addition to the noise of the motors and the pollutants they emit.

2. Your petitioner’s concerns are:

- Air pollution in your petitioners flat as a result of both displaced traffic (a permanent effect) and construction vehicles as stated in the Environmental Statement and Additional Provision 3 Supplementary Environmental Statement. Prof Frank Kelly of Kings College London says ‘low speed driving and idling is responsible for more emissions per unit of fuel consumed than A road or motorway driving’.

- Traffic noise in your petitioners flat from the HS2 constructions vehicles as well as from the displaced traffic as stated in 1.

To mitigate these things, soundproof glazing and an air filtration system must be provided for all flats on the street sides of the 30-40 Grafton Way building. Any baseline for air quality needs to taken from BEFORE the building site opposite 30-40 Grafton Way started its demolitions.

- Air pollution in Euston and Camden in general both from traffic being forced to drive at slower speeds due to reduction in the number of lanes available to drivers (for example on Euston Road and Hampstead Road) and from the construction sites themselves. Your petitioner gets about by foot so will be breathing in much more pollution than normal. Your petitioners experience of major building works in proximity to her home
is that the enforcement of the construction management plan is weak with out-of-hours working being frequent and damping down of dust being very infrequent.

To mitigate this, all construction sites must use construction machinery that complies with Euro IV emissions or better if such machinery is available, from the commencement of demolitions no matter if located inside or outside the Central Activity Zone. All sites must have a designated person with enforcement powers on duty and able to be phoned or emailed 24/7 should residents experience problems. Diesel vehicles under 3.5 tonnes must meet the Euro VI standards expected of vehicles over 3.5 tonnes.

-The Promoter issues contradicting information. In September 2015 at a meeting at the Surma Centre on Hampstead Road they provided a map showing an arrow pointing to Grafton Way with the wording ‘Strategic routes to/from south for all compounds’. At HoC Select Committee in December Mr Strachan QC showed a map saying there would only be 22 construction vehicles per day which would make no sense for a ‘strategic route’ which of these 2 maps is correct? I have tried to get clarification on this from HS2 but they have been unable to tell me. A more important point from the map shown by Mr Strachan QC for the first phase of construction was the fact there would be 99 extra HGV daily below my windows in total when the diversions caused by the scheme are taken into account. This goes up to 120 for the next phase.

-The promoter has agreed one for one replacement trees with Camden Council but Your Petitioner requests this be increased to 3 for 1 and for some of these to be planted in Grafton Way.

-Open space, St James Gardens is my nearest open space. The Promoter intends to destroy this. Mitigation: Your petitioner asks for a new publicly owned garden equal in terms of size and tranquillity be given to the community.

-At HoC Select Committee your petitioner asked what right the Archbishops Council had to agree to the headstones in St James Gardens (with the exception of the 3 they have agreed to preserve) being broken up without consultation with the Community. Your petitioner understands they do not have the authority to do this and that they have not consulted with the local parish. Your Petitioner wants all headstones preserved which she asked for in her responses to the Draft Environmental Statement, Environmental Statement and Additional Provision 3 Supplementary Environmental Statement.

- With regard to Drummond Street, Assurance 7 states- ‘The Secretary of State will require the nominated undertaker to maintain, where reasonably practicable, pedestrian connectivity between Euston Station
and Drummond Street at all times, except as required to implement traffic management measures, throughout the Phase One construction works'. Your petitioner asked that the 'reasonably practicable' be removed as access MUST BE maintained at all times.

- At HoC Select Committee your petitioner heard misleading information from the Promoters with regard to the station alternative Double Deck Down 3. I had the correct information in my petitioner exhibit documents but was stopped from speaking about it by the Committee. When the Select Committee published their report the incorrect information regarding the Northern Line was in there. If I had been allowed to speak this would not have happened. I ask the HoL Committee listen to the alternatives and instruct the Promoter to do fully costed reports by an independent body of all 3 for them as well as HS2s proposal.

- With regard to Euston Station Your petitioner asks that a comprehensive rebuild is done incorporating both the High Speed and Classic Stations as well as Crossrail 2.

- In Your petitioners petition to the House of Commons was listed 2 pages of inaccurate and misleading information written in the ES, and the lack of and bad engagement by the Promoter. These errors continued in the AP3 SES where in several places it said 'Grafton Way at its junction with Eversholt Street'. Grafton Way dose not join Eversholt Street. These kind of errors give your petitioner a lack of confidence that the promoter will be able to run the construction scheme properly.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: .................................. Signature.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF DOROTHEA HACKMAN AND CHRIS POWELL  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioners are  

Dorothea Joy Hackman and Christopher Charles Powell, who have lived in their basement flat in Mornington Terrace NW1 7RS for 25 years, working hard and long at rewarding but frequently stressful careers in further education and the trade union movement, in order to pay our mortgage and become the outright owners of our property. Here we have brought up our son who now works as a full-time teacher, and having just retired, we were looking forward at last to the quiet enjoyment of a pleasant life in our home. This includes involvement in our local community and public duty such as school governorship, as well as the particular pleasures of sunrises and sunsets viewed across the open space of the railway cutting; and twice daily walks to Regents Park and local bookshops.  

3. Your petitioners’ concerns are  

a) Your Petitioners are members of the Camden Cutting Group, our local residents groups, and have contributed to and fully support concerns stated in the petition that has been deposited by the Camden Cutting Group.  

b) Your Petitioners expressed their concerns in petitions to the House of Commons but these have not been addressed to our satisfaction. Some assurances have been made to our local Council (Camden) but in our view these neither go far enough nor are there adequate measures in place to enforce them nor to independently adjudicate whether they are equitably implemented.  

c) The quality of life in our community is eroded by the "land grab" of open spaces which can only be to our detriment while benefiting developers’ profits. Our area is badly treated in the HS2 proposals, both property and community. We receive no benefit whatsoever from this proposed infrastructure project, and yet it is considered acceptable to destroy two decades of our retirement, and the health and physical development of local children for the whole of their childhood. The cost to the nation of the additional healthcare would be avoided if sensible measures are taken now to limit the impact on our community.
d) In particular your Petitioners wish to see at least the following mitigations and safeguards that will protect some of their rights and interests:

i. Compensation is inadequate and inequitable. Whenever the quiet enjoyment of our homes is prevented for significant periods of time over months and years that should be compensated to the resident at market rates. This should be a right at any point during the decades of construction irrespective of the type of tenancy or ownership. It is not reasonable to expect people to live with this amount of disruption for two decades.

ii. Protection of the value of the property in which your Petitioners have invested their whole livelihoods by a fair compensation scheme for urban residents. For example, in the event our son relocates to Australia, we may wish to move to be close to any future grandchildren. This should be our choice, yet it will be difficult to sell a property right in the middle of an unprecedented infrastructure construction project of 18 years of relentless noise and pollution night and day.

iii. The Need to Sell scheme has no external adjudication which gives residents no confidence it will be genuinely available to people in urban areas. It needs at least to be improved by removing the requirement to show compelling reason, and the obligation to sell at 15% below the value. Additional unfairness in the NTS scheme is for landlords and people who move here recently - making our properties harder to sell as any buyer will have prior knowledge and no entitlement to the scheme.

iv. Your petitioners ask that personal compensation budgets be allocated in accordance with the Fair HS2 Compensation Charter so that your Petitioners can decide when the noise and dirt become intolerable and they need a break away for instance in a nearby hotel to get some sleep and peace for a few weeks. Rehousing when necessary must be in like for like housing (m²) nearby. We ask that any resident suffering significant impacts for a period in excess of six months be eligible for compensation to be calculated in relation to a fair unblighted occupancy value based on rental values for each month of impact.

v. A compensation scheme needs to be in place for homes where predicted residual severe adverse in-combination impacts still remain as admitted in the Environmental Statement even after the mitigations proposed by HS2 Ltd have been implemented. These can be in the form of rent reduction for tenants with the landlord compensated, and an amount based on market rents and unusable rooms for leaseholders and freeholders. Where there is predicted to be residual significant adverse impact after mitigation for over three years, there should be entitlement to the Express purchase scheme

vi. Double glazing will not save us from the “temporary” disturbance of ten years of constant heavy construction immediately on our road outside our home, followed by a further eight years of development over the station and tracks from Euston to Parkway. Even after the mitigation of noise insulation we remain in the thousand strong group of residents with severe adverse impact after mitigation. If the impact cannot be mitigated, then in fairness it must be compensated. The requirement to compensate will focus the Promoter’s plans on minimising the severity and duration of impacts to residents, something which is not yet in evidence.
vii. Your Petitioners ask for the use of rail rather than road to move spoil and
demolition and construction waste and construction materials and machinery -
Camden traffic cannot take hundreds of extra lorries every day. Tourists are
important to the economy, yet, for example, how will they reach the zoo? Even
the zoo coach parking areas are being taken over as construction compounds.

viii. Your Petitioners seek control of the speed of the construction lorries as well as
their emissions and those of stationary construction machinery. Both HGV and
LGV restricted to daytime and non-residential routes so that we have safe local
access to amenities and are spared avoidable noise and pollution.

ix. Your Petitioners ask that there be no construction compounds in Mornington
Terrace as the Promoter can easily use the main one in Hampstead Road and
the compound down in the Cutting.

x. Your Petitioners ask that local trees to be replaced within the area, ideally with
birches and limes as well as the resilient London plane trees. It will take 60 trees
to replace the air quality cleansing capacity of one mature plane tree, and the
tree replacement scheme needs to reflect this. The felling of mature trees in an
urban area is just unconscionable.

xi. We are particularly concerned at the net reduction of public green spaces west of
Euston station both during the two decades of construction and permanently
when the scheme is operational. It is outrageous when there is so much concern
about the obesity of children that their scarce playgrounds and public green and
open spaces are taken as construction compounds and for replacement housing.
The impact on health and amenity is unacceptable. We will be derided by future
generations as the ones who squandered their parks.

xii. Your Petitioners ask for a day a week of respite from all construction. Building
HS2 will be a long haul for our community, and knowing that there would be a
quiet day to relax or do homework and read at least once a week would help us
to weather the prolonged ordeal.

xiii. HS2 should justify case by case, and not be blanket exempted from core working
hours and noise and pollution thresholds. There needs to be realtime monitoring
of air quality made publically available. The combined and cumulative effects of
noise, vibration, pollution, traffic congestion, visual intrusion, road and bridge
closures and night time working over many years have not been assessed. In the
Cutting this will be for a ten year period. It is described as temporary as it is part
of construction rather than operation but it is clearly ridiculously to treat
construction going on for so long as temporary.

xiv. Your Petitioners ask that there be fines set in advance for every breach of
construction and amenity standards so that HS2 considers the local community
as well as the convenience of railways and construction. The fine money should
go into a Local Community Benefit Fund enabling the community to determine
what additional measures would help us survive a lifetime of construction. Fines
and compensation would concentrate the design of construction plans on
avoiding impacts on residents.

xv. Your Petitioners ask that construction machinery be fitted with noise limiters so
they cut out when the maximum decibels are reached, and with time limiters so
they cannot be switched on before 8 am or after working hours.
Your Petitioners ask for funding for local environmental enforcement officers to take immediate action whenever the Code of Construction Practice and Local Environment Management Plan are breached.

The hoardings protecting Mornington Terrace residents from the noise and dust and dirt of construction need to have enhanced acoustic performance and bespoke design. Serious construction for a ten year period cannot be described as a temporary disturbance. There should be recognition in the HS2 documentation of the special nature of building in the heart of a big city, and thresholds set realistically lower to take account of existing noise and pollution.

Consultation has not been genuine, information is insufficient, HS2 Ltd has no idea of how to engage or what engagement means. They treat residents with contempt. Despite repeated requests HS2 Ltd have not clarified who has received repeated representations from residents and who at HS2 Ltd has made subsequent decisions.

The country will receive poor value for money from the HS2 proposals, and there has not been a cost benefit analysis of the Old Oak Common proposals as requested by the House of Lords Economic Committee. Proposals concerning Old Oak Common need to be evaluated in the light of this information.

There have not been independent technical assessments of HS2 Ltd proposals and alternative schemes such as Euston Express, Double Deck Down and High Speed UK tunnelling and double deck down options to keep the same footprint and avoid rebuilding bridges and retaining walls, and demolishing homes.

Nor have there yet been sensible integrated planning proposals for Euston Station as a whole – high speed, classic and Crossrail 2. The absence of coherent proposals for increasing the capacity of local traffic to receive greater numbers of passengers is an additional concern. There should be no demolition of bridges and buildings until these proposals are detailed and agreed.

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.

Name: DOROTHEA HACKMAN Signature..........................

Name: CHRIS POWELL Signature..........................
To the House of Lords
SESSION 2015 – 16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midland) Bill

THE PETITION of:

(1) RAMAC HOLDINGS (TRADING) LIMITED

(2) RAMAC HOLDINGS LIMITED

(3) AMBROSETTI (UK) LIMITED

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners

Your Petitioners are (1) Ramac Holdings (Trading) Limited (hereinafter referred to as “RHTL”); (2) Ramac Holdings Limited (hereinafter referred to as “RHL”); and (3) Ambrosetti (UK) Limited (hereinafter referred to as “AL”).

RHL owns the freehold of the industrial estate situated at Appletree Industrial Estate, Appletree Road, Chipping Warden OX17 1LL and registered at the Land Registry under title number NN184714.

RHTL acquired, and continues to own, the freehold of the airfield site situated adjacent to the industrial estate owned by RHL. RHTL’s title to the airfield site is registered at the Land Registry under title numbers NN173059 and NN178087.

AL is the tenant of RHTL and has exclusive use of the airfield site for business purposes as well as occupying Units 1A, 1B, 2, 5 and 7 of the Industrial Estate.

When referred to together hereinafter, the Appletree Industrial Estate and the airfield site are referred to as “the Properties”.
AL’s business is centred on vehicle preparation and refurbishment, primarily “de-fleeting” vehicles at the end of their fleet lives. AL has a wide variety of clients ranging from major multinational car manufacturers, car hire companies and driving schools amongst many other fleet sector companies and agencies.

AL operates the following sites:

a. Kings North, Rochester, Kent – an approximately 25 acre site;
b. Sandwich, Kent – an approximately 20 acre site; and
c. Chipping Warden, Northamptonshire – a site in excess of 50 acres.

As regards the Chipping Warden site, AL started operations there based upon a strategic business decision on account of the Site’s central United Kingdom location and easy access to the Midlands fleet vehicle market, including via the M40 and M1. It was due to one of the key contracts won since opening the site that the further space at Units 1A, 1B and 5 were taken.

As a consequence, in the space of 12 months, the number of AL’s employees at the site has increased from approximately 20 to approximately 220 (including agency staff) as well as the units and storage areas on the industrial estate being used.

In general terms, a description of AL’s business is as follows. Vehicles are generally collected from the client by AL and brought to the site. Once there, the wear and tear of the vehicle is assessed and repaired (this usually amounts to repairing scratches and damaged paintwork, and other work of a similar nature). The vehicle is then also inspected for damage over and above the usual wear and tear before being refurbished, serviced, having the tyres changed and then having a final inspection prior to having marketing photographs taken.

Having taken all of these steps, the vehicles are then stored either in the warehouse facility or on the airfield site (depending on capacity and the type of vehicle/client) and the clients then notified of the vehicle’s availability for sale. Vehicles are then delivered to the client for onward sale.

In addition to storage, the airfield site is also used for road testing and the entire site sees a turnover of approximately 3,000 vehicles per calendar month (although, due to new vehicle registrations, peaks are seen in the months of March and September). Further, approximately 6,000 to 8,000 vehicles are held on site at any time.

The airfield site and its proximity immediately adjacent to the Appletree Industrial Estate is of fundamental importance and critical to the business of AL. There are
numerous vehicle movements each day from/to the airfield site and the units on the Industrial Estate as vehicles are moving through the “defleeting” process.

There is no scope (nor is it feasible) to relocate AL’s business to the Rochester or Sandwich sites in Kent.

As is made clear by the foregoing, your Petitioners own or have an interest in properties and/or businesses within the Chipping Warden area, some of which or part of which are subject to compulsory acquisition under the Bill (whether permanent or temporary) and some of which, whilst not subject to the compulsory purchase proposals of the Bill, are in the immediate vicinity of the proposed works including the tunnelling access shaft, spoil storage sites and spoil removal routes and they and their employees’ and contractors health, safety and wellbeing and their employment, businesses and livelihoods are liable to be injuriously affected by them.

It is respectfully submitted that the rights, interests and property of your Petitioners, and those of their employees and contractors, are injuriously affected by the Bill if it is passed into law in its present form. Accordingly, your Petitioners object for the reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioners’ Concerns

Your Petitioners had thought that an agreement had been negotiated with HS2 Ltd covering these various issues (which generate savings in the cost of the railway amounting to many millions of pounds), as reported to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on 16 March 2015. However, whilst the agreed assurances have been provided, that agreement has not been finalized which has led your Petitioners to submit this further Petition to the House of Lords.

Your Petitioners have many substantial concerns respecting the provisions of the Bill as affecting the Chipping Warden area, the Properties and the business and livelihoods of your Petitioners, their employees and contractors.

Save for concerns of more general application as contained within this Petition, your Petitioners’ principal concerns as regards the current proposals for the HS2 rail link are (at least subject to approval of the Additional Provisions of the Bill):

a. The construction of the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel which will see the northern tip of the airfield site both crossed by the proposed Green Tunnel and rendered redundant as against its current use; and
b. The use of more than 90% of the airfield site for the purposes of a temporary material stockpile but with an associated main compound and satellite compound in the local vicinity.

Your Petitioners estimate on information provided by the Promoter that the construction traffic generated from the tunnel excavation, spoil removal and associated works will impact upon the Properties for a period of more than 8 years. Heavy construction traffic will pass along rural roads creating unprecedented noise, dust, pollution, vibration and safety hazards in the area. It is anticipated that many hundreds of thousands of lorry movements will be required.

Your Petitioners submit that the scale of the excavation and construction in unprecedented for an area such as Chipping Warden, being in a rural setting in the UK greenbelt. Your Petitioners are greatly concerned by the overall impact with the construction of HS2 as proposed will have upon the neighbourhood, people, the environment and amenity of the Chipping Warden area and upon the fabric, general amenity and value of the Properties, and upon the ongoing viability of the businesses operated by your Petitioners. They contend that these works are unacceptable in this area and should not be permitted. In the alternative, and without prejudice to the previous, the works should be designed, operated and controlled with nothing less than the highest standards of design, constructions practice and mitigation. It remains unclear to your Petitioners that such standard will be adopted or, if adopted, will be carried through and enforced in the implementation of the proposed scheme.

Your Petitioners are concerned that the powers proposed in the Bill as affecting the Chipping Warden area and the Properties therein are either unjustified and/or unclear. Your Petitioners are also concerned that no adequate provision has been made to compensate the property owners, traders and businesses of the area according to the actual loss they would suffer. Furthermore, no adequate provision has been made to secure that damage and disruption are kept to a minimum or to secure that in other respects their interests are reasonably safeguarded. No mention has been made of penalties for the Promoters or losses to your Petitioners should any breaches of agreement or policy occur so as to result in injurious affection or harm to buildings, to owners, lessees or to occupiers.

In the ordinary course, your Petitioners understand that a project of this sort would now be subject to much more detailed design work that it appears has been undertaken. Significant detail is missing – as such the current scheme and its impact has not been properly analysed and the most appropriate tunnelling methodology, worksites and route alignment have not been chosen taking all criteria including risk
assessment, noise, pollution, vibration, environmental harm, traffic levels, health and safety into account. In consequence, the impacts upon the Chipping Warden area and the Properties and your Petitioners businesses and interests more generally are still ill-defined and your Petitioners are handicapped in their ability to engage with the Promoters in a positive fashion to safeguard both the interests of the area, the Properties and your Petitioners' business and other interests.

Your Petitioners have responded to the Promoters' invitation to submit details comments on the Environmental Statement associated with, and deposited at the same time as the Bill. Your Petitioners believe it is their right to expect the large quantity of information that has been omitted from the Environmental Statement. Your Petitioners are currently awaiting proofs of evidence on a number of issues. Your Petitioners respectfully reserve the right to raise again these issues at such time as your Honourable House comes to consider this Petition.

Your Petitioners are concerned that the powers proposed in the Bill as affecting the Properties and the Chipping Warden area more generally are either unjustified and/or unclear.

Your Petitioners are concerned about other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights, interests and property of your Petitioners and the businesses operated by your Petitioners for whom no adequate provision is made in the Bill.

Your Petitioners respectfully submit that they, their employees and contractors have rights under the Aarhus Convention (which has largely been transposed into UK legislation through EC Directives and Legislation) concerning:

a. Access to environmental information;

b. Public participation in the decision making process; and

c. Access to environmental justice.

Your Petitioners respectfully submit that the Bill deprives your Petitioners of their rights under this Convention, either in whole or in part.

The HS2 base case as regards its plans in the vicinity of the Properties is that there be a Green Tunnel running across and/or beneath the airfield site in particular. The result of this is that extensive surface works are required to support the tunnelling operations (and indeed to allow for the construction and installation of the cover of the Green Tunnel). supplying materials, removing excavated soil and storing the excavated soil. Your Petitioners submit that there will be a significant environmental
impact as a consequence of these works which, inter alia, will involve significant disruption and congestion to the local rural road network.

Your Petitioners object very strongly to the current plans (at least subject to approval of the relevant Additional Provisions) which include the siting of the Green Tunnel on and/or under the airfield site, and the siting of a temporary spoil storage site on the surface of the airfield site with all the associated construction work, spoil removal and likely site regeneration works which will last many years.

Further, your Petitioners respectfully submit that there is fundamental uncertainty as to the proposals for the path of the Green Tunnel. As is demonstrated by the limits of deviation shown on drawing no. C222-ATK-HY-DPL-020-215300, although the intended path of HS2 (and the associated tunnel) is shown as the centre line cutting across the northern tip of the airfield site, the said limits of deviation show that the actual path of the line could pass outside the northern tip of the airfield site or, more fundamentally, could cross the airfield site much closer to the southern edge, effectively resulting in the loss of approximately 30% of the airfield site as it currently stands.

Indeed, your Petitioners understand that, should the line follow the northern limit of deviation, the line would pass through open green land rather than disrupt land put to commercial use of significant financial worth. Your Petitioners therefore respectfully submit that the route of the line should be altered so that the line follows the northern limit of deviation and by way of Green Tunnel, to the greatest extent possible, the impact of the line upon your Petitioners.

Further, there is the issue of the proposed temporary stockpile. As is made clear at paragraph 2.2.24 of Environmental Statement Community Forum Area report 15 (hereinafter referred to as “CFA15”), under the current proposals, construction of the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel will be managed from the Chipping Warden main compound, the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel south portal satellite compound and the Chipping Warden Tunnel north portal satellite compound.

In effecting this construction, the airfield site has seemingly been set aside in the proposals as being one of the areas referred to in paragraph 2.3.15 of CFA 15 to be used for the storage of topsoil stripped as part of the works prior to it being used when the land is reinstated to its former use. It is not, however, clear as to whether this is the case or whether it will also be used to hold excavated material from other areas.
Paragraph 2.3.43 of CFA15 makes it clear that the main compound will be operational for approximately 5 years and 3 months from 2017 onwards and that, in line with paragraph 2.3.45 of CFA 15, the compound will be used to manage the construction of the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel which itself will take approximately 4 years and 3 months to complete.

Although paragraph 2.3.3 of CFA 15 states that “wherever appropriate” land taken temporarily will be returned to its pre-construction use, by that point the current plans will render at least part of the airfield site redundant in respect of its current use. This is therefore of no assistance to your Petitioners and does not address in any way their objections.

Your Petitioners therefore object to the proposals in their current form and respectfully submit that:

a. The line should run as a green tunnel at the northern limit of deviation so as to avoid the northern tip of the airfield site; and

b. The temporary stockpile site should be altered so as to avoid the airfield site and the Properties in their entirety.

Without prejudice to your Petitioners’ contentions as set out above, your Petitioners also object to the provisions of Clause 4 of the Bill and of Clause 8 insofar as the same would enable the Promoter to acquire rights in the subsoil and sub-surface of certain of the Properties. Your Petitioners appreciate that if there is no alternative taking all the relevant criteria into account there may be the need for the Promoter to obtain appropriate subsoil interests for tunnelling purposes but are concerned that the application of the powers as proposed in relation to the Properties (and particularly the airfield site) is excessive and unnecessary and that their application will lead to damage to the Properties and a serious detraction from the use of them by your Petitioners.

Your Petitioners are concerned about the definition of “Phase One purposes” set out in Clause 62 to the Bill and, in particular, to the inclusion of the words “otherwise for the purposes of or in connection with Phase One of High Speed 2 or any high speed railway transport system of which Phase One of High Speed 2 forms or is to form part”. This could permit the Promoter to use powers for the purposes of development in addition to those needed for constructing a railway. Your Petitioners would therefore seek sufficient safeguards to protect their property and business interests.

Your Petitioners therefore submit that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless, and to
the extent (if any) that proof is provided that there is no better alternative to the route alignment and proposed temporary stockpile sites taking all criteria into account and it can be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. Your Petitioners have not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting the Properties and they are not satisfied that it is necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

Accordingly, your Petitioners submit that the Promoter should demonstrate and be put to strict proof of the need for and desirability of the proposals in the Bill, as affecting the Properties and that the limits of deviation, the resulting powers for the compulsory acquisition of subsoil, the power to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the limits of deviation should be restricted in relation to your Petitioners’ property to the extent (if any) to which they can be strictly justified and so as to prevent interference with those Properties. In particular, your Petitioners contend that any interest in the Properties acquired (whether permanently or temporarily and, including but not limited to, in terms of the area over which it is to subsist, the form in which it is to take at law and any express or implied constraints which may be imposed upon the remainder of your Petitioners’ property) should be strictly limited only to that which is absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the proposed works. Once the purpose of construction is completed the property rights acquired for this purpose should be returned to the original holders.

Your Petitioners have significant concerns with regards to the noise, pollution and vibration arising from the excavation of the tunnels, the removal of spoil and the construction of the railway and its associated works and structures. Such activities will inevitably also include heavy lorry traffic and is a matter of significant concern to your Petitioners.

The operation of the railway (including the use of ventilation shafts where proposed and other ancillary uses) will inevitably give rise to air and ground transmitted noise, pollution and vibration. There are no clear and binding limitations on such noise, pollution and vibration in either the Bill or the Environmental Statement. There is presently little monitoring of current levels of noise, vibration, pollution, dust, airborne pollution and vehicular disturbance so as to evaluate the impact of any increase in the area. Your Petitioners submit that the Promoter should be compelled to use best available techniques in the constructions and operation of the railway and its associated works and structures to ensure that no noise or vibration can be felt or otherwise experienced in or on the Properties (beyond those generated by your
Petitioners' current uses) and such that there are no other adverse effects. Your Petitioners submit that strict standards should be set beyond those currently envisaged by the Promoter to protect the environment and to which the Promoter must be made strictly liable to comply in writing. Appropriate measure and penalties should be in place to safeguard the interests of all those affected by noise, pollution, vibration and health and safety breaches.

Your Petitioners consider that in the circumstances a noise, pollution and vibration monitoring and mitigation system should be in place before commencement and during construction of any works in relation to HS2. Further, there should be a resultant damage mitigation and monitoring system in place, again before commencement and both during enabling works, construction of the works and operation of the trains. There must also be an evaluation of the cumulative impact of enabling works, construction and the operation of the trains following completion. There must, in your Petitioners' submission be a threshold agreed between your Petitioners and the Promoter of the Bill. If that threshold is exceeded or any damage is caused the nominated undertaker should be obliged to cease construction or operation of the trains as the case may be until such time as remedial measures are in place, to pay appropriate financial penalties and only be permitted to resume the works once noise, pollution and vibration levels have returned to the levels to be set out under the Bill.

Your Petitioners request that provision be made for the appointment of a suitably qualified expert or experts in noise, pollution and vibration (to include that generated both during construction and operation of the railway) caused at the Properties by the operation of the project. Such an expert or experts should be agreed upon by the parties or in default of agreement should be appointed by the president of the appropriate body on the application of either party to report upon noise, pollution and vibration effects in the Properties and the surrounding rural area. Your Petitioners request that provision be made that the terms of the appointment should be agreed by the Petitioners, and the report should be addressed jointly to the parties whilst his/her fees should be borne by the Promoter. Your Petitioners request that provision be made for reports to be supplied immediately to the parties. Your Petitioners request that provision be made that all costs, expenses and VAT thus incurred should be borne by the Promoter. Your Petitioners request that provision be made that the noise impact, pollution impact and vibration impact (during both enabling works, construction and operational phases) should be monitored by the relevant experts appointed pursuant to such agreement at the cost of the Promoter for the period of the construction works and at regular intervals after commencement of the running of the trains.
Your Petitioners request that provision be made that all insulation and other remedial measures for all affected by the works as determined necessary by the expert appointed above be put in place at the cost of the Promoter before the commencement of enabling works and construction works in the vicinity of the Properties if there is any noise, pollution or vibration impact to the Properties or any part of them from the enabling works, construction of the works or the operation or maintenance of the trains and tunnels at any time. Your Petitioners request that provision be made that all statutory consents are to be obtained by the Promoter at its cost. Your Petitioners request that all such remedial measures and method statements are agreed in writing with them in advance.

Without prejudice to the foregoing, your Petitioners request that provision be made that if, notwithstanding the reports of the experts any noise, pollution or vibration impact or any other health and safety impact is felt by persons or in any of the Properties or any part of them or if any damage is caused from any vibration from the project at any time (including the operation of the trains at any time) all insulation and remedial measures are to be installed by the Promoter to your Petitioners’ satisfaction immediately upon request by your Petitioners and at the Promoter’s cost. Your Petitioners request that all such remedial measures and method statement are agreed with them in writing in advance.

Having regard to the rural nature of the Chipping Warden area and the businesses being carried out at the Properties, your Petitioners are also concerned that hours of working should be strictly limited. Your Petitioners believe that the Promoter’s proposals for limiting work hours are not satisfactory and seek the imposition of more appropriate working hours. Enabling works and construction of the works during the hours currently proposed would cause considerable disruption to the occupiers of the Properties and the businesses and your Petitioners.

The proposed works will impact significantly upon the use and enjoyment of the Properties, as well as on the businesses operated therein. Significant use of unsuitable highways by large multi-wheel vehicles both delivering equipment and supplied to the site and dealing with spoil as a result of the works is anticipated. The disruptive effect of such vehicle movements will be compounded by the permanent and temporary stopping up of nearby roads. The use and routeing of heavy lorries through the vicinity of the Properties is a matter of substantial concern to your Petitioners and, in their view, must be strictly controlled.
Your Petitioners are concerned about pollution, dust and dirt produced during the construction of the proposed works. Without prejudice to their contention that the Properties, and more specifically the airfield site, should not be used as a construction and spoil removal site, your Petitioners request that special provision be made to take account of the particular sensitivity of the Properties, the businesses operated by your Petitioners, the use to which the airfield site in particular is put and the rural setting. Your Petitioners would wish to see binding limits of pollution and airborne dust particulates imposed on the Promoter and the Promoter should monitor pollution levels and dust emissions, at their own cost both before and after enabling works and construction of the works at suitably agreed points at the Properties and in the immediate vicinity. Strict adherence to maximum pollution and particulate levels should be required and where maximum pollution and airborne particulate levels are exceeded the Promoter should be required to cease work and mitigate the excess levels. Your Petitioners request that provision be made to ensure that the Promoter takes responsibility for the reimbursement of your Petitioners for additional expense caused by dust and dirt such as, for example only, more frequent cleaning of the vehicles situated on the airfield site. Your Petitioners request the adoption of best practice in dust suppression at all times.

Your Petitioners are concerned to ensure that disruption to access to the Properties, both vehicular and pedestrian, caused by the construction of HS2 is kept to an absolute minimum during the construction period. Your Petitioners request that good and open access to the Properties be maintained in all cases, that vehicular access be maintained and that compensation be awarded for any costs incurred through inability to access, service or park at the Properties due to the works.

Your Petitioners further submit that the nominated undertaker should be required under the Bill to provide detailed plans, method statements and other particulars of works including schedules of deliveries occurring in and around the Properties substantially in advance of the commencement of enabling works and all construction operations.

Your Petitioners wish to be satisfied that there will be no disruption to statutory services provided to the Properties as a result of the construction of the proposed works.

The provisions contained within the Bill for compensation for compulsory purchase of property or of subsoil or new other rights (in all cases whether on a permanent or temporary basis) will not enable your Petitioners or other landowners to recover the full loss and expense which they will incur in consequence of the exercise of such
powers. Your Petitioners therefore submit that the Bill should be amended to rectify this.

Your Petitioners also object that the compensation provisions of the Bill are inadequate to compensate your Petitioners or their members or others in circumstances where no land (or interests in land) is acquired by the Promoter under the Bill, but where the value of such land and the properties erected on it is reduced or where such land and the properties erected on it and/or the business interests operated from it is otherwise adversely or injuriously affected by the construction or use of the proposed works. Your Petitioners therefore submit that the Bill should be amended to provide for claims for adequate compensation in respect of damage arising to their property by the execution of the works, or for injurious affection thereof by the execution or working of these works, separately from any claim for compensation in respect of acquisition of any land (or interest therein) from your Petitioners.

Your Petitioners further submit that the compensation provisions proposed in the Bill are inadequate to compensate your Petitioners for the loss, damage and inconvenience attributable to blight to the Properties, which they have already suffered or may now suffer as a result of the prospective construction and subsequent use of the proposed works. Your Petitioners fear, for example, that prospective lessees of properties will feel that the proposals may so blight some or all of the Properties that they would not be interested in acquiring any part or parts of the Properties, or that prospective or existing lessees will demand a considerably reduced rent, due to the prospect of the works. Further provisions should, they submit, be included in the Bill including provisions respecting the making and assessment of claims for compensation, in indemnifying your Petitioners for any loss they might suffer as the result of unfavourable rent reviews respecting leases insofar as the reduced rent payable (as it may differ from open market rent) is attributable to the proposed works and their effect on the Properties. Furthermore, compensation should be available for any loss (so attributable) which your Petitioners might suffer in the event of them not being able to let or re-let their properties (in whole or in part) to existing or new tenants or in the event of them only being able to do so at a reduced premium or rent.

Your Petitioners further submit that the Promoter should be required to indemnify them from all losses, claims and demands which may be made or suffered in consequence of enabling works and the construction, use or maintenance of the works or the operation of the trains and the maintenance of the tunnels at any time under the Bill, or their failure or want of repair, or in consequence of any act or
omission of the Promoter, his contractors or agents in carrying out the operation of
the trains and maintenance of the tunnels at any time under the Bill.

As a general matter, your Petitioners submit that provision should be made for the
Promoter to repay to your Petitioners all proper cost, charges and expenses
(including the proper fees of such professional advisers as they may instruct)
reasonably incurred in consequence of the Bill or of any provision made as a result of
this Petition.

Your Petitioners submit that provision should be made for the Promoter to pay
compensation on demand for reduction in market value of the Properties caused by
any of the foregoing. Your Petitioners submit that provision should be made for the
Promoter to indemnify the Petitioners for any injury to the Petitioners, their
employees, contractors, agents, invitees, tenants and licensees at the Properties.
Your Petitioners submit that provision should be made for the Promoter to indemnify
your Petitioners if insurance cannot be obtained by them or only at an increased
premium or subject to particular conditions/excesses. Your Petitioners submit that
provision should be made for interest to be payable by the Promoter on all sums due
and not paid. Your Petitioners submit that provision should be made for all
monitoring costs of your Petitioners to be borne by the Promoter. As a general
matter, your Petitioners submit that provision should be made for an overall indemnity
by the Promoter to put your Petitioners in the same position as in the “no project”
world. Your Petitioner submits that all undertakings and indemnities given by the
Promoter should be for the benefit of each of your Petitioners individually, their
successors in title and assigns and all mortgagees of the Properties.

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

CONCLUSION

Accordingly your Petitioners respectfully submit that:

a. the line should run as a green tunnel, at the northern limit of deviation so as
to avoid the northern tip of the airfield site;

b. the temporary stockpile site should be altered so as to avoid the airfield site
and the Properties in their entirety;
c. the Promoter should provide satisfactory and complete evidence and justification as to why it is necessary and required to designate the airfield site as a temporary material stockpile;

d. if the Bill is to proceed in its present form the Promoter should amend its proposals so that the line of HS2 passes outside the northern tip of the airfield site and so that the temporary material stockpile site is redrawn so as to exclude the aircraft site in its entirety; and

e. the Bill should not proceed in its present form until provision is made for the Promoter to have proved that all outstanding matters of concern and the environmental impact on the Properties and the Chipping Warden area more generally that are set out above have been address and resolved to the satisfaction of your Petitioners.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that the Bill fails adequately to safeguard and protect the interests of your Petitioners and that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, and unless all of the issues set out herein are fully addressed, the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

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..

David Keith Haines
Solicitor of the Senior Courts of England and Wales
Charles Russell Speechlys LLP
Agent for the Petitioners
15 April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF ST PANCRAS PARISH CHURCH EUSTON PCC

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are

Your Petitioners are St Pancras Parish Church Parochial Church Council in the London Borough of Camden, in Euston Road NW1 2BA. The church has existed on this site since 1822, and is the parish church of the Ancient Parish of St Pancras.

The parish stretches up either side of Euston station in the north to Cardington Street, Doric Way and Phoenix Way, down to Torrington and Tavistock Places in the south, Judd and Ossulston Streets in the east and Tottenham Court and Hampstead Roads in the West.

The north of the parish has high indices of deprivation, with moderate deprivation and a high student population further south. This petition expresses concerns from the PCC for our parishioners, and also heritage issues.

St Pancras church is a grade 1 listed neoclassical Georgian building of immense value to the history of London.

In St James Gardens, in the parish, in which there are still at least 35,000 people buried who will need reburial for which there needs to be discussion with the Diocese, and a number of listed monuments.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns are

I. Your petitioners concerns were not addressed in the cut and paste generic response document, nor in the House of Commons Select Committee. Neither do the assurances given to Camden Council reassure us as they do not go far enough, merely potentially improving the processes for whatever mitigations your petitioners may receive. Nor are there any clear plans for their implementation, enforcement nor outcome.
II. Your petitioner’s first issue is the continued and increased impact on St James Gardens, where the Vicar of St Pancras Euston Road has responsibility for the cure of souls for the thousands of people buried there according to the rites of the Church of England.

III. The Lancing Street playground, next to your Petitioner’s church hall, is taken as a construction compound by HS2, to the detriment of parishioners, particularly children. The reduction of amenity in loss both temporary and permanent of green spaces and trees is not acceptable.

IV. There is a six year increase in the duration of construction for the west part of the proposed Euston station and approaches to 2033 which increases the impact of the construction of HS2 on the lives of parishioners. The health impacts will be of long duration and have consequences for life expectancy.

V. There is no clear overall plan for the development of Euston station and approaches, and the subsequent over site development. There are massive cost increases, and the economic case is not proven.

VI. There is no coherent account taken of the combined impact over many years of the significant residual effects, meaning that habitability criteria over issues of noise, pollution, vibration and all the issues to do with construction have not been reasonably assessed, nor has compensation been provided and detailed.

VII. Construction traffic of heavy good vehicles on residential streets will increase by over 20% to remove the additional spoil created by the construction of a larger station basement and the retention of line X.

VIII. The construction of a higher, wider and longer Hampstead Road Bridge will create severance in the parish as well as increasing night work.

IX. Convenient and easy access to open space, play and sports facilities is essential to the physical and emotional health and well-being of communities. Access to the natural environment is known to reduce stress and anxiety, and activities arising from these amenities contribute to reducing problems with obesity. Plans by HS2 Ltd will rob our area of much of this vital public amenity. We do not consider the replacement proposals to be adequate in terms of accessibility, quality or quantity.

X. Mature trees are the vital lungs of our city as detailed in the “Urban Forest” report to the House of Lords on 2nd December 2015. Mature trees fulfill a significant role in reducing air pollution and in addition provide a range of benefits to the health and well-being of our communities. These include their role in temperature modification, reducing the risk of flooding and waterlogged ground, provision of shade and a natural habitat for a range of species.
XI. Trees are also appreciated for their aesthetic beauty and the screening and softening of a harsh urban cityscape. HS2 Ltd’s plans include the wholesale removal of much of these valuable and valued assets which play such an important role in the physical, emotional and positive environmental impacts on our communities. Current replacement plans are wholly inadequate in terms of number, size and maturity.

XII. The promoter’s environmental statement assessments and documents generally are full of mistakes and omissions and have taken no account of our carefully thought through responses.

XIII. Therefore your Petitioners ask for the following changes and mitigations and if these are not possible, then they ask that Old Oak Common is made the London terminus, at least until there is a coherent plan for the development of Euston Station.

XIV. Many of the detailed points made in the Camden Cutting Petition concerning noise are supported by your Petitioners, therefore we have not repeated them all in this petition, relying on the thorough work of our neighbours.

XV. Detailed planning for Euston station and approaches including genuine consideration of the same footprint plans such as Euston Express, High Speed UK and Double Deck Down must be undertaken, and needs to be co-ordinated with a national railway network strategy as well as Crossrail Two and the London Underground. Your petitioners urge you to use Old Oak Common (to the west of Euston) as a temporary terminus at least to give time to develop a clear plan for the development of Euston station and approaches.

XVI. Spoil should be taken out by rail, not by hundreds of HGV lorries on residential streets. Deliveries should also be by rail, with penalties for transgressions.

XVII. An architecturally pleasing bridge must be designed for the Hampstead Road replacement, if the case for greater height and size is made.

XVIII. There must be urgent discussions now for adequate provision of green and open spaces and playgrounds, both during construction, and after completion. These must be agreed in advance and be at least equivalent to the present areas and numbers of mature trees

XIX. Information reasonably required by your petitioners must be provided in time by HS2 Ltd, the promoter, for our presentations to select committee.
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.

Name: Dorothea Hackman
Churchwarden

Name: Revd Anne Stevens
Vicar

Name: Gaynor Paul Clark
Churchwarden
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF JONATHAN ZOKAY

Declares that:

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

2. I am your Petitioner, Jonathan Zokay of 6 Borrowdale, Robert Street, London, NW1 3QG. Your Petitioner has lived there for 8 years and 6 months. Your petitioner has lived in the area all his life. Your Petitioner is a 66 year old owner / occupier and is recovering from prostate cancer. Your Petitioner's property will not be demolished as a result of the bill but the construction traffic is 8 feet from Your Petitioner's doorstep which leads onto Robert Street and the property is 20 feet from Stanhope Street. Your Petitioner is going to experience 24 hour noise, dust, pollution and vibration due to where his flat block is situated.

3. The Bill includes power for the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker to do construction works which are estimated to take 15 years to complete and will include lorry movements 24 hours a day. In the last year your petitioner has needed emergency services for inflamed joints and an achilles rupture. Your Petitioner fears that emergency services will not have access to his home. The HS2 project may trigger a relapse in your Petitioner's condition as a result.

4. In mid February Camden Council began the building of a 5 story block of 90 replacement homes on Robert Street in the Regent's Park Estate, 10 meters from my bedroom window. This new block, Camden Council claimed, was for those residents due to lose their homes to HS2 yet only 11 are to be social housing! This new block remains on the planned route of HS2 with all its noise, vibration, lorry movements and air pollution. The new block deprives me of natural daylight and the quiet enjoyment of my home.

5. No baseline measurements for noise, vibration, or air quality were made before construction began. We requested double glazing and air purification units before work started but none was forthcoming. As I write, I am listening to a pile driver, just outside my bedroom window. Pneumatic drills start at 8 am every day. I asked to be assessed for air quality before the work began so that a comparative study could be made. I request that air monitoring equipment be placed on this site now as this project is estimated to continue until the spring of 2018.

6. I would therefore like a legal undertaking, that HS2 Ltd. buy my property in a like for like compensation scheme, allowing me to continue to live in a central London location. France and Germany have offered full compensation for blight on similar projects.
7. Your Petitioner objects to the HS2 scheme in its current form. Your Petitioner submits a plea to the House of Lords to pause HS2 to reappraise a proposal that falls short of public support. Should HS2 be allowed to continue in its current form capacity at Euston Station will be 30% less over a period of at least 10 years of construction work by which time technology will have moved on. Euston Station, when rebuilt, should remain within its original footprint.

There has been a total lack of scrutiny, of alternative routes and station design. Your Petitioner believes there is no independent, integrated transport network in this plan, that HSUK has better connectivity throughout Britain and is far more economically viable. An integrated design for Euston Station, such as double deck down would allow it to remain within its existing footprint and would preserve thousands of homes and businesses to the west of Euston Station.

8. Old Oak Common has been proposed as a temporary terminus until an integrated plan for the redevelopment of Euston Station is in place. This would allow passengers in either direction to transfer onto the Heathrow line and relieve congestion into London. Network Rail and Cross Rail 2 could be integrated with the Heathrow Line at Old Oak Common and continue to King's Cross. The petitioning to the House of Lords reveals how incomplete the current proposal is and how it does not represent integrated transport planning for the capital city's needs. Britain is a small island and cannot be compared with countries like France and China whose infrastructure needs are different from those of Britain.

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,

Jonathan Zokay
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF REGENTS PARK ESTATE RESIDENTS

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are the residents of the Regents Park Estate area and supporters from the Camden Civic Society.
   2.1 In the 2011 census there were 2,709 households and 7,228 usual residents on the estate, which is bounded by the Euston Road in the south, Hampstead Road in the East, Albany Street in the west, and the Peabody estate (previously Crown estate) and Regents Park Barracks to the north, leading up to the listed buildings in Park Village East and then to Parkway.
   2.2 The Estate was built mainly after the second world war, and is a pleasing balance of high rise blocks, lower build, and surviving Georgian and Victorian houses interspersed with green spaces, mature trees outlining the historic streets and squares, allotments and playgrounds. On the estate are also two primary schools (Netley and Christchurch), one further education college centre (Westminster Kingsway), a youth club (Samuel Lithgow) and tenant halls (Dick Collins, Silverdale) and community facilities (H-pod), several active churches (Mary Magdalen and the Antiochian church) and parades of shops.
   2.3 The Estate is an area of high deprivation primarily due to overcrowding in the social housing, and the community merits particular support. The original white British community, many of whom are now elderly, have been joined over the decades by waves of immigrants and refugees from Bangladesh, Somalia and the former Yugoslavia. Many former council tenants have exercised their right to buy resulting in a higher number of leaseholders, some of whom have sub-let, particularly to groups of students or sold on, often to young professionals, but the estate still has a majority of council tenants.
   2.4 The group on the Estate submitting this petition came together at meetings in 2015 convened by the Camden Civic Society and Netley Primary School Governing Body, and submitted an HS2 petition to the House of Commons as well as an unsuccessful deputation to Camden Council Development control Committee against HS2 replacement housing being built on public green spaces on the Estate. The group is
now over 500 strong and is submitting this petition to the House of Lords again under the auspices of the Camden Civic Society, which they have joined.

2.5 The Regents Park Estate residents do not feel in need so-called regeneration (developers profit) demolition of homes or further homes crowded into the estate reducing the green spaces. It is a wonderful community, currently vulnerable and needing the protection of Parliament because of the serious threat from decades of grievous disruption by the construction of High Speed 2.

3. Your petitioners’ concerns are

3.1 That the assurances given to Camden Council do not alter the issues your petitioners have with the HS2 proposals. Improving the processes for implementing the mitigations already on offer does not address the fact that the mitigations leave your petitioners to suffer twenty years of remaining severe adverse impacts in-combination. Nor has this been addressed by the House of Commons Select Committee.

A. Spoil removed by rail not lorries

3.2 There is apparently a working party but nothing, not even in draft has been communicated to community groups. Spoil should be taken out by rail, not by hundreds of HGV lorries on residential streets. Deliveries should also be by rail, with penalties for transgressions. An architecturally pleasing bridge must be designed for the Hampstead Road replacement, if the case for greater height and size is made.

3.3 There will be over 20% more excavated spoil to remove due to the proposals in the AP3 amendments for increased station basement and the reinstatement of line X. So an additional 1 million tonnes in addition to the 2.5 million tonnes previously estimated will need to be shipped out. This will mean over 20% more heavy good vehicles on your petitioners’ residential streets, rising to as many as 800 journeys a day during some years, with all the traffic disruption and pollution that will entail.

3.4 Having the HGVs comply with European emission legislation only reduces the amount by which pollution will INCREASE and is not enough to mitigate the impact on your petitioners’ estate. The proposals to use the Zoo carpark will impact on the few remaining hedgehogs, as well as visits by schoolchildren coming by coach; and will mean the HGVs travel through your Petitioners’ residential estate every day for decades to reach their main compound. This is both dangerous in terms of accidents to pedestrians and cyclists, and injurious to your petitioners’ health, development and life expectancy in terms of pollution. It is further proposed to take away our parking which will impact on disabled people, deliveries and visits by tradespeople.
3.5 There will be impact on emergency services not being able to reach your petitioners through the congestion, and the danger of death directly resulting to your Petitioners.

3.6 There have not yet been communicated any new proposals for the Hampstead Road Bridge from HS2 Ltd. The proposals in AP3 for the bridge were much worse: it is now to be 4.6 metres higher than previously with the road correspondingly higher, and even larger and uglier. Insultingly your petitioners are told this is in response to the community not liking the previous proposals – which is no excuse for making them worse.

3.7 The bridge is currently slabs on trestles, it was to have been trusses, but now will be a deck and beam construction with a 220 metre span. However, the changes are clearly to do with accessing the expanded basement on the west side of Euston station.

3.8 The bridge should instead be in keeping with the local context, and not outrage the streetscape, creating severance and disruption for your Petitioners. There will be increased night works, with demolition and pile driving which will increase the distress of your Petitioners. Further works will take place on the Estate, including the barrette walls from Granby Terrace all the way south to the station.

3.9 The duration of construction for the west part of the proposed Euston station and approaches was increased by AP3 by six years to 2033. This means that for the first eighteen years of a child’s life, if they are born at the start of the project, they will know nothing but pollution and dust and construction traffic and disruption, with previous playgrounds commandeered as construction compounds and not returned. A retired person will live out their final years in misery instead of the quiet enjoyment they had anticipated. The health impacts will be of long duration and have consequences for life expectancy.

B. Fair urban compensation and independent adjudicator
   We support the proposals in the Camden Cutting Petition.

C. Mitigation for 20 years construction, agreed and adequately monitored
   We support the proposals in the Camden Cutting Petition.

D. Minimal disruption & duration of every aspect of HS2 construction
   3.9 The duration of construction for the west part of the proposed Euston station and approaches was increased by AP3 by six years to 2033. This means that for the first eighteen years of a child’s life, if they are born at the start of the project, they will know nothing but pollution and dust and construction traffic and disruption, with previous playgrounds commandeered as construction compounds and not returned. A retired person will live out their final years in misery instead of the quiet enjoyment they had anticipated. The health impacts will be of long duration and have consequences for life expectancy.

E. Enforcement and fines for breaches of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)

F. Local Environment Management Plan (LEMP) actively enforced by officers on the ground
G. No demolition until we have the agreed integrated plan for Euston station

H. An integrated plan for HS2, classic Euston, Crossrail 2 and local transport

3.10 Work on this whole massive infrastructure project should not begin until a coherent and integrated plan is developed for Euston station and approaches. It cannot be designed in bits and hope they will fit together, this will not result in a world-class station. Euston station could be rebuilt in the same footprint – see proposals for Euston Express, High Speed UK and Double Deck Down, and also needs to be co-ordinated with a national railway network strategy as well as Crossrail Two and the London Underground and local transport. Your petitioners urge you to use Old Oak Common (to the west of Euston) as a temporary terminus at least to give time to develop a clear plan for the development of Euston station and approaches.

I. No temporary or permanent loss of public green/open spaces and trees

3.11 There must be urgent discussions now for adequate provision of green and open spaces and playgrounds, both during construction, and after completion. These must be agreed in advance and be at least equivalent to the present areas and shapes and numbers of mature trees which will need replacing at a ratio of 60 for one if their current air pollution reduction function is to be maintained. The current proposals entail a net loss of green space west of the station, with many household left with no public open green space near enough.

3.12 Loss of open spaces will be for two decades now, and more space will be permanently lost. Green lungs are essential to the health of your petitioners. And it is not acceptable to reduce this amenity. The felling of mature trees in the area must be avoided at all costs. Losing trees would not only impact on the streetscape, but also impact negatively on the health of your Petitioners.

3.13 It is to be avoided not only in the green spaces on the Estate, but also along the streets where the trees are to be felled to facilitate utility works. In the connection of replacement green spaces, and green spaces being restored to the community, it is to be noted that your Petitioners do not want the Euston Arch put back, as it would take far too much precious green space. It would have no architectural merit as it would be reconstructed and fake, and would compensate your Petitioners for nothing.

J. No worsening of air quality from HS2 pollution – monitor and improve current levels now

3.14 We ask that resident groups be accorded a formal interface with
HS2 Ltd in addition to Camden Council’s over the location of air quality (AQ) monitoring stations which should include residential locations where there is both a predicted significant residual impact on AQ and other locations where there is not - to address the possibility that the AQ modeling undertaken is not accurate.

3.15 Also, an obligation for the AQ monitoring output data to be accessible to the public in real time. Further, given any serious exceedances, empowerment for demolition or construction work to be stopped until acceptable remedial measures have been put in place.

K. Independent costings & technical assessment of HS2 & alternative railway schemes

L. Old Oak Common costings to be calculated as per Lords Economic Committee request

3.16 Your petitioners understand that an important reason for the extended timetable for the reconstruction of Euston is the need to avoid disruption to railway services. If this is so, then the diversion of services away from Euston, whether on a temporary or permanent basis, is key to reducing the term of the disruption to Camden.

3.17 In the absence of existing stations that could handle diverted services comfortably, Old Oak Common must play an important rôle as a temporary terminus and proper consideration must be given to extending Crossrail One to Watford Junction and Tring. Many middle and longer distance services into Euston could then be withdrawn as they will have been replaced by Crossrail trains which industry studies have indicated would be more convenient to the great majority of passengers and provide substantially greater commuter capacity compared with the gains that HS2 is claiming as a side-effect of its own scheme. Your petitioners note that the majority of trains planned to operate on HS2 during Phase One are in reality services that will migrate from the classic lines into Euston. Taken together these measures would greatly reduce pressure at Euston, both in respect of the demands on railway infrastructure (platforms, train paths) and on interchange facilities.

3.18 Your petitioners suggest that the promoter has ignored the implications of AP2 for capacity on Crossrail One and may not have undertaken sufficient work to support its claims that Old Oak Common as a temporary terminus would impose unacceptable time penalties on passengers during Phase One.

3.19 Your petitioners urge that an adequate investigation of the use of Old Oak Common as a temporary high speed terminus for the whole or part of the duration of Phase One of the construction of HS2 be carried out and the findings made public."
M. Timely information from HS2 enabling genuine engagement – HS2 has continued to fail to engage.

3.20 There is apparently a working party but nothing, not even in draft has been communicated to community groups. Information reasonably required by your petitioners must be provided in time for presentations to select committee.

3.21 The environmental statements are flawed with many inaccuracies of detail and methodology and omissions of information and assessments. There is insufficient accurate information to inform your petitioners’ petition. Neither have your petitioners received responses from HS2 to our reasonable questions at the so-called community engagement meetings. In particular, the residual significant impacts are considered in isolation rather than in combination over many years.

3.22 Long periods of time are described as temporary, and they are laid end to end creating decades of construction work. There need to be clear criteria for habitability and arrangements for compensation. Carrying out a project of this size and complexity in a densely populated area requires exceptional planning, and there is little evidence of the people who live here being taken into account. Your Petitioners feel ignored, with their interests subsumed to those of developers and commuters, and ask the Select Committee to take them into consideration. There is no gain for local people.

3.23 Therefore the residents of the Regents Park Estate ask for the following changes and mitigations. If these are not possible, then they ask that Old Oak Common is made the London terminus, at least until there is a coherent plan for the development of Euston Station. Many of the detailed points made in the Camden Cutting Petition are supported by your petitioners on the Regents Park Estate, as these relate to the immediate north of the estate and have similar impact. Therefore we have not repeated them all in this petition, relying on the thorough work of our neighbours.

N. Euston Station including HS2 and Crossrail 2 to be rebuilt in same footprint, no demolition until we have a plan

3.24 There is still no clear plan for the development of Euston station and approaches, integration with Crossrail 2 and the subsequent over site development, though a board with no community representation has been set up to look at this. It is the station that needs rebuilding, all the impact on the estate looks to your Petitioners like a developers land-grab to make profit. Therefore there will be many more years of construction while the station itself is rebuilt subsequent to 2033, and made fit for purpose.

3.25 Under the additional provisions the cost of Euston station to your petitioners and all taxpayers has increased from £2 Billion to
£2.25 Billion, and that is just for additional platforms and does not include the cost of developing the existing station so your petitioners see “half a station for double the money” when compared to the original estimates for HS2, the value for money status of which is in any case called into question by the House of Lords report.

O. No additional railway scheme into Euston until local transport has capacity to cope with the additional passengers.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: DOROTHEA HACKMAN Signature.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF GOLAMEAD LIMITED

Declares that

1. The petitioner would be specifically and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is Golamead Limited, a Limited Liability Company registered in England No. 1427824 and whose Registered Office is situated at 62 Gloucester Avenue London NW1 8JD. It is the freeholder of land at 62-68 Gloucester Avenue (plots numbered 272 and 274 in London Borough of Camden).

It is the freehold owner of the subsoil of the highway fronting its properties, which is unregistered title and forms part of Plot 306 in the London Borough of Camden.

The Members of your Petitioner are the leaseholders of the 16 flats at this address and they hold the freehold as a Limited Liability Company whose principal activity is to hold the freehold and to receive ground rents from these flats on a non-profit making basis.

3 Your petitioner’s concerns

3.1 Tunnel alignment

The proposed high speed railway will pass immediately behind and under your petitioner’s property. The Bill provides (Clauses 4, 1 & 8 and Schedule 11) for the acquisition of part of the subsoil of plots 272 and 274 at a depth of 9 metres or more for the purposes of constructing a railway tunnel, and also (Clause 5 (2) and Schedule 7) for the imposition of restrictive covenants to protect the tunnel. Your petitioner awaits a response to a letter to the promoter dated 27 November 2016 regarding a
minor realignment of the “down” tunnel, that is to say, in the direction of travel away from Euston, which appears to have been examined by the promoter in connection with another matter. It could reduce the risk of settlement damage to your petitioner’s properties, other properties of similar construction in Gloucester Avenue and to the utilities. It could reduce the construction risk associated with the cross-passages (“adits”) between the running tunnels as these would be shorter. The promoter’s study indicates that a small reduction in journey time could be achieved. In the absence of a satisfactory response from the promoter, your petitioner may wish to address the special select committee of your right honourable house on the subject.

3.2 Carrying out of utilities works

The Bill provides also (Clause 9 and Schedule 12) for the Nominated Undertaker to enter upon, take and use for the purposes of the Bill the subsoil included in Plot 306. The works are understood to be in connection with utilities. Your Petitioner has sought explanations from the Promoter as to why the existing powers available to the Utility Undertakers are deemed insufficient for this purpose and has received an explanation which it regards as insufficient. Your petitioner has studied the draft Code of Construction Practice (March 2016) and is concerned that the Promoter could undertake work during antisocial hours whereas the utilities companies are subject to conditions as to hours and to some measure of local authority control.

Your petitioner points out an inconsistency since there are under Plot 304 public sewers that (subject to assessment), may require works to protect them and for which no powers are included in the Bill. Such works would therefore have to be carried out by the utilities companies and be subject to the conditions that apply to these companies.

Your petitioner is concerned to receive reports that workmen engaged in connection with the utilities works for the proposed railway have recently been active in residential streets in Camden at unsocial hours. Your petitioner asks that there should be restrictions placed on any activity in connection with utilities works so that the amenity of residents may be protected in like manner as would apply if the utilities companies were carrying out the work for their own purposes.
Your petitioner may wish to address the special select committee of your right honourable house on the subject.

3.3. Movement of spoil by rail

Your petitioner is concerned about the movement of materials and spoil by rail. Your petitioner supports the use of rail for this activity (for the greater good) even though this is likely to have detrimental effects on the amenity of residents in its properties. HS2’s document, “Transport of Excavated Material by Rail HoC 10525” proposes three sites that may be suitable in connection with the removal of spoil by rail. The Camden Carriage Stabling Depot (“the CCSD”) is one of those sites. Your petitioner’s properties are separated from the CCSD, which is behind its properties, by a small residential development of two storeys above ground level, but the upper two storeys of its properties overlook the Depot and would therefore be subject to environmental nuisance if this particular option was selected.

The London Borough of Camden received by letter of 30 November 2015 from the promoter, assurances relating to the movement of materials and spoil by rail. Your petitioner asked the Chairman of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on 15 December 2015, for guidance as to whether it would be able to petition your right honourable house about the spoil issue if the assurances did not yield a satisfactory answer to its concerns. Counsel for the Department of Transport responded (as recorded in the Minutes of Oral Evidence) as follows: “The particular reason why – a particular reason why the date that’s been set for the next plan in relation to spoil by rail – that is to say May of next year – is to allow the opportunity for people who are concerned to, if they want to, to raise (the) issue with the second house. That’s been built into the timing for that purpose”.

Your petitioner has been informed by Camden Council that the Promoter did not meet to progress these assurances until February 2016, and that the Secretary of State for Transport may not make a decision until Summer 2016. Your petitioner observes that had the matter been handled more expeditiously by the promoter, the proposals might indeed have been sufficiently developed to allow the opportunity for people to raise the matter when petitioning your right honourable house. Your petitioner therefore reserves its position on the subject of the movement of construction materials and spoil until the outcome of the process established by the Assurances is known.

3.4 Mitigation measures
Your Petitioner is concerned about the suitability and effectiveness of any mitigation measures that the promoter might offer if the CCSD is used as a railhead. Your petitioner has studied the promoter’s draft Code of Construction Practice (March 2016). Much will depend on the agreed arrangements for its operation such as hours of work, the control of nuisance such as dust and the noise of machinery including the type of railway traction employed to move the trains and on the existence of specific, monitored and enforceable undertakings as to the operation of this site.

In discussions with Camden Council your petitioner has formed the opinion that the promoter is not recognising the issues found in blocks of flats which are conversions of old buildings, and that the promoter lacks the knowledge and understanding to be able to speak with authority on mitigation in such buildings. The assessment of appropriate mitigation measures ought to be carried out on a household-by-household basis by independent assessors who are sufficiently experienced to understand buildings of this age and type and the types of mitigation solutions that will be most effective and practical in the particular circumstances. Mitigation budgets for individual properties could provide a means of building on the much more detailed knowledge that the freeholders and leaseholders have.

The buildings on the north-west side of Gloucester Avenue area are exposed to significant heat build-up on sunny days, with large areas of glazing in south-west facing facades. Occupiers of buildings currently purge heat from buildings by opening the windows at the back of the building on hot days thereby drawing in cool air from the shaded side and allowing hot air to escape. Even then on hot days some rooms can become significantly overheated and during the peak summer months it is often necessary to leave the front patio doors open at the top of the building in order to get a comfortable night’s sleep. After secondary glazing is installed, this ventilation becomes impossible. HS2 have proposed small mechanical ventilators are used to create airflow to replace this ventilation, but the units proposed will be inadequate to the task in many cases. Air conditioning will be required in some houses to maintain a habitable temperature range.

Your petitioner may wish to address the select committee of your right honourable house on the subject.

3.5. **Compensation**

Your petitioner is concerned that the proposals for compensation and for express purchase are inequitable and unjust. The personal circumstances of several of its leaseholders are
that they may not live long enough to experience the recovery of property prices that might be expected once the project is completed. Several of the lessees sublet their flats although none of them bought their flats as investments. They will suffer loss as the rents that they can expect will be reduced owing to the noise and nuisance that the promoter forecasts will be suffered in the area.

Your petitioner therefore supports the petitions of the Camden Cuttings Group and the Gloucester Avenue Association in respect of compensation.

3.  

Euston station

It is the case that many of the ill-effects that your petitioners, its residents and neighbours will suffer are a direct consequence of the promoter's failure to devise a practical plan for Euston station and its approaches that can be carried out within a reasonable timeframe. Your petitioner therefore supports the calls for a re-appraisal of the plans for Euston and the approaches.

4. 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 on behalf of
GOLAMEAD LIMITED by

Marcia Louise Barrington
Director

Richard John Percival
Secretary

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THEPETITION OF Mr P and Mrs Cahill

Declares that:

1. The petitioner are specially and directly adversely affected by The Whole Bill
2. Your petitioner

The petitioners are Mr & Mrs P Cahill of 59 The Greenway Ickenham Middx UB10 8LX
3. Your petitioner’s concerns

1. The closure of public footpaths within The Hillingdon Trail particularly U81, U47 and U45.
2. The noise from 24hrs of construction and the noise levels when Hs2 is running.
3. The permanent closure of 3 holes on Ruislip Golf Course and the use of at least 2 holes on Uxbridge golf course, meaning the only 2 courses in the area will be seriously restricted permanently.
4. The Inadequate and very complicated compensation scheme from Hs2.

Our quality of life has been seriously affected by all aspects of the Hs2 process from walking our dogs, our daily run to try and keep fit the countless sleepless nights worrying about the financial losses we have already sustained, the knowledge that we cannot sell our property for a fair price even if we wanted to. To the stress, anxiety and frustration felt by all our fellow local residents when we try and speak to Hs2 to voice our concerns.

We used our life savings to buy a property in an area that was beautiful and tranquil where our son could grow up in and we could grow old in, instead it has turned into a never ending living nightmare and nobody will give us a straight answer to anything.

Our main worry is that Hs2 and the government seem to be ploughing ahead Without all the queries such as noise, the speed of the trains, track safety, tunnel extension’s, spoil dumping, alternative walking routes, road closures etc being resolved satisfactorily first.

If the Government feels it can justify spending 60 million pounds of taxpayers money and they can guarantee that there will not be an overspend, that the trains To Birmingham will arrive 20 minutes quicker than they do now and that at the end of the day the noise levels will not be as bad as expected then all well and
good. But from past experience it would be reassuring to know that if things do not go to plan then who is going to be held accountable.

The only solution for us would be to extend the tunnel by 200 metres

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remains, etc.

Mr Paul Phillip Cahill

Mrs Carol Cahill

Dated 10-4-16.
To the House of Lords
SESSION 2015 – 16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF: THE ERNEST COOK TRUST

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

The Petitioner is the Ernest Cook Trust (hereinafter referred to as “Your Petitioner”), a land-owning educational charity, founded by the philanthropist Ernest Cook in 1952: your Petitioner owns nine estates across five counties, covering a total of more than 22,000 acres of rural England.

Your Petitioner fulfils its charitable object by making educational grants and by using the estates as an education resource. Grants currently total £1.95m per year, for the benefit of children and young people, in the fields of the arts, the environment, and literacy and numeracy. Over 30,000 children visit your Petitioner’s estates every year as part of comprehensive outdoor education programmes, the aim of which is to take the curriculum outside.

Subject to fulfilling its charitable object, your Petitioner cares for the land in its ownership to the highest standard.

Your Petitioner has a rich history of philanthropy, pre-dating its creation; its beginnings were in the sale of the Thomas Cook Travel Agency (founded by Ernest Cook’s grandfather) to Compagnie Internationale des Wagon-Lits for £3.5 million in 1928.

Ernest invested his share of the sale proceeds in a number of his interests, culminating in your Petitioner being established. Ernest Cook then devoted the rest of his life until his death in 1955 to the preservation of English country houses, the estates to which they belonged, the paintings and furniture which they contained and the well-being of the communities of which the estates were the pillar.
In doing so, Ernest was able not only to preserve the buildings and landscape of the various estates that he had purchased but the social, economic, architectural and environmental aspects of rural life. These aims fed into the management principles of your Petitioner in 1952; they remain today.

Indeed, since Ernest’s death, the number of estates held by your Petitioner has increased; the estates now held and managed, using the best of both traditional and modern estate management principles, comprise the following:

a. Hartwell Estate, Buckinghamshire;
b. Boarstall Estate, Buckinghamshire;
c. Fairford Park Estate, Gloucestershire;
d. Hatherop Estate, Gloucestershire;
e. Slimbridge Estate, Gloucestershire;
f. Barnsley Village Estate, Gloucestershire;
g. Filkins Estate, Oxfordshire;
h. Little Dalby Estate, Leicestershire; and
i. Trent Estate, Dorset.

Across its portfolio, your Petitioner manages the estates taking into account the principles of sustainability in its widest sense as well as following the best practices of land management, including the protection of the landscape and heritage assets, and working closely with tenants and local communities.

Your Petitioner’s Trustees set extremely high standards of land management and the protection of the natural environment, encouraging the development of Countryside Stewardship or Higher Level Schemes across the portfolio. Further, as part of the Trustees’ role, they are particularly keen for more and more people to enjoy and learn from some of the most beautiful landscapes in the country. To further this aim, since 1974, your Petitioner has focussed heavily on opening up parts of the estates to the public with the development of selected permissive footpaths as well as affording opportunities to the public for walking, fishing, allotment gardening and rural holidaying.

Your Petitioner is committed to encouraging family succession on the estate farms. As a direct result of this commitment, a large number of estate properties have been renovated and improved, using traditional materials while embracing energy-saving technology where appropriate and possible.
Investing heavily in its housing stock to the highest standards, whilst retaining the best traditions of rural architecture, has generated a vital income stream for your Petitioner. In managing this housing stock, your Petitioner actively encourages lettings to local people whilst turning down applications for second home use. It is also one of the first major landowners in the country to see the potential of turning redundant farm buildings into small rural business premises and workshops. This has been so successful that now all of your Petitioner’s estates host a range of enterprises in converted buildings (such as, for example, the scaffolding business run from the Hartwell estate).

Against this backdrop, the proposed construction and running of HS2 through the middle of your Petitioner’s Hartwell Estate (which was one of the original estates purchased by Ernest Cook and is of particular historic and environmental significance) is particularly damaging both from an environmental (including heritage) perspective and an economic one.

The Hartwell estate is situated on the western edge of Aylesbury in Buckinghamshire; it principally comprises the following:

a. Hartwell House, a Grade I Listed building of internationally historic importance (it having been the onetime residence of the exiled future King of France, Louis XVIII), together with its Grade II* Listed registered parkland (laid out by Richard Woods) (hereinafter referred to as “Hartwell House”);

b. Aylesbury Park Golf Club (comprising 18 hole and 9 hole courses) providing an important local community amenity (hereinafter referred to as “the Golf Club”);

c. 10.5 hectares of sports pitches, let at a peppercorn rent to Aylesbury Vale District Council, for local amenity use;

d. 2 let mixed farms - Lower Hartwell Farm (a mixed business of 273 hectares) and Calley Farm (a dairy and arable business of 125 hectares);

e. A commercial scaffolding business;

f. 20 let houses and cottages; and

g. 24 hectares of woodland.

The above properties, including all land annexed thereto and owned by your Petitioner are hereinafter referred to collectively as (“the Properties”).

As is made clear in this Petition, the impact of HS2 on the entirety of the Hartwell Estate is significant, hence the need for your Petitioner to prepare and provide this Petition.
As is made clear by the foregoing, your Petitioner owns or has an interest in properties and/or associated businesses within the Hartwell area, some of which or part of which are subject to compulsory acquisition under the Bill (whether permanent or temporary) and some of which, whilst not subject to the compulsory purchase proposals of the Bill, are in the immediate vicinity of the proposed works including the construction of the proposed railway, spoil storage sites and spoil removal routes, and future remediation works and they and their employees' and contractors' health, safety and wellbeing and their employment, businesses, charitable endeavours and livelihoods are liable to be injuriously affected by them.

It is respectfully submitted that the rights, interests and property of your Petitioner, and those of its employees and contractors, are injuriously and specially and directly affected by the Bill if it is passed into law in its present form. Accordingly, your Petitioner objects for the reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner's Concerns

Your Petitioner had thought that an agreement had been negotiated with HS2 Ltd covering these various issues (which generate savings in the cost of the railway amounting to many millions of pounds), as reported by Mr T Mould QC to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on 18 November 2015. However, that agreement has not been finalised which has led your Petitioner to submit this further Petition to the House of Lords.

Your Petitioner has many substantial concerns respecting the provisions of the Bill as affecting the Hartwell area, the Properties and the charitable purpose, business and livelihoods of your Petitioner, its employees and contractors, and the heritage assets, parkland and various interests and businesses being operated from the Properties.

Save for concerns of more general application as contained within this Petition, your Petitioner’s principal concerns as regards the current proposals for the HS2 rail link are:

a. The impact that the current proposals will have on the setting of the Grade I Listed Hartwell House and its associated Grade II Parkland (albeit that some of the concerns in this regard have been addressed pursuant to an agreement dated 25 November 2015 and entered into between (1) The Secretary of State for Transport; (2) The National Trust for Place of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty; and (3) The Ernest Cook Trust ("the Hartwell Agreement")
b. The impact that the current proposals will have on Lower Hartwell Farm and Calley Farm - which in the case of the latter will result in the inevitable closure of the Farm;

c. The complete loss of the amenity land which is currently a community asset to Aylesbury Vale District Council and let by your Petitioner on a non-commercial rent basis (part of which has been addressed by the Hartwell Agreement in principle subject to further engagement and consultation);

d. The loss of the Golf Club which stands to be lost forever as a result of the proposals as they currently stand (43 hectares out of a total of 69 hectares will be lost to the scheme);

e. A fundamental impact on what was identified in the Environmental Statement as being a habitat of principal importance and a local BAP habitat (paragraph 7.3.11 on page 114 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement Community Forum Area report, covering CFA 11 (Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury);

f. As was made clear in both the Environmental Statement and other associated documents (including, for example, Buckinghamshire County Council’s submissions to the Transport Committee), your Petitioner is worried that there may be a fundamental impact on various protected animal species (such as a number of colonies of Bechstein’s Bats for example – a species protected by the EU Habitats Directive), particularly given the failure by the Promoter to ensure that an effective impact avoidance strategy is implemented;

g. The loss to your Petitioner of the ability to bring forward its development plans for part of the Properties in line with the planned expansion of Aylesbury (which was intended to account for some 145 Hectares of the Properties) and, more generally, the loss of lands in their current configuration used to take forward your Petitioner’s charitable object; and

h. The fact that, now that the Hartwell Agreement has been entered into, a substantial element of the impacts as regards the areas of the Properties not addressed by that Agreement could be avoided by altering the proposals so that a steeper gradient of the railway cutting embankments is achieved and so that the proposed environmental mitigation is re-allocated so as to be confined within one area of the Properties (identified as being the Aylesbury Mitigation Area in the Hartwell Agreement).

To the extent that these concerns are not full addressed, in detail, in this Petition, your Petitioner reserves its right (and intends) to adduce further evidence before the Select Committee that addresses such concerns fully.
Your Petitioner estimates on information provided by the Promoter that the
construction traffic generated from the construction, spoil removal and associated
works will impact upon the Properties for a period of more than 8 years (and as
regards some of the businesses in particular will result in total destruction
permanently). Heavy construction traffic will pass along rural roads creating
unprecedented noise, dust, pollution, vibration and safety hazards in the area. It is
anticipated that many hundreds of thousands of lorry movements will be required.

Your Petitioner submits that the scale of the excavation and construction is
unprecedented for an area such as Hartwell, being in a rural setting in the UK
greenbelt steeped in history and of significant heritage importance. Your Petitioner is
greatly concerned by the overall impact which the construction of HS2 as proposed
will have upon the neighbourhood, people, the environment (including the historic and
heritage significance of the Estate) and amenity of the Hartwell area and upon the
fabric, general amenity and value of the Properties, and upon the ongoing viability of
the charity operated by your Petitioner at Hartwell as well as all of the other interests
highlighted in this Petition. Your Petitioner contends that these works are
unacceptable in this area and should not be permitted. In the alternative, and without
prejudice to the previous, the works should be designed, operated and controlled with
nothing less than the highest standards of design, construction practice and
mitigation. It remains unclear to your Petitioner that such standards will be adopted
or, if adopted, will be carried through and enforced in the implementation of the
proposed scheme.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the powers proposed in the Bill as affecting the
Hartwell area and the Properties therein are either unjustified and/or unclear. Your
Petitioner is also concerned that no adequate provision has been made to
compensate the property owners, traders and businesses of the area according to the
actual loss they would suffer. Furthermore, no adequate provision has been made to
secure that damage and disruption are kept to a minimum or to secure that in other
respects their interests are reasonably safeguarded. No mention has been made of
penalties for the Promoters or losses to your Petitioner should any breaches of
agreement or policy occur so as to result in injurious affection or harm to buildings, to
owners, lessees or to occupiers.

In the ordinary course, your Petitioner understands that a project of this sort would
now be subject to much more detailed design work than it appears has been
undertaken. Significant detail is missing – as such the current scheme and its impact
has not been properly analysed and the most appropriate methodology, worksites
and route alignment have not been chosen taking all criteria including risk
assessment, noise, pollution, vibration, environmental harm, traffic levels, health and safety into account. In consequence, the impacts upon the Hartwell area and the Properties and your Petitioner's charity and interests more generally are still ill-defined and your Petitioner is handicapped in its ability to engage with the Promoters in a positive fashion to safeguard both the interests of the area, the Properties and your Petitioner's charity and other interests.

Your Petitioner has responded to the Promoter's invitation to submit detailed comments on the Environmental Statement associated with, and deposited at the same time as, the Bill. Your Petitioner believes it is its right to expect the large quantity of information that has been omitted from the Environmental Statement. Your Petitioner is currently awaiting proofs of evidence on a number of issues. Your Petitioner respectfully reserves the right to raise again these issues at such time as your Honourable House comes to consider this Petition.

Further, your Petitioner has engaged extensively, both in tandem with and independently of the National Trust For Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty, with HS2 Limited with a view to mitigating the effect of the proposals for HS2 on the landscape, environment and businesses of Hartwell Estate. This has included frequent attendances at meetings with the relevant Community Forum, a number of bilateral meetings with representatives of HS2 Limited and very close liaison with the National Trust (which is one of your Petitioner's tenants -- of Hartwell House) and adjacent landowners.

Your Petitioner is pleased to confirm that the Hartwell Agreement has been reached by your Petitioner, the National Trust and the Secretary of State for Transport in respect of your Petitioner's land to the north of the A418. However, despite the statement read out to the House of Commons Select Committee on 18 November 2015, an agreement as to your Petitioner's remaining points of concern has not been finalised.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the powers proposed in the Bill as affecting the Properties and the Hartwell area more generally are either unjustified and/or unclear.

Your Petitioner is concerned about other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights, interests and property of your Petitioner and the charity operated by your Petitioner and the businesses and interests of your Petitioner's tenants, licensees and other occupiers for whom no adequate provision is made in the Bill.
Your Petitioner respectfully submits that it, its Trustees, employees and contractors have rights under the Aarhus Convention (which has largely been transposed into UK legislation through EC Directives and Legislation) concerning:

a. Access to environmental information;
b. Public participation in the decision making process; and
c. Access to environmental justice.

Your Petitioner respectfully submits that the Bill deprives your Petitioner of its rights under this Convention, either in whole or in part.

The HS2 base case as regards its plans in the vicinity of the Properties is that there be a cutting through the middle of the Properties with extensive associated groundworks and extensive, and unprecedented, environmental remediation works that are set to change the character and use of the Properties forever. The result of this is that extensive surface works are required to support the operations, supplying materials, removing excavated soil and storing the excavated soil. Your Petitioner submits that there will be a significant environmental impact as a consequence of these works which, inter alia, will involve significant disruption and congestion to the local rural road network.

Indeed, it was noted by your Petitioner with very considerable concern that the Environmental Statement contained, for the first time and without your Petitioner having been consulted, extensive proposals for the Properties. Those proposals include, inter alia, the creation of grassland and wetland habitats covering more than 114 hectares of the Properties as well as further land to the south owned by the Carington estate and the Pearce family.

Your Petitioner appreciates that, as a matter of common sense, the construction of the railway will result in the loss of some wetland and grassland habitat. This issue was referred to at paragraph 7.4.27 on page 128 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement Community Forum Area report, covering CFA 11 (Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury). In that section eight ecological compensation areas were listed; it is of note that none of these referred to the extensive land in the ownership of your Petitioner and that the total of the eight areas only amounts to approximately 21.8 hectares. Your Petitioner fully understands and accepts the principle of biodiversity offsetting but submits that the proposals in their current form do not follow such principles. Your Petitioner further submits that the proposals cover a far greater area than is necessary for that purpose.
Your Petitioner objects very strongly to the current plans with all the associated construction work, spoil removal and likely site regeneration works which will last many years.

Further, your Petitioner respectfully submits that, save as provided for in the Hartwell Agreement, there is fundamental uncertainty as to the proposals themselves including, but not limited to, the route of the line. As is demonstrated by the limits of deviation shown on drawing nos. C222-ATK-HY-DPL-020-208700, C222-ATK-HY-DPL-020-208900 and C222-ATK-HY-DPL-020-209100, although the intended path of HS2 is shown as the centre line cutting through the centre of the Properties, the said limits of deviation show that the actual path of the line could pass further to the North, away from Hartwell House, or, more fundamentally, could cross the Properties much closer to Hartwell House – bringing with it greater impacts still to the setting of a Grade I listed building. The actual route constructed will also impact heavily all of the other Properties.

Your Petitioner therefore respectfully submits that, given the devastation that will be caused by the current plans, the route of the line should, at the very least for those parts of the Properties not addressed by the Hartwell Agreement and save for the development land within Calley Farm, be altered so that the line follows the northern limit of deviation, does so by cutting with embankments of the steepest possible gradient where the line passes through the development land within Calley Farm and that, to the extent proved necessary by the Promoter, the environmental mitigation is relocated to the Aylesbury Mitigation Area so as to minimise, to the greatest extent possible, the impact of the line upon your Petitioner and the associated businesses and other interests referred to in this Petition.

Further, your Petitioner respectfully submits that, bearing in mind the ecological, environmental, social and historical significance of the Hartwell Estate generally, it is inconceivable that these proposals (along with the others set out within this Petition) cannot be the best and most effective way of protecting the environment and existing habitats, the Properties, the businesses operated from the Properties and the expansion of Aylesbury by continuing to allow for redevelopment at Aylesbury Vale District Council’s preferred location.

Further, there is the issue of the proposed environmental remediation and mitigation. Your Petitioner respectfully submits that, when taking your Petitioner’s proposals into account, the proposed environmental remediation and mitigation in Hartwell is aborted so that the current rural, and environmentally supportive uses are maintained without further interruption. In the alternative, and strictly without prejudice to this
position, if some level of environmental remediation and mitigation is shown by the Promoter to be necessary, your Petitioner respectfully submits that it should be kept to a minimum, located purely within the Aylesbury Mitigation Area and should be designed in partnership with your Petitioner for the benefit of the Properties, the environment and the Hartwell area more generally. In this regard, your Petition contends that the Hartwell Agreement addresses these points in part only does not allay all of your Petitioner’s concerns.

Your Petitioner therefore objects to the proposals in their current form and respectfully submits that:

a. HS2 be redesigned to pass through such of the Properties as are not addressed by the Hartwell Agreement at the northern most limit of deviation save as regards the development land within Calley Farm (which should follow the southern most limit of deviation) by way of a cutting with a bank (as regards the development land within Calley Farm) of as steep a gradient as possible and in any event no shallower than 1:5;

b. The current proposals for environmental remediation and mitigation should be wholly redesigned so that the current uses remain which are wholly consistent with being environmentally progressive in the rural setting of the Properties and, to the extent that any environmental remediation and mitigation can be proved by the Promoter to be necessary, such environmental remediation and mitigation be limited to being within the Aylesbury Mitigation Area; and

c. The approach to temporary stockpiles and construction works be reconsidered as a result of the contents of this Petition generally.

Without prejudice to your Petitioner’s contentions as set out above, your Petitioner also objects to the provisions of Clause 4 of the Bill and of Clause 8 insofar as the same would enable the Promoter to acquire rights in the subsoil and sub-surface of certain of the Properties. Your Petitioner appreciates that if there is no alternative taking all the relevant criteria into account there may be the need for the Promoter to obtain appropriate subsoil interests but is concerned that the application of the powers as proposed in relation to the Properties is excessive and unnecessary and that their application will lead to damage to the Properties and a serious detraction from the use of them by your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is concerned about the definition of “Phase One purposes” set out in Clause 62 of the Bill and, in particular, to the inclusion of the words “otherwise for the purposes of or in connection with Phase One of High Speed 2 or any high speed railway transport system of which Phase One of High Speed 2 forms or is to form
part". This could permit the Promoter to use powers for the purposes of development in addition to those needed for constructing a railway. Your Petitioner would therefore seek sufficient safeguards to protect its property and other interests.

Your Petitioner therefore submits that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless, and to the extent (if any) that proof is provided that there is no better alternative to the route alignment, method of construction and remediation and mitigation strategy taking all criteria into account and it can be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. Your Petitioner has not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting the Properties and it is not satisfied that it is necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

Accordingly, your Petitioner submits that the Promoter should demonstrate and be put to strict proof of the need for and desirability of the proposals in the Bill, as affecting the Properties and that the limits of deviation, the resulting powers for the compulsory acquisition of subsoil, the power to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the limits of deviation should be restricted in relation to your Petitioner’s property to the extent (if any) to which they can be strictly justified and so as to prevent interference with those Properties. In particular, your Petitioner contends that any interest in the Properties acquired (whether permanently or temporarily and, including but not limited to, in terms of the area over which it is to subsist, the form in which it is to take at law and any express or implied constraints which may be imposed upon the remainder of your Petitioner’s property) should be strictly limited only to that which is absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the proposed works. Once the purpose of construction is completed the property rights acquired for this purpose should be returned to the original holders.

Your Petitioner has significant concerns with regards to the noise, pollution and vibration arising from the construction works, the removal of spoil and the construction of the railway and its associated works and structures. Such activities will inevitably also include heavy lorry traffic and is a matter of significant concern to your Petitioner.

The operation of the railway will inevitably give rise to air and ground transmitted noise, pollution and vibration. There are no clear and binding limitations on such noise, pollution and vibration in either the Bill or the Environmental Statement. There is presently little monitoring of current levels of noise, vibration, pollution, dust,
airborne pollution and vehicular disturbance so as to evaluate the impact of any increase in the area. Your Petitioner submits that the Promoter should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the railway and its associated works and structures to ensure that no noise or vibration can be felt or otherwise experienced in or on the Properties and such that there are no other adverse effects. Your Petitioner submits that strict standards should be set beyond those currently envisaged by the Promoter to protect the environment and to which the Promoter must be made strictly liable to comply in writing. Appropriate measures and penalties should be in place to safeguard the interests of all those affected by noise, pollution, vibration and health and safety breaches.

Your Petitioner considers that in the circumstances a noise, pollution and vibration monitoring and mitigation system should be in place before commencement and during construction of any works in relation to HS2. Further, there should be a resultant damage mitigation and monitoring system in place, again before commencement and both during enabling works, construction of the works and operation of the trains. There must also be an evaluation of the cumulative impact of enabling works, construction and the operation of the trains following completion.

There must, in your Petitioner's submission be a threshold agreed between your Petitioner and the Promoter of the Bill. If that threshold is exceeded or any damage is caused the nominated undertaker should be obliged to cease construction or operation of the trains as the case may be until such time as remedial measures are in place, to pay appropriate financial penalties and only be permitted to resume the works once noise, pollution and vibration levels have returned to the levels to be set out under the Bill.

Your Petitioner requests that provision be made for the appointment of a suitably qualified expert or experts in noise, pollution and vibration (to include that generated both during construction and operation of the railway) caused at the Properties by the operation of the project. Such an expert or experts should be agreed upon by the parties or in default of agreement should be appointed by the president of the appropriate body on the application of either party to report upon noise, pollution and vibration effects in the Properties and the surrounding rural area. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that the terms of the appointment should be agreed by the Petitioner, and the report should be addressed jointly to the parties whilst his/her fees should be borne by the Promoter. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made for reports to be supplied immediately to the parties. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that all costs, expenses and VAT thus incurred should be borne by the Promoter. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that the noise impact, pollution impact and vibration impact (during both enabling
works, construction and operational phases) should be monitored by the relevant experts appointed pursuant to such agreement at the cost of the Promoter for the period of the construction works and at regular intervals after commencement of the running of the trains.

Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that all insulation and other remedial measures for all parties and/or properties affected by the works as determined necessary by the expert appointed above be put in place at the cost of the Promoter before the commencement of enabling works and construction works in the vicinity of the Properties if there is any noise, pollution or vibration impact to the Properties or any part of them from the enabling works, construction of the works or the operation or maintenance of the trains and any tunnels at any time. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that all statutory consents are to be obtained by the Promoter at its cost. Your Petitioner requests that all such remedial measures and method statements are agreed in writing with them in advance.

Without prejudice to the foregoing, your Petitioner requests that provision be made that if, notwithstanding the reports of the experts any noise, pollution or vibration impact or any other health and safety impact is felt by persons or in any of the Properties or any part of them or if any damage is caused from any vibration from the project at any time (including the operation of the trains at any time) all insulation and remedial measures are to be installed by the Promoter to your Petitioner's satisfaction immediately upon request by your Petitioner and at the Promoter's cost. Your Petitioner requests that all such remedial measures and method statement are agreed with it in writing in advance.

Having regard to the historic nature of the Properties and the surrounding nature, the Nominated Undertaker should be required to provide adequate opportunity and funding for archaeological investigation in respect of the work sites along the proposed route. In your Petitioner's submission the Nominated Undertaker should be required to agree a programme of such work with the relevant local authority and English Heritage, in consultation with the National Trust and, as far as such investigations affect land owned by, or are otherwise under the control of, your Petitioner, your Petitioner. The funding of this should be borne by the Nominated Undertaker and/or the Promoter.

Having regard to the rural nature of the Hartwell area, the Properties and the businesses and other interests being carried out at the Properties, your Petitioner is also concerned that hours of working should be strictly limited. Your Petitioner believes that the Promoter's proposals for limiting work hours are not satisfactory and
seeks the imposition of more appropriate working hours. Enabling works and construction of the works during the hours currently proposed would cause considerable disruption to the occupiers of the Properties and the businesses carried out therein and your Petitioner.

The proposed works will impact significantly upon the use and enjoyment of the Properties, as well as on the businesses operated therein. Significant use of unsuitable highways by large multi-wheel vehicles both delivering equipment and supplies to the site and dealing with spoil as a result of the works is anticipated. The disruptive effect of such vehicle movements will be compounded by the permanent and temporary stopping up of nearby roads. The use and routing of heavy lorries through the vicinity of the Properties is a matter of substantial concern to your Petitioner and, in its view, must be strictly controlled.

Your Petitioner is concerned about pollution, dust and dirt produced during the construction of the proposed works. Further, your Petitioner requests that special provision be made to take account of the particular sensitivity of the Properties, the charity operated by your Petitioner, the use to which the Properties are put and the rural setting. Your Petitioner would wish to see binding limits of pollution and airborne dust particulates imposed on the Promoter and the Promoter should monitor pollution levels and dust emissions, at their own cost both before and after enabling works and construction of the works at suitably agreed points at the Properties and in the immediate vicinity. Strict adherence to maximum pollution and particulate levels should be required and where maximum pollution and airborne particulate levels are exceeded the Promoter should be required to cease work and mitigate the excess levels. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made to ensure that the Promoter takes responsibility for the reimbursement of your Petitioner for additional expense caused by dust and dirt such as, for example only, more frequent cleaning of the buildings situated on the Properties and any further steps that the Petitioner needs to take to protect the Properties as a whole. Your Petitioner requests the adoption of best practice in dust suppression at all times.

Your Petitioner is concerned to ensure that disruption to access to the Properties, both vehicular and pedestrian, caused by the construction of HS2 is kept to an absolute minimum during the construction period. Your Petitioner requests that good and open access to the Properties be maintained in all cases, that vehicular access be maintained and that compensation be awarded for any costs incurred through inability to access, service or park at the Properties due to the works.
Your Petitioner further submits that the nominated undertaker should be required under the Bill to provide detailed plans, method statements and other particulars of works including schedules of deliveries occurring in and around the Properties substantially in advance of the commencement of enabling works and all construction operations.

Your Petitioner wishes to be satisfied that there will be no disruption to statutory services provided to the Properties as a result of the construction of the proposed works.

The provisions contained within the Bill for compensation for compulsory purchase of property or of subsoil or new other rights (in all cases whether on a permanent or temporary basis) will not enable your Petitioner or other landowners and other relevant affected parties to recover the full loss and expense which they will incur in consequence of the exercise of such powers. Your Petitioner therefore submits that the Bill should be amended to rectify this.

Your Petitioner also objects that the compensation provisions of the Bill are inadequate to compensate your Petitioner or its Trustees or others in circumstances where no land (or interests in land) is acquired by the Promoter under the Bill, but where the value of such land and the properties erected on it is reduced or where such land and the properties erected on it and/or the business interests operated from it is otherwise adversely or injuriously affected by the construction or use of the proposed works (including but not limited to the impact on your Petitioner and the Golf Club as a consequence of the adverse public relations generated by HS2's breach of confidentiality and/or statements at public meetings). Your Petitioner therefore submits that the Bill should be amended to provide for claims for adequate compensation in respect of damage arising to their property by the execution of the works, or for injurious affection thereof by the execution or working of these works, or for the damage caused to the Golf Club and your Petitioner arising from HS2's breach of confidentiality and/or statements made at public meetings, separately from any claim for compensation in respect of acquisition of any land (or interest therein) from your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner further submits that the compensation provisions proposed in the Bill are inadequate to compensate your Petitioner for the loss, damage and inconvenience attributable to blight to the Properties, which they have already suffered or may now suffer as a result of the prospective construction and subsequent use of the proposed works. Without prejudice to the generality of that statement, your Petitioner fears, for example, that prospective lessees of properties...
will feel that the proposals may so blight some or all of the Properties that they would not be interested in acquiring any part or parts of the Properties, or that prospective or existing lessees will demand a considerably reduced rent, due to the prospect of the works. Further provisions should, it submits, be included in the Bill including provisions respecting the making and assessment of claims for compensation, in indemnifying your Petitioner for any loss it might suffer as the result of unfavourable rent reviews respecting leases insofar as the reduced rent payable (as it may differ from open market rent) is attributable to the proposed works and their effect on the Properties. Furthermore, compensation should be available for any loss (so attributable) which your Petitioner might suffer in the event of it not being able to let or re-let its properties (in whole or in part) to existing or new tenants or in the event of them only being able to do so at a reduced premium or rent. Furthermore, compensation should be made available for any and all losses sustained by your Petitioner and/or the Golf Club as a consequence of the breach of confidentiality and/or statements made by HS2 at public meetings. Furthermore, quite separately from any other element of loss, compensation should be made available to address the loss of the Golf Club including, but not limited to (i) the question of the rent liability owed to your Petitioner; (ii) the future maintenance liability of the land upon which the Golf Club is based; (iii) the potential inability for your Petitioner and/or the Promoter to assume and reasonably deliver any of the Golf Club's obligations; (iv) the loss of capital value of the golf course itself; the potential associated adverse impact on income and capital value of nearby assets owned by your Petitioner; and (v) the additional time and professional fees required and/or incurred in addressing all of these matters.

Your Petitioner further submits that the Promoter should be required to indemnify it from all losses, claims and demands which may be made or suffered in consequence of enabling works and the construction, use or maintenance of the works or the operation of the trains and the maintenance of any tunnels at any time under the Bill, or their failure or want of repair, or in consequence of any act or omission of the Promoter, his contractors or agents in carrying out the operation of the trains and maintenance of any tunnels at any time under the Bill.

As a general matter, your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to repay to your Petitioner all proper cost, charges and expenses (including the proper fees of such professional advisers as it may instruct) reasonably incurred in consequence of the Bill or of any provision made as a result of this and your Petitioner's previous Petition.
Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to pay compensation on demand for reduction in market value of the Properties caused by any of the foregoing. Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to indemnify the Petitioner for any injury to the Petitioner, its employees, contractors, agents, invitees, tenants and licensees at the Properties. Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to indemnify your Petitioner if insurance cannot be obtained by it or only at an increased premium or subject to particular conditions/excesses. Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for interest to be payable by the Promoter on all sums due and not paid. Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for all monitoring costs of your Petitioner to be borne by the Promoter. As a general matter, your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for an overall indemnity by the Promoter to put your Petitioner in the same position as in the "no project" world. Your Petitioner submits that all undertakings and indemnities given by the Promoter should be for the benefit of your Petitioner, its successors in title and assigns and all mortgagees of the Properties.

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

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly your Petitioner respectfully submits that:

a. HS2 be redesigned to pass through such of the Properties as are not addressed by the Hartwell Agreement at the northern most limit of deviation save as regards the development land within Calley Farm (which should follow the southern most limit of deviation) by way of a cutting with a bank (as regards the development land within Calley Farm) of as steep a gradient as possible and in any event no shallower than 1:5;

b. The current proposals for environmental remediation and mitigation should be wholly redesigned so that the current uses remain which are wholly consistent with being environmentally progressive in the rural setting of the Properties and, to the extent that any environmental remediation and mitigation can be proved by the Promoter to be necessary, such environmental remediation and mitigation be limited to being within the Aylesbury Mitigation Area;

c. strictly without prejudice to the foregoing, in the event that the Promoter continues to contend for environmental remediation and mitigation not based
on the current uses and/or environmental remediation and mitigation outside of the Aylesbury Mitigation Area, the Promoter should provide satisfactory and complete evidence and justification as to why and as to the proposals that the Promoter wishes to advance;

d. the approach to temporary stockpiles and construction works be reconsidered as a result of the contents of this Petition generally;

e. the compensation and loss matters referred to above must be addressed to your Petitioner’s satisfaction; and

f. the Bill should not proceed in its present form until provision is made for the Promoter to have proved that all outstanding matters of concern and the environmental, commercial and heritage impact on the Properties and the Hartwell area more generally that are set out above have been addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of your Petitioner.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that the Bill fails adequately to safeguard and protect the interests of your Petitioner and that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, and unless all of the issues set out herein are fully addressed, the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

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..

Richard Charles Andrew Flenley
Solicitor of the Senior Courts of England and Wales
Charles Russell Speechlys LLP
Agent for the Petitioner
18 April 2016
To the House of Lords
SESSION 2015 – 16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF: THE ERNEST COOK TRUST

Richard Charles Andrew Flenley
Agent for and on behalf of the Petitioner
Charles Russell Speechlys LLP
One London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1UN

18 April 2016
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS  
SESSION 2015-6

PETITION against the  

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION of ANTHONY HALLGARTEN, THERESA HALLGARTEN AND NORTH WEST ONE MANAGEMENT LTD

Declares that the Petitioners are specially and adversely affected by the Bill.

1. The Bill designates Regent's Park Road, NW1 as a street where anticipated works will have an impact by way of traffic congestion and/or interference with pedestrian passage, said to be predominantly in Q2 2017, with alleged “moderate adverse effects” by HGV or other vehicles.

2. The First and Second Petitioners are joint secretaries of North West One Management Ltd., the Third Petitioner. North West One Management Ltd is not a business but a non-profit making company, which owns the freehold of 188/190 Regent’s Park Road, NW1, part of an early Victorian terrace. Its shares are held proportionately by the eight long leaseholders of the Flats which comprise the property. North West One Management Ltd, the said long leaseholders and the occupants of the Flats and each of them may be specially and adversely affected by the works contemplated by the Bill. The Second Petitioner is also long leaseholder of Flat 3 and independently she and the Second Petitioner own and reside in 18, Chalcot Crescent, NW1 8YD, a turning off Regent’s Park Road, and they likewise may be specially and adversely affected by such works. Paras. 12 and following below apply also to that property.

3. Both properties lie within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area, and it is currently projected that, numerous works are projected to take place within or close to the area, liable to affect such properties. Some of those works are referred to hereafter.

4. By a notice 271/007732 from Messrs Winckworth Sherwood and Eversheds sent 23 November 2013 some (but alas not all of those interested in or occupying 188/190 Regent’s Park Road) were informed that it was intended to seek authority for compulsory acquisition by way of temporary possession of land, identified by what appears to be a strip of garden, Nos. 352 and 353 on sheet No. 1-06 which accompanied the said notice. No further information was provided. In particular, nothing was said about the nature or duration of the proposed works, how access was to be gained or otherwise what disruption or inconvenience was liable to be caused. Research revealed that Sch. 15 to the Bill identified Nos. 350-360 as required for “diversion or installation of works to utilities apparatus”, but this still left very substantial questions as to the nature or duration of the planned operation.
5. More generally, sheet No 1-06 indicates a number of planned operations in or in the vicinity of 188/190 Regents Park Road, viz Nos. 391 and 392 in Regent’s Park Road itself, No. 361 (Berkley Road), No. 342 (Gloucester Avenue), No. 413 (King Henry’s Road) and No. 390 (Bridge Approach). Again, no information was provided by the said notice or otherwise as to what was intended, although your Petitioners have been led to understand that No. 361 and possibly Nos. 391-2 represent “land potentially required during reconstruction”.

6. Your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

7. The bill is unclear as to what is planned for the strip represented by Nos. 352-3 or for the other areas in the vicinity of 188/190 Regent’s Park Road and the extent to which life as a resident of it will be disrupted and for how long. This uncertainty will affect the quality of life of those residing in the eight flats as well as their value and saleability — in particular Flats 1 and 2 which include the respective gardens of Nos. 188 and 190. The very fact that the details provided on sheet No 1.06 are so unclear, with no guide as to numbered references, make it virtually impossible to determine precisely what areas are required for what purposes and for how long.

8. Focussing in the first place on Nos. 352 and 353, your Petitioners are baffled why the said notice sent 23 November 2013 could not have contained a statement along the following lines: “We are likely to need temporary possession of...... in order to conduct the following works...... Those works are likely to take...... weeks/months/years. They will inconvenience you in the following respects......”

9. Having regard to the fact that nothing was said about what is intended to be done, there were two scenarios:

   (a) The work will be carried out entirely beneath the surface, tunnelling from Gloucester Avenue and/or Berkley Road. In that event, direct disruption to Flats 1 and 2 at 188/190 Regent’s Park Road may well be limited. Foreseeable risks would be of contamination and subsidence.

   (b) The work will call for surface excavation. If so, how will access be gained? (The only access to the gardens of 188/190 Regent’s Park Road is through the common parts and then via Flats 1 or 2). How deep will the excavation reach? How much disruption will there be to the user and enjoyment of their gardens by Flats 1 and 2 and for how long? Will the changes be permanent?

10. Thus your Petitioners ask that, in order to remove the uncertainty imposed on the property and the leaseholders’ and the occupiers’ peaceful enjoyment thereof, the wording of the Bill be amended so as to identify the nature and extent of the work to be done as well as its duration.
11. Up December 2015 communication from HS2 and its representatives was appalling. Doubtless to save costs, “form” letters were sent, which were not tailored to meet specific issues. This caused a great deal of confusion and distress. Belatedly, shortly before your Petitioners were due to be heard by the House of Commons Select Committee (hereafter “HCSC”), HS2 came forward with a series of very general assurances. Those assurances are wholly unspecific. Having regard to the time that has passed, there is no good reason why HS2 could not now state what needs to be done, what properties might be directly affected and how long operations are expected to take.

12. Turning now to the wider position, that is to say to works generally as designated on Sheet No.1-06 and otherwise within North London, your Petitioners submit that serious consideration should be given to altering the route of the proposed line – either by having the line terminate at Old Oak Common or by more tunnelling. As to Old Oak Common, HCSC Report in para. 221 dismissed this largely on the basis of distance from and access to Central London. Your Petitioners consider neither reason to be significant or persuasive. As to access to Central London, it is said that undie dependence would have to be placed on a single underground service, Crossrail; but this misses the point that the underground lines presently serving Euston are already over-stretched, as is indeed the road network.

13. The current choice of route is one which has grossly weighted matters in favour of construction at the expense of those living, working or travelling in North London, and in particular Primrose Hill, supported by no plausible cost/benefit analysis. Apart from the roads that skirt Primrose Hill (Primrose Hill Road and the southern part of Regent’s Park Road), the area has no through traffic. It is aptly known as “Primrose Hill Village” and is indeed quieter than many rural villages and those who live here value it for that quality. It is a close-knit community, as evidenced by its thriving Community Centre and the fact that through residents’ own efforts, its library has been saved as a community enterprise. As set out below, all this is under threat from the widespread works planned by HS2.

14. Against that background, your Petitioners would wish to draw attention to the following overlapping facts and matters which are liable prejudicially to affect Your Petitioners and the property:

(a) Dust, noise, vibration and pollution. Unless modified, the contemplated works and associated HGV traffic will cause years of such nuisance and any 24 hour working will cause sleep deprivation. Pollution levels in the area already exceed legal limits. Road closures and the extra traffic generated by HS2’s movements of waste and materials by road will inevitable exacerbate what is already a severe problem

(b) Closure or part closure of Adelaide Road and other streets. Your Petitioners would ask that serious consideration be given to relocating the ventilation shaft from Adelaide Road, a critical east/ west route, which it is envisaged will be subject to closure. Closures plus the significant extra
HGV traffic running through existing streets, will inevitably cause congestion and an unacceptable diversion of vehicles being routed through the Primrose Hill area. At peak hours there can be a queue of traffic along Primrose Hill Road stretching from the junction with Regent’s Park Road to that with Adelaide Road. In para 226 of its Report the HCSC showed that realignment of the track to allow for relocation of the shaft to Juniper Crescent would be relatively cheap and would only have a small impact on journey times. Your Petitioners ask that this alternative be revisited.

(c) In your Petitioners’ Petition to the Select Committee of the House of Commons, it was suggested that problems might be mitigated were the current Central London congestion zone extended northwards so as to deter vehicles from entering the works zone. Significantly, HS2’s response was that this was no concern of theirs, which illustrates all too well the absence of “joined-up thinking”. But your Petitioners submit that this is and remains a significant line of mitigation and in the event of this House being otherwise adverse to your Petitioners, they would urge that measures be taken to this end: that HS2, TfL, the Mayor’s office and the Boroughs of Camden, Islington and Westminster be directed to give serious consideration to setting up an extended zone for the duration of the works.

(d) 24 hour working. Your Petitioners appreciate that on occasions this may be necessary. They would however ask that the parameters for such occasions be narrowly defined. HS2 should not have liberty routinely to engage in 24 hour working, with all the nuisance which this entails, simply to reduce costs.

(e) The huge amount of HGV traffic will inevitably lead to an increase not only in pollution but in accidents involving, in particular cyclists. HS2 appear to have given no thought to their predicament. Belatedly in December 2015 HS2 stated that they would give further consideration to movement of materials and spoil by rail rather than road, but your Petitioners have no confidence that when the plan promised for May 2016 is issued (see para 229 of the HCSC Report), significant mitigation will be offered. Understandably Network Rail and others concerned with the current rail system serving Euston are resistant to anything which might affect operation or timetabling. Your Petitioners ask that measures be taken that the burden of the works be shared equitably rather than borne by those living and working in Camden. Your petitioners therefore ask that your House requires Network Rail and rail users make sacrifices so as to maximise the amount of spoil and material being moved by rail rather than road and that it examines whatever plan is presented with a critical eye.

(f) Parking for residents and businesses. Your Petitioners are anxious lest the area returns to the chaos which obtained some 15 years ago, before it became a CPZ. At the moment parking is barely held in balance.
Deprivation of spaces – eg because of temporary acquisition of roads for depots or works – Nos. 290, 361 and 392 – would have a catastrophic effect. The position will be exacerbated further if the Zoo Car Park (see below) is appropriated as an HGV holding area: the search for parking will inevitably spill over into the Primrose Hill area.

(g) Zoo Car Park: accommodation for 80 HGVs. Your Petitioners understand that overall there might be up to 800 HGV two way movements per day involving 400 vehicles, of which 90% will be HGVs. What is and remains unclear is the number of HGVs likely to be directed daily to or from the Zoo Car Park, if it is designated a holding area. Your Petitioners believe it is likely significantly to exceed the 24 movements which is stated to be the daily limit for individual construction sites. Your Petitioners therefore ask that serious consideration be given to the use of other holding areas and that a limit be imposed on the daily number of HGV movements to or from the Zoo Car Park, if that is to remain a holding area. Your Petitioners would add their concern over the Zoo Car Park goes beyond disturbance to its population of hedgehogs (cf. para. 229 of the HCSC’s Report)

These facts and matters should, of course, be seen cumulatively – something notably absent from the approach taken in HS2’s Environmental Statement.

15. Your Petitioners therefore ask that the methodology of the proposed works be revisited, so as so far as possible to avoid the problems referred to above. They request that HS2 should be required to consider alternative schemes to achieve the object of the Bill – including tunnelling and/or the use of the existing railway line rather than HGVs for soil removal, as above.

16. In the event that the works proceed substantially in their present form, peaceful enjoyment and values of the eight flats in 188/19 Regent’s Park Road and of 18 Chalcot Crescent will be substantially impaired.

17. Your Petitioners would add that in para. 228 of its Report the HCSC referred to the Borough of Camden having agreed a “set of assurances” with HS2. Your Petitioners say that these assurances are so generalised and bland as to give no real protection at all. In any event Camden’s resources are fully stretched: Primrose Hill is a conservation area but flouting of planning laws regularly goes unpunished. Thus your Petitioners have no confidence that Camden will be able to monitor and police the agreement; or that if they are so able, they will not focus first on communities south of Primrose Hill whose plight your Petitioners recognise is even worse than their own.

18. Turning now to issues of compensation, your Petitioners say that one of the fundamental errors underlying the Bill and HS2’s Environmental Statement is the assumption that urban dwellers are much more ready to absorb problems arising from major construction works. This is patronising and, worse, discriminatory. And in its assessment of the impact of noise and vibration, HS2 have the effrontery to suggest
that this is to be ignored because allegedly in the ordinary course of events other construction work would be taking place. Your Petitioners therefore humbly submit that the House should address the issue of compensation, not least the imbalance between levels of compensation proposed for urban as opposed to rural areas.

19. Although in its Report the HCSC addressed some of the flaws in the compensation scheme currently proposed, what your Petitioners say is needed is a comprehensive scheme: one that recognises that disruption will be of an unprecedented length of time and which provides real redress for the effect of blight in a wide variety of circumstances, covering owners/leaseholders (whether resident or not) and tenants. In particular there should be no requirement to show a “need to sell”; nor should it be necessary to have a 15% or other threshold. The HCSC Report (para 237) rightly stated that “Camden is exceptional and needs special treatment”. Your Petitioners ask that there be a simple question:

“In consequence of blight, has a property been sold or rented at a figure less than would have been achieved had there been no such blight?”

If no such test is adopted, then in effect those selling (for whatever reason) or renting out property in the blighted area will be subsidising the construction of HS2. Your Petitioners ask that your House takes steps to effect amendments to the Bill so as to ensure that they and others do not suffer in this way; that their interests should not be sacrificed in order to make the construction of HS2 economically viable.

20. Your First and Second Petitioners are each pensioners. Should they wish to move from a house to a flat outside the area (there are few 2-3 bedroom flats within it), they will be selling at a blighted and buying at an unblighted value. Unless the compensation scheme meets this predictable scenario, the outcome will not be a just one.

21. Your Petitioners ask that the House require that the Bill provides for sufficient funding in respect of compensation and/or if funds are limited, that any formula for their distribution should not favour rural over urban dwellers.

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

AND your Petitioners will ever pray, &c.

ANTHONY HALLGARTEN    THERESA HALLGARTEN
As joint secretaries for North West One Management Ltd and on their own behalf

18 Chalcot Crescent, London NW1 8YD, tel 07807 079 763    April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Edward Robert Hynds

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 33, 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 500 metres from the portal cutting and 750 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 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 Outdoor 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 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 within 800 metres from the trains exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel and are the finding their house prices blighted. They are concerned that they are unable to sell in what has become a dysfunctional housing market. They feel that they are trapped for 10 or more years and find the ‘Need to Sell scheme’ (NTS) complex, slow and does not ensure 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 GM/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.

**Remedies:**
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

Edward Robert Hynds

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: Robin and Karen Hopkinson

 Declares that:

1. The petitioner* is* specially and directly adversely affected by: provisions of AP4 contained within a bill to make provision for a high speed railway [h52] 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. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLaughlin.

Clauses 1 to 65, along with accompanying schedules, authorise and detail the works to be done in relation to the construction and the operation of the railway [h52] mentioned in paragraph 1 above.

The Additional Provision October 2015 amends Clause 1 along with Schedules 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 11, 12 &15

The petitioner* is* Robin and Karen Hopkinson, freehold owners of 9, Kings Lane, South Heath HP16 0QZ. We, as a family, with children and pet dogs have lived here, since building our own dwelling, approximately 9 years ago.

We chose and moved to South Heath specifically for the quiet, rural surrounding location as a safe, secure environment in which to live and raise our children: Anna (15yrs) and Olivia (13yrs) now both attending local Grammar schools, travelling by school coaches.

Your Petitioner will be directly, specially and injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, in relation to which your Petitioner has already petitioned

This Petition against the Additional Provision is without prejudice to your Petitioner’s previous Petitions submitted against this Bill

1. Your petitioner’s concerns

We foresee that our property is to be severely blighted, being some 400m from the proposed tunnel portal at the rear of Frith Hill, and approx. 650m from a vent shaft and transformer house in Chesham Rd. Both of these new large engineering structures intended for h52 will be intrusive and completely adverse in every way to our current quality of life.
Your Petitioner is aghast at HS2's proposals to stockpile excavated materials in nearby sites - Potters Row and fields either side of the line trace. Windblown dust and mud will massively affect our lives. Your Petitioner is partially asthmatic and has to use medication to counter this. Severe noise/continual sonic disturbance created when trains rush into/ out of the tunnel portal will be inflicted upon our family, causing lack of sleep and misery for us. We cannot see how noise levels currently enjoyed can be maintained during the construction phase of 8 years, and indeed from high speed trains thereafter. We understand that peak noise disturbances at 100 second intervals are the key to sleep disturbance/deprivation at nights - this is wholly without the accompanying increase in stress levels for our "simple" human family, having to experience the severe blight and ongoing trauma that these construction/operational activities will undoubtedly cause.

As stated: We are sited approximately 400m from the Tunnel Portal works and around 650m from the Chesham Rd Vent/Transformer station works. We do not accept why we should have our ongoing lives and surroundings blighted by the operational noise being created here. Noise barriers are subjective, and with trains entering/exitng a closed tube we do not believe attenuation will be sufficient. We understand that scientific levels of peak LOAEL (60dBmax façade) and louder will be likely to occur in our area. We do not accept this imposition at all.

Prevailing winds are predominantly focused from Westerly directions here: also airborne noise is affected by barometric pressure and we do not believe this has been sufficiently addressed - these will exacerbate the increased airborne noise from HS2 works, polluting our lives and our immediate areas, already adding to severe stress we are currently suffering having to absorb HS2 proposals/amended proposals ad infinitum. AP4 does not sufficiently address our community and other concerns when compared with previous noise studies (AP2).

And as has already happened, these proposals have largely devalued our beautiful dwelling, which was a great part of our pension provision, now grossly affected.

We are indeed now trapped and devalued for now and our retirement by this governments instrument of intended high speed rail travel.

Your Petitioner will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner has requested (and continues to request) that the presently proposed fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended throughout the entirety of the AONB, in accordance with proposals such as the Tunnel Bored One Way from the South and CRAG's proposed T3i. This will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner, and will reduce the impact on the AONB. Failing which, the Petitioner requests extensive further mitigation and compensation for all of the inconveniences and loss he will suffer.

It is this Petitioners considered opinion - That it is surely obvious a deep tunnel complete under the whole of the Chilterns is needed to avoid all of the accompanying grief and collateral damages caused to this family and numerous others: ie: by way of Tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns AONB. Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to be monitored and enforced by Bucks County Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd. if indeed this governments agent HS2's, astonishing unnecessary waste of taxpayer's money is to be commenced.
2. 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.

ROBIN HOPKINSON KAREN HOPKINSON

14TH April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION Of Dr Catherine Elphinston 

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 Clauses 1 and Schedules 1 of the Bill and associated powers in the Bill; 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 Dr Catherine Elphinstone lives at Lamb Cottage, Potter Row Great Missenden HP16 9LT and is specially and directly affected by HS2. Potter Row lies at the North-West end of South Heath in the Chilterns’ Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“the AONB”). It is a very close knit community of some 40 homes and nearly 80 people with a strong community support network. Our community cannot survive the proposed changes and I am hugely impacted by both the construction and operation of HS2 Ltd’s proposals.  

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 (from the portal at the south end behind Bury farm) it is parallel to the planned route of HS2, between 250m to 350m away. HS2 will run at 360km/hr every 100 seconds when in the cutting alongside our lane, shattering the present tranquil environment.  

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

Your petitioner is concerned that the landscape and community will be forever blighted by HS2. Your Petitioner is a member of that community, retired and, and lives in close proximity to the HS2 line, and is concerned that:  

a. Currently our home in Potter Row is in a “peaceful” environment. The proposed increase in noise from HS2, which is after mitigation, is unacceptable. It will completely alter the character and enjoyment of our home, our garden, and daily life. Construction itself will take many years, be very disruptive, and its close proximity to our home means we will suffer ongoing excessive noise for literally years.  

b. I fear that the community will break up (as it is already doing) as people sell up (being bought most commonly by HS2 Ltd) and the current support network disappears leaving a fragile community made even more vulnerable.  

c. Access to Great Missenden and surrounding areas via A413 will be difficult. If the Haul Road to the portal that also runs to the west of Potter Row is not moved then the forecast congestion will isolate us from vital facilities in Great Missenden. Your petitioner is especially concerned about emergency services access to Potter Row.
d. Your petitioner is most concerned about property blight and the loss in value of their property. I am concerned that the only way to move will be to qualify under the Need to Sell scheme, but this brings with it its own stresses that some in Potter Row have already experienced.

e. The landscape, setting, natural beauty and visual impacts will be altered irreparably for the length of Potter Row eg a large portal area with a massive horseshoe bund, a wide cutting; a taller electricity pylon; a noise barrier at the top of the cutting on the Potter Row side. All this is alien to our area and the AONB

f. 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.

g. The archaeological and historical setting of Potter Row is compromised by the wide cutting, the bunding, and the noise barrier. Their impact was inadequately assessed in the environmental statement

h. Amenity will be lost, as the footpaths we walk are changed, including the one through Potter Row’s “own” ancient woodland (Jenkins Wood). Walkers will be exposed to excessive noise. The footpath through Jenkins Wood is to be closed during construction, and when it re-opens it will take a new longer path round the portal, destroying its tranquil rural character

i. The construction site area is now more than half a kilometre long. During the seven year construction period there will be light pollution and security arrangement. This will be followed by permanent light pollution and injurious levels of noise.

Your Petitioner will be directly, specially and injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, to which your Petitioner accordingly objects for the reasons given above.

It is hard to see how the Potter Row community can survive the changes being thrust upon it.

Your Petitioner believes the devastation that HS2 would bring can only be averted by extending the bored tunnel throughout the AONB, or at minimum an extra mile to the end of Potter Row at Leather Lane. This would take the portal some distance from any community.

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:
Sign here

Type name: Catherine Elphinstone

Date: 15/4/2016

15/4/2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Beverley Manton

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 Clauses 1 and Schedules 1 of the Bill and associated powers in the Bill; 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 Beverley Manton, lives at The Old Lamb, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire HP16 9LT and is specially and directly affected by HS2. Potter Row lies at the North-West end of South Heath in the Chilterns’ Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“the AONB”). It is a very close knit community of some 40 homes and nearly 80 people with a strong community support network. Our community cannot survive the proposed changes and I am hugely impacted by both the construction and operation of HS2’s proposals, due to its close proximity and the nature of the impacts.

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 (from the portal at the south end behind Bury Farm) it is parallel to the planned route of HS2, between 250m to 350m away. HS2 will run at 360km/hr every 100 seconds when in the cutting, shattering the present tranquil environment. The noise has been inadequately mitigated.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioner is particularly concerned as to the loss of community in Potter Row. The Potter Row community is eroding by the selling up of those unable to continue in Potter Row and the absence of their replacement by natural turnover by people valuing the qualities that Potter Row has had in the past. This is making Potter Row a less pleasant and sustainable place to live, as its support network deteriorates and disappears. HS2 Ltd has taken little account of the community impacts in designing their proposal – either in construction or operation.

HS2 will degrade the physical environment of Potter Row, through first construction works and then the operation of high speed trains. The seven to eight year construction period will bring with it the further problems of road congestion and the isolation from vital facilities.

When HS2 is operational the level of noise generated on HS2 Ltd.’s own assessment will be sufficiently loud that it will have injurious effects on our health and wellbeing. The night-time peak noise exceeds the Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) as specified by HS2
Ltd and the World Health Organisation for myself and all homes in Potter Row. Mitigation is simply inadequate.

The natural beauty and tranquillity of the area will be ruined. The simple pleasures of walking the local footpaths – especially down to Great Missenden will be permanently lost. Sitting in the garden will no longer be enjoyable.

The Need to Sell scheme, which will increasingly be the only way to move as construction nears, is onerous, stressful and overly intrusive. It should be a ‘right to sell’ scheme, not ‘need to sell’ and other ways such as a Property Bond should be considered. Your petitioner hopes that the new, Need to Sell valuation process proposed by the House of Commons Select Committee will be put in to practice by HS2 Ltd and that there will be a wider choice of local valuers available to the property owner.

Your Petitioner believes that the devastation that HS2 would bring can only be averted by extending the bored tunnel to throughout the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, or at minimum extending it to beyond the end of Potter Row to Leather Lane, to bring the portal to be at some distance from any community.

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:

Date:
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF  Gillian Williamson

Declares that:

Your petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill
Your petitioner
The petitioner is the freehold owner of 4, Bayleys Hatch, South Heath, Bucks. HP16 9QG

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location and is located 250 metres from the middle of the train track at the point at which it leaves the portal and 150 metres to the earthworks around that. (measurements taken from HS2 map no. CT-06-033 using the scale provided. You may find this figure different to that quoted by the promoter who have rounded it up to a greater distance which matters when it comes to noise levels.)

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.

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 will address most, if not all, of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner and will reduce the impact on the AONB.

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.

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,
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.

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.

Your petitioner will lose the tranquil nature of the environment in which she lives. Her ability to enjoy her garden will be affected by noise, dust and potential pollution for the duration of the construction phase and forever after that by the noise of passing trains. The anticipation of this causes your petitioner a great deal of emotional pain.

Your petitioner walks along established paths in the fields around her home frequently and choses routes that keep to natural spaces away from roads or industrial noise. Her ability to choose routes that do not involve using a car to find a good place will be severely restricted both during the construction phase and after.

The value of your petitioner's property has been affected by the proposed works since the public announcement of the scheme in 2010. Due to the cost of moving home your petitioner had only planned to move once more in her remaining life but her control about how and when to sell and what value her home will attain has been made very uncertain. The need to sell scheme is onerous and does not offer compensation for an additional house move. (estimated at £20,000 in your petitioner's case by local estate agents). The need to sell scheme implies that a loss of 15% must be borne by all property owners affected. (Although this is better than what is understood to be 25% loss of value for anyone who overlooks the construction.) It feels unfair to your petitioner, who is a law abiding, tax paying citizen and who has worked hard to pay for her home to be financially penalised to such an extent because she happens to be living in a place the government plans to destroy.

**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:**
- Local Environmental Management Plans (LEMP) to be monitored and enforced by Bucks County Council with all costs to be borne by HS2 Ltd
- 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.
- 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.
**Dysfunctional Housing market:** Your Petitioner is 250 metres from the trains exit/entrance at the South Heath portal of the Chiltern Tunnel. Your petitioner as stated earlier is concerned that she will be unable to sell in what has become a dysfunctional housing market. Your petitioner finds the ‘Need to Sell Scheme’ (NTS) complex, slow and does not ensure un-blighted house prices.

**Remedies:**
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, friendly to the elderly and with more stringent rules to ensure reasonable un-blighted valuations.

**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:**
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.
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.

**Health and Wellbeing:** Your Petitioner is concerned that her wellbeing has been adversely affected, and continues to be, since the announcement of HS2 in 2010. The undeniable result of HS2 is worry, anxiety and stress and, in effect grief as in a bereavement about the loss and destruction of the natural environment and pleasure of her garden that currently supports a healthy enjoyable lifestyle.

**Remedies:**
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. Your petitioner specifically requests no radios or bad language from construction workers to be overheard by her in her garden/home.
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):
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.
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.
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.
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.

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. 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 sleep patterns. 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.

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.

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

Conclusion
Your Petitioner supports the petitions for a longer fully bored Chiltern Tunnel that extends throughout the Chilterns AONB. Such tunnel extension is being petitioned by the local County, District and Parish Councils and the Chiltern Conservation Board and in the alternative a shorter extension to Leather Lane. If your honourable House alters the Bill to provide for such an extended tunnel most of your Petitioner’s objections would be removed.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully requests that unless the Bill is amended as proposed above or suitable undertakings obtained from the Promoter, the Bill, along with accompanying Schedules, so far affecting your Petitioner and your Petitioner’s area, along with the wider AONB, be not allowed to pass into law. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner.

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 your petitioner will ever pray, etc.

14.4.2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION of MERIDEN PARISH COUNCIL

Declares that:

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

Your petitioner

1. Your Petitioner is Meriden Parish Council, the council of the Parish of Meriden situated in the Metropolitan Borough of Solihull.
2. The semi-rural Parish has a population of just over 2,700 residents living the eastern part of the Borough.
3. The parish of Meriden covers an area that includes the village of Meriden, Millisons Wood, Fillongley, Eaves Green, Church Lane, Harvest Hill, Four Oaks (Back Lane & Cornets End Lane. The parish is broadly bounded by the A45 by-pass to the north, by a tributary of the river Blythe to the east, by another tributary of the Blythe to the south and the A452 by-pass to the west. Extensive sand and gravel workings lie to the south of the application site, forming those parts of the Meriden Quarry complex that are accessed from Cornets End Lane.
4. The wider surrounding landscape, beyond the quarry complex and Meriden Village, includes the Stonebridge Golf Course to the north-west, and Packington Hall and Park to the north, and classic Ancient Arden/Arden Parklands farmland to the south, west and east. Other nearby settlements include Millisons Wood (1.25 miles north-east), Hampton in Arden (1.8 miles south-west), Berkswell (3.15 miles south) and Coventry (centred 6.5 miles south-east).
5. The area known as ‘Arden’ in modern planning guidance and policy documents refers to that part of Warwickshire and north Worcestershire that was anciently covered by the vast Forest of Arden. The name is thought to be derived from an Ancient British word ‘ardu’, meaning ‘high land’. In existence before the Anglo-Saxon period and continuing into the Middle Ages, an area roughly corresponding to the north-western half of Warwickshire was then heavily forested and was gradually cleared for new settlements and agricultural land (fields). At the time of the Domesday Survey (1086) there were over 50 square miles of woodland and wood pasture, or some 35% of north-west Warwickshire, including Coventry and Birmingham.

Clerk: Barbara Bland
55 James Dawson Drive, Millisons Wood, Coventry, CV5 9QJ
T: 01676 522474  M: 07767 162423  E: barbarablandmpc@btconnect.com
www.meridenparishcouncil.org.uk
6. Though the vast majority of this forest has long since gone, the memory has lingered on in place names like Hampton-in-Arden, Henley-in-Arden, Tanworth-in-Arden and Weston-in-Arden (now part of Bulkington). Several substantial remnants of the ancient woodland still exist in this region, however, although many of them have been replanted with non-native coniferous plantations for commercial purposes, a process encouraged by the Forestry Commission. The Arden landscape we recognize today is essentially a man-made pastoral landscape.

7. The village of Meriden derives its special character from its rural setting and its historic roots, central to which is its Parish Church with magnificent views towards Birmingham and beyond sited on a hill-top, and its collection of historical buildings and the village green that sits in the conservation area.

8. The preservation of Meriden Gap which is an open green interval separating the major conurbations of Birmingham and Coventry has been a corner stone for regional planning policy for decades.

Your petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioner accepts that construction and operation of the proposed railway will adversely affect the Parish, but considers the powers proposed go considerably further than is necessary and impose too great an impact on a small community. Your Petitioner considers that some of the adverse impacts on Meriden Parish could be avoided through amendments to the Scheme, and that there are ways to improve the mitigation of the impacts that are unavoidable.

Your Petitioner’s concerns in relation to the interests of the Parish are as follows

- Impacts of the scheme on local roads through construction traffic related to HS2 and any associated works to go through Meriden Parish.
- Development expedient to the construction of HS2 to be authorised within Meriden Parish if it would be likely to increase traffic through Meriden village.
- The external appearance of all Works necessary or expedient for the construction of HS2, which would be visible from within Meriden Parish, to be subject to the approval of Meriden Parish Council (such approval not to be withheld unreasonably).
- Village road infrastructure currently cannot support the traffic from the increase in population and business growth.
- Meriden Parish is already at risk of flooding, River Blythe, with remedial recommendations being considered in relation to surface water being contained on designated flood plains made available by the farming communities.
- Impacts of the Scheme on woodlands, habitat and wildlife.
- Impacts on agriculture.

There has been no consideration of the multiple proposals affecting Meriden Parish and decisions on HS2 must not be made in isolation as

Clerk: Barbara Bland
55 James Dawson Drive, Millisons Wood, Coventry, CV5 9QJ
T: 01676 522474 M: 07767 162423 E: barbarablandmpc@btconnect.com
www.meridenparishcouncil.org.uk
• HS2 significantly impacts Meriden Parish because of its linked associated developments
  (i) Garden City Housing and Commercial Centre developments;
      The development is proposed by our local Borough Council as it is around the proposed Birmingham Interchange Station.
  (ii) M42 Motorway Service Area development;
  (iii) M42 junction 6 expansion to accommodate the Genting Arena and Hotel Complex;
  (iv) Birmingham International Airport expansion programme;
  (v) Coventry City Council Local Plan Review and removal of greenbelt for housing and commercial centre development on Meriden Parish eastern border.

• Bickenhill Household Waste recycling centre should not be relocated within the Parish of Meriden referred to within the Select Committee’s published report page 26 paragraph 66 and is not identified as a feasible alternative site.

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.

Councillor Rosemary (Rosie) Weaver
Agent

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 Ian and Mrs Rosemary Chisholm
who live at Deancroft
London Road
Wendover
Buckinghamshire
HP22 6PN

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Phase 1 of the Whole Bill.

2. Your petitioners.

We are a married couple aged 69 and 65 yrs respectively, and have lived in our property for 35 yrs. We live on a stretch of London Road, the A413, on the outskirts of Wendover, Buckinghamshire. Ours is one of 23 properties. The A413 is a busy road, partly dual carriageway in some sections, but not ours. It is a single carriageway, and our property is separated from the carriageway by a grass verge, pavement and a service road.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

As already stated, we live on a stretch of London Road, the A413, on the outskirts of Wendover, Buckinghamshire. Directly beyond our rear boundary is the London to Aylesbury Chiltern Line. Our property is situated just within 300 metres of the centre of the proposed HS2 Line and viaduct.

Property blight: As a retirement planning measure, we had our property valued in February 2010. In March 2010, HS2 Phase 1, a new London to Birmingham rail link was announced. As information about it and its intended route became public, we realised that its route would pass close to our home, and we suspected what has now become a reality, that we are victims of property blight. We hoped then, and still do, that a fully bored tunnel beneath the length of the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), would be a much more acceptable option for us.

Dust pollution: As the Lords Select Committee members, you are likely to know that Wendover is situated in the Chiltern Hills, whose surface geology is a substantial layer of chalk. When dry chalk is disturbed, it produces a thick white dust. When wet, it forms sticky clumps. We feel
anxious at the prospect of being exposed to breathing a concentration of chalk dust particles. We think a fully bored tunnel, whilst not removing the risk, would considerably minimise it.

Noise nuisance and effects of repetitive vibration: We are concerned about both constructional noise and repetitive vibration effects. At the outset, 6 yrs ago, HS2 Ltd personnel at several of their roadshow events, attempted to reassure us that our fears of noise nuisance were unfounded. They did this by inviting us into sound booths, to listen to passing high speed trains, whose noise turned out to be no louder than a chaffinch! Since then, at further roadshow events, they have continued to play down the noise nuisance level, and we remain deeply troubled by this threat. All the more so now that the mitigation being offered for Wendover, is a trio of 4-6 metre high sound barriers, which seems excessive for silencing the sound of a finch. Some would say that the construction phase will be temporary. Even so, we find this an unpalatable prospect. The operational phase will of course be permanent. The prospect therefore, of enduring a very loud noise every 1+1/2 minutes, which could possibly be capable of causing hearing loss, is absolutely unbearable and unacceptable. The solution to this, surely must be a fully bored tunnel.

Difficulty gaining access to and from our property during construction:
As already stated, our stretch of the A413 is single carriageway. Access and exit is a pre-existing issue for us, particularly at peak traffic times. A fully bored tunnel would alleviate much of our concern.

No Personal Benefits: Having no personal benefits is compounded by property blight, stress and worry over the prospect of this scheme. To add insult to injury, we are having to contribute financially towards the scheme, through payment of Income Tax on spiralling cost estimates. Euston Station is 37 miles away from where we live, Curzon Street Station, Birmingham, 96 miles away. Were we to want to use this new service, there is no station that we could access between the two mentioned.

Disruption of Power Supply: The existing power line, conducted via pylons, passes approximately 150 metres from the front boundary of our property, parallel with the route HS2 is to take. Two pylons are clearly visible from our home. We believe one or more pylons will need to be re-sited, and we anticipate disruptions to our power supply as a consequence. A fully bored tunnel would obviate the need to re-site any of these pylons.

Management of Water System: As already stated, our section of the A413 is single carriageway, and is regularly prone to flooding. Bucks County Council and our MP are aware of this, but the problem remains unresolved. As part of the HS2 scheme, two very large balancing ponds, each approximately 100 metres long, are to be sited at the front of our property, one left and one right, very close to the A413 itself on its far
side. Our concerns are

1) Silting up
2) How are they to be maintained
3) Overspill from them is likely to add to our regular flooding experiences.

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: The Chiltern Hills were designated an AONB in 1965. Our local focal point of the Chilterns is Coombe Hill, with its Boer War memorial. Living as we do, within walking distance of Coombe Hill, we feel very protective towards the AONB, and feel strongly that a fully bored tunnel would be the best method of preserving its iconic status.

Wildlife Sustainability and Conservation: We are ardent amateur naturalists, with particular reference to butterflies. Many years ago in fact, we contributed as recorders, to the content of a book entitled ‘The Butterflies of Berkshire, Bucks and Oxfordshire’. The continued survival of several species is under threat due to habitat loss. The proposed scheme is likely to compound the threat to continued survival for those vulnerable species, by at best disturbing, at worst destroying their habitat. A fully bored tunnel, especially once HS2 is operational, would have much less of an impact on them and their habitat.

Final comment: We need a fully bored tunnel rather than compensation in old age!
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.
Your Petitioners therefore pray to 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 Counsel, Agent and witnesses in support of the allegations
of this Petition against such of the clauses and provisions of the Bill as
affect the rights and interests of your Petitioners and in support of such
other clauses, amendments or 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 may deem to
meet.

Signed:

Date:
IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF
LORDS
SESSION
2015 - 2016

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON TO WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION of FELICITY JANE PALMER

1. The Petitioner Felicity Palmer is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill, especially those parts which relate to the construction and operation of the railway within the Chilterns AONB, notably the valley of the river Misbourne from Chalfont St Giles to Wendover in Buckinghamshire.

2. The petitioner is a resident of the hilltop village Holmer Green, less than 2 miles from the Misbourne Valley and the A413, the road which is planned to be a major route for construction vehicles. The petitioner regularly walks in this beautiful valley enjoying the wildlife associated with the river Misbourne. The petitioner teaches at Wendover House Campus, part of Chiltern Way Academy, a specialist school for boys and girls with social, emotional, communication and interaction difficulties. The school is approximately 200m from the proposed rail route.

3. THE CONCERNS

3.1 The river Misbourne, a rare and vulnerable chalk stream, including Shardeloes lake, near Amersham, will be at risk from the bored tunnel. The water table could rise and flood, become polluted and/or the river could disappear for ever along with its associated ecology. At present, in the absence of current geological tests, the damage to the aquifer, resulting from boring at the proposed depth, is uncertain. Future hydrological and geological investigations may reveal the need to bore at a greater depth hence strengthening the case for a longer tunnel.
3.2 The petitioner would face long delays whilst travelling to and from Wendover during the construction phase of HS2, both along the busy A413, and all local routes which would inevitably suffer as a consequence.

3.3 The petitioner’s job will be at risk since the school where she works plans to relocate if the proposed route is implemented. The school in its present location would become unsafe for its pupils. Increased noise during construction and operation would cause pupils pain and stress. Angry pupils will face danger if they abscond from their taxis, whilst caught in heavy traffic and long delays on their daily journeys to and from school. Parents will not want to send their children to a school in such a problematic location. A longer tunnel would eliminate almost all these problems and allow the school to continue to thrive in its beautiful and peaceful location.

3.4 HS2 Ltd has accepted that a longer tunnel through the Chilterns is both feasible and can be built within the necessary timescales with significant environmental, social and business benefits. A longer tunnel would lighten traffic problems during the construction phase, as spoil from boring the tunnel would be removed along the trace. The petitioner is calling for an independent review to compare the cost of longer tunnelling against the cost of alternative mitigation which would be necessary for the currently proposed scheme.

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.

Dated: 15th April 2016

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

SIGNED

Felicity Jane Palmer
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Mr Rodney Nicol Craig

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

2. Your petitioner
   Your Petitioner is, Mr Rodney Nicol Craig, of 5 Trafford Close, Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 OBS, 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 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.

   Your Petitioner used to live at Dell Cottage, Ballinger, at the west end of the very quiet road, Herberts Hole, and still has a vegetable garden in Ballinger which the Petitioner visit regularly. The Petitioner has friends in South Heath and regularly visits the South Heath Garden Centre and uses the B485 and Frith Hill for these visits, also to go to meetings at Ballinger Hall, to visit Chesham for shopping and Hyde Heath Church.

   The AP4 modification to the alignment has helped South Heath in this respect, but 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. The Petitioner walks within the tranquillity of the AONB which will be adversely affected by HS2.

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

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required. The main objections from HS2 of the proposed long tunnel have been on the grounds of cost and tunnelling rates of progress, which the Petitioner does not agree with.
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 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. As a fall back position if the full long tunnel is not possible the tunnel should be extended to Leather Lane.
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 Chiltern 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 ask 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.

.........................................................
Rodney Nicol Craig
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Patricia Mead

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioner is resident at 18 Hale Road, Wendover in the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. She will be specially and directly affected by the whole Bill, both during construction and after completion of the project.

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

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

a) Noise from trains up to 400 metres long passing every 100 seconds.

b) Damage to local heritage and facilities

c) 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 her concerns in paragraph 4 above and all of her concerns in paragraph 5 above. It accepted by all parties that such a tunnel is feasible. In her 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 she considers the case for a fully-bored tunnel to be overwhelming.

7. 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.

Patricia Mead
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF The Woodland Trust

Declares that:

The Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by clauses 1, 2, 4, 14, 19 and 29 of the Bill

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

2. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLoughlin.

3. Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway transport system mentioned in paragraph 1 above. They include provision for compulsory acquisition, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. Clauses 37 to 56 of the Bill establish a regulatory regime for the railway transport system and clauses 59 to 65 of the Bill deal with miscellaneous and general provisions.

4. Clause 1 of the Bill will authorise the nominated undertaker (as defined in the Bill) to construct and maintain the works specified in Schedule 1 to the Bill (“the scheduled works”), being works for the construction of Phase One of High Speed 2 (“HS2”) and works consequent on, or incidental to, such works. The lines, situations and levels of the scheduled works and the limits of deviation within which the works may be carried out are shown on the deposited plans and sections referred to in and deposited with the Bill.

5. Clause 2 of the Bill will authorise the nominated undertaker to carry out certain additional works for the purposes of or in connection with the scheduled works or otherwise for the purposes of Phase One of HS2.

6. Under clause 4 of the Bill, the Secretary of State will have power to acquire compulsorily so much of the land within “the Act limits” as may be required for the purposes of or in connection with Phase One of HS2 or any high speed rail transport system of which it forms or is to form a
7. Clause 14 of the Bill introduces Schedule 15 to the Bill which contains provision about temporary possession and use of land in connection with the works authorised by the Bill.

8. Clause 19 of the Bill provides that Planning Permission is deemed to be granted under Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the carrying out of development authorised by the Bill. Schedule 16 sets out the conditions of deemed planning permission.

9. Clause 29 of the Bill provides that orders under section 198(1) or 202(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and regulations under section 202A(1) of that Act and sections 211(1) and (5) of that Act do not apply to certain tree works identified in clause 29(1).

Your petitioner

10. The Petitioner is the Woodland Trust, who was established in 1972 as the national charitable body for the protection, wellbeing and increase of the nations’ woods and trees. This conferred important duties upon your Petitioners, who have since that date become a highly respected national authority and charity, with 225,000 members nationally. Your Petitioners own and care for over 1,000 sites covering more than 24,000 hectares (over 60,000 acres) across the UK. This is the equivalent of 38,000 football pitches.

11. They have created over 32km² (12 sq. miles) of new woodland and are working hard to restore 52,000 ha of damaged ancient woodland. They are advisers to local authorities, government agencies and local communities, contributing to many plans and strategies as well as planting and maintenance regimes. Through many publications, volunteer days and other means, they inform and advise the wider public and other stakeholders on many matters relating to the active use and development of woodlands across the country. Your Petitioners’ members include those who enjoy and are concerned for the amenity of ancient woodlands which would be significantly affected by HS2 works.

12. Your Petitioners recognise the principle of the Bill insofar as its intention is to improve public transport and accessibility in England. Your Petitioners appeared before the House of Commons Select Committee on HS2 and recognise that some positive changes have been made to the proposed scheme, which have resulted in the reduction in the amount of ancient woodland that would be lost and damaged. However, these changes do not go anywhere near far enough and your Petitioner objects to the works authorised by the Bill which will injuriously affect many areas of ancient woodland as well as ancient and veteran trees along the route.

13. Your Petitioners are recognised to be a national authority on ancient woods and trees, and advocates of the benefits and values that they deliver for society. Your Petitioners are currently fighting 525 development threats to ancient woodlands across the UK. The protection of ancient woodland is one of their primary charitable aims. They also set up and manage the Ancient tree Hunt which identifies and monitors ancient and veteran trees across the UK.
14. Your Petitioners charitable aims and their functions, rights and interests and the interests they protect, and the rights and interests of their members whom they represent are therefore injuriously affected by the Bill and your Petitioners accordingly object to it for the reasons, amongst others, subsequently discussed.

15. Ancient woodland is land that has been continuously wooded since 1600. England's ancient woodlands and trees represent a living cultural heritage, a natural equivalent to our great churches and castles. They are also our richest wildlife habitat and are highly valued by people as places of tranquillity and inspiration.

16. Where your Petitioners refer to ancient woodland they mean woodland recorded on the Natural England Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI). The AWI is the nationally accepted database for identifying ancient woodland. It is considered provisional as woodland can both be added and removed from the AWI as and when new evidence becomes available.

17. Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable resource, of great importance for its wildlife, soils recreation, cultural value, history and the contribution it makes to our diverse landscapes.

18. It is a scarce resource, covering only 2.7% of England's land area. In addition ancient trees outside ancient woodland can be hundreds of years old, provide habitat for many different species and are part of our landscape and cultural heritage. The ancient woodlands along the proposed HS2 railway line are all notable for their differing contributions to landscape, amenity, culture and biodiversity. For example, ancient woodlands provide homes for many of our rarest animals, such as the Bechsteins bat - one of England's rarest mammals listed on Annex II of the EC Habitats and Species Directive and as near-threatened on the International Union for Conservation of Nature red list.

19. Ancient woodland can have historical and archaeological significance because of low levels of disturbance and they can also be a source of inspiration for local culture and folklore.

Your petitioner's concerns

20. Under the current proposals the HS2 scheme will directly damage or destroy 34 woodlands resulting in the loss of at over 30ha of ancient woodland (the equivalent of 48 football pitches). In addition 29 will suffer serious harm through indirect effects, such as noise, lighting and dust. A comprehensive list of the 63 ancient woods affected by the scheme can be found at the end of this section (paragraph 83).

21. The numbers of ancient woodlands quoted within this petition are subject to change as your Petitioner receives clarification from Natural England and continues on-going discussions with HS2 Ltd.

22. In summary your Petitioners concerns are as follows:

- The loss of over 30ha of irreplaceable ancient woodland is unacceptable
• The inclusion of irreplaceable habitat in the No Net Loss of Biodiversity Calculation is unacceptable and sets an unacceptable precedent. Irreplaceable habitat losses should be compensated using a bespoke, case by case methodology and not a generic metric.

• Compensation planting should be provided at a minimum ratio of 30:1 based on the highest possible outcome of the draft Defra biodiversity offsetting metric, which does not cover irreplaceable habitats.

• Translocation of ancient woodland soils should only been used as a method of last resort and should not be assumed to be a proven method of replacing ancient woodland.

• No ancient woodland should be lost as a result of temporary land uses, such as haul routes and construction compounds

• Indirect effects on ancient woodland such as dust, changes to lighting, increases in noise and fragmentation of woodlands should be addressed and reduced. The Promoter does not currently recognise many of these serious impacts.

• All trees planted as part of the proposed scheme should be UK sourced and grown

• Mechanisms for providing ecological compensation planting outside of the Bill area should be considered. This would enable the scheme to provide more and better quality compensation at a landscape scale in accordance with the Lawton Review (2010).

• There should be a series of covenants and/or provisions to secure the future of all the land affected and benefitting from compensatory planting, which will ensure that such woodland is properly monitored, maintained and protected.

Loss of Ancient Woodland

23. Government policy recognises the importance of the preservation and enhancement of ancient woodland. The Government has made a firm commitment that the existing area of ancient woodland should be maintained and there should be a net increase in the area of native woodland. Further clarification is given in the National Planning Policy Framework:

Planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.

24. Your Petitioners submit that the works proposed under the Bill will have significant adverse impacts on ancient woodlands and individual ancient and veteran trees along the route, some of which lie within a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Promoter's own Environmental Statement (ES) and subsequent Supplementary Environmental Statements (SES)
identify that the works will deleteriously and greatly impact on such areas.

25. Your Petitioners wish to ensure that the effect on ancient woodland, and the species that depend on them, is firstly avoided and, if that is not possible, minimised so far as is possible. Your Petitioners further consider that this national, flagship project must set the benchmark for future projects and development across the nation. It should provide a shining example of best practice in enhancing biodiversity. The HS2 project despite the changes proposed by the House of Commons Select Committee still falls a long way short of this.

26. Your Petitioners believe and will contend that the proposals have not adequately sought to avoid adverse impacts upon ancient woodland, do not provide appropriate compensation and effective measures to minimise harm nor appropriate compensation nor effective controls relating to implementation.

27. The development of a railway through areas of ancient woodland will cause significant fragmentation. Once fragmented, woodlands have small area to perimeter ratios and lack a significant core area. This make the habitat less appealing to specialist woodland species but it also undermines their value from an amenity point of view because the peaceful centre of the woodland is so much smaller; the visitor does not feel so distanced from noise and physical disturbance. On-going construction activities within and alongside the woodland can make it even less appealing for visitors.

28. Your Petitioners seek an amendment to the Bill to require that appropriate buffering is designated where any works take place on land adjacent to ancient woodland and seek an assurance that any buffering required be planted at the earliest opportunity to maximise its impacts on both local amenity and the viability of remaining ancient woodland and before any works commence in the vicinity of areas of ancient woodland.

29. Government policy repeatedly sets out the need to follow the mitigation hierarchy as set out in the NPPF:

If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

30. It is fundamental that there is proper consideration of the environmental impact of HS2 and that the likely significant effects are accurately assessed, so that appropriate mitigation can be designed to be integral to the project and adequate compensation measures are appropriately secured. Your Petitioners consider that this has not been the case.

31. Your Petitioners are concerned that potential means of avoiding impact upon ancient woodland have not been adequately explored or utilised. Further, many of the mitigation and compensation measures proposed are insufficiently detailed and are only to be implemented “if reasonably practicable”, with no explanation given as to what this actually means or any evidence of how this has been assessed.
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32. In addition, there is little or no information on how the nominated undertaker and contractor will be obliged to put mitigation and compensation measures in place as well as monitor and manage them in the decades to come. Given that mitigation and compensation planting is to mitigate/compensate in respect of woodland over 400 years old, the funding of and measures to ensure on-going monitoring and management are crucial. Your Petitioners have asked for assurances that compensation sites for ancient woodland loss are monitored for at least 50 years and that they are managed in perpetuity.

33. The need to monitor newly planted woodland is also recognised by the Environmental Audit Committee:

   Government should establish a process to monitor all aspects of the environmental protections needed for HS2 for the 60 years following the start of construction and operation of the railway, including biodiversity mitigations, compensations and offsets. This process must be managed by an independent body, which should be tasked with monitoring and publicly reporting progress against the ‘no net biodiversity loss’ objective.

34. Your Petitioners seek the adoption of best practice throughout the design, construction and operation of the project; full compensation and mitigation as appropriate; effective control measures during construction and monitoring thereafter; and the full documentation of these measures and procedures in Parliamentary Undertakings and the Environmental Minimum Requirements. Your Petitioners will provide the details of what is being sought in the remainder of this Petition and in supplementary evidence.

35. Your Petitioners submit that the nominated undertaker should provide and make public detailed plans, method statements, work programmes, and schedules of deliveries in relation to each work site, well in advance of the commencement of operations. Your Petitioners should be notified well in advance of any alterations in methods of construction and construction operations which will affect ancient woodland particularly in relation to site servicing and set up arrangements. Your Petitioners have requested several assurances (Nos. 22 and 24) in relation to this. They are still under discussion with HS2 Ltd.

**No Net Loss of Biodiversity**

36. The Promoter has set itself the aim of no net loss of biodiversity for Phase 1 of the HS2 project. Ancient woodland is irreplaceable and the only way this objective could be achieved is by avoiding any loss or damage to ancient woodland whatsoever.

37. Your Petitioners are concerned that ancient woodland loss has been included in the “no net loss” calculation. It is completely inappropriate to assign offsetting values to irreplaceable ancient woodland, even if it is not strictly for offsetting purposes. By including ancient woodland in the “no net loss” metric the implication is that ancient woodland can be replaced.

38. Furthermore, different distinctiveness ratings have been awarded to different types of ancient woodland, implying that Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) lost to the scheme can be replaced by new planting. PAWS
should receive the same distinctiveness rating as ancient semi-natural woodland (ASNW).

39. Your Petitioner insists that ancient woodland is removed from the “no net loss” calculation as its inclusion sets a damaging precedent for the treatment of ancient woodland in this and future projects. Compensation for its loss should be determined on a bespoke, case by case basis. Your Petitioners assurance no. 4 covers this request.

40. Your Petitioners' views are shared by the Environmental Audit Committee which has stated:

> If the offsetting metric is used to determine compensation for ancient woodlands on the HS2 route, these habitats should receive the maximum score possible on all criteria (distinctiveness, condition and position within ecological networks) to recognise their irreplaceability and to maximise the extent of the offsetting provided. But ancient woodlands should be treated separately from the overall biodiversity 'no net loss' calculation”.

41. Your Petitioners humbly request that the nominated undertaker adopts a net gain approach to biodiversity on this flagship project, rather than their current proposal of 'no net loss'. This is view supported by the Environment Audit Committee:

> On HS2 the Government should aim higher than simply striving for no net biodiversity loss. As it further develops its processes and metrics for biodiversity offsetting, it should seek to weight these to be more likely to produce biodiversity gains and take explicit account of local communities' well-being.

Compensation and Mitigation

42. Central to your Petitioners' concerns over the proposed scheme are the proposals for mitigation of and compensation for the effects on ancient woodland and how these two elements have become blurred within the ES. Once the hierarchy of mitigation measures has been followed, any loss of irreplaceable ancient woodland that is considered unavoidable cannot be mitigated, cannot be included in offsetting and so must become the subject of compensatory action. Your Petitioners also seek assurances that secondary broadleaf woodland loss will be compensated as per the Defra ‘Offsetting Metrics’.

43. The “offsetting metrics” provided by Defra for replacement planting does not cover ancient woodland, because irreplaceable habitats are excluded from the metric. Consequently your Petitioners consider that the minimum ratio of planting proposed to compensate for the loss of irreplaceable ancient woodland must logically exceed the maximum ratio that can be calculated using the Defra offsetting metrics.

44. Your Petitioners want compensation for loss of ancient woodland to be set at a minimum ratio of 30:1, based on the highest ratio obtained using the draft Defra Biodiversity Offsetting metric. The current proposal falls woefully short of this figure, and your Petitioner calculates that the current ratio is as low as 3:1. Your Petitioner has sought an assurance (No.7) in relation to this, but no
agreement has been reached.

45. At the very least Your Petitioners consider that the Promoter should publish a total figure specifically relating to ancient woodland compensation planting. This is not included in the ES or subsequent SESs, despite requests by Your Petitioner for HS2 Ltd. to release such a figure.

46. All compensation planting should be carried out at a landscape scale as per the 'Lawton Principles', an approach endorsed by the Natural Environment White Paper which champions the role that new woodland must play in supporting biodiversity, reversing fragmentation and building better habitat networks to create landscape that are more resilient to change.

47. Where there is insufficient land within the Bill limits, your Petitioners would seek assurances that additional land is bought forward outside of the current Bill to enable the application of appropriate compensation metrics. Your Petitioners consider that the quality and quantity of potential compensation has been constrained as a result of all the compensation falling within the narrow strip of land defined by the Bill limits. Tackling compensation on a landscape scale rather than an artificially delineated area will increase positive ecological outcomes.

Tree Provenance

48. The provenance of trees is extremely important in any proposed scheme of compensation planting, given the threat posed by tree diseases. All trees planted should be selected because they represent a minimal risk to biosecurity and also that they are resilient to future risks. New woods should have a broad genetic base to ensure they are more resilient to threats.

49. Local seed collection and locally sourced trees should form a large element of the planting mix but using a wider range of local UK provenance native species and including some planting stock of non-local, but still UK provenance, will help this by increasing genetic diversity in new native woods. Your Petitioners would urge the nominated undertaker to procure UK sourced trees at the earliest opportunity.

Translocation of Ancient Woodland

50. It is your Petitioner's view that ancient woodlands cannot be translocated. Translocation of some component parts of ancient woodland, such as soils, coppice stools and deadwood are all proposed as forming part of the compensation package for loss of ancient woodland. Your Petitioner considers such actions to constitute a salvage operation only which may add some value to potential receptor sites but cannot be considered equivalent in any way to the ancient woodland destroyed. However, a detailed methodology statement for any such translocation is not included within the ES, any subsequent SES or the Woodland Strategy.

51. Translocation of ancient woodland soils is a relatively new process and literature on the subject is scarce. There is no information currently available that proves that translocation of soils can offer any measure of compensation for ancient woodland loss. Therefore, your Petitioners request that the use of translocation
as a form of compensation should not be used to reduce the amount of compensation provided in the form of tree planting.

52. Given the paucity of information relating to the translocation of ancient woodland soils your Petitioners request that a detailed methodology statement is prepared for each donor and receptor site where translocation of soils is proposed and that this includes details of subsequent monitoring and maintenance that will be required at the receptor site. Furthermore, the methodology statements will need to identify what a successful translocation will look like and what will be done if the translocation fails.

53. As previously stated, your Petitioners expect these sites to be monitored for a period of at least 50 years and managed in perpetuity. In recognition that the planting is to compensate for the loss of ancient woodland that is at least 400 years old.

**Temporary Land Take**

54. There are currently proposals for temporary land take within at least four ancient woodlands. This number may be subject to change because of omissions and uncertainties within the ES and subsequent SEEs and on-going discussions with HS2 Ltd.

55. Your Petitioners submit that destroying ancient woodland for temporary land uses is entirely unacceptable. Ancient woodland now makes up such a small part of our landscape that even small losses may have irredeemable impacts on the flora and fauna found in an area. Furthermore, it is impossible to replicate because many of the species that make up ancient woodland are long-lived and slow growing. Your Petitioners humbly ask that the Bill be amended to disallow any temporary land take within ancient woodland.

56. Temporary land take adjacent to ancient woodland will also have significant impacts upon this irreplaceable habitat. For example, although the ES states that sensitive habitats will be avoided, a main construction compound which will be operational for six years has been placed directly on the boundary of Long Itchington Wood (CFA16). This would have significant impacts on the biodiversity of this ancient woodland as on-going noise, light and chemical pollution will impact upon the woodland. Further, it is proposed that this site will include accommodation for up to 300 railway workers, and there is a concern that additional problems could increase the risk of disturbance through unmanaged access. As workers would be on site 24 hours a day this could also include further nocturnal disturbance. Your Petitioners submit that the Promoters should be obliged to review the areas identified for temporary land take and relocate temporary works to areas which avoid these sensitive habitats where temporary works would have a permanent impact. It is not possible to temporarily take land from ancient woodland as the habitat is irreplaceable.

**Lighting and Noise**

57. Lighting control is important because lighting will have a significant impact on species within woodland in terms of disturbance. Of key concern to your Petitioners is the impact of artificial light required for working after the daylight
fades as all of the activities proposed for the additional hours of working would require lighting to enable them to be carried out effectively and safely.

58. Light pollution, especially night working, interferes with interactions between species, affecting foraging and predation, reducing breeding success and thereby affecting on-going population viability. Research has found that artificial night lighting had a strong effect on the timing of breeding and individual mating behaviour in some songbirds. Female blue tits were found to begin egg laying earlier if nesting close to artificial light sources. This could result in chicks hatching before enough food is available in the environment to support them. Artificial light also caused yearling males to start singing earlier making them less attractive to females, in turn having a negative impact on breeding numbers.

59. The ability to permit certain works to only take place during daylight hours should also be enabled in relation to ancient woodland sites.

60. Noise and its impact on the natural environment has not been properly assessed. Your Petitioners ask that noise associated with construction must also be closely controlled and monitored by the Local Planning Authority and contractors with regard to sensitive and irreplaceable natural habitats such as ancient woodland. Natural England states that ancient woodland is exceptionally rich in wildlife, and supports many rare and threatened species. Many of these species are particularly vulnerable to changes in their environment. For example the industrial noise associated with construction can interfere with male bird song, such that females may not hear it at greater distances and/or it is less attractive to them due to distortion.

61. Planting woodland buffers can provide a physical barrier to many forms of disturbance, including noise and light pollution both from the train itself and the construction process. It will attenuate noise pollution limit light penetration, and reduce the negative effects of compaction and vibration in adjacent areas. These buffers would need to be bespoke to match the local needs and landscape. Your Petitioners ask that they are fully engaged in working up these schemes.

Pollution Associated with Construction

62. Your Petitioners would like to see full and proper regard to the impact of pollutants associated with the construction works on the ancient woodland. Application of herbicides and spillage of hazardous substances may occur during construction and these may have local impacts on adjacent ancient woodland. Harmful emissions will also be released by construction vehicles. Increasing nitrogen can alter the outcome of competitive interactions, changing the character of woodland vegetation in terms of species composition. These impacts must be fully considered throughout the construction process and as the railway begins operation. Your Petitioners seek an assurance that the extra sensitivity of ancient woodland will be specifically considered when pollution control measures are drawn up as part of the code of construction practice.
Future-Proofing

63. In line with the offsetting principles set out above your Petitioners request that steps are taken to not only manage and monitor new planting but also to respond to failures in the mitigation and compensation planting schemes. Currently there is no contingency scheme in place for the failure of any of the proposed compensation and mitigation schemes. Clear remedial steps should be set up to enable any losses to be assessed and made good in the next appropriate planting period. Such steps should be included within the environmental management plan to be implemented by the nominated undertaker and in other documentation as appropriate.

64. Your Petitioners see legally and financially binding conservation covenants or similar private agreements as being vital to a system for securing the future of these ecological compensation areas. New woodland planted as compensation for ancient woodland loss would not enjoy any protection in the National Planning Policy Framework and would therefore be vulnerable to potential future development. Your Petitioners seek guarantees that these sites would not be lost to future development from the railway or other forms of development and would be secured to remain as woodland for years to come. Given the difficulties of ensuring local planning consistency along the whole route, an undertaking from the Secretary of State would seem the most appropriate in this regard.

Authorisation Procedures

65. Clause 19 of the Bill provides that planning permission is deemed to be granted for the works authorised by the Bill and consequently the statutory controls on development enacted by Parliament in the Town and Country Planning Acts are dis-applied.

66. Your Petitioners accept that Clause 19, and Schedule 16, of the Bill will enable the local planning authority for the area to exert some influence on the type of development for which powers are being sought by the Promoter. However, your Petitioners have grave concerns in relation to the extent of these powers, for example in respect of the Local Authority’s ability to impose conditions about the conduct of works, the management of impacts, replanting schemes and other measures for woodlands and biodiversity protection and mitigation, and they crave leave to comment in further detail on these concerns at the appropriate stage.

67. Your Petitioners are concerned that, as many of the mechanisms for implementing mitigation measures will fall to local planning authorities to consider and determine, those authorities are able to do so effectively in pursuit of the shared and reasonable desire to improve the local amenity of their areas and ensure that mitigation works are of the highest quality both with regard to the biodiversity and amenity value of mitigation and compensation works, through appropriate tree planting according to the Lawton Principles. Your Petitioners therefore ask that local planning authorities can, following consultation with your Petitioners and by means of agreed condition(s) on works approved, ensure that the detailed implementation of the proposals takes the necessary environmental care; and, where opportunity presents itself, enables environmental enhancements to add
68. As indicated earlier, the Bill contains provisions which provide outline planning permission for the development authorised by the Bill and disapply a number of other statutory regulation regimes which would normally apply in relation to the construction of works, including the normal provisions of the Town and Country Planning and related Acts, and the listed buildings and conservation area controls in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Your Petitioners note that in many instances there are streamlined, replacement approval processes proposed in the Bill, which aim in particular to shorten the time taken for decisions to be made and in some cases limit the number of factors that may be taken into consideration.

69. Your Petitioners have an important role as consultees and advisors on development affecting woodlands and their wider environment, and seek to play a full part as obligatory consultees where the works are likely to affect such areas of woodland. Your Petitioners wish to be among those who are required to be consulted in relation to the following: Code of Construction Practice, Local Environmental Management Plans, Environmental Minimum Requirements, Planning Applications, Groundworks, Utilities Proposals, Planting Proposals and Public Realm Proposals relating to ancient woodland.

70. Your Petitioners will wish to ensure that the Code of Construction Practice is complied with properly and would wish to engage fully with the on-going implementation process.

71. Your Petitioners seek assurances that the nominated undertaker will carry out the compensation for the impact on ancient woodland in accordance with the following requirements and the associated monitoring and maintenance and that these activities are carried out prior to work starting on the construction of the railway. This is critical to ensure that the lag time between the destruction of existing habitats and the creation of new habitats is as short as possible:

- Procurement of trees from local and national nurseries.
- Tree planting should be carried out as soon as is practicable.
- Agreement to methods of working, e.g. translocation method statements.
- Agreement to long term management and monitoring until newly planted trees start to function effectively as woodland habitat.
- Agreement on methods of protecting amenity woodland from the blight of long term works of uncertain timeframe.

Construction Concerns

72. Your Petitioners would hope and expect that the nominated undertaker would agree reasonable hours of operation. Within and adjacent to sensitive habitats such as ancient woodland these would exclude working after dark.

73. Your Petitioners are also concerned to ensure that the nominated undertaker is required to adopt the very highest standards in respect of mitigation of the
effects of noise, vibration and dust caused during the construction period and in particular that the construction code replicates your Petitioners' best practice requirements applicable to other major construction projects.

74. Your Petitioners seek assurances that working practices will be agreed and implemented to minimise effects on ancient woodland during the construction period. There should also be a guarantee that any future changes to industry standards will also be complied with.

Tunneling Works

75. Your Petitioners are keen to ensure that every possible step is taken to minimise the loss of irreplaceable ancient woodland rather than to have to compensate for its loss. Your Petitioners would humbly ask that opportunities to realign the track should be taken to avoid the destruction and damage of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland. Your Petitioners are concerned that many of the alternatives to the proposed scheme have been dismissed without being fully considered, even though they could significantly reduce the impact of the line on the environment.

76. Your Petitioners ask that the Bill be amended to increase tunneling within the Chilterns AONB such that the line within the AONB is fully within a bored tunnel. An increase in tunnel length would significantly reduce the environmental impact of the scheme and save an additional 0.7ha of ancient woodland at Jones Hill Wood (CFA 10). As such your Petitioners support the proposals put forward by Buckinghamshire County Council in their petition.

77. Your Petitioners are also supportive of any other tunnels along the line that would reduce the loss of ancient woodland and minimise any indirect impact on ancient woodland. For example, if tunnels were constructed at both South Cubbington Wood (CFA 17) and Broadwells Wood (CFA 18) a further 5.2ha of ancient woodland could be saved, or 16% of the ancient woodland currently threatened by the scheme.

78. Your Petitioners also seek amendment to the Bill to ensure that no structures associated with tunnels or construction works are erected within ancient woodland.

79. It is proposed that tunnelling should take place 24 hours a day 7 days a week. Along with concerns over artificial lights associated with night working your Petitioners are also concerned about vibration under ancient woodland and other disturbances adjacent to ancient woodland. No information has been provided on the impact of vibration on the natural environment. For example a tunnel is located directly below and a tunnel portal directly adjacent to Long Itchington Wood (CFA 16) a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) designated as it is one of the best examples of Oak coppice in the Midlands and is home to many species of birds including Tawny Owls who breed in the wood.

80. The impacts of tunnelling under ancient woodland are relatively unknown. Your Petitioners seek assurances that an effective scheme of monitoring and recording will be established before, during and after works and during the operating lifetime of the tunnels. Your Petitioners also ask that protocol should be put into place to remedy any negative impacts as soon as they are detected.
81. Your Petitioners would like to have working practices agreed with the nominated undertaker to minimise the disturbance associated with tunnelling on sensitive habitats such as ancient woodland. The area of land take at tunnel portals should also be minimised and sited to avoid ancient woodland. Your Petitioners seek amendment to the Bill and the deposited plans and sections accordingly.

**Operational Railway Issues**

82. Your Petitioners are concerned that operational maintenance to keep railway lines clear may adversely affect nearby woodland unless carried out with proper care, and therefore submit that there be provision in a long term management strategy for an agreed set of maintenance standards to be used by contractors and enforced by the nominated undertaker.

**Woods Affected**

83. Your Petitioner considers that the directly affected ancient woodlands (and the Phase One Community Forum Area (CFA) in which they are located are:

**Woods suffering direct loss (34)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woods</th>
<th>CFAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battlesford Wood</td>
<td>CFA 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnocks Wood</td>
<td>CFA 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones' Hill Wood</td>
<td>CFA 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheephouse Wood</td>
<td>CFA 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoypond Wood</td>
<td>CFA 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed near Decoypond Wood 1</td>
<td>CFA 12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed near Decoypond Wood 2</td>
<td>CFA 12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed near Decoypond Wood 3</td>
<td>CFA 12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossy Corner Spinney</td>
<td>CFA 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halse Copse</td>
<td>CFA 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Covert (Glyn Davis Wood)</td>
<td>CFA 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Itchington Wood</td>
<td>CFA 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Firs</td>
<td>CFA 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cubbington</td>
<td>CFA 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crackley</td>
<td>CFA 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birches Wood</td>
<td>CFA 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughknowles</td>
<td>CFA 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadwells</td>
<td>CFA 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Poors</td>
<td>CFA 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-named Wood near Stoneleigh</td>
<td>CFA 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwaste Wood</td>
<td>CFA 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sych Wood</td>
<td>CFA 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wood</td>
<td>CFA 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker's Spinney</td>
<td>CFA 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundhill</td>
<td>CFA 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rookery  CFA 21
Little Lyntus  CFA 22
Fulfen  CFA 22
Ravenshaw  CFA 22
Vicar's Coppice  CFA 22
Big Lyntus  CFA 22
John's Gorse  CFA 22
Hanch Wood  CFA 22
Parkhall  CFA 25

Woods damaged indirectly (29)

Bayhurst Wood  CFA 6
New Years Green Covert  CFA 6
Great Halings Wood  CFA 7
Little Halings Wood  CFA 7
Northmoor Hill  CFA 7
Juniper Wood  CFA 7
Bow Wood  CFA 8
Weedon Hill Wood  CFA 8
Stockings Wood  CFA 9
Jenkins Wood  CFA 9
Havenfield Wood  CFA 9
Oaken Corner/Castle Wood  CFA 9
Rushmore  CFA 10
Rowborough Copse  CFA 10
Greatsea  CFA 12
Finemere  CFA 12
Romer  CFA 12
Fox Covert (Whitfield)  CFA 14
Redhill Wood  CFA 15
Thorpe Rough  CFA 16
North Cubbington  CFA 17
Weston Wood  CFA 17
Blackwaste  CFA 18
Big Poors Wood  CFA 18
Kingswood  CFA 18
Roger's Copice  CFA 20
Weeford Park  CFA 21
Rough Leasow  CFA 21
Tomhay  CFA 22
Your Petitioners acknowledge that although there are some rational grounds for the development of a high speed rail line they are of the view that the opportunity for the attainment of these benefits does not override the need for a proper environmental balance to be struck. Your Petitioners believe that a proper regard should be had for the environment and those living and enjoying the amenities of woodlands close to the works and the operation of the works.

Phase I of HS2 will directly affect 34 ancient woodlands and indirectly affect 29 ancient woodlands along the route. At least 8 ancient trees would also be destroyed. This represents the loss of a great wealth of historic natural resources that is of both local and national importance as ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat. Your Petitioners, as the body to which many turn for guidance and action to safeguard, maintain and develop the nation's woodlands expects the highest standards of mitigation and compensation measures to protect this important part of the country's heritage and to create an exemplar project.

Whilst recognising that some limited changes have been made to the Bill, your Petitioner seeks further substantial amendments to the Bill and assurances from the Promoters and HS2 Ltd to meet its outstanding concerns outlined above, including to ensure that the extent of loss of ancient woodland is significantly reduced, that the highest standard of mitigation measures are implemented and that where some loss of ancient woodland is inevitable adequate compensation is appropriately secured.

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.

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Nicholas Butterworth

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Nicholas Butterworth, resident at Church Cottage, St Leonards, Tring, 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 at the disruption that will be caused to his journeys by traffic congestion and movements of construction transport and equipment. He needs to make journeys several times a week from St Leonards through The Lee to Great Missenden and Wendover to use the A413 for shopping, medical services, recreation and to gain access to High Wycombe, Gerrards Cross, Denham and the A 40 to Central and West London. Your Petitioner regards the A413 as an essential part of the Buckinghamshire transport network infra-structure and is greatly concerned at the prospect of major lengthy delays caused by the construction of HS2 on the surface through the greater part of the Chilterns as will make that road virtually unusable to him and many others causing A413 traffic to use the narrow lanes of the AONB which were never intended for such heavy and disruptive use and which will result in lasting damage to a characteristic feature of the area. Your Petitioner is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413
b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 16:30 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.

Nicholas Butterworth

18th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Anne Connor Butterworth

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Anne Connor Butterworth, resident at Church Cottage, St Leonards, Tring, 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 at the disruption that will be caused to her journeys by traffic congestion and movements of construction transport and equipment. She needs to make journeys several times a week from St Leonards through The Lee to Great Missenden and Wendover to use the A413 for shopping, medical services, recreation and to gain access to High Wycombe, Gerrards Cross, Denham and the A 40 to Central and West London. Your Petitioner regards the A413 as an essential part of the Buckinghamshire transport network infra-structure and is greatly concerned at the prospect of major lengthy delays caused by the construction of HS2 on the surface through the greater part of the Chilterns as will make that road virtually unusable to her and many others causing A413 traffic to use the narrow lanes of the AONB which were never intended for such heavy and disruptive use and which will result in lasting damage to a characteristic feature of the area. Your Petitioner is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

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

e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the
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 to 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
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.
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 Connor Butterworth

18th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Mr & Mrs Andrew Dunlop  

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 Rosehill Barns, Chetwode, Buckinghamshire, MK18 4LF. 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.

Andrew Dunlop & Sarah Dunlop

04/04/16
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF those listed below:

James Adam
Priscilla Adam
Harold Leslie Ayres
Olive Madeline Ayres
Caroline Byford
Shaun Byford
John Cole
Margaret Cole
Hazel Coles
Peter Coles
Michael Coventry
Sigrid Coventry
Tina Crawford
Mark Eaton
Gerald Harris
Madeline Harris
Allan Hewitt
Leah Hewitt
Margaret Hewitt
Elizabeth Philomena Kearney
Michael Richard Kearney
Julie Lue
Kenneth Lue
Mandy Luzar
Vincent Luzar
Jon Nicol
Karen Nicol
John Stockwell
Nancy Stockwell
Caroline Tomlins
Mark Tomlins
Denise Waterton
Neil Waterton
Graham Williamson
Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners

1. The Petitioners live in London Road, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6PN, within a group of 25 properties, five of which have been/or are being purchased by HS2 Ltd under the Need to Sell Scheme. The properties are shown on map CT-10-020. Your petitioners have been the recipients of letters and information in the post from HS2 Ltd which indicate that it considers that they are affected by the Bill.

2. Their ages range from early 40s to late 80s and there are four children who attend local schools. Of your Petitioners, the newest moved here five years ago and the longest has been here for over 60 years. All the properties are detached and are a mixture of bungalows and houses.

3. Your Petitioners live in a valley within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the proposed route of HS2 is in close proximity to their properties. Map PC-01-021 shows that one property is in Home Owner Payment Zone 2, 13 are in Zone 3 and the others are between 300m and 400m from the centre of the proposed line and adjacent to designated Safeguarded Areas. One property is the subject of negotiation for sale to HS2 Ltd under the Express Purchase Scheme.

4. Three of the properties were used to take sound measurements for later comparison purposes.

3. Your Petitioners' concerns

5. Your Petitioners' main objective is to persuade your Honourable House to lower the line into a fully-bored or mined tunnel as it passes through the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

6. Objection is taken to both the construction and operation of certain of the scheduled works proposed to be undertaken in and near Wendover between Great Missenden and Stoke Mandeville. These works consist mainly of an embankment between Hartley Farm and Road Barn Farm; Small Dean Viaduct; and an embankment between the northern end of the Small Dean Viaduct and the southern end of the Wendover cut and cover tunnel. They include ancillary works such as satellite compounds, auto-transformer stations - Rocky Lane Underbridge Satellite Compound and Wendover Auto-transformer Station Satellite Compound (400m away), the Small Dean Viaduct Launch Satellite Compound (250m) and the Small Dean Viaduct Main Compound (650m) (see map CT-05-037), balancing ponds (see map CT-06-037) and portal buildings.

Problems caused by the construction process of the scheduled works
7. Your Petitioners aver that during construction of the scheduled works there would be the following effects:

8. The A413 (London Road) on which your Petitioners' properties are located and which is their sole means of access, is a single lane in each direction and the normal volumes of traffic will be hugely disrupted by the large number of traffic movements of heavy vehicles and plant serving the construction sites. Several hundred HGVs per day will cause long delays along this and all local roads, especially the B4009 and A41, which your Petitioners use on a regular basis, and give rise to increased risk and safety concerns.

9. Air quality will deteriorate to the level of discomfort and hazard to health through exhaust fumes from plant and large number of heavy vehicles using the A413 to transport the many thousands of tonnes of chalk, and the dust arising from the excavations for the viaduct and embankment.

10. Your Petitioners are also concerned that asphyxiative and explosive gases are to be stored at the Small Dean compound with the consequent risk to health from build-up and lateral migration.

11. Construction work, particularly pile driving in connection with the construction of the Small Dean Viaduct, plant and arisings movements will produce substantial noise and vibration, leading to difficulties in concentration during the day. The construction areas and compounds will be brightly lit for extended periods which in this area of little artificial light will make sleep at night difficult.

12. Your Petitioners are concerned that although the Code of Construction Practice might be written to the highest standard, enforcement will not be total without independent monitoring and fast track arrangements for the raising and resolution of breaches.

Problems caused by the operation of HS2

13. Your Petitioners aver that the operation of HS2 following the completion of the proposed scheduled works would have the following permanent effects:

14. The balancing ponds in Rocky Lane and London Road represent a risk to health as they will be substantial bodies of dead and stagnant water, contaminated with toxic substances from the railway. There is a risk of contamination seeping into the groundwater and aquifers.

15. Your Petitioners are also concerned that they will be at or above the level of the houses in London Road (A413) with the consequent risk of overflow and flooding in the periods of heavy and sustained rainfall as has been experienced in recent months and which is expected to become less exceptional in the future. The edge of one of the balancing ponds is approximately 30m from four of the properties.

16. Noise from the trains will continue to place an intolerable strain on your Petitioners' peaceful enjoyment of their homes as trains will be running along the top of an
embankment and on viaducts. This whole section of the line, and your Petitioners’ properties, are in a valley so noise from the train will bounce off and be amplified by the hillsides.

17. The embankments and viaduct will be approximately 15 metres high with gantries adding a further five metres, some 20 metres in total. The line will be visible from some of your Petitioners’ properties, as well as numerous viewpoints in the locality. All the structures will be permanent scars in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

18. Your Petitioners’ properties have been blighted since the announcement of HS2 in 2010 and their value will be adversely affected on a permanent basis.

Mitigation for construction of the present proposal

19. That construction traffic on the A413 and B4009 be permitted only during the agreed working hours, excluding rush hour (7-9am and 5-7pm) on weekdays.

20. That the number of construction vehicles using local roads be limited, and always in a manner so as to cause as little inconvenience to other road users as possible.

21. That all excess arisings be removed by rail, not road, to a suitable location and not be permitted to be dumped in the Chilterns AONB.

22. That before construction starts, a traffic management plan be agreed with the local county, district and parish councils, with arbitration being sought if agreement cannot be reached.

23. That for all matters relating to construction, permitted working hours be strictly limited to weekdays between 8am and 6pm, on Saturdays between 8am and 1pm, and no work at all on Sundays, with an hour before and after for start-ups and close down.

24. Your Petitioners support The Wendover Society and others in the specific limitation of noise levels, and that an independent organisation be appointed to monitor noise levels on a frequent and regular basis, with the results of such monitoring being immediately made public.

25. That artificial lighting at construction areas be limited to working hours.

26. That before construction starts, the Proposer should agree maximum level of toxic traffic emissions from construction traffic with local county, district and parish councils, with arbitration being sought if agreement cannot be reached.

27. That funding be made available to Wendover Health Centre and local hospitals for the provision of any necessary additional facilities to cope with increased demand on the health services.
28. That the Proposer ensures that full compensation for damage or loss to property or loss in property caused by construction of the scheduled works will be available to all those who suffer such loss.

29. That the Code of Construction Practice and all regulations and agreements dealing with all the above matters in paragraphs 19-28 be legally enforceable both at criminal and civil law, with civil law breaches being first dealt with by an Ombudsman, and the local county council having the right to bring both criminal and civil proceedings.

Tunnel Options

30. Your Petitioners support the proposal that part of the scheduled works be replaced by a tunnel under the whole of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This would overcome most of the disadvantages set out in paragraphs 6-18 above and all the disadvantages set out in paragraphs 19-29 above.

31. The Proposer has failed to take into account the value of the benefits that a tunnel would bring. For example, there would be no need to construct two exceptionally large viaducts, an overbridge, embankments and a cut-and-cover tunnel as well as the purchase of land and properties and the moving of electricity pylons, and damage to the environment would be avoided.

32. Your Petitioners support the Long Tunnel as proposed by Buckinghamshire County Council and others. If this proposal is not accepted, your Petitioners support the Short Tunnel option as proposed by The Wendover Society and others.

33. Your Petitioners recognise that the Extended Cut & Cover Tunnel proposal would give protection to our parish church of St Mary's and Manor School, but the associated 6m high noise barriers are ugly and unproven and the risk of disruptive noise is very real. This option would be very damaging to your Petitioners as it would bring the tunnel portal to within 950 metres of their properties and additional mitigation measures would have to be sought.

34. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that unless the Bill is amended by the inclusion of a Long Tunnel under the whole of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or a Short Tunnel from Wendover to Great Missenden it should not be allowed to pass into law.

Financial Compensation

35. The values of your Petitioners' houses are already blighted to the extent as to be unsaleable on the open market and they are outside the present compensation zones. The compensation proposals by the Proposer are inadequate and your Petitioners seek a modification of the scheme to include their properties so that they may seek Express Purchase by the Proposer.
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.

James Adam

Priscilla Adam

Harold Leslie Ayres

Olive Madeline Ayres

Caroline Byford

Shaun Byford

John Cole

Margaret Cole

Hazel Coles
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.

Peter Coles

Michael Coventry

Sigrid Coventry

Tina Crawford

Mark Eaton

Gerald Harris

Madeline Harris

Allan Hewitt

Leah Hewitt
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.

Margaret Hewitt

Elizabeth Philomena Kearney

Michael Richard Kearney

Julie Lue

Kenneth Lue

Mandy Luzar

Vincent Luzar

Jon Nicol

Karen Nicol
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.

John Stockwell

Nancy Stockwell

Caroline Tomlins

Mark Tomlins

Denise Waterton

Neil Waterton

Graham Williamson

15 April 2016
To The House of Lords
Session 2015-16

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

The Petition of Cora Bower

Declares that

1. The petitioner is the owner of 54 Mornington Terrace NW1 7AR on the border of the cutting close to the heavy engineering works at the Portal under Parkway.

2. Your petitioner is an elderly partially disabled woman who has lived quietly in this resident area for over twenty years.

The proposed engineering works include major pile driving and tunnelling, building and pipe laying, usually working at night and at weekends over decades. The noise, vibration, dust and disorder will cause stress and illness, dangerous for frail pedestrians, cyclists like her family visiting from Highbury with a young child. The family attend St Mark's Church nearby. To avoid the dust and noisy traffic conditions she will be confined to the house with windows closed. Unlike the rural community on the route, there is no compensation for the community in Camden in spite of the statement that "protected children and old people" would be given special treat.
The petitioner would like to ask what form would this special treatment take. The Protected area is another matter—where the geographical position is the qualification for priority claim for compensation.

Mitigation

The petitioner suggests most important mitigation measures involve controlling air quality by monitoring, by giving warning of high readings over local radio broadcasts so protective measures (masks for example) can be worn.

Similarly high levels of noise and vibration should be monitored, by the residents as well as the HS2, in other words trigger levels must be revealed to the public on a “freedom of information” basis.

Uncertainty the speed from humming should so by rail (or canal) not by road on hundreds of lorries causing danger to the community.
To recapitulate—

Trigger levels for sound vibration and air quality must be clearly understood by residents. There should be monitors set up in the cutting area and viability of bad levels caused by the work of pile driving, grinding metal, digging and demolishing, and any other damaging noise. These results should be published or made known to all.

Vibration and shocks should also be monitored.

Air quality also needs clear inspection and monitoring so that we have a baseline and measurement of degradation of air we are breathing so that masks can be worn appropriately by vulnerable residents.

This could be linked to an arrangement with the building contractor when a family continue to live in a home when major reconstruction is going on, but also includes a night shift of heavy noisy work to keep them awake over some decades. The arrangements would need to be similar to that for a war zone.
The Speaker then asks that, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, he given an opportunity to give notice on all or some of the issues raised in his petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

And the petition remains...

CORAL BOWER

18 APRIL '16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Michael Neil Geddes and Madeleine Angela Wahlberg

 Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners

The petitioners live in residential property at Lowfield, Long Itchington Road, Offchurch, which is acknowledged by HS2 Ltd to be adversely impacted by HS2, and are thus specially and directly affected by the proposal.

3. Your petitioners concerns

Your Petitioners seek undertakings from the promoter to mitigate the impact of the construction and operation of HS2 on their property and that of neighbouring properties, in particular but not only the noise impact of the Fosse Way Construction Compound and the construction of Offchurch Cutting.

This compound will be operational for five years and is situated in close proximity (100-300m) to a number of residential properties, including our own, while construction of Offchurch Cutting (situated between the Construction Compound and our properties) will take three years. Mitigation proposed by HS2 Ltd is inadequate to give proper protection to our property and that of neighbours from the impact of all sources of nuisance. We therefore seek undertakings and assurances to ensure that:

a. Modern best practice standards (such as used in the construction of Crossrail) should be applied to the mitigation of noise, dust, vibration and other sources of nuisance during construction and operation.

b. The compound should be surrounded by earth bunds (not just fences). There should be no breaks in these bunds on the sides facing residential properties. The bunds should be of sufficient height to block all sources of noise and light nuisance from the compound.

c. Solid fill should be used under the ends of the green bridge of Offchurch Greenway, filling the cutting, to prevent noise channelling along Offchurch Greenway.
d. The impact of the construction of Offchurch cutting should be mitigated by fencing or use of temporary spoil heaps.

e. There should be no flexibility to vary upwards the height of Offchurch Cutting.

f. In view of the close proximity of the construction compound and the Offchurch Cutting to residential properties, there should be an absolute ban on night and weekend working.

g. In order to address the impact of dust, mitigation should include, but not be limited to, the use of ‘bottom drop’ trucks; and damping should be undertaken at the dust source, with the supply of water identified in advance.

h. In order to further address the impact of construction noise, mitigation should include, but not be limited to quiet vehicle reversing indicators; no tamping at night within hearing of these properties; and no use of water pumps at night unless the noise is fully mitigated.

i. Compound lighting should be of low intensity and directed away from residential properties.

j. Operational mitigation should include, but not be limited to, the use of noise and vibration reducing ballast in track construction in this area.

k. Wall insulation as well as double or triple glazing should be offered to houses to mitigate noise to individual properties both during the construction and operation phases.

l. The proposed closure of Long Itchington Road should be implemented prior to all other construction activity in the area.

m. The land identified for the construction compound should be returned to agricultural or community-agreed use.

n. Any further land taken for construction nearby should be subject to the same agreements and undertakings as the currently identified land in the Hybrid Bill.

o. A planting plan for the area to be planted between Fosse Way and Greenway, which identifies what species; when to be planted; and how and by whom maintained, will be agreed with the local community before the closure of the compound.

p. The replacement routes and bridges for Offchurch Greenway shall be provided within 2 months of closure.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 April 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF DAVID AUGER

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill except the provisions under the cross-headings “Railway matters” and “the Crown”.

Your petitioner

2. The petitioner is David Auger (hereinafter referred to as “your petitioner” or “the petitioner”) who is the owner and occupier of the leasehold property 52A Mornington Terrace, London NW1 7RT (“52A” or “the Property”) on a long lease with 99 years remaining with the Freeholder being the local authority, London Borough of Camden. The petitioner is currently 48 years of age, married with a 41 year old wife and eight year old daughter who attends a local school five minutes walk away. Your petitioner submitted a petition to the House of Commons allocated number 1652 in relation to the Bill before the Additional Provisions were introduced, and a petition AP3 038 as an amendment, however his concerns were not resolved and further, concerning, information has come to light and he seeks to petition your Lordships’ House.

2.1. Mornington Terrace runs approximately North-South parallel and adjacent to the West Coast Main line railway line into Euston Station where the proposed route is included within the cutting between Mornington Terrace and Park Village East (“Camden Cutting”).

2.2. Mornington Terrace (“the Terrace”) was built in the first half of the 19th Century probably between 1840 and 1850. The building at Number 52 (“the Building”) is five storeys high split into three flats with the petitioner’s flat being the Ground and Lower Ground with garden. The Building is situated at the top (North) end of the Terrace, close to Delancey Street and is within the Camden Town Conservation Area.

2.3. The construction of the Building is typical of the period with rather shallow foundations to be expected. Extensive damp works carried out at the Property suggest the building is typical. The petitioner understands that the building is situated on London Clay which may also have been backfilled after original construction of the Camden cutting. The cutting was considerably widened at the start of the 20th Century, it is believed, when the houses on the opposite side of the road was demolished and the street renamed Mornington Terrace (previously Mornington
Road). Most of the current Mornington Terrace including the petitioner’s building is listed.

2.4. In 1998 when your petitioner purchased the property the trains were barely audible from inside the Property as this was a significant factor to consider at the time of purchase but the Property enjoys a lot of light having only a six foot wall on the other side of the road rather than similar buildings as the Terrace being four storeys high excluding the lower ground level. The panoramic views are a feature of the neighbourhood and from the main reception room of the Property.

2.5. The Terrace is a relatively quiet residential street with speed bumps and a 20mph speed limit. Initially the traffic was light but there has been an increase in traffic, after similar traffic calming measures were introduced in neighbouring streets with vehicles using the Terrace as a cut through from Mornington Crescent up to the junction with Parkway rather than use Camden High Street and Delancey Street which experiences much heavier traffic flows. Generally though, the traffic is light.

Your petitioner’s concerns

3. The proposed Scheme described in the Environmental Statement attached to the Bill includes widening the cutting on the western side and the demolition of a number of buildings in the vicinity of the petitioner’s property including carriage sheds and some very substantial residential blocks. This will cause considerable noise and dust with potential exposure to any toxic or dangerous substances in the buildings including potentially asbestos. In addition three bridges will demolished including Granby Terrace where your petitioner rents a garage and Mornington Street Bridge just down the road, all of which Your petitioner uses regularly. In addition both the retaining walls on each side of the cutting, plus a further wall mid cutting, will be demolished to some extent. All of this is easily within 1/4 mile and some much closer within 50m and will create noise as well as dust with additional impacts from heavy goods vehicles.

3.1. Considerable construction is planned in the Camden Cutting including the rebuilding of three bridges, three retaining walls as well as a box structure housing the high speed tracks, the Euston Portal and a new Head-house building. This will create noise as well as dust with heavy construction techniques potentially causing substantial vibrations. This was an issue for some properties on Mornington Terrace during the West Coast Main line upgrade 15 years ago. During those works vibrations were apparently bad enough to cause items to fall off shelves although not in your petitioner’s property as most of the relevant works at that time were further away at the southern end of the Terrace. This time, your petitioner understands, works will be within 50m of the petitioner’s property. The Head-house building is also expected to be above the current retaining wall in height impacting the view from your petitioner’s property.

3.2. Historically legislation has been introduced in Parliament and at the European level to protect individuals from unreasonable construction practices including hours of construction working and environmental considerations including noise, dust and air
quality as well as the right to take legal action for nuisance. At the present time your petitioner’s rights and protection from such threats will be significantly reduced or even removed without a change in current proposals, as the proposed mitigation measures leave an unacceptable level of residual significant adverse effects.

3.3. Your petitioner believes the planned works, as described in the Environmental Statement, (“ES”) deposited with the Bill, together with the supplementary Environmental Statement deposited with AP3 (“SES2 and AP3ES”) controlled by the measures described, and in the Code of Construction Practice, will significantly affect your petitioner and other residents of Mornington Terrace simply based on what is stated including noise, with your petitioner’s property being offered noise insulation, dust, increased traffic being on an HGV route, being in close proximity to construction compounds as well as 60m from a large construction site for over 10 years with large amounts of the construction activity at night. Your petitioner’s property will also be permanently impacted by the change in views from his property as well as operational effects.

3.4. The majority of the works take place in the cutting will be done outside core hours including the demolitions and a considerable amount of piling.

3.5. There are a number of planned road closures and diversions as a consequence of the works. The Environmental Statement notes heavier traffic on Arlington Road and Mornington Street This will impact residents on Mornington Terrace as drivers find ways round congestion. Mornington Terrace is also anticipated to be closed for periods of time.

3.6. Delancey Street, less than 20m from your petitioner’s property will also be used as a major construction route. Mornington Terrace itself will be also be used by HGVs going to the construction compound proposed on Mornington Terrace itself. HGVs using local roads will cause increased noise, air pollution including toxic gasses and particulates.

3.7. The effect of road closures, demolitions and construction works will have an impact on the community, also described in the Environmental Statement as a severe adverse effect.

3.8. Your petitioner currently rents a garage from London Borough of Camden off Granby Terrace. This will be demolished and alternative garaging needed. With the number of streets impacted by the proposed Scheme it is unclear how the residents will have anywhere to park as residents’ parking spaces are removed.

3.9. Utility works will also be required on Mornington Terrace.

3.10. Your petitioner’s Property is set in a conservation area with a considerable number of listed buildings. The presence of the railway cutting creates a sense of openness and long range views both across the cutting and southwards towards the west-end with the BT Tower for example clearly visible. The ES includes detailed sections on the
impact of the proposed Scheme on Cultural Heritage as well as Landscape. The Environmental Statement notes Viewpoint 004.2.007: View west from Mornington Terrace, Viewpoint 004.1.008: View west from Mornington Street and Mornington Terrace and Viewpoint 004.1.010: View west from the corner of Delancey Street and Mornington Terrace (which is taken very close to the Property) all impacted.

3.11. Following the completion of the works there will be permanent changes in views from your petitioner’s property and Mornington Terrace in general including views of the retaining walls and Mornington Street Bridge but particularly the Euston Portal Head House. While the SES2 and AP3 ES describes the impact from Park Village East across the cutting towards Mornington Terrace the reverse view is not described in the Environmental Statement despite being impacted as shown by a picture in the Map Book.

3.12. Public transport used by your petitioner and family will be impacted (particularly C2 Bus) and London Underground.

3.13. Your petitioner notes that the impact of the changes described in the new Environmental Statement accompanying AP3 are of increased significance and duration compared to the original scheme. This was after the original ES was described as a worse-case scenario. For example:

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 4.10.4 notes

4.10.4 At the north end of the railway approach, the duration of noise impacts from the revised scheme will be increased over those for the original scheme, both during the daytime and at night. Additional work activity at track level near the tunnel portal at night will increase impacts so that, in the revised scheme, a further approximately 25 dwellings on Delancey Street are likely to qualify for noise insulation. Impacts at the northern end of Park Village East, including residential properties and Park Village Studio, are also predicted to be longer due to the additional need for construction vehicle access from the north and for construction plant to be placed on Park Village East for the reinstatement of Line X.

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 AP3 ES 19.13.5 notes:

19.13.5 In respect of other environmental topics, SES2 (Part1B) acknowledges that in respect of sound, noise and vibration, the reinstatement is likely to extend the duration of significant adverse effects on nearby residents, in construction Stage A, although the levels of significance will not be made worse.

3.14. Your petitioner notes that this appears inconsistent with the Promoter’s assertion that the new phased approach for Euston reduces the impact of construction.

3.15. Your petitioner has read the Environmental Statement in detail and particularly the Approach to Mitigation described in Volume 1 and noted figure 43: Mitigation Hierarchy. He suggests that in understanding the devastating impact the proposed scheme will have on his life and that of his family over the next decade or more, that
alternative schemes should be sought where the "human cost" is too high. With the information available to him, he suggests that the current proposal is just such a scheme and is unacceptable.

**Lack of clarity on overall scheme in Euston area and approach**

4. The Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker to do construction works which are estimated to take approximately 10 years to complete in the immediate vicinity of your petitioner's property. At the current time the intended plans and works are not completely specified and the detailed arrangements for mitigation are equally unclear or open ended and subject to variation leaving your petitioner in an impossible position as to exactly how he should petition. No clarity has been received since he petitioned the House of Commons. The Bill is effectively a carte blanche to set in motion whatever HS2 Ltd and relevant Government Ministers think appropriate and potentially even beyond the scope of High Speed rail but rather property development and alleged regeneration in your petitioner's local area. The total environmental impact of all the proposed activity is unquantified as no integrated Environmental Statement has been prepared.

4.1. The new design produced in AP3 for a high speed station to the west of the "conventional station" does not include the whole station and with a Crossrail 2 station to be included later to the east of the conventional station the current ideas around an HS2 / Crossrail 2 interchange appear flawed with such a wide separation. The need for an integrated station was highlighted before the House of Commons Select Committee, which was endorsed, but plans have not been drawn up at this time in relation to the station serving the non high speed train services. Indeed, your petitioner understands that the basic timetables agreed between the Promoter and the London Borough of Camden have slipped already. Hence the plans for the overall redevelopment of Euston Station itself are incomplete and the corresponding assessment of impacts is therefore incomplete as the, as yet unspecified, works to the remainder of the station will undoubtedly further negatively impact your petitioner in terms of additional air quality and traffic impacts at the very least assuming no further works are required to the conventional tracks in the cutting. Even this cannot be assumed since the design of Hampstead Road Bridge has been put forward to maintain flexibility in relation to moving the alignment of the conventional tracks and changes to the tracks in Euston will have an impact in the Camden Cutting in close proximity to your petitioner's home. The same challenge of how to undertake the construction works while keeping the trains running will also exist. The solution being used for HS2 of simply building a new station alongside the old one will not be available.

4.2. Your petitioner objects to this piecemeal approach on the basis that a comprehensive design is required and that any further works in the Euston area will undoubtedly further impact your petitioner. These impacts should be considered together with the currently proposed scheme which cannot be done until the future plans for the entire Euston station are known. Consequently your petitioner requests that the Bill should be amended to allow for a temporary station at Old Oak Common and the Euston area
work delayed until a comprehensive plan with the associated Environmental Impact Assessment has been prepared.

4.3. The additional provisions and new design have formally removed the originally proposed HS1 - HS2 Link. However your petitioner understands the original route or alignment of tracks, which impact the angle of approach for the tunnels to the Euston Portal, has not been changed despite any requirements that existed previously in the relation to the Link being removed. Prior to submission of the bill it was noted in the ES that work had been undertaken to reduce environmental impacts.

There does not appear to have been any consideration of the approach to reduce the environmental impact after submission and the removal of the Link, with the work focussing instead on station design. Therefore a better solution has not been sought. The use of the platforms at Old Oak Common intended for the HS1-HS2 Link lines to support the use of Old Oak Common as a temporary terminus appears to have been missed.

4.4. The current alignment requires the extensive demolition works proposed in the Cutting including the residential tower blocks and bridges described in the current scheme. Your petitioner understands from the Promoter that no assessments or alternative plans have been carried out or considered after the decision to remove the HS1-HS2 link to evaluate the merits of a slight variation which would for example avoid the demolition of the Park Village East retaining wall or Mornington Street Bridge. Your petitioner was informed at the Information Session held on 8 July 2015 that the representatives present (the experts on this matter) did not know if the alignment could be varied to avoid demolition of the Park Village East retaining wall. Your petitioner asks that detailed analysis is undertaken to evaluate the possibilities and what the consequences might be given the scale of disruption that will be caused to local residents under the current scheme. Your petitioner appreciates that this will take time and repeats his ask in relation to Old Oak Common becoming a temporary terminus. Further, at the same Information Session held on 8 July 2015, your petitioner was informed that the current plans on number and length of high speed trains running into Euston meant that, with the numbers of passengers alighting at Old Oak Common, the trains would be significantly under capacity or less than half full. This would suggest the need for a terminal at Euston is somewhat less than had been originally anticipated.

4.5. At the following week's information session, held on 15 July 2015 regarding Euston Station design, your petitioner was informed that part of the design process included an evaluation of proposals where the Deliverability Criteria was

"Is the station solution deliverable without causing unacceptable impacts, either to the local community, or to passengers using the existing railway?".

However, in SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 1 para 1.3.4 it does not mention local residents.

6
"The design and staged construction programme of the revised scheme has been planned to minimise disruption to the operation of the conventional station, but also to be compatible with the potential future redevelopment of the conventional station."

Your petitioner submits that the current proposal does not meet that Deliverability criteria, and for example, no proper evaluation of the multiple impacts has been properly undertaken. Further, the decision on the current plans appear to have been nearing completion and the decision taken selecting the station prior to the decision to reinstate Line X which increases the impact on local residents in the Camden Cutting Area yet further.

4.6. Your petitioner notes that a number of alternatives for the station have been considered including the Double Deck Down option. While not technically qualified to assess the engineering challenges, your petitioner notes that the current proposals, for only half a station and construction extended to 2033, cost a similar amount to the original proposal for an entire station with considerable disruption as well. Having ruled out possible alternatives too early, the result is not dissimilar but with a much larger footprint and only half a rebuilt station. Your petitioner therefore repeats his request that plans for Euston be revisited and Old Oak Common used as a temporary terminus while a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken for all alternatives. Your petitioner notes that the level of devastation to his neighbourhood is too high and encourages the consideration of the full range of alternatives.

Lack of clarity on impact on your petitioner, his family and his property

5. Despite the proximity of the petitioner’s property to the proposed main line of HS2 and the construction sites, only very limited correspondence has been received from HS2 Limited regarding the impact and non specific to Mornington Terrace. Your petitioner has asked HS2 Ltd about his Property specifically but has been informed that the information is not available i.e. only that which was in the Environmental Statement. Questions in relation to your petitioner’s property were not answered because apparently the information has not been prepared for individual properties. This is despite the analysis and description given in both the original Environmental Statement and the greater impacts in AP3 Environmental Statement Non Technical Summary specifically referring to Mornington Terrace, as described in this Petition. Your petitioner petitioned the House of Commons both on both the original bill and AP3. The Petition response documents were generic and non specific, frequently referring to the Environmental Statement that often had been quoted in the original petition. Your petitioner, having identified errors in the Environmental Statement has requested details of the known errors in the document. HS2 Ltd has refused to give these. The only conclusion that can be drawn by your petitioner is that while the plans prepared by HS2 Ltd do not have the detailed impacts, the preparers of the environmental statement have concluded on the devastating impacts the proposed scheme will have on local residents and have reported accordingly. If the plans are insufficiently advanced to consider impacts at a property level then your petitioner is concerned at the lack of detail around potential mitigation with many of the
conclusions within the Environmental Statement being after mitigation allegedly detailed in the Code of Construction Practice but little actually guaranteed.

5.1. Your petitioner is aware that immediately prior to London Borough of Camden's scheduled appearance before the House of Commons Select Committee agreement was finally reached and a number of assurances provided. Residents were not party to any of the discussions and were not provided sufficient time to digest before they themselves were scheduled to appear. Further the agreements themselves were often unclear and indeed subject to further negotiations. Indeed Camden only published the subsequent agreements in February 2016. The Statement of Expectations agreed between the Promoter and LANC and subsequently Camden is still draft and has not been published. The assurances have been portrayed as fixing the construction impacts in Camden, but rather they are frequently mechanisms designed around controlling the impacts rather than reducing them, without clarity to actually provide comfort to residents.

5.2. The promoter has not engaged with residents as to the meaning of the assurances and how they will operate. In the one (and only despite months of requests) meeting on the specific subject of noise insulation that was held on 7 April 2016 with the Camden Cutting Group co-chairs (of which your petitioner is one), it became clear that there were clear differences as to interpretation between HS2 Ltd and London Borough of Camden, and residents understanding from conversations with Camden. This is the only meeting HS2 has held with residents of which your petitioner is aware.

5.3. Your petitioner, with other residents on Mornington Terrace raised their concerns including around the specifics of Noise Insulation with the House of Commons Select Committee. Despite specific comment by the Select Committee for HS2 Ltd to engage with residents on Mornington Terrace, and the assurances given to London Borough of Camden on engagement, there has been a steadfast refusal by HS2 Ltd to engage with residents. For example the Euston Community Representatives group has not met since September 2015. This has fundamentally impacted residents' ability to resolve issues prior to petitioning the House of Lords and the need to petition on many matters again. The Promoter's actual behaviour for the last four months could not, in this petitioner's opinion, be further from the wishes of the House of Commons Select Committee.

5.4. Your petitioner therefore repeats his objection that the entire scheme south of Old Oak Common is inadequately specified with a lack of sufficient clarity around mitigation measures set out in The Environmental Statement that was deposited with the Bill together with the Code of Construction Practice that is also flawed (as is shown in subsequent paragraphs).

5.5. In order to overcome your petitioner's concerns and notwithstanding previous proposals, your petitioner requests your Lordships' House to require the Promoter / HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker to review the construction strategy for the project in the Euston Area, the Camden Cutting and Camden Town generally with its related works by considering their cumulative impacts.
on communities. The various impacts are discussed further in this Petition but there is a cumulative impact of all the impacts described.

Exclusion of works outside scope of high speed rail

6. The current plans include the potential for over site development including a number of structures south of the Mornington Street Bridge. Your petitioner is concerned that these plans are incomplete or conceptual and the impacts incompletely assessed. Your petitioner remains concerned as to the current plans and specifics.

6.1. For example, the visual impact assessment appears flawed. The proposed buildings will fundamentally impact the views across the cutting in both directions, impacting the settings of the listed buildings in conservation areas that are a fundamental part of the local community. Your petitioner asks these building are designed with minimum impact above street level and that any such impact is in keeping with the surroundings. Your petitioner is concerned that without appropriate controls over the appearance of these buildings, any future buildings will be under less stringent controls resulting in an inevitable deterioration of the visual landscape as a whole.

6.2. Your petitioner is further concerned as to scheme only providing cover for the high speed tracks will alter the acoustics of the cutting making it noisier.

6.3. The scheme also refers to what utility and ancillary works will and will not be undertaken and your petitioner fears such works not specified will further impact him and his family.

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 3.3.10

In the approach, ancillary works for OSD are proposed over the high speed tracks between Granby Terrace Bridge and Mornington Street Bridge. However the construction of OSD will need to be authorised by separate planning applications, which will need to be supported by an ES.

6.4. In light of the revised scheme and the inclusion of the over site development works, your petitioner requests that, if over site development is to be undertaken, that the full effects should be considered and reported on rather than the current arrangement where local residents will be subjected to numerous proposals all contributing to detrimental impacts but not considered collectively.

6.5. Your petitioner notes that European directives on Air Quality requires that where a development causes a breach of relevant emissions levels in a location it should not proceed. Also that the development should not proceed if it makes worse an existing breach and therefore delays compliance with existing values. Your petitioner believes any OSD in the foreseeable future would result in further breaches and seeks clarification and confirmation of the situation. Your petitioner reserves the right to petition further in this regard.
6.6. Your petitioner is also concerned by Clause 48 of the Bill (compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration and relocation) which is too broad in scope and is not limited by time or distance. Your petitioner believes that this power should be removed and submits it should be, or at least if not then significantly reduced in scope, and limited in time.

6.7. Your petitioner also believes it is unnecessary and inequitable to seek to acquire permanent rights in relation to any property where limited and temporary rights are sufficient for construction of the works. Indeed, while your petitioner's property is not currently impacted it is in close proximity to the works and other properties with an associated legacy from such open ended arrangements.

6.8. Accordingly, your petitioner requests that the Bill be amended so that the nominated undertaker may only acquire limited and temporary rights that are actually required for the purpose of the scheme being a high speed rail and nothing further.

Environmental Statement attached to the Bill

7. Your petitioner understands one of the purposes of an Environmental Statement is to identify potential effects from major works for purposes of both information and assurance to those impacted. The original ES Non Technical Summary notes on page 3:

"As required by law and Parliamentary rules, the Government has provided Parliament with a detailed statement assessing the likely significant effects of the Phase One project on the environment - the ES. The ES has been prepared by a group of independent environmental consultants on behalf of HS2 Ltd."

7.1. Your petitioner is concerned that the impression given in the scheme is one of detailed control and mitigation measures but actually in examining the impacts in a specific situation there is a oft repeated reference to other documents with technical sounding names and “reassuring” acronyms but opt outs or exclusions frequently exist that result in your petitioner having no real protection that can be relied upon, or if necessary, enforced.

7.2. Your petitioner objects to the wording “provided that such measures are reasonably practicable and do not add unreasonable cost or delay to the construction or operation of the project.” Such exclusions are too subjective and allow too much scope for variable application based on flawed priorities of what is reasonable or unreasonable.

7.3. Your petitioner submits that this “reasonableness test” should be replaced by a higher standard, i.e. "best practicable means" which should be on the face of the Bill. The measures should be agreed with the relevant local authority who should have final say rather than HS2 Ltd, and measures should be subject to independent assessment, verifiable and challengeable.

7.4. Further, your petitioner requests that in addition to the Bill together with the Environmental Statement being amended to remove the “reasonableness” test and
instead applying "best practicable means" in all cases as requested above, any further documents not directly part of the bill by being attached or referred to but without legal standing need to be incorporated.

8. Your petitioner further objects that the current scheme has numerous work streams running in parallel but that no cumulative analysis of all the impacts has been considered including noise, dust and air quality from both demolition and construction, with utility works as well as additional transportation. In the absence of such analysis then your petitioner has no alternative but to object to the scheme proposed in the area of Camden Town and Euston as a whole. Accordingly your petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to provide a detailed assessment to the cumulative impacts in a format that is comprehensible to a local resident such as your petitioner and that your petitioner is given an opportunity to comment and further petition as may be necessary.

9. Your petitioner notes the undertaking that the effects described in the Environmental Statement will not be exceeded but is concerned that this is being used to justify "a worse-case scenario" with the supposed concession that it will not be as bad. Unfortunately this approach creates uncertainty as to what is actually proposed and difficulties in assessing the real impact. This is compounded by the fact that HS2 Ltd refuses to publish known errors in the document, so the petitioner is left wondering as to how breaches are treated when an error is involved.

9.1. An example of this can be seen with the three buildings proposed in the Cutting all of which are described with a height of up to 8m including the Euston Portal head-house almost directly opposite your petitioner's property. The maximum possible size is now correctly shown in the photomontage but your petitioner disagrees that the impact is not significant. This scale of the building above street level appears out of all proportion to the access requirement described.

9.2. The Environmental Statement ('ES') is clear that there are a large number of significant adverse effects that will not or cannot be mitigated by HS2 as they remain Significant Adverse even after mitigation. Your petitioner is concerned that there appears to be no category defined worse than Significant Adverse with the effect that while impacts may be worse during actual construction, they may not be categorised as such. This leads to how any increase in impacts over those recorded in the Environmental Statement will be identified and acted upon.

9.3. Further, there are references to controls as yet unidentified with the view to suggest the impact is less

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 4.10.6

4.10.6 As in the main ES, it is expected that under the requirements of the draft CoCP, the contractors will, through the application of best practicable means (BPM), find additional ways to reduce noise levels and vibration on site so that the extent of noise
insulation and residual significant noise and vibration effects will be less than that reported at this stage.

9.4. Overall, Your petitioner is not convinced that the Promoters have properly considered all the impacts of the construction, particularly noise, on the surrounding roads and the consequences of Mornington Terrace being listed in the Environmental statement. In order to overcome your petitioner's concerns relating to the lack of proper mitigation and controls, your petitioner requests the Promoter be required forthwith to provide a detailed assessment of the impacts on your petitioner's Property (along with the other local residents) and provide a clear indication as to extent of sound insulation possible and that will be provided together with clarity on the need for re-housing and the impacts of that.

10. In his first petition, your petitioner raised the issue of defects in the ES and the concerns of the London Borough of Camden. Your petitioner notes that AP3 ES and SES2 Volume 2 includes a section on errors in the original ES but that to date, despite numerous requests the Promoter has refused to provide an equivalent list or any details of known errors in the AP3 Environmental Statement. Your petitioner reserves his right to petition on any matter that comes to his attention as a result of an omission or inconsistency that may yet to be communicated.

10.1. In addition to the errors, your petitioner is further concerned that some of the omissions are so significant as to amount to a failure to comply with Parliamentary Standing Orders and he filed a Memorial ("the Memorial") on behalf of Camden Cutting Group to that effect.

10.2. Notwithstanding the previous paragraphs the Promoter's response to the Memorial was that a number of the issues raised were not for the Examiners to consider, but rather the HS2 Select Committee. Your petitioner was concerned that this would increase the time required before the Select Committee significantly and when Camden residents did finally appear there was considerable pressure to reduce time available. Your petitioner therefore humbly asks that adequate time is made available before the House of Lords Select Committee if the Promoter is unable to provide adequate information in the meantime.

Status and use of the Code of Construction Practice.

11. Attached to the ES is a draft Code of Construction Practice, ("CoCP"). It is understood that this will be used to manage and mitigate issues identified. However the code does not clarify what exactly, if anything, will actually be done.

Referring back to Draft CoCP para 13.2.2 notes the following (i.e. no commitment):

"........then, where despite the implementation of BPM the noise exposure exceeds the criteria defined in this CoCP, the contractors may offer: noise insulation; or ultimately temporary re-housing."
11.1. Your petitioner notes that the Code of Construction will continue to be applicable. 

The Environmental Statement is also rather vague SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 1 para 7.1.1

The measures that will be used to mitigate likely significant adverse environmental effects during construction and operation of the scheme are described in the main ES, including the NTS, and the draft CoCP, which sets out measures to manage and control the effects of construction. These were provided to Parliament at the same time the Bill was deposited in November 2013. The same generic mitigation measures described in the main ES still apply. Site-specific mitigation measures are described within volumes 2 and 3 of the SES2 and the AP3 ES, where required.

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 1.1.8

It should be noted that the standard measures that will be used to mitigate likely significant adverse environmental effects during construction and operation of the scheme are described in the main ES, Volume 1, Section 9 and the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) submitted in support of the Bill. Implementation of these measures has been assumed in this assessment.

Your petitioner raised a number of concerns in relation to the CoCP in his first petition and these remain despite the assurances received by Camden where key documents, such as LEMPs, and details are still unavailable. Your petitioner notes that these documents are full of good intentions but lack detail. Your petitioner notes that similar good intentions are included in the draft Community Engagement Framework but the practice is totally opposite behaviour. Your petitioner is concerned that once the construction work starts, the Promoter will treat other documents with a similar level of disrespect.

11.2. Your petitioner attended the information session held by the Promoter on 30 June 2015 in relation to the CoCP and understands the framework around the controls including the CoCP has been used before and is based on a number of infrastructure projects including Crossrail and HS1. Your petitioner is concerned that the scale of works, particularly at a surface level in relation to HS2 in the Camden Cutting, is unprecedented in terms of scale, impacts and duration. Your petitioner enquired as to the work that had been done in relation to this and what allowances had been made for the significantly increased duration for example but no substantial reply has been received. Given the unprecedented nature of this project, your petitioner is concerned that the overall impact on residents has not been adequately considered or mitigated.

11.3. Further your petitioner is concerned that the critical detail that would be provided in the Local Environment Management Plans, LEMPs, was not available per HS2 and yet drafts at least appear to have been available as early as Spring 2014 following a FOI request from another local resident which is not consistent with what was presented at the information session by HS2 Ltd.
11.4. Your petitioner read with interest the Select Committee Report from the House of Commons and the response from the Department of Transport and particularly Paragraph 73:

"The Promoter recognises that residents in Camden whose homes are particularly close to the construction works for HS2, such as Ampthill Estate, will wish to be consulted on the mitigation measures for these works. HS2 will engage with local community representatives on the Local Environment Management Plans (LEMPs). Furthermore, engagement on the Community Liaison Plans will include mechanisms for residents associations and other established groups to communicate their preferences regarding how the impacts of the construction programme can be moderated, including consideration of construction breaks and non-working Saturdays."

Your petitioner is concerned that the Promoter appears to be delaying the publication of any LEMP until after the House of Lords petitioning to avoid adverse comment since the matter has been raised by residents for nearly 2 years without success. Your petitioner reserves the right to petition further given the current uncertainty and the poor engagement to date by the Promoter.

11.5. Notwithstanding the concerns with the content and extent of the draft CoCP, your petitioner is also concerned that the proposed CoCP has no statutory basis since it is not actually part of the Bill. Consequently, your petitioner is concerned as to how HS2 Ltd will be held accountable for the actions measured against the CoCP. Further the status of the policies referred to within the CoCP (for example the policy on re-housing referred to previously) is equally unclear. Your petitioner submits that the Code of Construction Practice together with the relevant policies should be incorporated into the Bill in such a way as to ensure their compliance can be legally enforced by those they are designed to protect.

11.6. Further your petitioner is extremely concerned that his local authority appears unable to get agreement from the Promoter on provision of detailed, timely and regular results from the monitoring of construction impacts. The petitioner is appalled that such vital information for his protection should be withheld and can think of no conceivable reason why an organisation should validly seek to withhold such information. Your petitioner therefore requests full investigation of this matter as to why agreement has not been reached. This should be done even if the Promoter subsequently reaches agreement with London Borough of Camden since it demonstrates a wider problem which is critical to protecting the health of local residents impacted by construction. Further, your petitioner requests that such information is made public to ensure those impacted are fully informed.

11.7. Further, your petitioner is left wondering who HS2 Ltd would ultimately be accountable to. One suggestion is that Parliament and not the nominated undertaker should be accountable for the project, however your petitioner urges your Lordships' House to consider additional arrangements including residents' representatives. Any monitoring required under the Code of Construction Practice should involve the relevant local authority as well as independent experts with effective oversight and
redress arrangements in the event of non-compliance with the Code of Construction Practice. Further, remuneration targets and bonuses for managers involved in delivery must reflect the high importance of safeguarding the health and safety of local residents by compliance with the Code as well as timely completion which appears to be an overriding concern at present at the expense of local residents.

11.8. Even with a workable set of environmental standards, your petitioner is concerned as to their compliance and the associated risk of HS2 Ltd / the nominated undertaker / the Promoter failing to fulfil their obligations, consequently your petitioner requests that the Bill includes provisions enabling enforcement against the Secretary of State in the event of one of the above failing to fulfil their obligations. Your petitioner is also concerned that "commercial" decisions may be made around environmental issues such that limits may be breached to keep to deadlines. This ethos has already be shown in some of the "reasonableness" tests. Consequently your petitioner urges that strict penalties be included within the framework of control with a high monetary quantum, including a substantial element going to those impacted. This is not to reward those but rather to deter any breaches by the Nominated Undertakers at others expense. While it is anticipated that HS2 Ltd may object to this, there can be no justification for doing so if the intention is to be bound by the limits imposed.

11.9. Further given the close relationship between the Secretary of State, the promoter and the nominated undertaker, there is a concern around the possible fettering of the Secretary of State's discretion to act given the agreements that maybe in place. Consequently, your petitioner urges that the Bill should be amended so that undertakings given by the Secretary of State and / or the promoter / nominated undertaker / HS2 Ltd during the passage of the Bill are enforceable by the beneficiaries of the undertaking in the courts.

11.10. In light of the above and the fact that the works proposed under the new scheme have increased, including the reinstatement of Line X included within AP3 which is only at a conceptual planning stage, your petitioner reviewed the mechanisms available to residents impacted during construction works of Crossrail including a review of documents published following the work of the Crossrail Complaints Commissioner.

11.11. Your petitioner is concerned that HS2 appears to be following a methodology that has failed to adequately deal with at least some of the issues experienced with Crossrail and your petitioner has identified a number of other projects including the Thames Tideway Tunnel and Northern Line Extension that also have Codes of Construction Practice. Your petitioner notes that while a number of assurances have been given in this area to others, residents have no such protection. Accordingly your petitioner humbly requests your Lordships' House to consider whether the Promoter is following best practice and to request the Promoter to incorporate the additional measures included in other more recent projects to provide additional controls to protect your petitioner and other local residents, including as an example but not limited to a commitment to brief the work force about local issues including noise, as has been done in the Thames Tideway Tunnel CoCP, to ensure that community
relations are not a "box ticking exercise" that never influences what actually happens on site.

11.12. Your petitioner is concerned that the current corporate culture within HS2 Ltd is flawed as noted in recent reports, and that the ability to rely on HS2 Ltd to comply with the spirit of protecting residents is lacking. Your petitioner suggests an independent Adjudicator is required to monitor compliance with the Code of Construction Practice and related documents with sufficient enforcement abilities. It is not sufficient to rely on a Complaints Commissioner who is reactive rather than proactive. The role of the Complaints Commissioner is considered later in this Petition.

Inappropriate use of impacts being identified as “Temporary”

12. Your petitioner notes that the scheme separately identifies effects as being either the construction phase or operational phase and as being either Temporary or Permanent with the over-riding principle appearing to be that anything during the construction phase is Temporary. Your petitioner would like to point out that the terms used in this consequence are merely relative and that, in the area of employment legislation for example, temporary has been used to try to circumvent protection for individuals and so too in this case where a period in excess of 10 years is considered temporary. Your petitioner strongly disagrees.

12.1. To further illustrate, your petitioner questions whether someone would consider moving to a temporary home likely for 10 years, a temporary school for 10 years, use of a temporary car for 10 years. Certainly with respect to the very young or very old the term temporary would take on a different perspective. An alternative scheme might be to shut down the existing rail services into Euston, it would only be a temporary measure but your petitioner suspects that even 24 hours would be unacceptably long for most commuters rather than just “temporary”.

12.2. Another scenario could be if your petitioner wished to sell his property at some point in the next 10 years while construction was underway. In 2017 say with 9 years to go a potential purchaser faced with 9 years of future construction would undoubtedly take a very different view to a purchaser in 2025 with only one year of construction to go despite all the construction effects being only temporary. Your petitioner suspects that a scientific study as to how long impacts would need to be before behaviours changed would show that it would be a much shorter period than 10 years.

12.3. Your petitioner is concerned that a number of assessments that should be required to understand their impact in the environmental statement have been excluded or where negative impacts identified they have been downplayed or dismissed on the basis that they are “temporary” but without further analysis. For example temporary loss of parking is identified, however the issue of where the vehicle should be kept with the shortage of parking is not addressed. If no alternative parking facility is provided then the only alternative to sell the vehicle is hardly temporary? Another example would be the loss of a playground in a public space, for a six year old child this is pretty permanent if the playground is next available 10 years later when now a
sixteen year old. Your petitioner is also concerned as to the cumulative effects of all the different temporary items which does not appear to have been assessed as a totality.

12.4. Your petitioner is concerned at the common theme that runs through the environmental statement that appears to link the idea of temporary with the idea of a reduced level of mitigation and ultimately compensation. For example the statement “Utility works will be temporary in nature and are a common occurrence in urban areas.” However this is flawed since the majority of utility works normally undertaken are repairs and maintenance rather than the major infrastructure works planned in the scheme with removal of utilities from one street and potential replacement elsewhere as per the reference to possible works in Mornington Terrace if there is insufficient space in Park Village East. Utilities works may be common in London as a whole but not in an individual street such as Mornington Terrace.

12.5. Accordingly your petitioner objects to the principle that the application of the relevant rules and regulations in relation to the construction works should be on a "Temporary" basis. This is particularly relevant to potential health impacts where any reduction in life expectancy has to be considered permanent.

12.6. In order to overcome your petitioner’s concerns, your petitioner requests guidance on the significance of the length of time where impacts occur rather than simply Temporary or Permanent. Further, your petitioner requests that the simple link between “Temporary” and level of mitigation or, in the absence of adequate mitigation, then compensation, be broken and instead the more equitable principle of preventing and compensating losses suffered be followed. Following this, your petitioner requests the Promoter / HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker to review the construction strategy for the project in the Euston Area, the Camden Cutting and Camden Town generally in light of the change of principle that where residents are impacted then costs will be incurred from mitigation or compensation that may impact some of the design decisions that have been made.

12.7. Your petitioner notes that the Promoter has provided no adequate response to issues raised by this petitioner or others in this regard and your petitioner repeats his request that alternative less disruptive alternatives are examined.

Waste and hazardous materials

13. Your petitioner notes that there is a considerable amount of demolition and excavation proposed within the Euston and Camden Cutting area. Your petitioner is concerned regarding the age and scale of some of the buildings to be demolished together with the previous industrial usage of the land being excavated. Your petitioner is concerned that the full impact on local communities has been underestimated and by suggestions that principles of waste hierarchy embodied in legislation are being ignored by HS2 Ltd.
13.1. AP3 includes the reintroduction of Line X with the associated replacement (and therefore demolition) of the retaining wall in the middle area of the cutting to the west of the conventional tracks, Line D. Further with Line X sitting on part of the box or dive under structure the high speed tracks will sit on, the excavations for this structure may be deeper.

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 AP3 ES Para 19.13.4 notes:

"19.13.4 The reinstatement of Line X is not considered to require an assessment of the environmental effects or proposed mitigation for: agriculture, forestry and soils; air quality; cultural heritage; ecology; land quality; socio-economics; traffic and transport; and water resources and FRA."

13.2. In order to overcome your petitioner's concerns, your petitioner requests your Lordships' House to require the Promoter / HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker to obtain an independent assessment of the current scheme and that proper identification of the potentially hazardous materials be carried out prior to commencement of works.

13.3. Further your petitioner requests that the Bill be amended that (1) The Secretary of State and the nominated undertaker be required to comply with the requirements of the Waste Framework Directive and review its decisions on treatment of waste to ensure compliance with the waste hierarchy as detailed in that Directive. Such review should include publishing details of the "integrated design approach" to waste management and subject to consultation to enable effective public participation on this issue and (2) The Secretary of State, the nominated undertaker and the relevant local authority be required to agree arrangements for monitoring and enforcement of mitigation measures designed to safeguard local communities near the construction sites for the high speed railway and associated development from adverse effects created by waste. Such plans to be overseen by an independent body picked by Parliament

Road closures and congestion

14. The environmental statement that was deposited with the Bill suggests a number of road closures and significant disruption. This will undoubtedly result in severe congestion in the surrounding area and use of other residential roads by increased vehicular traffic and construction vehicles.

14.1. Park Village East will need to be closed fully for a period during demolition and reconstruction of the retaining wall, during which all traffic will be diverted however no alternatives are provided.

14.2. The proposed Scheme also includes the demolition of the Mornington Street Bridge. This is within 100m of the petitioner's property and removes one route over the railway line. It should be noted that for several months of 2013 structural repairs were carried out to the bridge with a traffic contra-flow system in place causing disruption
and clearly demonstrating a lack of coordination. The bridge is planned to be closed for 4 years.

For example SES 2 and AP3 Vol 2 CFA01 para 8.4.39 considers the access issues to Park Village East following the removal of the Mornington Street Bridge

"The demolition and replacement of Mornington Street Bridge will also mean that residents will not be able to gain vehicular access to and from the east, while those works are in progress. There will be continuing discussion with residents in Park Village East in order to identify ways to reduce the impacts of these works. The access restrictions for residents and the duration of the construction works will result in a major adverse isolation effect on the local community which is significant."

14.3. Mornington Terrace is a one way street with traffic flowing northwards in the opposite direction to Park Village East. Access to your petitioner’s property from the North is then round one of the various "one-way" routes either Park Village East and Mornington Street Bridge, or Parkway, Arlington Road, Delancey Street and Albert Street. Alternative access would be from the South via Hampstead Road, however this is not considered in the Environmental Statement nor is the "access from the west" equivalent to para 8.4.39 above.

14.4. The proposed Scheme also includes the demolition of the Granby Terrace Bridge (at the same time as Mornington Street Bridge for 2017 to 2023. This effectively removes any access to Mornington Terrace from the south or west apart from Euston Road and Hampstead Road (via Mornington Crescent), already congested before works commence.

14.5. Your petitioner remains concerned that the Promoter still does not fully understand the traffic flows in the Camden area particularly around the Camden Cutting and particularly the one way routes with Park Village East southwards and Mornington Terrace northwards.

This is shown by the suggestion in relation to cycling.

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 AP3 ES Para 15.4.71 notes:

15.4.71 During the works that affect Park Village East a footway will be maintained alongside the worksite. Cyclists may be required to dismount to pass the worksite, but alternative routes are also available for cyclists via A4201 Albany Street or Mornington Terrace. The effect on cyclists is therefore not significant.

This was further demonstrated at the information sessions when HS2 representatives were unable to explain how local residents approaching home from the Marylebone flyover (which your petitioner frequently does) were expected to reach their homes on Mornington Terrace without a significantly delayed journey.

14.6. Your petitioner notes that plans include the temporary closures of Mornington Terrace.
SES2 and AP3 ES Volume 2 CFA01 Para 5.3.79

5.3.79 During short discrete periods of construction activity, Mornington Terrace may need to be closed to through traffic. The road will then access bi-directionally, from the north end of Mornington Terrace in and out from A503 Delancey Street and from the south end via Mornington Terrace, Clarkson Row (or Mornington Place) and Mornington Crescent.

In your petitioner's case this would be from Delancey Street however this would be an a difficult if not dangerous manoeuvre with the current layout which is designed to prevent a left turn against the one way system. This does not appear to have been considered.

14.7. Considerable Utility works are planned for Mornington Terrace, Delancey Street and neighbouring streets. This will cause further considerable disruption.

14.8. Your petitioner is concerned about the cumulative impact of works from multiple utilities contractors contributing individually to the total disruption and noise. This is increased by the obvious lack of coordination in the last couple of years with major disruption from major works to a bridge scheduled to be demolished and replacing water mains where major works again required.

14.9. The proposed Scheme in its current format does not consider the cumulative effect of all the construction activities, road closures and traffic congestion. and is indeed flawed in the opinion of your petitioner in the suggestion that there is a reduction in the traffic on Mornington Terrace and that drivers facing traffic jams on other neighbouring roads won't consider an alternative route. Common sense (and indeed the experience from traffic calming measures) suggests drivers will seek alternatives.

14.10. Your petitioner also notes that London Borough of Camden are concerned and noted the following in their extremely detailed response to the Environmental Statement, on page 59:

"Camden Council has reviewed the transport assessment within this ES and very specifically the core transport information provided in Vol 5. On the basis of its own Screenline surveys and data and experience and that of other stakeholders, it is Camden Council's contention that the transport impacts described in the ES are largely under-estimated resulting in inadequate mitigation proposals arising from this inaccurate and not fit for purpose transport assessment."

14.11. Overall, your petitioner is not convinced that the Promoters have properly considered the impact of the closure of Park Village East on the surrounding roads (with the additional impact of Construction Compounds partially blocking roads as well (see below) and the consequences on the various one way routes around the area. Consequently your petitioner objects to the proposals in relation to road closures without a proper plan for alternatives.
14.12. In SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 Table 26 your petitioner notes that during busy periods Mornington Terrace will experience 20-30 HGV two way movements serving the construction compounds and yet Mornington Terrace does not appear in Table 28 suggesting increased impacts and indeed Table 30 notes that Mornington Terrace traffic impacts for all traffic are moderate beneficial in scenarios 2 and 3 and for HGVs moderate beneficial in scenario 2. Mornington Terrace is currently rarely used by HGVs in your petitioner's experience. A possible explanation could be the case that road closures offset the increased traffic when open but this would not be a beneficial effect in your petitioner's view.

14.13. Further, Table 28 in the SES and AP3 ES shows Mornington Crescent, Mornington Place, Mornington Street, Albert Street and Arlington Road all worse which as a local resident, your petitioner would expect to impact Mornington Terrace significantly.

14.14. In order to overcome your petitioner's concerns relating to severe congestion, your petitioner requests the Promoter be required to provide an explanation forthwith as to how the various one way systems are expected to work around Camden Cutting and Camden Town from 2017 to 2023 and beyond through the construction period.

14.15. Your petitioner notes the proposals for a Traffic Management Plan to be agreed with the London Borough of Camden however your petitioner is concerned that no sensible workable solution is possible and that this will not be realised until too late in the process. Further, whatever proposals are adopted, your petitioner requests that risk assessments to be completed by the nominated undertaker, relevant statutory undertakers and emergency services in relation to the access and transport issues raised by increased road usage for each Community Forum Area in the Camden area should be available to the public.

14.16. Consequently your petitioner remains concerned with regard to this area but understands that discussions in this regard are ongoing with London Borough of Camden and Transport for London. At a minimum he humbly asks that junction modelling be undertaken and made publically available, that the Promoter be urged to provide a proper and reasoned explanation as to what the impacts are to your petitioner.

Air quality and pollution

15. The London Borough of Camden already suffers some of the highest levels of air pollution and according to media reports is in breach of various legal limits and facing fines. Your petitioner is naturally concerned about air quality issues which is particularly obvious when cleaning around the air-vents in the Property.

15.1. The proposed Scheme in its current format does not appear to consider the cumulative effect of all the construction activities, road closures and traffic congestion. In addition Mornington Terrace is in area designated as CFA01 in the Environmental Statement but is close to the boundary of both adjacent areas CFA02
and CFA03. There does not appear to be any cumulative analysis of effects between areas.

15.2. With air quality and pollution apparently already exceeding legal limits, the scheme will result in levels increasing yet further. This will undoubtedly have a negative impact on local residents’ health. With poor air quality linked to early cause of death, your petitioner is left wondering what is an acceptable level of increase? Would one resident suffering an early death as a result of increased pollution over a 10 year period be an acceptable cost of HS2 in its current format? If one is acceptable then what is the cut off point? How many man-years of lost life are acceptable? If one is unacceptable then a major re-think is required. In the view of your petitioner any argument that a deterioration in air quality is acceptable as it won’t have a lasting impact is akin to a smoker arguing the impact of a cigarette is not significant and lungs will re-grow when medical evidence is that 10 years of smoking is damaging – albeit only temporary in some people’s opinions?

15.3. Your petitioner notes that in the Environmental Statement that the air quality in Mornington Terrace is not predicted to be adversely impacted. This is surprising given the amount of significant adverse impact in neighbouring streets and the amount of Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) to be used in the cutting with the prevailing winds blowing the pollution towards Mornington Terrace. Your petitioner seeks clarification and reserves the right to petition further.

15.4. Your petitioner notes that the Cutting area falls outside of the Central Activity Zone, within which all Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) will be powered by latest class IV best practice standard engines. The Cutting area is classed as part of ‘Rest of Greater London’, where IIIb-class machinery may be used. The Cutting area should be treated as if it were part of the Central Activity Zone for these purposes as the duration and impact of the works is similar to those in Euston.

15.5. Your petitioner understands that before the construction commences there will be an air quality baseline monitoring study and requests a copy of this report should be made public. Your petitioner submits that the Bill should be amended so that thresholds for air quality and an air quality mitigation plan should be produced for each Community Forum Area, to apply both during construction and operation of HS2 and that any construction activity should not be permitted to start that that is predicted to contribute to the air quality worsening above the current baseline.

15.6. Further, undertakings should be required so that HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must ensure that air quality is maintained within acceptable and legal levels in urban areas including Mornington Terrace and Delancey Street to ensure that the levels of dust and air pollutants, including vehicle emissions, are no worse than prior to the commencement of works and brought within legal limits where applicable. This should include detailed actual monitoring where works are carried out and including on Mornington Terrace rather than just extrapolations from existing research points.
15.7. Your petitioner requests that the local authority, London Borough of Camden, should be provided with powers to monitor air quality in accordance with binding mitigation plans and in the event air quality thresholds are breached, your petitioner submits that the Bill should be amended to enable the local authority to require the cessation of construction activities until such point as air quality thresholds are complied with.

15.8. Where mitigation measures are insufficient to mitigate the impact of increased pollution or where, for whatever reason, construction is not halted per the proposal in the previous paragraph then undertakings should be required so that HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must fully compensate for alternative accommodation costs for all those impacted recognising that simple monetary compensation can never cover the impact on health caused by long term exposure to air pollution. Your petitioner recognises that this could be extremely expensive but asks what price is HS2 Ltd putting on the health of local residents.

15.9. Your petitioner notes that the EU directive on Air Quality requires that where a development causes a breach of relevant emissions levels in a location it should not proceed. Also that the development should not proceed if it makes worse an existing breach and therefore delays compliance with existing values. Your petitioner believes the construction work proposed, including the on-site construction vehicles, trains to convey materials and road vehicles make it implausible that HS2 will meet this criterion and asks that HS2 make a clear commitment that they will abide by the Directive and ensure not undertake construction that would breach emissions standards.

15.10. Your petitioner has noted that the Promoter appears confident that the impact from dust in relation to construction and demolition can be minimised.

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 4.3.6

The main ES reported that the methods for controlling and managing dust emissions from construction outlined in the draft CoCP were likely to be effective and there would be no significant residual effects from dust emissions. The assessment of the revised scheme has applied updated guidance on controlling construction dust. The conclusion is that there will be no significant residual effects during construction Stage A.

SES2 and AP3 Vol 2 CFA01 para 7.4.18

The methods outlined within the draft CoCP are considered effective at reducing dust emissions and no significant residual effects are considered likely from dust emissions.

15.11. However, your petitioner is concerned to what significant means in reality, particularly when at the relevant Information Session the mitigation shown in relation to demolitions was a photograph of a man holding a hose, hardly effective when demolishing a housing block. Consequently your petitioner asks that HS2 provide community feedback on dust and air quality in the form of ‘traffic light’ red / amber / green signs in public locations on local streets including the north end of Mornington Terrace. Such feedback should be updated weekly. More detailed data for agreed
locations in residential streets should also be provided regularly, particularly on construction routes and also locations that are downwind of the major work.

**Building and Satellite Compounds**

16. During the construction phase of the proposed Scheme, a number of “satellite construction compounds” including Mornington Terrace Sidings, Granby Terrace, Carriage Shed & Park Village East, Park Village East (North) and Mornington Street Over-bridge Compounds will be sited close to your petitioner’s property with North and South Hampstead Road, and others further afield. A number of these will have out of hours working with significant construction activities and increased traffic and congestion resulting from the vehicles going to and from these compounds.

*Mornington Street Over-bridge Compound*

16.1. Of particular concern to your petitioner is the Mornington Street Over-bridge compound site which is sited actually running along Mornington Terrace as per the Map Book.

16.2. The Mornington Street Over-Bridge Compound will partially obstruct the Terrace, increase noise and traffic congestion as well as removing car parking spaces. The lack of specifics implies a proper analysis has yet to be carried out and the promoter is “hedging his bets” obtaining as many sites as possible despite the obvious negative impacts on local residents. Of particular concern is the statement in the Environmental Statement, when describing the compound, is that it "may be larger". The responses to his questions at the information session held by the Promoter following the publication of SES2 and AP3 ES unfortunately only reinforced the view that the compound’s use was unclear with the experts made available unable to articulate the exact needs, and totally unsympathetic to residents’ concerns.

16.3. Your petitioner is concerned about the risk to public safety posed by the potentially large, heavy lorries and articulated vehicles, that may use the compounds especially in light of the residential nature of Mornington Terrace.

16.4. Your petitioner objects to the use of a residential street such as Mornington Terrace being used as the location for a Satellite Compound, other than for specific works directly in relation to the works thereon, for example specifically the Mornington Street Bridge eastern foundation, given the obvious negative impacts on local residents and the number of other sites in the area and wonders are all of them really necessary in such close proximity and of such a size.

16.5. Your petitioner is not satisfied that full consideration has been given to the exact requirements for the various sites or the potential for using other sites not on residential roads particularly when such non specific details are given. Accordingly your petitioner requests an undertaking be required from the Promoter to properly evaluate what the exact requirements are and to identify a solution not using
residential streets wherever possible given the disruption caused, particularly given
the presence of multiple other sites not on residential roads in close proximity.

16.6. From discussions with the Promoter, your Petitioner understands this "may be larger"
comment relates to wider not longer however nothing that can be relied upon has
been received and he seeks further clarity and reassurance. Your Petitioner raised this
issue before the House of Commons Select Committee on behalf the Petitioners from
Mornington Terrace appearing collectively. This concern remains since the Promoter
in response at the hearing in December 2015 referred to an assurance given to
Camden that in fact relates to construction compounds of different projects and
appears not relevant in this instance.

16.7. Your petitioner therefore urges the Promoter be instructed to rethink the approach to
this compound and to reduce its size to the absolute minimum which is clearly defined
in a better understanding of the compromise that is needed to reduce the impacts on
residents, and to provide the appropriate assurances and undertakings. He is awaiting
a further response from the Promoter and reserves the right to petition further.

16.8. Your petitioner notes that the number of HGVs visiting the two compounds related to
Mornington Terrace is 20-30 per day during the busy periods which are unspecified.
Your petitioner suggests this is unacceptable on a quiet residential street and an
alternative needs to be found utilising the rail connections in very close proximity,
indeed the Mornington Terrace sidings compound is already effectively connected to
the rail network.

16.9. Your petitioner is concerned that the part of the ES relating to compounds makes no
mention of the need to remove mature London plane trees to make way for this
compound. Mornington Terrace is a tree lined street, with mature London plane trees
a number of which will potentially be removed for the Satellite compound. Their death
cannot be mitigated given the difficulties of transplanting mature trees.
Notwithstanding the above, Your petitioner objects to the removal of the mature
trees to facilitate a satellite construction compound given the long term consequences
on the view down the Terrace. Accordingly your petitioner requests an undertaking be
required from the Promoters to ensure no trees are damaged under any
circumstances and suggests administration and support facilities and storage at the
very least can be sited elsewhere.

Mornington Terrace Sidings Compound

16.10. Your petitioner is also concerned regarding the Mornington Terrace sidings satellite
compound site that although in the Camden Cutting will be directly outside his property
albeit the other side of the retaining wall. Your petitioner is concerned at the proximity
of this site to his property but previously thought the impact will be reduced as it is in
the cutting, a much more appropriate location than on a residential street.
Notwithstanding that, he is now extremely concerned around noise given the impacts
of recent investigative works undertaken in the first couple of months of 2016. Further,
he is extremely concerned at the inability of those responsible to answer simple
questions regarding the investigative works and the lack of mitigation present despite the apparent agreement with London Borough of Camden that appropriate measures would be used.

16.11. Accordingly your petitioner requests that (notwithstanding other requests) that night time working in the compound is kept to a minimum particularly noting that from the experience of the West Coast Main Line upgrade works, considerably less actual night time working was actually required than originally requested, and that any deliveries are on an exception basis and only during core hours.

16.12. Further, notwithstanding the above, your petitioner notes that compounds may use generators. These will undoubtedly be noisy contributing to the background noise of the area. Your petitioner finds it inconceivable that a suitable power source could not be found or provided in such a location as the Camden Cutting over a 10 year period and consequently requests an undertaking that generators will not be used in built up areas except as a last resort and with clear procedures to ensure compliance.

**Park Village East (North) Compound**

16.13. Your petitioner is also concerned regarding the Park Village East (North) satellite compound site that although across the Camden Cutting will be directly opposite his property at the same level and with the prevailing winds carrying the noise across the cutting. Recent investigative works in the cutting on the Park Village East retaining wall has clearly demonstrated how the sound carries and has been loud enough to disturb sleep. Questions to the Promoter about the recent works remain unanswered. It is unclear that the new effects have been included in updated noise models and your petitioner seeks clarification in this area and reserves the right to petition further.

**Residential on street car parking**

17. The proposed Scheme notes a loss of car parking from various sources including road closures with utility works as well as using local roads for satellite compounds / depots. In addition any construction traffic will undoubtedly effectively remove residents' parking spaces given the narrow nature of residential roads with cars parked along them and the likelihood of damage from HGVs.

17.1. In his first Petition, your petitioner noted that the suggestion that the impact on parking amenity in Mornington Terrace would be "moderate adverse" as not being credible given the proposals. Your petitioner was disappointed but not surprised to note the following in the new Environmental Statement.

Non Technical Summary, Page 33
SES CFA01 Summary of residual environmental effects - Traffic and Transport

"Effects on parking and loading facilities arising from construction of the revised scheme in Stage A are identified at the following locations:

Mornington Terrace (major adverse);"
The effects are in fact worse when multiplied up by the fact that several streets are impacted with the demand for spaces no different but the supply of spaces reduced.

17.2. At the information session following publication of AP3, your petitioner asked the simple question "Where should I park my car?". The first reply was "somewhere else", when asked where with the suggestion that adjacent streets did not have rows of empty residential parking spaces, it was finally admitted that the HS2 individual did not know and the staff member was the alleged expert.

17.3. The Promoter does not appear to have even asked the question to London Borough of Camden on the number of spaces and permits issued and hence the scale of the problem. This is just another example of how the Promoter has failed to properly consider issues despite being on notice of them for over two years.

17.4. The reality is that the Promoter has come up with a plan removing the ability for local residents to park (and therefore possibly have a car) with no plan or mitigation considered. While a relatively smaller issue compared to the "will I be able to sleep at night for the next 10 years" it clearly demonstrates the Promoter's complete disregard for local residents and a casual indifference to the problems created.

17.5. In order to overcome your petitioner's concerns, your petitioner requests the Promoter / Nominated Undertaker be instructed to undertake a detailed assessment of the total impact on the parking requirements of the Proposed Scheme and publish a plan as to how this issue will be managed.

17.6. Further, your petitioner requests that powers to review the zoning and rules for such permits to give greater flexibility to local residents impacted by HS2 in finding somewhere to park, and in particular to evaluate the number of permits issued against the number of spaces available.

17.7. Your petitioner therefore asks an undertaking be given that no residential parking spaces will be removed until a specific replacement is found for each removed space within a short distance from residents' properties.

17.8. Further, your petitioner humbly asks your Lordships' House to instruct the Promoter to have a greater respect for local residents' concerns, and in examples such as the above, realising that they may well be right given their local knowledge rather than ignoring them on the basis they are simply being unreasonable.

**Heavy Goods Vehicles**

18. Your petitioner is concerned by the significant amount of waste which is potentially due to be transported by road in the immediate vicinity of Mornington Terrace which will impact significantly upon the quiet enjoyment of the Property and the neighbourhood by way of noise, disturbance, visual intrusion and traffic increases.
Your petitioner is concerned that the plans for such a significant number of lorry movements have not been properly assessed.

18.1. Consequently, your petitioner objects to the use of HGVs to remove spoil and rubble from excavations and demolitions. All such transportation should be via rail to avoid additional (and therefore excessive given current) pollution levels including dust, particulates as well as Nitrogen Dioxides.

18.2. Your petitioner understands a study is being undertaken in this area as agreed between the Promoter and London Borough of Camden due in May 2016. Accordingly your petitioner reserves the right to petition further when that study becomes available. It is disappointing that while this study was to be available prior to the Bill being discussed in the Lords, further delays have yet again denied residents appropriate and necessary information.

18.3. Notwithstanding the objection above, your petitioner objects to the use of HGVs on Mornington Terrace which is a quiet residential road with traffic calming measures unsuitable for HGV transportation. Consequently your petitioner requests the route be amended accordingly, or if this is not possible then appropriate measures must be introduced to protect local residents given the volume of vehicles anticipated.

18.4. Notwithstanding the objections above, your petitioner objects to the use of HGVs outside core hours given the additional noise and vibration caused. Consequently your petitioner requests the plans be amended accordingly, or if this is not possible then appropriate measures must be introduced to protect local residents given the volume of vehicles anticipated.

18.5. Whatever proposals are adopted, your petitioner requests that large vehicles as well as other construction traffic must be strictly controlled, having regard to the particular sensitivities of the area. Your petitioner therefore requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to binding mitigation measures in relation to the control of all construction traffic, assessment of suitability of roads for construction traffic, routing of lorries and other vehicles in accordance with a list of routes to be agreed with the nominated undertaker, London Borough of Camden, and local residents' representatives.

18.6. Whatever proposals are adopted, your petitioner requests that binding mitigation measures should include traffic management plans to be agreed between the nominated undertaker, the local authority being London Borough of Camden and the relevant highway authority to be monitored and enforced by environmental health officers.

18.7. Whatever proposals are adopted, your petitioner requests that risk assessments should be completed by the nominated undertaker, relevant statutory undertakers and emergency services in relation to the access and transport issues raised by use of construction traffic and HGVs in such high numbers for each Community Forum Area.
in the Camden area. Your petitioner requests that the results the risk assessment should be available to the public.

18.8. Whatever proposals are adopted, your petitioner requests that appropriate funding should be provided by the nominated undertaker to the highway authority for the maintenance, repair and reinstatement of highways required as a result of use by construction traffic.

18.9. With the current proposal for a significant number of HGV movements on Mornington Terrace and neighbouring streets all of which are construction routes, your petitioner has a number of important safety measures that he would like to be implemented to protect him, his family and local residents.

- No HGV movements on residential roads at night, all deliveries etc to be planned in advance so not required at night.

- No HGV movements between 7.45am to 8.45am and 3.15pm to 4.15pm when parents with children are walking to and from local schools.

- Metal Bollards to be placed on all pavement corners to prevent lorries mounting the pavement potentially injuring pedestrians or worse. With such bollards in place, the size of HGVs to be limited to those easily able to make the turning without endangering pedestrians.

- Pedestrian crossing at the top of Mornington Terrace to allow residents to walk up to Delancey Street and then down Parkway to Camden Tube Station and local amenities without having to cross roads without using a crossing.

- Pedestrian crossings to be placed on Mornington Street, Albert Street and Arlington Road to ensure residents can walk to Mornington Crescent Tube Station again avoiding having to cross the roads without a pedestrian crossing.

- All HGVs associated with HS2 to carry clear livery to enable residents to identify any dangerous practices.

18.10. Accordingly your petitioner urges the Promoter be instructed to ensure the above is implemented, in full, prior to any HGVs associated with the project or its enabling works being allowed to use residential roads.

18.11. Your petitioner notes that the Promoter is proposing that all HGVs entering low emission zones should be euro VI compliant. Since Camden is not in a low emission zone, your petitioner requests that this proposal be extended and that all HS2 connected vehicles entering the London Borough of Camden should be of the highest standard and that at least 50% should be non-diesel.
Noise during construction

19. The Environmental Statement deposited with the Bill acknowledges that cumulative impacts, particularly noise, arising from the construction works will significantly impact Mornington Terrace. Previous conversations had indicated that your petitioner's property would get noise insulation however in a recent generic letter addressed to his property and "the occupier" it notes "may" in bold. This is extremely distressing that even at this stage and with the understanding from discussions with Camden that there is still no clarification or certainty.

19.1. Despite some of the general mitigation measures proposed by the Promoter, your petitioner notes the following from reading the new ES published with AP3:

NTS Page 31-32
SES CFA01 Summary of residual environmental effects - Sound, noise and vibration

A number of residential properties in the Park Village East area, the Mornington Terrace area, Ampthill Estate, the Cobourg Street area and the Regents Park Estate area are estimated to qualify for noise insulation. The noise insulation will reduce noise inside these properties to a level where it would not significantly affect residents.

Construction of the scheme will result in significant temporary noise and vibration effects on a number of residential properties at Mornington Terrace, Gillfoot in Ampthill Estate, Cobourg Street, Euston Street, and Cartmell on Hampstead Road. Despite measures to reduce noise and vibration impacts on residential communities, there will be significant effects on the following residential areas during construction: Park Village East; Mornington Terrace and parts of Mornington Place and Crescent;

and

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 14.3.13 and 14

"14.3.13 Taking account of the avoidance and mitigation measures set out in the previous paragraphs, the following residential buildings are forecast to experience noise levels higher than the noise insulation trigger levels as defined in the draft CoCP:"

......

- in the Mornington Terrace area (approximately 130 dwellings):
  - Delancey Street (approximately 25 dwellings);
  - Mornington Terrace, North (approximately 60 dwellings);
  - Mornington Place (approximately 20 dwellings); and
  - Mornington Crescent, (approximately 25 dwellings); and"

"14.3.14 The mitigation measures, including noise insulation where necessary in the affected parts of these buildings, will reduce noise inside all dwellings to a level where it should not significantly affect residents."

19.2. However your petitioner remains concerned as to what significantly means and how this statement can be made with no regard to the type of building and restrictions it
may have from its construction. Further since no measuring has been done inside residents' buildings and none is systematically planned how would this be assessed. Consequently your petitioner requests that in addition to external noise monitoring, HS2 monitor noise levels inside properties that have had secondary glazing installed to ensure that noise levels do not exceed anticipated standards.

19.3. Your petitioner's concern has been compounded by the Promoter's refusal to discuss matters even as to whether his property is included within the 60. From recent discussions with London Borough of Camden there are 138 residences on Mornington Terrace that should be offered noise insulation but with HS2 and London Borough of Camden frequently unable to agree anything on a timely basis your petitioner is left in the dark as to what may or may not be offered.

19.4. Your petitioner notes the specific noise levels predicted in Volume 2 CFA01 Table 19 for Mornington Terrace (90 dwellings) including your petitioner's it is assumed since he has not been told this by the Promoter.

Day-time: construction noise, Contiguous piling retaining wall abutments, excavation, barrette wall construction (Park Village East) with typical and highest monthly noise levels around 70dB and 80dB. for 24 months

Night-time: Construction noise and vibration Mornington Street Bridge demolition, construction of new bridge piers with typical and highest monthly noise levels around 60dB and 75dB. Noise: 30 Months Combined noise and vibration: 3 Months

Your petitioner is concerned that the highest individual noise events will likely be louder than these figure.

19.5. Your petitioner remains concerned that the fundamental calculations needed for forecasting noise impacts, known as the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) and Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) may not have been correctly identified and were set too high in the Environmental Statement, leading to material underestimation of the adverse noise and significant adverse noise impacts likely to arise from the high speed railway and its construction. Further your petitioner is concerned that the Promoter continues to only consider construction noise and not the cumulative noise that will be suffered with the additional noise added to the existing noise background. This is further compounded by concerns as to how the current baseline has been established and the very little noise monitoring close to your petitioner's property.

19.6. At the House of Commons Select Committee, the Promoter argued that the type of noise insulation needed was not new, well understood and there should not be the problems with it that residents were raising. Your petitioner wonders if this is the case, then why the Promoter is so resistant to providing details with residents in an open and transparent way. None of the possible explanations can reflect well on the promoter or put residents minds at ease.
19.7. Following his appearance before the House of Commons Select Committee, your petitioner continues to be extremely concerned about construction noise, not least because of (1) the lack of engagement by HS2 following his appearance despite the encouragement from the Select Committee to do so and (2) the letter received on 9 April 2016 where none of your petitioner’s concerns as set out in previous petitions regarding the particular challenges of his building have been addressed. Indeed the suggestion continues to be made that insulation will be fitted internally when there simply isn’t sufficient space to do so with the original shutters that are present. Consequently your petitioner remains concerned that the Promoter is seeking approval for their plans when the current proposals are insufficiently developed and the impacts are not fully understood or assessed. Your petitioner asks that no construction work be allowed within 100m of his property until all the outstanding queries on construction noise are resolved, and reserves the right to petition further.

19.8. The Promoter has referred to a number of general mitigation measures such as screenings. Your petitioner, with assistance from his fellow Camden Cutting Group Committee Members, has considered the general mitigation (i.e. mitigation provided to the benefit of everyone outside individual properties and requests your Lordships' House to support the following proposals with the Promoter.

19.8.1. that HS2 commit to using very quiet plant and construction techniques and that HS2 go beyond "Best Practical Means" in order to minimise the impact on residents, thereby avoiding merely "practical" methods which could mean techniques that can be used without extra inconvenience, time or cost to HS2 and thereby affording greater protection to residents albeit to the detriment to HS2 but in a more equitable balance.

19.8.2. that local acoustic screens are built as close as possible to the works within the Cutting (which is up to about 100m wide) in order to limit breakout of noise at source. These screens will need to be specially designed and will influence how the work is undertaken and your petitioner asks that they are made an essential part of the construction requirements and budget given how much more effective they are than perimeter screens. In particular, given the expectation that the demolition in relation to mid-cutting retaining wall associated with line X will have a significant impact on your petitioner in Mornington Terrace, it is requested that this work is screened as close as physically possible. It is understood that this may have an impact on Line D but this would only be a temporary effect.

19.8.3. that perimeter screening in Mornington Terrace is designed by acousticians and built specifically for the Camden Cutting and are transparent to maintain the level of natural light reaching your petitioner’s property particularly at the lower ground level.

19.9. Your petitioner notes that according to the policy, noise insulation is dependent not only on noise levels but the number of days and/or nights impacted. Since, as clearly stated in the letter of 9 April 2016 the Promoter has not committed to providing noise
insulation to your petitioner’s property this continues to be of concern. The Draft Code of Construction Practice requires that the trigger levels are applied when the noise levels predicted or measured by the contractor exceeds the limit in for ten days in any fifteen consecutive days or for 40 days in any six month period. This is a potential 800 days over the ten year length of the construction. Your petitioner believes this is totally unreasonable and proposes the following levels consistent with the request of the Camden Cutting Group and that the noise trigger levels are applied when the noise level predicted by the contractors exceeds the limit for five days in any fifteen consecutive days or 20 days in any six month period or 30 days in any twelve month period or 40 days in any two year period.

19.10. After further analysis your petitioner is concerned around baseline measurements, and the number of measurement locations where results appear to have been substituted or very small samples taken and then the results extrapolated. Your petitioner is also concerned as to the reliance being placed on the noise model by HS2 given recent observations of how real noise travels. Further the noise model has not been calibrated through real world testing, and there are no plans to do so. Your petitioner asks that the noise modelling be subject to a calibration regime. Testing should be conducted to determine how closely the noise model accurately represents real noise effects from the Cutting on various receptors including those beyond the current predicted range of significant impact. Mitigation should be re-considered as necessary in the light of this calibration. This is an appropriate and proportionate step given this scale, duration and intensity of noise has never been created previously in a densely populated residential area.

19.11. Your petitioner is further concerned that the Promoter is not using best practice and indeed has even relaxed the trigger criteria compared to Crossrail which apparently was also where the model used. He seeks confirmation. Further your petitioner notes that despite the exceptionally long construction time, the Promoter is using different methodologies for construction noise and operational noise. Your petitioner believes that LAMax limits should be given for the construction phase in addition to the LpAeq dB limits given in the CoCP. These refer to individual noise events (as opposed to averaged noise levels over a period of time) which can be disruptive to sleep even if the average noise is relatively low. HS2 have said that limits for LAMax are not feasible however the Code of Construction practice for the Thames Tideway Tunnel includes limits for LAMax as does the Draft Camden Local Plan 2015 Appendix 2. Your petitioner urges your Lordships’ House to request HS2 explain why the use of LAMax is not feasible when it clearly is for other similar projects. Your petitioner is concerned that if LAMax is not incorporated into the assessment thresholds, then the mitigation will be inappropriate and ineffective with the end result of disturbed sleep patterns for a considerable period of time which is detrimental.

19.12. Your petitioner is aware of assurances given to London Borough of Camden Camden that confirm that the Local Authority retains its powers and obligations under section 60 and 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974. In theory this allows Camden Council to determine lower noise thresholds for noise insulation and re-housing. In practice this is not adequate as it provides no clarity to residents on whether or how this power will
be used over the extensive period of works. Further the Promoter is able to influence controls through arguing that construction of the project cannot be delayed. Instead it makes residents reliant on Camden Council, a body with conflicting interests. Your petitioner believes that it is appropriate that Parliament makes a clear determination on this as part of the legislative process.

19.13. Your petitioner considers that the duration of the project and projected noise levels is such that lower noise level thresholds would be more appropriate. Your petitioner requests your Lordships' house to recommend the following limits to the Promoter.

- 65 dB during the day 0800-1800 on weekdays (instead of 75 dB)
- 60 dB during the day 0700-2200 Sunday (instead of 65 dB)
- 55 dB at night 2200 -0700 dB (same as proposed by HS2)
- 65 dB at other times (instead of 65-70 dB)

19.14. Your petitioner's concern as described in the first Petition has only been magnified by the casual disdain and indifference frequently displayed by HS2 employees. The limited information obtained on the practicalities on the noise insulation has suggested that your petitioner may well be offered a wholly inappropriate solution to his property requiring a number of original features to be removed destroying the character of period building together with a substantial ventilation unit having to be installed in rooms that do not have space for them without removing other used items such as wardrobes. This is totally unsatisfactory. Your petitioner urges the Promoter to provide adequate information as to what the proposals are for your petitioner as part of the Petition Response Document or beforehand or be prepared to explain why this has not been possible over the last 2 years. Your petitioner reserves the right to petition further in this regard once clarification has been received.

19.15. Your petitioner considers it vital that adequate monitoring is possible within the local authority, London Borough of Camden, and that possible budgetary constraints may impact the level of expertise and resources available. Accordingly your petitioner requests HS2 provide funds for London Borough of Camden to employ as many full-time acoustic experts to engage with HS2 and their contractors as necessary to be effective.

19.16. Your petitioner's property has a private garden. At the present time it is unclear the impact the construction noise will have in rear gardens however your petitioner is concerned that he will suffer an adverse effect and lose the amenity of his garden for up to 10 years. Recent works in the cutting have clearly identified this is a problem with residents on Albert Street behind your petitioner's property kept awake by noise passing either over or more likely through the gap between 52 and 53 Mornington Terrace Your petitioner therefore requests your Lordships' House to ask the promoter to develop proposals as to how this will be mitigated if all the other proposals in are insufficient.

19.17. Where mitigation measures are insufficient to mitigate the impact of increased noise then undertakings should be required so that HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must fully compensate for losses suffered including
alternative accommodation costs recognising that simple monetary compensation can never cover the impact on health caused by long term exposure to loud noise.

19.18. Your petitioner notes that the Government accepted in its response to the House of Commons Select Committee report that there should be a review of compliance and noise thresholds within 6 months of start of the construction works. Your petitioner asks that there should be a mechanism to incorporate the views of the local residents and that the results of the review should be made public no later than 8 months after the start of the construction works. Your petitioner is concerned that remedial action is unspecified and further asks that if the thresholds are breached construction activity is halted until the matter is resolved.

Night time working

20. The Environmental Statement notes the majority of the works to take place in the Camden cutting will be done outside core hours including:

- evening work to construct retaining walls and abutment works in the south of the station approach;
- night work to demolish the carriage shed and buildings close to the railway;
- night work to demolish parts of Granby Terrace Bridge, Hampstead Road Bridge and Mornington Street Bridge, including installation of bridge demolition decks; and
- night work to construct parts of Granby Terrace Bridge, Hampstead Road Bridge, Mornington Street Bridge and the east west over bridge including construction of new bridge piers, installation of temporary supports, trusses and precast decks.”

20.1. Your petitioner notes the specific noise levels predicted in Volume 2 CFAO1 Table 19 for Mornington terrace (90 dwellings) has increased for typical monthly noise levels from 50dB to 70dB and for highest monthly noise from 65dB in the original ES to 80dB. No detailed explanation has been received.

20.2. Notwithstanding the submissions raised in relation to noise in general, your petitioner objects to the relaxation of rules around night-time working. Previous upgrade works to the West Coast Main Line originally sought similar carte blanche that was not in fact all required and when night-time working did occur compensation was offered recognising the disruption caused.

20.3. Your petitioner submits that any activities generating noise, especially at night should be restricted:

20.3.1. that all work is done during Core Hours except when required for technical reasons only, not cost or programme reasons.

20.3.2. that all work outside of the normal working hours is justified as part of the LEMP process, on a case by case basis with London Borough of Camden following Section 61 procedures. Where a justification cannot be made to the satisfaction of all
parties engaged in the LEMP process, the work must take place during normal working hours.

20.3.3. that more rail services are diverted to other stations than currently planned by HS2 during the construction of HS2 in order to allow more construction during normal working hours in the approach to Euston in order to better balance the impacts on stakeholders rather than local residents bearing nearly all the burden. This would also better allow use of rail for transport of spoil and construction materials, and more room for acoustic screening immediately adjacent to the works.

20.3.4. that for one full 24 hour period every week, usually Sunday, there will be no work.

20.3.5. that night-time work be suspended completely during school exam periods and that consideration be given to the needs of young children in setting working hours.

20.4. Notwithstanding this, your petitioner is concerned at the number of days identified in the Policy "Noise insulation and temporary re-housing policy [E23 appendix B]" before levels are triggered and requests that these be reviewed and recognising the long construction period that additional tests be included covering longer periods than just six months, and noting that the current policy would exclude any mitigation if less than 40 (ie 39) days in six months is 21% for the whole 10 year period. Losing a night's sleep more than once a week for 10 years cannot be acceptable from a medical perspective. Therefore the levels should be reduced to 20 days within a six month period and 30 days within a 12 month period. Further, if levels are expected to exceed reasonable thresholds in 60 days throughout the construction period then mitigation including sound proofing and/or re-housing should be available at the resident's request.

20.5. Further, the policy is silent on the practicalities of re-housing. Clearly the odd night in a 5 star hotel would be acceptable to most residents however weeks on a camp bed in a hostel of some description would not. Your petitioner notes the Policy was first issued after all the consultation periods on the Environmental Statement were closed and further drafts are still imprecise. This is particularly concerning with an organisation such as HS2 Ltd with such a poor history of its ability to treat residents reasonably. Your petitioner therefore urges your Lordships' House to ask the Promoter to further develop the policy to resolve the uncertainties raised and your petitioner reserves the right to petition further when clarity is obtained.

Vibration during construction

21. Your petitioner is concerned about the impact of vibration on your petitioner's property which was built around 1845 with shallow foundations on London Clay. Increased vibration increases the risk of settlement and movement of the foundations impacting the fabric of the building at 52 Mornington Terrace.

21.1. Your petitioner notes the following in the AP3 ES:
"Construction of the scheme will result in significant temporary noise and vibration effects on a number of residential properties at Mornington Terrace, Gillfoot in Ampthill Estate, Cobourg Street, Euston Street, and Cartmell on Hampstead Road.

Despite measures to reduce noise and vibration impacts on residential communities, there will be significant effects on the following residential areas during construction: Park Village East; Mornington Terrace and parts of Mornington Place and Crescent;"

and

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 14.3.15 and 18

"14.3.15 Construction works close to the following residential buildings are forecast to result in ground-borne noise or vibration greater than the level at which it is likely to significantly affect the occupants for durations of up to three months:

- Mornington Terrace;"

14.3.18 Vibratory piling of bridge piers and vibro-compaction is likely to result in appreciable ground-borne vibration at a small number of dwellings closest to these activities, as listed in Table 19. These receptors will also be exposed to appreciable noise from the construction of the revised scheme. The significance of the identified vibration effects has been assessed on a community basis in combination with the airborne noise also identified at these receptors.

Volume 2 CFA01 Table 19 for Mornington terrace (90 dwellings) shows

Night-time: Construction noise and vibration Mornington Street Bridge demolition, construction of new bridge piers with typical and highest monthly noise levels around 60dB and 75dB. Noise: 30 Months Combined noise and vibration: 3 Months

21.2. Your petitioner notes that following his appearance before the House of Commons Select Committee, the vibration from piling in relation to the Mornington Street Bridge foundations will not be noticeable in his property however with some elements in the cutting still at a conceptual design stage he remains concerned in this area. He is wondering if, with the amount of work planned in close proximity to his property, why the Promoter refuses to provide stronger reassurance. Coupled with a vague policy on re-housing during periods of vibration, your petitioner seeks undertakings in this area that his sleep will not be disturbed from the construction works.

Mornington Street Bridge

22. The current scheme allows for the demolition of the Mornington street bridge part of which is listed and its reconstruction. This bridge is close to your petitioner's property
and used on a regular basis. Views relating to the rebuilt Mornington Street Bridge are shown in the ES Vol 2 CFA01 Map book.

22.1. Your petitioner understands that this is required to allow the widening of the Camden Cutting to allow the HS2 tracks to the west of the current West Coast Main Line and the extension of Euston Station to the west. Your petitioner questions the analysis that this is appropriate given the high cost and disruption together with the “loss” of the historical setting for the heritage assets associated with the bridge.

22.2. Consequently your petitioner urges your Lordships’ House to require the Promoter to re-evaluate the need for the alignment, particularly in light of other design questions and whether the demolition and re-construction work is justified.

Granby Terrace Bridge

23. The current scheme allows for the demolition of the Granby Terrace Bridge and its reconstruction. This bridge is close to your petitioner’s property and gives access to a garage rented by your petitioner is just off the bridge which will also be demolished. At present London Borough of Camden has not identified a replacement. Your petitioner asks that a replacement garage is identified.

23.1. In relation to the need for the demolition of the Bridge, your petitioner raises the same concerns as with the Mornington Street Bridge with regard to the alignment and cost.

23.2. The current scheme notes the bridge will be closed for 5 years at the same time as the Mornington Street Bridge effectively preventing access to Mornington Terrace from the west and north. It does not appear the combined impact has been considered for such a long period of time.

23.3. Consequently your petitioner urges your Lordships’ House to require the Promoter to re-evaluate the consequences of the proposed Scheme and provide proposals around the cumulative impacts on road congestion.

Hampstead Road Bridge

23.4. The new AP3 scheme included a redesigned bridge for Hampstead Road. In describing the new scheme your petitioner has noted the following however he has also understood that the change of design was to accommodate the new service ramp.

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 3.3.11

"The design of Hampstead Road Bridge, shown as a truss bridge in the original scheme, has been changed to a beam bridge to address stakeholder concerns about visual impact. It also provides for an access ramp into a service and logistics basement beneath the high speed station and relates to the proposed deck over the high speed railway between Hampstead Road Bridge and the high speed station."
23.5. Your petitioner understands that the height of the new bridge is as a result of the need for flexibility around the conventional tracks limiting the number of supports within the bridge resulting in the proposed structure. A further study is currently being conducted and your petitioner reserves the right to petition further when details of the new proposals are known.

Landscapes and views

24. Your petitioner notes that with the construction works are scheduled to last in excess of 10 years that the impacts of construction will cause a detrimental effect as well as the lasting impacts of permanent changes. Your petitioner objects to the principle that where mitigation is not possible that no compensation is payable where losses are suffered.

24.1. During the works the views near your petitioner’s property are described and labelled Viewpoint 004.2.007: View west from Mornington Terrace, Viewpoint 004.1.008: View west from Mornington Street and Mornington Terrace and Viewpoint 004.1.010: View west from the corner of Delancey Street and Mornington Terrace (which is taken very close to the Property).

24.2. Your petitioner notes that the views from Mornington Terrace across the cutting towards Park Village East are variously described thus:

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 12.3.14 and 1S

12.3.14 Protected views have also been identified in the Conservation Area appraisals for Regent's Park⁹⁹; Camden Town⁹⁹; Bloomsbury¹⁰⁰; Primrose Hill¹⁰¹ and Regent's Canal¹⁰². Specific designated views within the study area for CFA1, with views towards the revised scheme in the Camden Town Conservation Area statement include:

• views west along Parkway towards Regent's Park, with views from the junction of Delancey Street and Parkway across the existing railway cutting to Park Village East; and

• panoramic views from the west end of Delancey Street along Mornington Terrace across the existing railway cutting to the south, with the housing blocks of the Regent's Park Estate in the middle ground and the West End skyline, including the Euston and BT towers, in the background.

12.3.15 The following views are designated as important views in the Regent's Park Conservation Area statement:

• views of Chester Terrace from Chester Road and from Chester Place;
• views from Mornington Street to Park Village East; and

and

Euston Planning Framework Supplementary Planning Document:
53.9. Any development must avoid having an unacceptable impact on the amenities of surrounding residents, both at Park Village East and east of the railway tracks. Any proposed development should very carefully respect the setting of the Nash villas in terms of built form, layout, scale and proportions. The scale of any proposed development should also be sensitive to the views and setting of Camden Town conservation area, located to the east of the railway tracks particularly the area around Mornington Crescent. The Camden Town conservation area was designated in 1986 and extended in 1997. The panoramic views from Mornington Terrace across the railway cutting are identified as a key view in the conservation area character appraisal.

24.3. Following the completion of the works there will be permanent changes in views from your petitioner's property and Mornington Terrace in general including the retaining walls and Mornington Street Bridge but particularly the Euston Portal Head House.

24.4. The new ES describes the proposed buildings as follows:

Vol 2 CFA01 Part 1B para 12.4.3

The Stage A construction works are described in Section 5. The construction works, ordered from south to north, that have particular importance in determining the effects on landscape and visual receptors include:

- construction of a portal headhouse in the railway cutting adjacent to Park Village East; the Mornington Street Bridge ventilation building adjacent to the rebuilt Mornington Street Bridge; and an emergency access and fire fighting (intervention) building adjacent to the reconstructed Granby Terrace Bridge. Each of these buildings is likely to be up to 8m high in relation to adjacent street levels in Park Village East; and

24.5. Your petitioner disagrees with the assessment of the changes described in the new ES for view 004.1.008: View west from Mornington Street and Mornington Terrace, illustrated as a photomontage in Figure LV-01-267 (Volume 2, CFA1 Map Book) and described on page 99 of SES2 and AP3 ES Volume 5 Appendix LV-001-001 Landscape and Visual where the new ES notes the following:

"There will be direct and open towards the railway corridor and replaced Mornington Street Bridge in the foreground and middle ground. The existing pillars will be reinstated and the overall appearance of the bridge will be in keeping with the existing character. Oblique views of the tunnel portal head house will be possible over the parapet wall and viewed against the Park Village East and railway corridor backdrop. The new elements will be characteristic of the existing view and will be viewed by the receptor as one of a series of components. The magnitude of change will be low which, assessed alongside the high sensitivity of the receptor will result in a minor adverse effect."
Your petitioner notes there is, erroneously in his view, no mention of the ventilation building that will be visible. Further in the Photomontage the current baseline (2013) for the revised scheme is incorrect and the picture is actually the same as the photomontage (2026) below it.

24.6. Your petitioner also disagrees with the assessment of the changes described in the new ES for view 004.1.010: View west from the corner of Delancey Street and Mornington Terrace and a photomontage illustrated in Figure LV-01-004 (Volume 2, CFA1 Map Book) and described on page 99 of SES2 and AP3 ES Volume 5 Appendix LV-001-001 Landscape and Visual where the new ES notes the following:

"There will be views of the top of the tunnel portal head house in the middle ground of the view. This will be seen against the backdrop of Park Village East and the existing railway corridor. The parapet wall in the foreground will screen the lower levels from Mornington Terrace. Oblique views of the tunnel portal head house will be possible from the Edinboro' Castle public house and adjacent dwelling, but it will be largely characteristic of the existing view over the railway corridor. The magnitude of change is considered to be low and will result in minor adverse effects."

Your petitioner notes there is, erroneously in his view, no mention of the ventilation building that will be visible. The fisheye lens view of the images in the map book distorts how close the buildings in Park Village East look in reality. This view is the one from your petitioner's property and he strongly disagrees with the suggestion that blocking the views of park Village East is not significant, particularly in the context of the view's status described above.

24.7. Your petitioner also disagrees with the assessment of the changes described in the new ES in relation to the Euston East Victorian Residential LCA where the new ES notes

"Following construction there will be a minor alteration to characteristics of the character area, with the replacement of Mornington Street Bridge and the presence of the new south tunnel portal, headhouse and hardstanding in the adjacent Euston Station Gateway LCA. The magnitude of change will be low which, assessed alongside the high sensitivity of the receptor, will result in a minor adverse effect."

24.8. Your petitioner is concerned that if the new buildings in any way impact the quality of the views and they are not protected in the ways suggested there will be less requirement with future development and a slow erosion of the views currently valued. Accordingly your petitioner requests the size of these railway related buildings are reduced in size wherever possible above street level and are subject to a full design to ensure they are in keeping with the surrounding areas. Further your petitioner seeks proper explanation from the Promoter as to the omissions and classifications described above before petitioning further.

24.9. Your petitioner requests your Lordships' House require the Promoter / Nominated Undertaker to clarify the height of the building and indeed if the impression within the map book is correct then to undertake a detailed redesign of the Head house to
ensure that it does not reach a height above the retaining walls of either Mornington Terrace or Park Village East thereby ensuring the views across the cutting towards listed buildings in both directions are preserved. Your petitioner reserves the right to petition further once the designs are clarified or made available.

Operational impacts including noise and vibration

25. Your petitioner is concerned about noise and vibration from the trains and associated works, including changes to the existing rail network, which may have an adverse impact. Of particular concern is the apparent attitude displayed by the Secretary of State, the Promoter and Nominated Undertaker that by living next to the existing railway line your Promoter has somehow consented to any additional noise produced on an escalating scale. This is akin to someone living on a standard road being told they have accepted vehicle noise when the road is widened with additional new lanes and made into a motorway. During the 16 years since purchasing the property your petitioner is already concerned that noise levels have increased from 1998 without mitigation particularly in relation to wheel squeal.

25.1. Your petitioner is further concerned by the statement in the Environmental Statement in ES Vol 2 CFA01 Paragraph 11.5.8-9

"11.5.8 Significant ground-borne noise or vibration effects will be avoided or reduced through the design of the track and track-bed.

11.5.9 The mitigation measures will reduce noise inside all dwellings such that it will not reach a level where it would significantly affect residents."

Your petitioner objects that the term “significantly” is open to interpretation and submits that measures must be sufficient to ensure at a very minimum current noise levels are not exceeded and that to protect local residents’ mitigation measures should be introduced to ensure WHO guidance is complied with in relation to the rail network.

25.2. Further, your petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd be required to commit to the same threshold for ground borne noise as the Northern Line Extension - meaning ground borne noise levels no greater than 30dB LpAmax for urban areas.

25.3. Further, your petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd be obliged to commit to designing the high speed railway to operate in such manner that the revised noise exposures are not breached. or, in the case of case of urban areas such as the Euston Approach that the speed is restricted until after entry into the Euston Portal, and prior to exit from the Portal.

25.4. Further, your petitioner requests that a binding requirement included in the Bill for noise monitoring with obligations on HS2 Ltd to introduce additional mitigation measures, including reduction in train speeds, in the event forecast noise levels are exceeded.
25.5. Your petitioner notes that the proposed scheme includes works to the existing railway some of which are described in the activities of the Mornington Terrace sidings compound in ES Vol 2 CFA01 para 2.4.56

"The compound will specifically support the classic railway enabling works including:

- reconfiguration of the classic railway approach by decommissioning two western lines to recreate a four track approach;
- vertical and horizontal realignment of track;
- removal, replacement and reconfiguration of rail switches and crossings;
- reconfiguring overhead line equipment, signalling and communications systems; and
- decommissioning and closure of the existing railway dive under."

Following the West Coast Main line upgrade a number of years ago, the noise generated from the line has increased, particularly amount of wheel squeal. On the basis that noise is cumulative and that the proposed scheme with HS2 will add to the noise generated, your petitioner requests that in undertaking works to the existing lines, that measures are introduced to reduce the noise where possible. Accordingly, your petitioner requests your Lordships' House to require the Promoter/HS2 Ltd or Nominated Undertaker to review the specification of works for the works to the existing railway to achieve a reduction in noise generated as a mechanism to reduce the general noise levels and assist in the mitigation of noise generated by the new scheme.

25.6. Further, your petitioner is concerned that the presence of the decking in preparation of over site development on part of the cutting but leaving long thin tracts of open space with the conventional railway will negatively impact the acoustics of the cutting and seeks a commitment that should this issue arise it will be remedied to ensure the baseline noise levels in the cutting are not exceeded.

Compensation

26. Your petitioner took comfort from the statements made on 20 December 2010 by Philip Hammond, Secretary of State for Transport:

"I have indicated that we will seek to go further than has happened with previous such infrastructure schemes in the UK, because it is right and proper that individuals who suffer serious financial loss in the national interest should be compensated............."

However the various proposals put forward and consulted on have not been honoured following that statement not least in that landlords not resident are excluded in the current proposals not that this currently impacts this petitioner, unless of course he decides to not live in his property during the noisy works to escape and seeks to rent it out to offset the costs of living elsewhere.
26.1. Your petitioner is concerned that the use of the safeguarding area for compensation purposes is flawed. The safeguarding area was designed for the identification of land needed for the construction design not those impacted. Consequently in an urban environment such as Camden cutting it is flawed with respect to properties such as your petitioner’s on the edge of the cutting where land is not needed to be purchased but will still be fundamentally impacted.

26.2. In 1999 Railtrack made cash payments to residents including your petitioner as compensation for disturbance during one weekend of noisy work on the tracks during the West Coast Main Line upgrade. The proposal by HS2 that nothing should be paid in compensation for 10 years of disruption (on the basis that 100% of the impact will not be completely mitigated) when Railtrack considered one weekend worthy of something is beyond the comprehension of this petitioner.

26.3. Your petitioner submits that the compensation provisions as they currently stand in relation to property that is not compulsory acquired and other matters are not sufficient to compensate your petitioner adequately for the loss and damage they may incur as a result of construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development.

26.4. Your petitioner objects to the current proposals in that where inadequate mitigation is provided or possible (which may be the case for your petitioner in relation to sound proofing and visual impacts), the compensation arrangements are flawed being inequitable and in breach of the basic legal principles in relation to losses that will be suffered as a result of the construction and operation of the line.

26.5. Your petitioner notes in particular that the Promoters have consulted on compensation proposals related to the Bill and recently made decisions following that consultation process. Your petitioner considers it fundamentally unjust that rural residents are to be treated in a different, preferential way from him simply for the reason that the Promoters consider that residents of urban areas are used to having to put up with the adverse effects of construction works and railway noise and therefore are, in some way, more immune to their effects. This is patently not the case. Your petitioner considers this to be grossly unfair and therefore asks for amendments to the Bill to ensure proper compensation will be payable not only to those in the local Borough whose land is to be acquired, but also to everyone who will be badly affected by the works based on the reality and not an arbitrary assessment.

26.6. Your petitioner requests that appropriate procedures should be introduced that all individuals are adequately compensated for any damages or losses suffered including loss of enjoyment of property. Arrangements should be made for the protection of Properties along the route including the petitioner’s property. This compensation should be adequate to cover all losses associated with the capital value as well as potential rental incomes given the length of construction period is such that owner occupation is not possible throughout the 10 year construction period. Given circumstances change, any damages should not be limited to owner occupied at the time but all those suffering loss.
27. Your petitioner is particularly concerned, that with the proposed night-time working, the ability to get a proper nights' sleep will be almost impossible. This could have a severe impact on his daughter's education. One option would be for local residents to seek alternative accommodation and rent out their properties rather than live with the noise and uncertainty of when the HS2 provided alternative accommodation would be available. This of course may be difficult but your petitioner submits that measures should be made to ensure residents are no worse off. For example, rental income from properties impacted by works where owned by individuals using alternative accommodation should not be taxed as this effectively penalises the owner by the alternative accommodation costs being paid out of net of tax income. Undertakings should be required so that HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must rent the property in the absence of a third party rental market. For example, despite the petitioner's daughter being only eight years of age, the petitioner should be able to rent out his property and seek alternative accommodation while his daughter does her A-levels for example such is the length of works proposed. The taxation of any rental income, even if the property could be let, means the alternative accommodation paid for would be significantly less than that in Mornington Terrace.

27.1. Your petitioner raised these issues before the House of Commons Select Committee to which the Promoter responded that in the case of temporary construction impacts the policy is to mitigate rather than compensate. The issue of the numerous instances of significant adverse effects that remain unmitigated was not responded to by the Promoter.

27.2. Your petitioner maintains his position that the current schemes available to your petitioner are inequitable and seeks an instruction to the Promoter to implement new fairer schemes through establishing an Independent Compensation Commission to draw up a fair compensation scheme(s) and administer it. The Commission should take evidence from residents and address the needs of both property owners and long term tenants.

27.3. The only scheme available to your petitioner is the Need to Sell Scheme which he suggests is unreasonable. Your petitioner urges that an express purchase scheme be made available to urban residents impacted for long periods (over 3 years), an urban property bond scheme to assist the liquidity of the property market as well as a compensation scheme for loss of enjoyment for people suffering residual significant adverse effects who are either unable to move or who would prefer not to do so.

Compensation to London Borough of Camden (Freeholder of the Building)

28. Your petitioner has had long running disputes with the Freeholder of the Building, the London Borough of Camden particularly around timely repairs to the Building. London Borough of Camden has cited availability of resources (i.e. money) as impacting the timing of external refurbishments rather than actual need, and while this is not accepted as a valid defence, your petitioner is concerned that if London Borough of
Camden is not adequately compensated for losses from HS2 then the Council resources will be stretched further resulting in amongst other things delays to future repairs to the Building supposed to be carried out under the terms of the lease.

28.1. Further your petitioner is concerned that proximity of the building to the construction works will result in additional repairs or refurbishment being necessary. The length of time the scheme is expected to take will mean that at least one external refurbishment should be undertaken during the period. In the first instance these works would be undertaken by London Borough of Camden as the Freeholder who would seek to recover a proportion of the costs via the service charges.

28.2. Your petitioner urges that compensation is available to London Borough of Camden in relation to any additional costs incurred as a result of HS2.

Community

29. Your petitioner has identified the following in relation to Mornington Terrace.

"There will be temporary major adverse amenity effects (due to a combination of some or all of the following: HGV movements, noise and air quality effects) on residents at Mornington Terrace, Mornington Crescent, Mornington Place, Mornington Street, Albert Street, Plender Street, Parkway and Delancey Street"

29.1. However no updated community impact assessment sheet has been completed for Mornington Terrace on the basis that the assessment was already significant adverse. Your petitioner suggests that given the scale and duration of the works are unprecedented that a new scale is required which allows an increase above the one already recorded to capture the true impact. By not updating the assessment the risk is that it is incorrect. The duration identified is 4 months which appears clearly incorrect. Your petitioner seeks a proper explanation as to the current assessment and why no update has been prepared and how impacts that get worse but already labeled as significant adverse are monitored to prevent an increasing impact on your petitioner.

Complaints Commissionaire

30. Your petitioner is concerned that given the increase scope and duration of works proposed that insufficient controls are proposed, particularly after reading the reports of the Crossrail Complaints Commissioner given that HS2's control framework has been based on experiences from Crossrail.

30.1. In particular your petitioner has identified the following:

30.2. Crossrail Complaints Commissioner's report as presented at the Planning Forum Meeting on 26 September 2013
"In three of these cases the contractor had largely determined when each separate complaint may be closed. Complainants had been left to make fresh complaints about essentially the same thing for an average of over eight months. I take a poor view of this practice, which has happened before. I continue to point out to Crossrail how unsound it seems to the complainants, to my office and local authority officers to hand investigation and resolution back to the contractor who allegedly caused the problems in the first place. I also believe it distorts the 'Number of complaints closed within ten working days' statistics published by the Helpdesk each period."

Later in the same report:

"Recurring, previously upheld complaints

I have been contacted several times by a former complainant whose complaint about communications between parties at Whitechapel I upheld last March. Since the summer, substantial and detailed complaints about construction impacts and communications shortcomings have been made by this person to a contractor and Crossrail. Although the most recent complaints do not exactly follow the previous ones they appear to have much critical substance in them about communications.

I made it clear to the project that where I have upheld all or part of a complaint, I do not expect during the remaining life of the project to find the matter coming up again."

30.3. Crossrail Complaints Commissionaire's report as presented at the Planning Forum Meeting on 25 November 2013 was the next report.

"I have accepted a new complaint for investigation from a Whitechapel resident about the amount of time spent complaining to Crossrail. The substantial body of evidence of doing this over several years is evidently genuine. The same person had previously complained to this office about communications issues and after investigation, steps were put in place to regulate communications better.

Several complaint investigations I reported on at the last Forum have not at the time of writing been concluded, nor the results published. Discussions with Crossrail management have become extended over time."

30.4. Your petitioner is concerned that publication of these reports appears to have ceased.

31. Your petitioner asks your Lordships' House to appoint an independent Complaints Commissioner for HS2 construction with at least the following powers:

- to deal quickly and effectively with issues raised.
- to enforce agreed environmental or time limits
- to serve cessation orders on contractors in breach of agreed standards.

32. Your petitioner also requests the Select Committee to hear evidence from the Crossrail Complaints Commissioner on whether the complaints process is working effectively and how it could be improved upon for HS2.
Line X reinstatement

33. Your petitioner notes that Line X is being reinstated as part of the revised scheme in AP3.

SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 CFA01 Part 1A para 3.3.6

..... In order to provide additional flexibility and resilience to the operation of the conventional rail station and West Coast Main Line (WCML) services before 2026 and greater capacity for growth in conventional services after 2026, the revised scheme includes the reinstatement of Line X.

33.1. Your petitioner understands that the proposal to reintroduce Line X was only taken sometime in August 2015. Your petitioner is concerned the effects of the works in relation to this have not been properly assessed and indeed will raise the residual effects that were already significantly adverse in many areas to unacceptable levels. Questions in relation to conceptual designs still remain unanswered.

33.2. Accordingly your petitioner objects to Line X's reinstatement until such time as the appropriate information is available and reserves the right to petition further once matters are clarified.

Habitability

34. Your petitioner is concerned that the cumulative effect of all the residual impacts rather than being significantly adverse in a number of areas, actually amount to "unacceptably adverse", potentially in individual cases, and in totality. Your petitioner is concerned that the impacts are so severe that life during a significant part of the works planned over a ten year period will be intolerable and his property will become uninhabitable for him and his family. For reference: HS2 propose that the daytime limit for rehousing is 85 dB; this is equivalent to a very busy road with heavy lorries one metre from your house. The Health and Safety Executive requires ear defenders to be worn in a place of work which has this level of noise. Since the policy is based on 1m in front of the property, the situation could arise when standing in the front garden, the noise could be at a level where ear defenders are required and yet the current proposal would be that the house is still habitable.

34.1. Your petitioner therefore humbly requests your Lordships' House to ask that the Promoter implements the following noise thresholds for re-housing:
   75 dB during the day 0800-1800 on weekdays (instead of 85 dB)
   70 dB during the day 0700-2200 Sunday (instead of 75 dB)
   65 dB at night 2200-0700 (same as proposed by HS2)
   70 dB at other times (instead of 75-80 dB)

34.2. At the present time no clear answers have been provided on the practical implementation of re-housing local residents including the availability of alternative
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accommodation in the local area. Indeed, the impression given by HS2 staff is that the policy is to avoid re-housing. However if is to be used as the ultimate mitigation in a control framework, it must be sufficiently developed as to be feasible with people in the local area. Your petitioner suggests this has not been done and humbly requests your Lordships' House to ensure the Promoter properly assesses the feasibility and requirements before relying on the policy.

34.3. Your petitioner is aware that there are ongoing discussions between the Promoter and London Borough of Camden and that other petitioners are raising this issue including Camden Cutting Group of which your petitioner is a co-chair. He therefore humbly requests your Lordships' House to ask the Promoter to consider the multiple impacts and associated habitability question in relation to Mornington Terrace as well as other properties in the area and reserves the right to petition further when the discussions with London Borough of Camden are further advanced.

35. In light of the above, the petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to your petitioner's expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to representation before the Select Committee.

The prayer

36. 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

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

DAVID AU EER

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Camden Cutting Group

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill except the provisions under the cross-headings “Railway matters” and “the Crown”.

Your Petitioner

2. The petitioner is the Camden Cutting Group, a neighbourhood organisation with over 270 active local supporters. The Camden Cutting Group speaks for those residents in the area bound in the south by Granby Terrace, in the north by Parkway, in the west by Park Village East, and in the east by Arlington Road. About 3,000 people live in this area. The open railway cutting leading to Euston is in the centre of this neighbourhood.

3. The Camden Cutting is at the centre of a London community that coexists with the railway. The area is a real neighbourhood, surprisingly quiet, and a liveable mix of two Conservation Areas, historic buildings and social housing. The Cutting area is currently a tranquil area, with relatively little through-traffic, benefiting from the space and light and air that the railway cutting creates while accepting the limited intermittent noise the trains produce during the daytime.

Your Petitioner’s concerns and how the Camden Cutting neighbourhood is directly and specially affected by HS2

4. The Environmental Statement published with the Additional Provision (AP3) details that all the streets within the above area are predicted to suffer significant adverse effects as a result of the scheme, even after the inclusion of the mitigation proposed by the Promoter (including 622 of the 1,349 properties being provided with Noise Insulation).

5. Our immediate neighbourhood is threatened by heavy construction for ten years (2016-2025) and the wider community for at least eighteen years (2016-2033).

6. A significant proportion of this construction will be undertaken at night, in the close vicinity of dense housing. Night-time construction on this scale and for this duration has never previously occurred in a residential area of the UK.

7. The final report of the House of Commons Select Committee states that “Camden is exceptional, and needs special treatment” (para 237).
8. The Environmental Statement ('ES') is clear that there are a large number of significant adverse effects on the community that cannot be mitigated by HS2 as they remain Significant Adverse even after mitigation.

9. In spite of the scale of the work, the duration and the anti-social impact, compensation is extremely restricted. Except under the very limited circumstances of the Need to Sell Scheme, residents are not being offered any protection against the fall in value of their homes during the lengthy construction period, making moving home impossible. For those staying in their homes throughout the construction phase there is no compensation provided in spite of the acknowledged un-mitigated significant adverse environmental impacts. If such work is to occur its impact on the local community must firstly be minimised, secondly be fully mitigated where possible, and third, compensation paid where mitigation is otherwise impossible or incomplete.

10. Prior to the House of Commons petitioning process we met many times with the staff of HS2 Ltd to discuss specific local issues of concern and have attended open consultation events set up by HS2 Ltd and the London Borough of Camden ('LBC'). These events were frequently HS2 Ltd informing the local community rather than open dialogue and have had little effect in persuading HS2 staff to lessen the impact of HS2 on our community. The AP3 proposal documents, the Supplementary Environmental Statement for AP3 ('SES'), and the current proposed Bill give no indication that HS2 have grasped the nature of the local community that has striven so hard to engage with it. Concerns that we have raised about the Environmental Statement and Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) have not been addressed.

11. We believe it is inappropriate to bring construction on this scale into a dense residential area of London in the manner being proposed. The Promoter's desire to protect other interests including Network Rail and Train Operating Companies, is at the expense of residents. The rights and interests of local residents are deeply damaged in a way that should be unacceptable in a modern democracy.

12. We are aware of the assurances given to London Borough of Camden during the House of Commons consideration of the Bill. These assurances are often concerning process and fail to reduce significantly the majority of significant adverse impacts on your Petitioner's members. Consequently they are inadequate, and while individually are mostly a step in the right direction they do not provide sufficient protection for residents in the Cutting area. In the sections below we ask for measures that would guarantee that the assurances already given by HS2 Ltd can be adequately enforced, and we seek additional assurances that will give adequate protection to residents.

Summary of works and our concerns

13. The work that will be happening outside our doors, as described in the Bill includes:

   (a) Demolition of 12 metre high Park Village East (PVE) retaining walls and of the central retaining wall at the Parkway portal
   (b) Reconstruction of PVE retaining walls at a height of 35 metres high above HS2 track level plus 15 metres below existing track level requiring extensive contiguous piling, ground anchors and compensation grouting
   (c) Deep excavation and construction of new retaining walls within the Cutting
(d) Construction of a high speed rail dive-under box about 30m deep
(e) Demolition and reconstruction of the existing Line X conventional rail cross-over
(f) Phased demolition and reconstruction over eight years of Hampstead Road Bridge (currently 4.8 metres higher and twice as long at 220 metres)
(g) Demolition and reconstruction of Mornington Street Bridge, and construction of a temporary replacement bridge
(h) Demolition and reconstruction of Granby Terrace Bridge
(i) Construction of two concrete portal boxes
(j) Reception and dismantling of tunnel boring machines
(k) Construction of three ventilation/intervention buildings adjacent to the Cutting
(l) Works on the classic railway tracks, signalling and other systems
(m) Installation of new tracks, gantries, signals etc
(n) Construction compounds throughout the neighbourhood
(o) Utility works in many neighbourhood streets
(p) HGV construction traffic along both residential streets and main roads for years
(q) HGV holding area in the London Zoo car park
(r) Years of ‘significant noise’ and months of ‘significant vibration’

14. Most of this work will take place in the 750 metre length of the Cutting, making it an incredibly intense work site for many years. The proximity of the 4 key rail lines into Euston intended to remain open throughout the construction period means that much of this work will take place during ‘possessions’. (Possessions are periods when the Promoter takes possession of the working lines temporarily. To avoid disruption to rail users these possessions will generally be at night-time, in particular 23.00 – 05.00).

15. Work at Euston Station (18 years) and possible redevelopment of the conventional rail side of the station (probably beyond 2033) followed by over site development in the Cutting (further decades of work) will also impact our neighbourhood.

16. The Draft Code of Construction Practice allows much of the work in the Cutting to be exempt from normal working hour restrictions and to take place 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

17. The Cutting is a large open area with hard sound reflective surfaces; works anywhere in the Cutting will create impacts for a great distance. Mornington Terrace, Clarkson Row, half of Mornington Crescent, Park Village East and part of Parkway are completely exposed across the open Cutting to the full brunt of the works. The adjoining cross streets of Mornington Street and Mornington Place are almost as exposed as are parts of Delancey Street. A wider area will be affected by construction traffic with heavy lorries on quiet residential streets and about 900 HGVs a day (450 ‘two way trips’) on the local High Street A400. These impacts will include air pollution as well as noise and vibration.

18. Additionally your petitioners are most concerned to note that some neighbourhood streets will suffer a permanent increase in traffic and pollution as a result of HS2 with predictions of up to 40% more traffic than is currently the case.

19. The human cost of the HS2 construction has not been considered seriously by HS2 Ltd. If you are working at home, attending school and revising for A Levels for example or hoping to sleep at night between 2016 and 2025 your life will be seriously disturbed.
It is unrealistic to think that life goes on as normal while a 12 metre high 3 metre thick retaining wall is being demolished outside your house and a 35 metre high one being built in its place (just one example). The basic human right to the peaceful enjoyment of property is being removed by ten years of disruptive construction in the Camden Cutting.

20. The Promoter has frequently stated that a principle of infrastructure construction is that impacted residents must be prepared to bear some level of ‘temporary’ disturbance for the wider public good. However HS2 do not recognise that ten years of construction is not a ‘temporary’ disturbance. Over the decades the legislative framework has developed to protect residents from the damaging and unreasonable impacts of construction in normal circumstances but the Promoter is seeking to disapply much of that legislation and replace it with their own set of rules while removing resident’s recourse to legal remedy.

21. The Construction Programme in SES2 & AP3 ES 3.2.1.1 Vol 2 Figure 9a and the Construction Phasing Maps in the Vol 2 Map book SES2 & AP3 ES 3.2.2.1 CT-20-005 to 010 clearly show ten continuous years of construction 2016 to 2025. Within this period, table 19 in the AP3 ES predicts periods of noise up to 36 months where the ‘significance criteria’ will be exceeded in the Camden Cutting neighbourhood. The actual length of time that residents are expected to put up with serious disruption may be much longer, for example from 2017 to 2022 in the one location where detailed noise graphs have been provided.

22. The night time noise during the construction phase will be a particular issue for the Cutting. There are no comparable projects in the UK where such a level and duration of night time noise has been created in a densely populated residential area.

23. The SES & AP3 ES Section 14 describes some of the noise and vibration that Camden Cutting residents will experience and includes the statement in 14.3.14 that ‘The mitigation measures, including noise insulation where necessary in the affected parts of these buildings, will reduce noise inside all dwellings to a level where it should not significantly affect residents.’ Evidence is not given to support this. In particular it disregards the particular nature of construction noise, and how disruptive this is to sleep patterns. It is unrealistic to contend that installation of secondary glazing will make homes fully habitable. HS2’s noise insulation policy requires noise to be reduced to below SOAEL level, but to provide full mitigation over long periods and allow adequate sleep the noise insulation mitigation should be set at LOAEL level.

24. HS2’s modelling of the impact of construction noise in the Cutting area is inadequate. There is a risk that it fails to take account of the way that noise is reflected and channelled by the hard surfaces in the Cutting area, and also through gaps in some buildings for example with sound reaching the rear of buildings that are not currently identified for noise insulation.

25. The noise modelling is based on ‘average’ noise levels (LAeq) not maximum noise levels (LAm) and therefore its intrusive impact on sleepfulness has not been accurately assessed or mitigated. Further the noise model has not been calibrated through real world testing, and there are no plans to do so.
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26. In addition, the installation of secondary glazing where Noise Insulation is being provided may have knock on effects that ultimately could make many homes uninhabitable. The policy of installing secondary glazing to mitigate for excess construction noise relies on windows remaining closed during construction periods. Many homes rely on windows being open to manage heat build up, in particular in summer months and at night. The current proposals from HS2 Ltd do not provide adequate ventilation given the building stock and specific issues in the Cutting area (inhabited mansard roofs in many houses for example).

27. Temporary re-housing will be required for at least some people, but the current policy is inadequate. (Note that we contend that an adequate policy on habitability would see a much larger number of people potentially eligible for re-housing. Also note that this ‘temporary’ re-housing may be for many years in practice). Irrespective of the number re-housed, the policy is inadequate in providing no assurance that residents will be entitled to equivalent accommodation locally that takes account of their particular needs (e.g. schooling), and ensures they do not bear any of the costs of this re-housing. HS2 Ltd have consistently stated that they do not believe any re-housing is required for noise mitigation, and this appears to explain why the content of the policy is inadequate. Our contention is that the policy will be required, and must be made adequate.

28. Vibration will exceed the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level for periods of up to three months for some Camden Cutting households (SES & AP3 ES14.3.15 & Volume 5 Technical appendices Sound, noise and vibration SV-002-001) but inadequate proposals are made for mitigation or temporary rehousing.

29. The SES & AP3 ES recognises ‘residual’ significant negative impacts on our neighbourhood but does not propose solutions, implying that we are to put up with them without mitigation or compensation.

30. The Bill currently before the Committee in the House of Lords still does not account for these issues. The report of the Select Committee in the House of Commons contains repeated references to the ‘exceptional’ nature of the impacts on Camden and there are warm words from the government on dealing with impacted communities fairly. Yet the Bill remains unchanged, and with the interests of residents hugely damaged.

31. In the House of Commons Select Committee stage of the Bill, HS2 Ltd gave a number of assurances to Camden Council which were suggested as being to the benefit of local residents. We believe these assurances, while welcome, do not get anywhere near to appropriately managing, mitigating or compensating for the proposed development. We note that Camden Council has a complex relationship with HS2, and while it has a role to represent local residents and protect their interests, it also has a role as a development partner of HS2 on the Euston Station Strategic Redevelopment Board. These roles conflict, and Camden Council does not operate purely as the representative of the interests of local residents.

32. There are omissions and inaccuracies in the various AP3, SES and ES documents that limit our understanding of the impacts. HS2 Ltd staff have in many cases failed to answer questions or provide information that would assist in this regard. Our members
have repeatedly asked for a list of known errors in the documents some of which may impact on residents, but HS2 Ltd has refused to provide this information.

33. The design of the HS2 works in the Camden Cutting and at Euston is still not complete, with critical elements still at the conceptual design stage and your petitioner is concerned there may be impacts not anticipated in AP3 and the Bill or that technical difficulties may extend the duration of the construction process and prevent the reinstatement of key local infrastructure that has been removed to facilitate HS2 coming to Euston.

**The Relief Sought by your Petitioners**

34. The impacts on Camden Cutting of HS2 are many and varied and there is no single measure that will stop serious detriment to the community and individuals. Most of our community wish to stay where they are, not pack up and leave. Many modifications are required to the HS2 proposals to make the neighbourhood liveable during the years of construction.

35. For the reasons given in this petition, your Petitioners respectfully ask that the proposed scheme be varied that appropriate amendments to the Bill be made on each of these issues is addressed below.

**Development of Euston Station**

36. The current Bill is seeking outline permission for re-development of both sides of Euston station. However the Supplementary Environmental Statement for AP3 only covered the impacts of development of the HS2 side (West) of the station.

37. Any changes to platform or track layout in Euston Station has knock on impacts on the Hampstead road bridge and the track layout in the cutting. In particular, any design decision to have a “level deck” at Euston and reducing the height of the conventional tracks and platforms will increase the incline out of Euston station and possibly require further significant engineering works in the Camden Cutting area. With the Promoter’s and Network Rail’s desire to keep the rail network running, your Petitioner is extremely concerned that any further work will be immediately after the HS2 works in the Cutting area thereby extending the devastating construction impacts well beyond 2026 for the Cutting area as well as Euston Station.

38. There are currently no clear plans for re-development of the classic (East) side of the station, yet the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons called for an integrated approach. Current proposals for Crossrail 2 do not provide a high quality integrated design. Until there is a plan for a comprehensive, integrated station, incorporating all phases of HS2, classic station redevelopment and Crossrail 2, the full extent of the appropriate demolition and construction work cannot be determined.

39. We believe that a further Environmental Statement is required in order to understand the total impact on the local community of developing both sides of the station, not only in the area in the immediate vicinity of Euston Station but also in the approaches. This requirement stands, whether HS2 and others accept the need for an integrated design, or whether HS2 and Railtrack proceed with the current A/B1 and B2 approach with separate developments of the classic and HS2 (West) sides of the station.
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40. We ask that the relevant authorities (e.g. Department for Transport, TfL, Railtrack and HS2) be required to develop a plan for an integrated design (including all phases of HS2, classic station redevelopment, and Crossrail 2), including the final approach to the station. This plan must have HS2 Design panel members' input embedded from the start in a meaningful way.

41. We ask for an undertaking that no demolition works in the Camden Cutting area and south to Euston Station take place until after (1) a full Environmental Impact Assessment of an integrated design has been carried out with the associated publications and consultation on an Environmental Statement has been carried out including calculating the cumulative impact of all aspects of the redevelopment of Euston station and its approaches, and (2) detailed designs for an integrated Euston Station have been prepared and passed the appropriate planning scrutiny.

42. We ask that the Committee direct the government to provide a funding package and an appropriate legislative framework for the redevelopment of the whole of Euston station if any work is to begin on demolition and construction work on the West side of the station.

Alternative Principal or Temporary Terminus Station at Old Oak Common

43. If HS2 stopped at Old Oak Common the negative impacts on densely populated parts of London would be avoided (much as has been done in France and Germany for example) and the necessary mitigation and compensation asked for in this petition would not be required.

44. It is already proposed that there be a station on the HS2 line at Old Oak Common (OOC).

45. We note also that the original siting of the terminus at Euston assumed that HS2 needed to link to HS1, and this made Euston a logical terminus. The idea for a link has since been dropped. However since this significant change of scope, no significant work has been conducted on the optimal siting of the HS2 terminus (or indeed whether a terminus of the size proposed in Euston is needed at all).

46. At a minimum we ask that Old Oak Common is developed as a temporary London terminus for the high speed section of the line to allow time for alternative proposals for the resolution of delivering HS2 services into central London to be properly assessed, and ultimately resulting in a well considered design for Euston Station and its approach to be developed within the existing station.

47. We ask that a cost benefit analysis is conducted that estimates the overall reduction of cost to HS2 of terminating the line at Old Oak Common (in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham), including any necessary redesign of the station at Old Oak Common to make this possible, and calculate the effect on the cost benefit analysis. This could include any other alternatives identified now the HS1-HS2 link has been removed as impractical with Euston as the Terminus.

Noise Thresholds for Noise Insulation

48. We ask that the noise thresholds for noise insulation should be lower than the limits in the CoCP. These limits are based on BS5228 and are used for typical construction projects where disturbance is temporary, not ten years. Normal life cannot go on during
ten years of excessive noise. Normal life includes sleeping, doing homework or revision, socialising, working or just being at home or in one’s garden.

49. Noise levels that exceed the 'significance criteria' for periods of up to 36 months or three years spread over a significantly longer period and with typical highest monthly noise levels of 70 to 90 dB are tabulated in Table 19 of the SES2 and ES Vol 2. Note that this means that the highest individual noise events will likely be significantly louder than these figures. We have asked for further noise graphs for additional locations in addition to the one we received after our House of Commons Select Committee appearance. This one location showed worryingly high noise levels both day and night for most of the ten year period. To date these additional graphs have not been provided.

50. Noise limits for obtaining residential Planning Permission are lower than those proposed by HS2, even if high levels of noise are not present for the entire time.

51. Right now the streets in the Camden Cutting are quiet with only local traffic and limited intermittent train noise principally during the daytime; years of potential round the clock heavy civil engineering will alter the external environment radically for the worse.

52. We ask that given the exceptional nature and duration of the HS2 construction project (10 to 18 years or more) that acceptable noise limits follow standards for permanent conditions, not those for typical construction works.

53. For these reasons, we ask that the noise thresholds for noise insulation should be lower than the limits in the CoCP and Information Paper E23. We ask that the limits should be:

   - 65 dB during the day 0800-1800 on weekdays (instead of 75 dB)
   - 60 dB during the day 0700-2200 Sunday (instead of 65 dB)
   - 55 dB at night 2200 -0700 dB (same as proposed by HS2)
   - 65 dB at other times (instead of 65-70 dB)

54. Further, the CoCP and E23 Information Paper requires that the trigger levels are applied when the noise levels predicted or measured by the contractor exceeds the limit in for ten days in any fifteen consecutive days or for 40 days in any six month period. This is a potential 800 days over the ten year length of the construction.

55. We ask that these trigger levels are applied when the noise level predicted by the contractors exceeds the limit for five days in any fifteen consecutive days or 20 days in any six month period or 30 days in any 12 month period or 40 days in any two year period.

56. We are aware of assurances given to Camden Council that confirm that the Local Authority retains its powers and obligations under section 60 and 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974. In theory this allows Camden Council to determine lower noise thresholds for noise insulation and re-housing. In practice this is not adequate as it provides no clarity to residents on whether or how this power will be used over the extensive period of works. Instead it makes residents reliant on Camden Council, a
body with conflicting interests. Your petitioner believes that it is appropriate that Parliament makes a clear determination on this as part of the legislative process.

Use of LAmax as a threshold measure for Noise Insulation

57. We ask that in addition to the LpAeq dB limits given in the CoCP and Information Paper E23, LAmax limits are given for the construction phase. LAmax refers to individual noise events (as opposed to averaged noise levels over a period of time) and are relevant as it is individual noise events that are a key determinant of sleepfullness of an environment at night, not just average noise.

58. We have been told by HS2 staff that the current noise model does not support prediction of LAmax. If this is the case then we contend that the current noise model is not fit for purpose as a tool for measuring and managing the impact of construction noise of this scale, duration and intensity in a densely populated residential area. We ask that HS2 Ltd is directed to create an appropriate noise model and noise policy that accounts for LAmax events at night and the impact on sleepfullness, and that no night-time construction noise is created until this is in place. This policy needs to be drafted on the realistic basis that many homes cannot be easily protected from unacceptably high levels of LAmax noise.

59. HS2 have contended that such an approach is not possible, which risks leaving residents open to significant harm. If this is the case, we ask that a highly precautionary approach is taken to estimating and mitigating the impacts in the Cutting area. This approach must consist of lower LAeq noise threshold levels, for both noise insulation and re-housing, noise insulation above minimum requirements, an extended re-housing policy and compensation.

Validation of Noise Modelling

60. The determination of which homes qualify for noise insulation packages (or re-housing) is based on noise modelling conducted by HS2. In a variety of instances we believe this modelling fails to take account of the specific local environment and is insufficiently precise. In other cases the modelling is based on inaccurate or inadequate baseline noise data. We ask that HS2 commit to reviewing all such cases and re-model as necessary.

61. We ask that the noise modelling be subject to a calibration regime. Testing should be conducted to determine how closely the noise model accurately represents real noise effects from the Cutting on various receptors including those beyond the current predicted range of significant impact. Mitigation should be re-considered as necessary in the light of this calibration. This is an appropriate and proportionate step given this scale, duration and intensity of noise has never been created previously in a densely populated residential area.

62. In order to accurately predict if insulation or rehousing will be necessary we ask that HS2 undertake an open review of construction noise modelling and reporting of data (as we have spotted a number of errors) by a third party, with all results made public. The review should consider the specific nature of the Camden Cutting environment (large open cutting with hard sound reflective retaining walls and no mitigating features), the actual designs and construction techniques, equipment and programme,
and also construction traffic. The review should also consider the accuracy of baseline modelling and whether it is sufficiently detailed.

63. We ask that this noise modelling and mitigation specifically addresses impacts at the rear of buildings (e.g. rear facing windows in Mornington Terrace and Delancey Street for example), buildings exposed behind gaps between other buildings, and buildings that have direct line of sight of the works even if they are further away (such as Mornington Street for example) not just those facing the works. Recent works in the cutting have clearly identified this is a problem with residents on Albert Street kept awake by noise passing either over or through gaps on Mornington Terrace.

64. Noise modelling should also incorporate an assessment of the impact of increased numbers of construction vehicles on all designated construction routes using the LOAEL assessment for Construction noise so that residences can be provided with suitable mitigation (if they have to keep windows closed to make the noise environment acceptable) based on actual monitored baseline data to record the existing noise levels, and not modelled baseline data.

65. We ask that in addition to external noise monitoring, HS2 monitor noise levels both inside properties that have had secondary glazing installed, and others adjacent that have not, to ensure that noise levels do not exceed responsible standards.

**Noise Insulation Package**

66. Many buildings in the Cutting area are also exposed to significant heat build up on sunny days, with large south or west facing facades. Occupiers of buildings currently purge heat from buildings by opening the windows on hot days, although even then on hot days some rooms can become significantly over-heated. After secondary glazing is installed, this ventilation becomes impossible. HS2 have proposed small mechanical ventilators are used to create airflow to replace this ventilation, but the units proposed will be inadequate to the task in many cases. Air conditioning will be required in some houses to maintain a habitable temperature range.

67. Further problems arise from the installation of secondary glazing include condensation and moisture build up, and increased levels of carbon dioxide / indoor pollution. Recent research shows that indoor pollution is a factor in ill-health and early death that is currently not adequately understood.

68. We are aware of the assurance given to Camden to survey a representative sample of properties to consider these issues, and we believe this is a step in the right direction. We believe the ‘representative sample’ approach will be inadequate in practice and lead to significant and unacceptable variability in the quality of noise protection or ventilation measures provided, and to unacceptable ‘knock-on’ issues from insulation packages making homes uninhabitable in practice.

69. We note that appearing before the Select Committee of the House of Commons HS2 agreed it would be ‘eminently sensible’ for HS2 Ltd to engage directly with residents such as those on Mornington Terrace to discuss the details of noise insulation and the practical difficulties arising. Residents were cautioned by HS2 that they should not engage in foot-dragging or be un-constructive. In practice, residents have been willing and eager to engage for several years and it is HS2 staff that has been unwilling to
engage. HS2 are pursuing a ‘one size fits all’ approach without listening to the community and engaging on the practical issues.

70. We ask that all homes are individually assessed for noise insulation packages. We ask that assessments should be performed by an independent body or company, who has expertise in assessing both glazing and ventilation, and the resulting impacts on a property (for example the Buildings Research Establishment), and working within Listed Buildings regime where necessary. The scope of the assessment should include what insulation is needed to bring noise levels (including night time LAmax noise) within acceptable parameters; assessing heat build up on hot summer days/night and how this will be maintained with appropriate thresholds (max 24C at night); assessing how properties can have adequate ventilation to manage moisture build up; assessing how properties can have adequate ventilation to manage CO2 build up; assessing how properties can adequately meet any other appropriate habitability considerations. We note that HS2’s current proposals are for an individual ‘measure up’ of the fitting of noise insulation, but do not review the package as a whole for a particular property.

71. There are significant issues posed by the construction, layout and heritage features of particular properties. For example properties with box shutters cannot accommodate the standard secondary glazing internally as proposed by HS2.

72. We believe that retro-fitting appropriate noise insulation and ventilation to period properties is going to be difficult in many cases and has been under-estimated by HS2 Ltd. In some cases it may not be possible to provide a reasonable solution in a period property that ensures the property is reasonably habitable. HS2 have repeatedly failed to engage seriously in discussion on this point, and therefore the opportunity to design appropriate schemes and undertake them prior to construction work commencing have been lost.

73. We ask that this detailed assessment and any necessary building works are carried out prior to any construction work commencing. We ask that HS2 Ltd be prohibited from commencing construction until this has occurred.

74. We ask that if a noise mitigation proposal cannot be found that meets the reasonable needs of residents then HS2 Ltd will offer rehousing or suitable alternative mitigation.

75. We ask that an independent adjudicator be appointed who can consider cases where agreement cannot be reached. The adjudicator needs to be adequately resourced and experienced in assessing the multiple needs of particular homes.

76. We ask that the independent adjudicator should have the remit to review any cases where noise insulation does not work, or causes unacceptable ‘knock-on’ issues. In such circumstances, we ask that the adjudicator have the power to direct HS2 to conduct remedial work, or to direct HS2 to provide appropriate mitigation such as re-housing. This power to direct HS2 is required in our view given the poor approach of HS2 staff and the experience of residents impacted by other projects such as Crossrail where some complaints took a considerable period of time to resolve.

77. We ask that all noise insulation packages be designed and installed to suit the requirements of each individual property and its inhabitants. This could include alternatives to secondary glazing, such as fitting sash windows with laminated acoustic...
glass and brush seals, if they are appropriate for the building and if their performance is acceptable to residents.

78. We ask that, owing to the long timescales of the project, residents are eligible for both noise mitigation packages and temporary rehousing at different times during the ten years of construction. For example, if a resident is faced with a 10 year period of significant noise for which they would be offered an insulation package, with a particular peak for 30 month where they would qualify for re-housing, it should be open to the resident to take advantage of the re-housing policy for 30 months, and to take advantage of the noise insulation installation for the remaining period. As currently drafted, the policy would force a resident to choose between the two options.

79. We are obliged to make clear that HS2 have been very poor at engaging with Camden Cutting Group and others on this issue. HS2 have been resistant to meeting to discuss these issues and are only prepared to discuss them with London Borough of Camden, regarding LBC as the ‘valid representative’ of the community.

80. Even when HS2 are prepared to ‘engage’ representatives of the community this is generally a one way exercise. To quote a senior HS2 engagement manager when recently asked to define engagement: “we will meet you when we have something to tell you”. The senior manager was unaware of the recent report made by PACAC that was highly critical of HS2’s approach to engagement and broken culture, which, we suggest, indicates why so little progress has been made in fixing it.

81. We ask that on all these points HS2 be required to engage directly, regularly and substantively with the local community.

Noise thresholds for temporary rehousing

82. We ask that the limits for rehousing are lower in each category listed in Table 1 of the ES Vol 5 Draft Code of Construction Practice CT-003-000 and Information Paper E23. We ask that the limits for temporary rehousing are:

- 75 dB during the day 0800-1800 on weekdays (instead of 85 dB)
- 70 dB during the day 0700-2200 Sunday (instead of 75 dB)
- 65 dB at night 2200-0700 (same as proposed by HS2)
- 70 dB at other times (instead of 75-80 dB)

83. For reference: HS2 propose that the daytime limit for rehousing is 85 dB; this is like a very busy road with heavy lorries one metre from your house. The Health and Safety Executive requires ear defenders to be worn in a place of work which has this level of noise. This is 1m from the facade. Any resident then leaving their property and walking along the street would be exposed to levels in excess of 85dB.

84. Similarly, we ask that LAmax is used as a threshold measure for determining whether re-housing is the appropriate mitigation, just as we ask that LAmax is an appropriate threshold measure for noise insulation.

85. We ask that temporary rehousing is within the locality, of an equal standard to resident’s current housing, is agreed with individual households, that residents are
given the choice to make their own arrangements, and that HS2 are to pay all costs associated with rehousing and with the vacant property.

**Vibration**

86. We ask that HS2 adopt the vibration standards proposed in the Draft Camden Local Plan 2015 Appendix 2 which give a lower limit at night time.

87. The CoCP offers no commitment to survey or protect all properties in the Camden Cutting from vibration.

88. Most of the properties adjacent to the Cutting do not have proper foundations and are of uncertain robustness. We ask that all properties within 50m of the existing retaining walls that enclose all sides of the Camden Cutting between Parkway and Granby Terrace Bridge are given structural surveys before construction commences to assess their vulnerability for damage from the proposed works and that they are actively monitored during the construction works.

89. We understand that the disturbed clay adjacent to railway cuttings can disintegrate over a long period of time and ask that geotechnical monitoring of the ground adjacent to the Cutting is undertaken and that core drilled samples are taken prior to works starting for evaluation.

90. We ask that HS2 coordinate pre-construction defect surveys and maintain a dialogue with the relevant property owners throughout the duration of the works.

91. There is a need for speed controls on HGVs and other traffic on construction routes, but there is also a need to reduce vibration that could be exacerbated by speed humps and table junctions (eg. Mornington Street/Arlington Road junction and all of the interventions proposed for Delancey Street relating to the new cycle lanes). We ask that HS2 bring forward an appropriate solution that meets both these requirements and for this solution to be in place before use by any construction traffic.

92. We ask that when vibration is predicted to be above SOAE thresholds at night and is unmitigated that residents will not be expected to remain in their homes and will be re-housed.

**Noise Mitigation Techniques and Screening**

93. We ask that given that the works are in a densely populated environment and go on over many years that HS2 commit to using very quiet plant and construction techniques and that HS2 go beyond ‘Best Practicable Means’ in order to minimise impact on residents. Here, ‘practicable’ means techniques that do not cause extra inconvenience, time or cost to HS2 and this will not be sufficient.

94. We ask that local acoustic screens are built as close as possible to the works within the Cutting (which is up to about 100m wide) in order to limit breakout of noise at source. These screens will need to be specially designed and will influence how the work is undertaken and we ask that they are made an essential part of the construction requirements and budget.

95. The SES & AP3 ES states that perimeter screening 2.4m high will generally be used at the perimeter of construction sites and 3.6m high in some cases. The design or
96. We ask that acoustic screening is designed by acousticians and built specifically for the Camden Cutting. In order that the streets do not feel as if they are in a construction site we ask that the screens are either glazed or planted green walls.

97. We ask that no percussive piling takes place in the Cutting, in particular in the removal and re-construction of Mornington Street bridge as there are other techniques available, albeit at potentially higher cost, that will allow this removal at an acceptable noise level.

98. We ask that the CoCP is modified to include a commitment to brief the work force about local issues including noise, as has been done in the Thames Tideway Tunnel CoCP. Without this commitment it is possible that community relations are a ‘box ticking exercise’ that never influences what actually happens on site.

99. We ask that all residents on impacted streets be issued with protective ear defenders to protect their hearing when walking to and from their homes.

Working Hours

100. As described in the ES Vol 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. The work will be noisy, disruptive and go on over 10 years. This is unacceptable in a densely populated neighbourhood.

101. We ask that these exceptions to the Core Working hours are removed from the CoCP and that all exceptions are justified on a case by case basis with LBC following Section 61 procedures.

102. We ask that all work is done during Core Hours except when required for technical, not cost or programme, reasons.

103. We ask that HS2 justify as part of the LEMP process, on a case by case basis, all work outside of the normal working hours. Where a justification cannot be made to the satisfaction of all parties engaged in the LEMP process, the work must take place during normal working hours.

104. We ask that more rail services are diverted to other stations than currently planned by HS2 during the construction of HS2 in order to allow more construction during normal working hours in the approach to Euston. This would also better allow use of rail for transport of spoil and construction materials, and more room for acoustic screening immediately adjacent to the works.

105. We note that the government response to the House of Commons Select Committee report suggested that working hours and respite periods could be negotiated via the LEMPs and Community Liaison plans with community input. In practice we believe that once the Bill is approved and contracts signed there will be no ability for working hours to be amended. We therefore seek an assurance that working hours will be reduced.
with full respite periods of three days at least once a month, and at least one non-working day / night per week.

106. We ask that night time work be suspended during school exam periods and that consideration be given to the needs of young children in setting working hours.

107. This package of 'asks' listed in paragraphs 48 to 106 above in relation to the management and mitigation of construction noise are vitally important to our community. We recognise that in some areas these go beyond the measures provided for other construction projects, but our contention is that the remedy should be appropriate to the problem. The construction work we face, particularly at night, is unprecedented in the UK in a densely populated residential area, and the current proposals from HS2 fall far short from creating habitable homes in the Cutting area. It is vital that an appropriate package is now instituted that manages the impact before construction work begins.

**Construction noise review**

108. We note that the government accepted in its response to the House of Commons Select Committee report that there should be a review of compliance and noise thresholds within 6 months of start of the main construction works.

109. We ask for an assurance that this review will include direct engagement and input with the local community.

110. We ask that this review be conducted by a body or entity independent from HS2. For example the review should be commissioned by and report to the Construction Commissioner or the Independent Adjudicator.

111. We ask that this review is repeated as necessary at intervals determined appropriate by the Construction Commissioner.

112. We ask that assessment locations are chosen that reflect both the worst case scenarios (maximum exposure) and other locations where residents have been disturbed (e.g. as reported by the HS2 complaints procedure).

**Study on the effects of construction noise**

113. We note that paragraph 333 of the final report from the House of Commons Select Committee states that:

"The Promoter has commissioned a study on the effects of construction noise which will report by mid-2016 and will recommend standards. It will be important to follow through on its observations. Depending on the outcome of the study it may be appropriate to revisit aspects of the trigger times and levels."

114. We have subsequently asked HS2 staff to provide further details on this study: its scope, methodology, authors etc, but we have not been provided any details so far. (We note in passing that this is yet another example of poor engagement with the community by HS2.) Clearly this study was intended to provide comfort to the House of Commons that these issues are being seriously considered, however with no details provided subsequently we are led to the conclusion that this 'study' is a smokescreen and is not of serious intent.
115. We ask that full details of the scope, methodology and authors of the study be provided by HS2.

116. We ask that the authors of the study be required to conduct some engagement with the community to understand points of concern, and to provide information on their work.

117. We reserve our position on the findings of this study, and may need to address the Select Committee if the findings are of concern.

**Independent Advisory Service**

118. We also note that HS2 provided an assurance to LBC that on engagement with residents expected to be impacted by excess noise. Assurance 1938 from the register states that:

"The Promoter will actively engage with HS2 LANC on the provision of advice to the public in relation to eligibility and application of the construction noise and vibration mitigation package. Such considerations will include but not be limited to an independent advisory service. The Promoter will progress the engagement and will report back to the House of Commons Select Committee on progress, and in any event will aim to conclude considerations by the time the Bill reaches the House of Lords."

119. We note that the bill has now reached the House of Lords, but that there appears to be no progress on any items including an independent advisory service. Discussions between HS2 and LBC may be on-going, but in the meantime impacted residents are being formally advised by HS2 Ltd of their options (letter sent to impacted residents 8/4/16). The need is now, but the provision of advice is absent.

120. We note that this is an example of the type of issue we would expect an Independent Adjudicator to be able to hold HS2 to account on, in a timely manner.

121. There is a great need for such a service. The work that HS2 Ltd is going to conduct is of such scale, duration and complexity that residents need to understand their options and be suitably advised. Performed well, such a service will reduce the stress that individuals and families feel placed in such a situation.

122. We are aware of the HS2 ‘information centre’ in Euston. This centre is inadequate to perform this task in any way. Critically it is not independent of HS2 therefore cannot perform a trusted advisory role for impacted residents.

123. Any such service needs to be well funded given the numbers of properties involved. Staff need to have suitable a suitable understanding of the technical issues be able advise appropriately on noise insulation, ventilation etc.

124. We ask that HS2 be directed to put in place an independent advisory service.

125. We reserve our position on this issue on the understanding that HS2 may still be discussing this issue with LBC, however we may need to address the Select Committee when the outcome of these discussions is known.
Air Pollution

126. Air pollution (NO2, PM10 and PM2.5), predominantly generated by traffic, already has a significant impact on the lives of Camden residents, particularly those who live near main arterial roads such as Hampstead Road / Camden High Street (the A400), Delancey Street (A503) and Parkway (A4201).

127. Despite the fact that some local roads are noted in the ES as having raised pollution levels during or following construction (e.g. Arlington Road and Delancey Street), no mitigation has been proposed. The cumulative impacts of raised levels have not been taken into account and the fact that levels of Nitrogen Dioxide already exceed European guidelines by a large amount has not been factored in.

128. We note that the Cutting area falls outside of the Central Activity Zone, within which all Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) will be powered by latest class IV best practice standard engines. The Cutting area is classed as part of ‘Rest of Greater London’, where Illb-class machinery may be used. The Cutting area should be treated as if it were part of the Central Activity Zone for these purposes as the duration and impact of the works is similar to those in Euston.

129. We ask that all vehicles and plant are Euro VI compliant for emissions no matter where they are used for the entire project. Using Euro VI lorries only in the Low Emission Zone is not sufficient.

130. We ask that non-diesel vehicles are used for all work where possible and the percentage in use to be reported every 6 months

131. We ask that HS2 provide community feedback on air quality in the form of ‘traffic light’ red / amber / green signs in public locations. Such feedback should be updated weekly. More detailed data for agreed locations in residential streets should also be provided regularly, particularly on construction routes and also locations that are downwind of the major works

132. We ask for a formal review and audit of the approach the Promoter and any contractors are taking to reducing Air Quality at least every year through the building programme. The purpose of such a review will be to ensure that as technology evolves, or sufficient quantities of low emissions vehicles are available, these are incorporated into the construction approach. Contractor’s contracts should reflect this requirement that more stringent limits will be set during the course of the project at agreed review points (as has happened on other large infrastructure projects recently).

133. We note that the EU directive on Air Quality requires that where a development causes a breach of relevant emissions levels in a location it should not proceed. Also that the development should not proceed if it makes worse an existing breach and therefore delays compliance with existing values. We believe the construction work proposed, including the on-site construction vehicles, trains to convey materials and road vehicles make it implausible that HS2 will meet this criterion.

134. We ask that HS2 make a clear commitment that they will abide by the Directive and ensure not undertake construction that would breach emissions standards.
135. We ask that HS2 commission an independent study demonstrating whether the project will meet the requirements of the Air Quality Directive.

136. We ask for NOx and PM10 filters to be installed on all ventilation fans provided to those houses both with and without noise insulation packages.

**Compensation in urban areas**

137. We understand from consultation meetings with HS2 that our neighbourhood has been excluded from the compensation proposals offered to rural areas on the basis that we are accustomed to train noise and that the Draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) will protect us from the effects of construction. The first of these arguments is irrelevant: we are not petitioning about the effects of HS2 when it is in operation; it is the ten to eighteen year construction period that is our concern. The second argument is false: we are not protected by the Draft Code of Construction Practice as most of the construction activities in the Camden Cutting are specifically exempted from the prescribed working hours, few mitigation proposals are guaranteed by the CoCP and there remain significant adverse residual impacts identified within the SES2 & AP3 ES even after mitigation is provided. The environmental statement highlights the adverse impacts after mitigation.

138. We have also been told that compensation is not required in urban areas because intervening buildings will shield residents from the noise of the works. A visit to Mornington Terrace and Park Village East will show that there are no intervening buildings and that residents will be exposed to the full impact of one of the largest construction sites in Europe. Many other properties not immediately adjacent to the Cutting are also unscreened through gaps between buildings on the Cutting, or because they line streets which run perpendicular to the Cutting.

139. The Government's April 2014 ‘Decision Document’ did not respond to the issues that the Camden Cutting Group raised in its substantial responses to the Compensation Consultation and the Environmental Statement Consultation. The compensation measures offer nothing to those in the Camden Cutting neighbourhood whose homes and community will be seriously affected.

140. The Compensation proposals do not respect the statement made in the House of Commons on 20 December 2010 by Philip Hammond, Secretary of State for Transport: "I have indicated that we will seek to go further than has happened with previous such infrastructure schemes in the UK, because it is right and proper that individuals who suffer serious financial loss in the national interest should be compensated."

141. The promoter has suggested in response to asks at the House of Commons Select Committee that compensation is not necessary because the policy in previous infrastructure projects is to "mitigate not compensate". However the construction impacts in the Euston area and its approach through the cutting are not fully mitigated and indeed in many instances the mitigation quoted by the Promoter will not be put in place in the desire to keep the existing rail services running. Consequently your Petitioner asserts the Promoter’s position is flawed and compensation for the construction impacts is appropriate.
142. Rural areas are offered a variety of compensation schemes that urban residents are excluded from: Voluntary Purchase Offer, Alternative Cash Offer and Home Owner Payment. We ask that equivalent schemes should be available in urban areas to provide flexibility for the various different types of resident in the Cutting area, owner occupiers, property owners and council tenants.

143. We ask that an Independent Compensation Commission is established to draw up a fair compensation scheme and administer it. The Commission should take evidence from residents and address the needs of both property owners, reluctant landlords, long term tenants (including council tenants). It should consider the needs of those who want to stay in their homes, but be appropriately compensated, and also the needs of those who need to move during the period of construction works but who should receive a fair unblighted value for their property.

144. We believe a fair principle of such a scheme is that it should be designed to meet the specific needs of residents of the Euston and Camden Cutting area. The limits of such a scheme could be drawn to focus on significantly impacted groups, in particular the scheme should include compensation where there are 'predicted unmitigated significant adverse residual in-combination effects'.

145. In 1999 Railtrack made cash payments to residents of the Camden Cutting of between £150 and £300 (depending on location and property) as compensation for one weekend of work on the tracks. The work in question was only on rail systems and did not involve any of the much more disruptive heavy civil engineering that will be required for HS2. Similar compensation could form part of the compensation measures and we ask that it be considered.

146. We ask that the concept of 'Personal Compensation Budgets' as proposed by local authorities including Camden in their 'Fair HS2 Compensation Charter' be considered. This would allow people to make their own arrangements for dealing with times of significant disturbance in addition to any measures proposed by HS2.

147. We ask that an urban Property Bond scheme be considered, in particular for the Euston and Camden areas given the 'exceptional' nature of the impacts that have been identified. Criteria for residents to be included in such a scheme could be based on the impact residents will be exposed to, not simple distance from the works (as applies in rural areas).

148. Such a scheme would protect the interests of a property owner who over the construction period of 10 years may reasonably want to move house as they start a family and need to move from a smaller, central property to a property more suited to their changing family life. This is a common occurrence in the Cutting area, and such residents are already faced with accepting significantly reduced values for their property if they wish to move.

**Compensation: Need To Sell Scheme**

149. The only compensation currently available to all but a few Camden Cutting residents is the Need to Sell Scheme (NTSS). The rules for the NTSS are unfairly restrictive.

150. The NTSS is inadequate and unreasonable because:
(a) Applicants need to prove a ‘compelling reason to sell’ that is acceptable to a panel; you can’t just move for your own reasons like everyone else. Even if HS2 has made your life unbearable and potentially your property uninhabitable and definitely unsaleable at unblighted value you will not get compensation unless you can provide personal circumstances that satisfy a tribunal that you have a ‘compelling’ reason to sell.

(b) Although the latest version of this scheme has changed the word ‘hardship’ to ‘need to sell’ there is no change in substance to the working of the scheme. Statistics produced by the Resident’s Commissioner in September 2015 show eight of 58 applications refused only because a ‘Compelling Reason to Sell’ has not been proven and a further eight refused partly because of this.

(c) In rural areas people living within 120 metres of HS2 automatically qualify for various forms of compensation with no need to prove ‘a compelling reason to sell’ yet in Camden people living 10 metres from incredibly disruptive works must do so.

(d) A reason for wishing to sell might well be that the applicant does not want to live in the middle of one of the largest construction sites in Europe for ten years but this is not recognised by the scheme (a point noted by the House of Commons Select Committee).

(e) The long time scale of HS2 demands flexibility: people might well, through a normal web of human circumstance, want to move house during the next 10 years but not qualify under the scheme and suffer considerable loss to their assets and to their enjoyment of a home. People must be free to move home over the next 10 years and not be trapped, unable to get on with their lives as they normally would.

(f) If you have received an offer 14.99% less than ‘a realistic unblighted asking price’ (Decision Document 2014) you are not eligible to even apply for the NTSS and will suffer a 14.99% financial loss because of HS2.

(g) The ‘no prior knowledge’ stipulations in the NTSS do not reflect the extended time scales and new impacts in AP3 that were not known to property purchasers between 2010 and 2015.

(h) Non-resident landlords are unfairly excluded from the scheme: disruption caused by construction works could severely undermine the rental value of properties and make lettings impossible. No compensation is offered by the NTTS scheme.

(i) Even if landlords were covered by the NTTS scheme they would need to sell their property to take advantage of it. Landlords should have an option to retain their property but be able to ask HS2 to cover costs such as mortgages, bills, fees where rental has fallen and will not cover them.

151. We note that many of these inadequacies were recognised by the Select Committee of the House of Commons who requested the Department for Transport (DfT) to look again at the structure of the scheme. We note that response from DfT was negligible and made no serious adjustments to the operation of the scheme. The deficiencies therefore remain unresolved.
152. We ask that the Need To Sell scheme is modified to:

(a) Remove the requirement to show compelling reason to sell

(b) Drop the 15% rule

(c) Relax ‘no prior knowledge’ rules

(d) Include landlords in the scheme

**Compensation: Express Purchase**

153. We envisage there will be situations where the Construction Commissioner directs HS2 to undertake action. Experience from other projects, such as Crossrail shows that the promoter can often fail to engage reasonably with the process, with the Commissioner relatively toothless to enforce an outcome that resolves the situation.

154. We ask that the Construction Commissioner be given the power to approve homes for the Express Purchase scheme if complaints remain unresolved after a reasonable period (for example 3 months). This will have the benefit of providing an effective remedy in at least some situations (although not all residents would want to take advantage and move, most just want the problem fixed). It also provides an incentive to the Promoter to ensure reasonable proactive follow through on any issues.

155. We also ask that any owner predicted to experience greater than three years of residual significant adverse impact (i.e. after mitigation) should be eligible for Express Purchase.

**Loss of enjoyment of property**

156. The promoter argues that those in urban areas are used to construction noise. However such disturbance is a rare occurrence and when it occurs it is minimised by legislation that the promoter in this case is seeking to remove. When disturbance does occur it is for months, not years, and not of the intensity proposed. Therefore your petitioner requests that any resident suffering significant impacts for a period in excess of six months be eligible to a compensation to be calculated in relation to a fair unblighted occupancy value (based on rental values) for each month of impact.

**Compensation - conclusions**

157. Not only will adequate compensation provide appropriate relief to residents facing years of hardship from the construction impacts, it will also act as an incentive to the Promoter to adequately mitigate the impacts. If the impacts were to be fully mitigated then no compensation would be necessary. And if the construction impacts are not fully mitigated then under the promoter’s own argument of ‘mitigate vs compensate’ then compensation is not unreasonable.

**Rail not Road**

158. HS2 construction traffic will be a major source of pollution, noise, vibration and potential accidents and will have the largest impact on the wider area.

159. A construction railhead(s) in or near Euston could significantly reduce construction traffic and have major environmental benefits in Camden and beyond, and we are supportive of the study underway to assess how this can be done with the maximum percentages of materials to be moved in this way.
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160. As with other construction work, we ask that transport by rail is done so as not create unacceptable noise and that all properties affected must be offered the noise insulation and/or ventilation package. We note with regret that the study agreed to by HS2 was programmed to be complete by mid 2016 and that this has denied us the opportunity to include any details in our petition.

161. In particular, we ask that where there are options for constructing a ‘rail not road’ scheme, that the scheme details reflect how disruption to residents will be minimised, and does not prioritise the operational needs of HS2 or Network Rail.

162. In the event that a rail scheme is implemented for conveying spoil and materials, the impacts of this should be fully assessed and Environmental Statement updated. These impacts must then be fully mitigated, for example a railhead north of the portal may require more houses in Gloucester Avenue to receive noise insulation.

163. If the outcome of the study is unsatisfactory we reserve our position and may wish to address the Select Committee on the subject.

Construction Traffic

164. Construction lorry routes are proposed by HS2 on residential streets in the Camden Cutting area. This will cause air pollution and noise and vibration to adjacent properties and increased danger to pedestrians and cyclists. It has been reported in the press that three cyclists have been killed to date by CrossRail lorries and we do not want similar fatalities from the construction of HS2. HS2 staff refer to their safety plans, however we suggest similar measures were put in place by CrossRail and the only 100% way to prevent deaths is keep the HGVs out of residential areas and off cycle routes.

165. We ask that HS2 trains all lorry drivers in safe driving techniques and that the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) and Construction Logistics and Cyclist Safety Scheme (CLOCS) is implemented in full.

166. We ask that there is no transport of materials or waste outside of core hours on the roads.

167. We ask that physical barriers, or road signs with camera enforcement, are used to ensure that other traffic is not able to use residential streets as rat-runs to avoid congestion from construction traffic / utilities works / diversions on main roads.

168. We ask that road humps and table junctions on construction routes be removed to prevent unacceptable noise and vibration from HGVs to residential properties which are often only a few metres away from the road edge (with speed enforcement by other means).

169. We ask that HS2 provide sufficient funds to LBC for local traffic management and for traffic management schemes to be developed with the community.

170. We ask that HS2 does traffic modelling to the satisfaction of LBC and TfL using VISSIM modelling to give a fine-grained understanding of traffic at all junctions including minor roads (not just SRN / TfL roads at major junctions).
171. We ask that residential streets are not used as construction routes but that where HGVs have no alternative but to use residential streets to access specific sites we ask that their numbers be strictly limited to a pre-agreed level and that no additional vehicles be allowed to use that route. (This is necessary to ensure that once residential roads have reached ‘significant adverse’ community effects, or air pollution then it is not permissible for contractors to further increase the problem and benefit from the fact that there is no higher category higher than "significant adverse" that additional vehicles will push the route into).

172. The trigger limit of 25 HGVs per street per day prior to formal notification is not acceptable and should be removed to prevent journeys being spread further across the area in an effort to bend the rules.

173. We ask that the size of construction vehicles used on local residential streets is limited appropriately where vehicles are required for Utility works or there is no alternative route.

174. We ask that HS2 have an enforceable mechanism to ensure that construction vehicles stay on their agreed and designated routes.

175. We ask that HS2 makes proposals to maintain safe cycle routes throughout construction and specifically that North-South designated Route 6A on Arlington Road (to be signposted later this year as a ‘Quietway’ as an official part of the London Cycle Grid) is kept free from HGVs and LGVs to protect cyclists seeking to avoid Camden High Street with its additional loading of construction vehicles and to permit safe cycling.

176. We ask that HS2 makes proposals to maintain safe pedestrian crossings throughout construction and construct new ones where there are significant increases in traffic due to HS2 construction.

177. We ask that HGVs going to the concrete batching plant at Kings X do not drive east-west across Camden Town but use the Euston Road.

178. We ask that an assessment and mitigation of accident black-spots is done by HS2 on construction routes including the Delancey Street / Arlington Road junction.

179. We ask that HS2 report three months before preparatory construction work begins on the measures they have taken to implement their commitments and that regular monthly Traffic Management Plan review meetings are held with residents (and not just the Local Authority) so that real-time experience of traffic issues can be taken on board.

**Permanent Traffic**

180. We ask that the road system is designed to minimise traffic increases on all residential roads due to HS2. Currently this is not the case. Coordinated planning with TfL, LBC and the community is needed.

181. We ask that the new Euston Station taxi rank is moved to the south of the station away from the little open space that will exist after the HS2 station is built, and further away from residential areas. Taxi provision should not result in taxis having to use Harrington...
Square and the perimeter of the Ampthill Estate as a route between drop-off and pick up to ensure that residents health is protected.

**Satellite Construction Compounds**

182. There will be five construction compounds on or adjacent to residential roads in the cutting area north of Granby Terrace Bridge. All five are in close proximity to residential homes. The largest, Carriage Shed and Park Village East Compound, will include handling spoil removed from the Cutting in digging out the west side of the Cutting and station as well as processing the material from the demolitions. Until the study on spoil is completed the exact use of this compound is uncertain and your Petitioner reserves the right to raise further issues when that study is available.

183. Many of the residential roads to the east of the Cutting have been designated construction routes. Use of these areas extends either side of the working hours described in the ES, further increasing disruption to residents. This must be restricted to Core Working hours as a minimum and not using shoulder periods for bringing vehicles into position outside hours.

184. We ask that the size of these local compounds is minimised wherever possible and made smaller than proposed by HS2. The main compound at the Temperance Hospital site is only a 10 minute walk away, and deliveries of plant and materials should only be allowed via the main construction compound or at Euston Station, not via the satellite compounds.

185. We are particularly concerned that a proper analysis of the proposed use of these compounds has not been carried out and proper alternatives considered with opportunities to merge compounds and restrict those at street level. Some of the issues in this area appear to relate to a failure by HS2 Ltd and Railtrack to reach agreement allowing the impact on residents to be minimised. For example the ES lists the Mornington Street OverBridge compound as operating until 2020 and mainly during the day despite the bridge work being at night and reconstruction during 2021-22. Other queries remain unanswered despite the residents of Mornington Terrace raising this before the House of Commons Select Committee. It is still unclear why this compound is required for the intervening period between demolition and reconstruction of Mornington Street Bridge and ask that it be removed entirely. We reserve the right to appear again before the Committee when full additional information that has been asked for becomes available.

186. We ask that resident parking spaces that are lost due to Construction Compounds and other HS2 works are replaced in the same or adjacent streets by converting pay and display spaces or yellow line areas to resident parking and that no spaces are removed until alternative spaces are clearly identified and implemented.

**Design of the Cutting**

187. The design of the approach to Euston and of the Station should address the needs of the local community and not just those of HS2. The unique qualities of the Camden Cutting neighbourhood must be preserved. Specific elements of this infrastructure are dealt with in paragraphs 188 to 213 below.
188. The “to be appointed” Euston Design Panel should be appointed forthwith to ensure that its advice and input is taken on board early and must include members with accredited Conservation qualifications, members of Camden Design Review Panel (as soon as that body is appointed) and an appointee of the local community with architectural expertise.

**Hampstead Road Bridge**

189. HS2 proposed in AP3 to raise Hampstead Road Bridge by 4.8 metres and double its length to 220 metres. The effect on the urban environment is severe.

190. Eye level views between Camden and central London along Hampstead Road will be blocked and the unfriendly nature of the proposed design, along with its great length, will create an isolated and inhuman streetscape. It will cut off Camden visually from central London, discourage pedestrian use and create an inhospitable and unsafe environment in the centre of London.

191. The Hybrid bill planned to demolish and rebuild Hampstead Road as a truss bridge over a period of 6 years, phased to enable a single lane of traffic in either direction. The AP3 scheme will take 8 years, and now provide a deck and beam bridge that is 4.8m above current road level, 220m long, with a ramp off the south side to access the new service basement of Euston Station from 2033.

192. This design was driven by the basement service access to the station – requiring a ramp off the side of the bridge, and therefore not allowing trusses above the road level, As a result a deeper structural zone for the bridge is required underneath the road deck, pushing the road level higher up.

193. More frequent columns beneath the bridge would reduce the depth of the structure and thus height of the road.

194. We understand that the clearance under the bridge is designed to a European standard for high speed running that may not be necessary here and ask that this parameter be reconsidered.

195. Raising the road deck causes a number of issues - the height is both a visual severance and a danger to pedestrian and cyclist users; - the length means the road will be higher than the joining roads and the surrounding pavements, and it will therefore not ‘fit’ into the surrounding neighbourhood causing harm to the setting of the listed terrace on Mornington Crescent; - the service ramp can only be accessed for southbound traffic, meaning HGV delivery lorries will have to circle residential Harrington Square (often at unsociable hours) to reach the southbound traffic lanes; - the road junctions and crossings shown will be dangerous and circuitous for both pedestrian and cyclist users.

196. We ask for the bridge to be lower and shorter causing less construction and operation issues as described above. The community would prefer a lower road level with less disruption to the surrounding setting of roads and pavements, even if this meant a truss bridge design – there are many examples of elegant bow string truss type structures from recent urban projects (not like the utilitarian box truss bridge in the photo-visual shown in the Hybrid Bill and ES documents).
197. We are aware of the assurance given to Transport of London to conduct a study to review the design of the bridge. We welcome this as an opportunity for HS2 to develop a more appropriate design that takes account of the needs of the community and the surrounding context, and we ask for the points above to be taken into account during this study process resulting in a high quality design proposal that is sensitive to its context.

198. We cannot take a final position on the design of the bridge until such time as the study is completed, so we reserve our position on this subject and may need to address the Select Committee on this point once the report is published. Whilst the study may not look at actual design proposals it is very important that the HS2 Euston Station Design Panel (or HS2 Design Panel if the ESDP is not yet appointed) is part of this study, and the options sifting from the earliest possible point and see this as an urgent matter to be rectified. The Design Panels have highly respected engineers, bridge designers and architects who will be able to give valuable creative input from the outset.

**Temporary Mornington Street Bridge**

199. The proposed temporary Mornington Street Bridge has long approach ramps that will make it difficult for cyclists, people with push chairs and the elderly to use. We ask that it is designed to make it more user friendly with shorter and wider access ramps and a wider deck across the cutting to allow for people and cyclists to pass each other easily. There should be steps in the opposite direction to the ramp on each side so that the bridge can be approached from both South and North on both sides, and to give equality of access to those who find ramps difficult to navigate.

200. The current proposals leave unclear whether the current mature plane trees on the pavement on Mornington Terrace will be cut down when the temporary bridge is installed. We ask for a commitment that the bridge will be designed in such a way that these full grown, mature trees that are an essential part of the visual identity of the Terrace are all retained.

**Replacement Granby Terrace Bridge**

201. The proposed bridge design (arch and truss combination) is inappropriate in a residential location, proximate to listed properties. The proposed design is also of restricted width.

202. We ask that the design of the bridge is revised to reflect its surroundings and to create an appropriate structure for the location with a single unified design along its length. Again the Design Panel should be involved early on, at feasibility stage.

203. We ask that the existing bridge be rebuilt to the same width and the same parking space availability, so as to maintain parking capacity in the area as well as avoid creating a narrow ‘canyon’ for pedestrians and cyclists to traverse.

**Park Village East Retaining Wall**

204. HS2 propose to demolish and rebuild the 12 metre high, 3 metre thick brick retaining wall along Park Village East that forms the western side of the Camden Cutting. The scale and elegance of this wall contribute positively to the character of the neighbourhood. Demolition of this wall and construction of its replacement will cause severe noise and disruption.
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205. If the design of the scheme requires this demolition we ask that the impact of this significant infrastructure build is fully mitigated: for instance more day-time possessions of the adjacent railway line would reduce the night time impact to better balance the needs of the railway to be built and the needs of the community to sleep. We also ask that the replacement wall is considered carefully as a contextual design as it forms the foreground to the important II* listed houses on Park Village East when viewed from Mornington Terrace.

Design of the Approach to Euston

206. The proposed track layout in the Camden Cutting requires the demolition of the Hampstead Road Bridge, the Granby Terrace Bridge, the Mornington Street Bridge, the Park Village East Retaining Wall and the Central Retaining Wall at Parkway. It also requires the construction of a rail dive-under in a large excavated cut and cover concrete structure with new deep retaining walls. Line X for conventional trains will be demolished and reconstructed at a later date.

207. The design of this infrastructure responds to the needs of HS2 but has little regard to the needs of the local community or the urban fabric of London. HS2 is being built in a densely populated neighbourhood and we ask that the designs take account of this. The Hampstead Road Bridge study must have early input from the Euston Station Design panel (or HS2 Design Panel if the Euston Station Design Panel is not appointed), and the options assessed must allow for a design of the highest quality in this sensitive location (as it forms the setting to the Listed buildings on Mornington Crescent). The brief for this design must have community input because, to date, HS2 have repeatedly ignored/miscontrued community views on this element (as reported at several ECRG meetings).

208. Consideration needs to be given to the setting of the Conservation Areas and Listed buildings (Grade II and II*) on both sides of the Cutting. The Bill removes protection from some of our local heritage assets and we ask that the Local Authority retains this control. LBC have been given some limited assurances on this point, but only relating to ‘important assets’, which excludes residential homes.

209. We ask that HS2 design infrastructure in the Cutting (e.g. retaining walls, replacement bridges, vent shaft and headhouse) to enhance the urban environment and minimise the impact on the residents of Camden. Design Panel input should be provided early on.

210. The Bill proposes a reinstatement of Line X for classic trains in what appears to be the same geometry as the existing Line X which produces ‘wheel squeal’. We ask that the new Line X is designed to eliminate this.

Landscape

211. The landscape of the Cutting is significantly enhanced by the mature plane trees along most of Mornington Terrace, and the plantation that runs the length of Park Village East. We are concerned that in some cases these may be removed during the construction phase when alternative ‘workarounds’ could be used. We are also concerned that when they are removed HS2 believe that 1-for-1 replacement is adequate. A mature plane tree in the streetscape of Mornington Terrace cannot adequately be replaced by a sapling after construction is complete.
212. We ask that planting on Park Village East adjacent to the Cutting is maintained or replaced with equivalent planting in a suitable depth of soil so as not to require irrigation and with suitable trees and shrubs to encourage bird life.

213. We ask that the all existing mature trees and the retaining wall along Mornington Terrace adjacent to the Cutting are maintained throughout the construction period, including those near the new temporary Mornington Street bridge.

**Code of Construction Practice**

214. HS2 have committed that the CoCP will be 'best practice'. We welcome this principle, but reviewing the draft CoCP published in March 2016 we are concerned that the CoCP does not actually reflect best practice. We ask that the CoCP is further developed to ensure that it is best practice. We reserve our rights on this issue as further drafts are published and may wish to address the Committee on this issue at a later date.

215. Further your Petitioner is extremely concerned that his local authority appears unable to get agreement from the Promoter on provision of detailed, timely and regular results from the monitoring of construction impacts. The petitioner is appalled that such vital information for residents protection should be withheld and can think of no conceivable reason why an organisation should validly seek to withhold such information from the community or the Local Authority given its statutory role in managing Environmental Health. Your Petitioner therefore requests your Lordships to fully investigate this matter as to why agreement has not been reached. This should be done even if the Promoter subsequently reaches agreement with London Borough of Camden since it demonstrates a wider problem that is critical to protecting the health of local residents impacted by construction. Further, your Petitioner requests that such information is made public to ensure those impacted are fully informed.

216. We are also aware that Transport for London are working with the London Borough of Camden to create a Construction Logistics Plan. We agree with the position of LBC that this plan must be incorporated into the CoCP and we ask the Committee to ensure this occurs.

**Engagement of Local Community in the Local Environment Management Plans**

217. The impacts shown in AP3 and SES2 will be managed by the ES and CoCP which set out the proposed approach for how Local Environment Management Plans will be agreed. These are the rules by which construction of the work will be governed. It is proposed that the contractors for the project, as well as local council, will be involved in agreeing these plans. We believe that representatives of the local community should also be involved. We note that while Local Authorities are central to this process they are not synonymous with the local community. As the London Borough of Camden themselves have expressed it: "it is the promoter’s responsibility to engage with the community to ensure their concerns are heard and responded to directly, rather than using [LBC] as the intermediary".

218. We ask that three representatives from Camden community groups including the Camden Cutting Group be on the body that develops LEMPs.

219. We ask that CFA1 has its own LEMP that addresses the unique issues of the area.
220. We ask that community representatives have input to local environmental issues during construction and also formal input into Contractor’s Environment Management Plans (CEMPs).

**Engagement and Management of Local issues by HS2**

221. We draw the attention to the recent report of the House of Commons Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee (PACAC) which was highly critical of HS2’s willingness to engage, and made the following comments:

"The continuing existence of a culture of defensive communication and misinformation within a public body, responsible for the delivery of such a large and highly controversial project, is not acceptable. … Unless those responsible for delivering HS2 understand that first and foremost they serve the public, and take action to reflect this, then they will continue to be vulnerable to the criticism that they have disregard for members of the public who are impacted by this large-scale infrastructure project." (Source: Summary of report)

"The depth and extent of criticism expressed in the vast majority of the evidence that we received highlights the need for a fundamental shift in how HS2 Ltd communicates and engages with the public. We have seen no evidence to suggest that this step change has taken place." (Source: para 33)

"Whilst we do not seek a return to the Phase One community forums, we are concerned that HS2 Ltd has failed to identify what we believe to be the root cause of the forums’ failings: namely that the process was treated as a one way 'box-ticking' exercise by HS2 Ltd, with no genuine two-way engagement. Whilst we are broadly supportive of any engagement activity which offers the public a genuine opportunity to discuss and contribute to the process, unless there is a change in approach from 'transmit' to 'receive' on HS2 Ltd’s part, then these new proposals will also fail. In particular we urge HS2 Ltd to address its "defensive" style of communication and to embrace openness and transparency." (Source: para 38)

"We cannot over-state the importance for HS2 Ltd of developing a strong customer focus on the needs of those whose homes and communities are seriously affected by what remains a highly controversial project." (Source: para 45)

222. Camden Cutting Group submitted evidence to the PACAC and we were pleased to have the Committee listen to our concerns and reflect them in their report.

223. In particular we endorse the comment that HS2 regard ‘engagement’ as a one way transmission process, and not an opportunity to listen and shape their proposals to take account of community needs.

224. We also note the strategy of HS2 to regard engagement with London Borough of Camden as engaging with the community. We believe that LBC have a vital role to play, but HS2 has a responsibility to engage with the community directly.

225. Regrettably our recent experience since the ‘Camden’ hearings at the Select Committee of the House of Commons has been no better. We read with interest the Draft Community Engagement Framework published by the Promoter in January 2016. However the reality in the first four months has been poor with HS2 staff clearly unaware of the expectations set out in that document. This further concerns residents
that HS2 as staff can’t follow the process in this document, what reliability is that any other elements of the CoCP or information papers will be followed?

226. We ask that HS2 be directed in the strongest possible terms to undertake meaningful and substantive engagement on issues of concern to the local community, and to be fully and properly transparent with all members of the community about everything it is planning to do.

227. We ask that HS2 commit to briefing the construction work force with information obtained from liaising with the community regarding matters such as noise generation and access issues. This has been proposed in the CoCP for the Thames Tideway Tunnel project.

228. We ask that the HS2 local office to deal with all community issues for Euston and the Camden Cutting (CFA1) area be staffed by knowledgeable staff with appropriate expertise and experience. We are deeply concerned by our dealings to date with the employees in this office who do not appear to have a reasonable understanding of the scheme, its local impacts or key issues in how these are managed.

229. We ask that an independent person be appointed to chair engagement meetings between HS2 and community groups and representatives. HS2 have been very poor at maintaining a schedule of meetings, in providing reasonable information, and in following up on open action items and information requests. Engagement forums such as the Euston Community Relations Group (ECRG) should be chaired by an independent person able to call HS2 to account. This person could be selected by, and be accountable to the Residents Commissioner.

230. We ask that all on-going studies be conducted promptly, with all workings and assumptions made public. We reserve the right to appear before the Committee where reports have not yet been published. Where relevant the studies must include input from the HS2 Design Panel (e.g. Hampstead Road Bridge).

Clause 48
231. Clause 48 of the Bill allows ministers to compulsorily purchase land if they think HS2 creates “an opportunity for regeneration or development” on it. This clause states that if the Government “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” it may acquire the land compulsorily. This clause, which has no spatial or time limits, represents a new general power that seems to be unprecedented in the history of infrastructure projects. We are concerned that this power will be used to the benefit of large scale development and to the detriment of local communities and ask that the powers are removed from the Bill. HS2 should be for improving transport not for providing money making opportunities for large scale developers at the cost of the existing community. Development should be regulated by Local Authorities using the Planning system; there is no case for HS2 being above the laws that apply elsewhere in the country.

Enforcement
232. We are concerned that the proposed CoCP has no statutory basis since it is not actually part of the Bill and do not know how HS2 Ltd will be held accountable for the
actions measured against the CoCP. The status of the policies referred to within the CoCP (for example the policy on re-housing) is also unclear. We ask that the Code of Construction Practice together with the relevant policies should be incorporated into the Bill in such a way as to ensure their compliance can be legally enforced by members of the public impacted by the non-compliance.

233. We ask that the Bill includes provisions enabling enforcement against the Secretary of State in the event of HS2 Ltd / the nominated undertaker / the Promoter failing to fulfil their obligations regarding environmental standards.

234. We are concerned that environmental standards in the ES, CoCP and other project documents may be breached in the interests of cost or programme requirements.

235. Any monitoring required under the Code of Construction Practice should involve the relevant local authority as well as independent experts with effective oversight and redress arrangements in the event of non-compliance with the Code of Construction Practice. We are concerned that there is no independent method of monitoring compliance by HS2 and their contractors in relation to noise, vibration, dust and other issues.

236. We ask that HS2 adequately fund additional Environmental Health Officers at LBC to monitor these issues, ensure compliance and deliver enforcement.

237. We ask that an Independent Adjudicator be appointed with the power to ensure any commitments entered into by HS2 are met in practice, including assurances, undertakings, and policies in HS2 information papers. These assurances should include those relating to the working culture of HS2 and the engagement with local communities and to investigate any instances of complaints that cannot be resolved by the resident’s and construction commissioners.

238. We ask that the Independent Adjudicator must be separate from HS2, and not report to the Chair of HS2.

239. We ask that the Independent Adjudicator have the mandate and resources to proactively monitor whether HS2 are meeting their commitments, and not purely act reactively as part of the escalation process when complaints occur.

240. We believe this is especially important given the range of well documented examples of the Promoter's failure to have regard to residents' well being (as evidenced by the PACAC report in March 2016). The length of time that the concerns around the pervasive culture of disdain for residents have existed without corrective action means that residents have no trust that the Promoter is capable of acting reasonably towards impacted residents, that a reactive Complaints Commissioner is insufficient, and that an Independent Adjudicator is therefore essential to manage enforcement.

241. We ask that an Independent Adjudicator be given the mandate to direct HS2 to undertake actions to meet its commitments.

242. We ask that the Select Committee hear evidence from the Crossrail Complaints Commissioner on whether the complaints process is working and how it can be improved upon for HS2.
243. 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, etc.

Signed

Matt Hollier
Co-chair Camden Cutting Group

David Auger
Co-chair Camden Cutting Group

Luisa Auletta
Co-chair Camden Cutting Group and Roll B Agent

17th April 2016
6 Mornington Terrace, London, NW1 7RR
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr Anthony Lea

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner lives at St Francis, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9JP, 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.
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
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.

Anthony Lee

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 Mrs Patricia Lea

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner lives at St Francis, Oxford St., Lee Common, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9JP, 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.
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
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.

\[ \text{(AGENT)} \]

Patricia Lea

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Kirsty Wheeler

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner lives at  Sly Corner House, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LD, 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.
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
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.

Kirsty Wheeler

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 Mary Godfrey

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner lives at 2 Hunts Green Cottages, Hunts Green, The Lee, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LX, 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 tranquility of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to her household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden, 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 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.

Mary Godfrey
Date: 4th April 2016.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF William N Avery  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

Your Petitioner is William Avery of 88 Aylesbury Road who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives and works 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  

Your Petitioner has been a resident of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB for 25 years and 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. This is because your petitioner both lives and works in Wendover and therefore will be seriously disrupted due to the construction of the current mostly surface proposals for the track as it passes through Wendover. In addition, your petitioner’s wife who works for Buckinghamshire County Council commutes to Amersham and also around the county as part of her job and will also be seriously affected by construction works to the detriment of her ability to do her important job and to herself in terms of the associated stress and frustration.  

In addition, your petitioner chose to live in Wendover 25 years ago because of the attraction of Wendover, its amenities, including St Mary’s Church and transport links and its setting in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) which is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention and naturally assumed that this status
would result in the beauty of the area being preserved and not ruined by an unnecessary railway which is of no direct benefit to your petitioner.

Specifically, 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, on embankments and 6 metre sound barriers which will look hideous and will fail to achieve the intended mitigation of noise.

As a result the tranquility of the area and the beauty of the landscapes will be permanently destroyed which will have a direct detrimental effect on your petitioner and will have severe adverse effects on the reputation, social, environmental and economic cohesion of Wendover during construction and operation of the railway. Wendover will be radically altered, the character of the town irreversibly changed with a resultant negative commercial effect which will reduce the value and salability of both your petitioner's private property in Wendover.

4.1 Your Petitioner's preferred mitigation ("Ask")

Your Petitioner requests that Wendover and the surrounding AONB be protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover.

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.

Specifically, your petitioner understands that this can be achieved by 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.

4.2 Your petitioner's less preferred mitigation (backup "Asks")

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 4.1 above then the mitigation measures set out below would be substantially mitigated. The construction mitigation will still apply where relevant.

However, if the House of Lords is not persuaded to agree to a fully bored tunnel your petitioner requests that the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented.

Hierarchy of Mitigation - Scope of work

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.

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

Hierarchy of Mitigation - Construction.

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 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 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.

Your Petitioner also requests, in order to have a fair understanding of the relative costs 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.

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.

WILLIAM N AVERY
17th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF SANDRA AND HOWARD JACOBS

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners are Sandra and Howard Jacobs, owners and occupiers of 169 and 169a Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8LA, who have resided at the above address for the past 20 years. The route of the Proposed Scheme, which is in a bored tunnel at this point, runs to the rear of the majority of the properties on the north side of Gloucester Avenue and directly beneath some of them. Protective utility works are proposed on Gloucester Avenue.

3. Your Petitioner’s Concerns are set out in the clauses which follow.

4. Your Petitioners argue that their 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. Your Petitioners consider that they have not been given a fair hearing by HS2 and that their interests in relation to safeguards of property and personal rights have not been protected. Your Petitioners consider the process by which HS2 is being imposed by power on them specifically, and on the citizens of Camden generally, is undemocratic and arbitrary. Your Petitioners consider the process has been a breach of their legitimate rights as citizens.
6. Your Petitioners consider that the overall solution of the House of Commons Select Committee for Camden, that its citizens should rely on HS2’s assurances to Camden Council (assurances that are as yet unknown), provides an inadequate safeguard of their interests and of those of the citizens of Camden as a whole.

7. Your Petitioners are concerned that the impact of the **amount of waste** to be excavated and removed from the construction of the new railway has been underestimated.

8. Your Petitioners request that HS2 Ltd be required to comply with the requirements of the Waste Framework Directive and review its decisions on **treatment of waste** to ensure it complies with the waste hierarchy, as detailed in the above Directive. Your Petitioners consider that the plan HS2 to remove spoil using the carriage sidings alongside Gloucester Avenue were introduced too late, for them to be digested before the House of Commons Select Committee hearings. Inadequate information was provided and the plans remain uncertain.

9. Your Petitioners are concerned about the adverse impacts on **air quality** that will result from the construction and operation of the high speed railway line and the associated development. Euston Road is one of the most polluted roads in Britain. Many other roads in Camden are presently above the legal pollution level. Massive construction work, *with the threat of up to six hundred lorry journeys per day*, will inevitably increase this already-illegal level. There is no doubt that increased levels of air pollution will cause additional deaths in Camden, particularly among the young and the elderly (we two petitioners are both now aged 77 years). Your Petitioners therefore request that before construction begins is a monitoring study of air quality is undertaken, benchmarked against the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010. A copy of the report should be made public.

10. *As yet, no proper measurement of Air Quality has been carried out by HS2,* which instead has relied on extrapolation from readings made by the London Borough of Camden. This method is inadequate, both in general and in many specific instances, to justify the weight and reliance put upon it by the Promoter. Your
Petitioners therefore request that the local authority be provided with powers to monitor air quality in accordance with binding mitigation plans. In the event that air quality thresholds are breached, your Petitioners submit that the Bill should be amended to enable the local authority to require the cessation of construction until air quality thresholds are complied with.

Your Petitioners further request that, in order to limit an increase in air pollution, the number of HGV journeys during construction of HS2 should be reduced by removing all spoil by rail and by providing construction materials by rail rather than by road. We also request that all vehicles used in construction should meet the latest European emission standards.

11. Vibration

Your Petitioners are very concerned about noise and vibration caused by the construction and operation of the high speed railway. Your Petitioners are concerned that there appears to be no mechanism in the Bill to deliver a properly noise-mitigated railway.

Your Petitioners are concerned that the fundamental calculations needed for forecasting noise impacts, known as the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) and Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL), have not been correctly identified and were set too high in the Environmental Statement, resulting in material underestimation of the adverse noise and significant adverse noise impacts likely to arise from the high speed railway.

Your Petitioners are concerned that the thresholds adopted in the Environmental Statement for noise limits were set above what the World Health Organisation considers acceptable, particularly given the moves by the World Health Organisation to set new lower targets on the basis of the latest medical research on the impact of noise on human health.

Your Petitioners are concerned that the specific impacts of ground-borne noise have not been properly considered or explained to the community and the limit for
ground-borne noise does not reflect recent or practice or experience and the methodology used for predicting the impact of ground-borne noise is insufficiently robust and no amelioration measures have been suggested to deal with this problem.

Your Petitioners therefore request
HS2 Ltd be instructed to issue revised noise thresholds covering the LOAEL and SOAEL for noise exposure, in rural and urban areas and during the day and at nighttime to reflect World Health Organisation guidelines, including World Heath Organisation guidelines on peak noise (60db max pass-by outside, giving 45db inside).

HS2 Ltd be required to set noise limits for construction which are in line with World Health Organisation limits and local authorities be provided with enforcement powers to order the cessation of construction activities if and whenever such exposures are breached.

HS2 Ltd be obliged to commit to designing the high speed railway to operate in such manner that the revised noise exposures are not breached.

A binding requirement be included in the Bill for noise monitoring, with obligations on HS2 Ltd to introduce additional mitigation measures, including reduction in train speeds, in the event that the forecast noise levels are exceeded.

HS2 Ltd be required to commit to the same threshold for ground borne noise as the Northern Line Extension - meaning ground-borne noise levels no greater than 25dB LpAsmax for rural areas and 30dB LpAsmax for urban areas.

Your Petitioners are concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State or arbitration. Your Petitioners are also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the nominated undertaker.
Your Petitioners request that Clause 35 and schedule 25 are deleted from the Bill.

12. Your Petitioners consider HS2’s traffic plans for the construction phase are very alarming. The planned road closures, together with the additional HGV traffic, will bring Camden to a halt. There are hundreds of different effects listed in the Environmental Statement by HS2, but no convincing summary of their combined impact. HS2 is seeking powers to deny the citizens of Camden the right to a functioning traffic system.

The most serious issue is the removal of spoil from Euston. This spoil amounts to two million tons, apparently requiring up to six hundred lorry movements every day for twenty years. Your Petitioners insist that all spoil from Euston be removed by rail.

Your Petitioners are particularly concerned about the vulnerability of the Parkway junctions to gridlock from HS2’s construction traffic. These junctions (Parkway, the Outer Circle, Albany Street, Park Village East, Gloucester Avenue and Oval Road, and Delancey Street), are Primrose Hill’s link to Camden Town and to the rest of London. HS2 must not be allowed to cause their long-term blockage.

Your Petitioners also protest against HS2’s plan to commandeer the Zoo Car Park for its lorries.

13. Moving the vent shaft to Juniper Crescent

At present, HS2’s tunnels are due to go just inside railway land. The tunnels run from the portal (the tunnel entrance south of Parkway) to a vent shaft on Adelaide Road. Common sense suggests that it would be better for the tunnels to run centrally under railway land. The construction of a vent shaft on Adelaide Road will mean closure the road for many months, causing traffic chaos in England’s Lane and elsewhere. It will also inevitably damage the Adelaide Road Nature Reserve.

There is a solution readily available. Following the abandonment of the HS1 Link, the old site of Primrose Hill Station is now available. HS2 itself has produced a report on
the possibility of moving the vent shaft there (showing that this is possible and only rejecting the move on the grounds of (1) expense; and (2) it slowing HS2’s trains down). Your Petitioners believe that if HS2 altered the angle of its portal by a very small angle (less than 6 degrees), this would make this realignment easier.

14. Code of Construction Practice
Your Petitioners are concerned that the nominated undertaker's ongoing accountability is unspecified. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply and the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event that the contractors do not comply with the Code of Construction Practice. Assessment in the environmental statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be fully effective, however, the Code of Construction Practice has no legal status.

Your Petitioners submit that the Code of Construction Practice should be incorporated into the Bill. Parliament, and not the nominated undertaker, should be accountable for the project. Any monitoring required under the Code of Construction Practice should involve the relevant local authority as well as independent experts with effective oversight and redress arrangements in the event of non-compliance with the Code of Construction Practice.

The standards set out in the environmental statement and the Code of Construction Practice is of "reasonableness" and "reasonable endeavours". Your Petitioners submit that this should be replaced by a higher standard, i.e. "best practical means" and the measures should be agreed with the relevant local authority. Measures should be subject to independent assessment verifiable and challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

15. Your Petitioners are concerned about the danger of water pollution arising from the construction and operation of the proposed high speed railway and associated development and the run-off into surrounding watercourses, as well as the expected flow rates or impact on surrounding transport links.
Your Petitioners therefore request that, throughout construction, there should be sampling of surface water at different locations surrounding each construction site and these samples should be independently tested at a United Kingdom accreditation service laboratory. The results from the sampling should be shared with the Environment Agency and the relevant local authority. The results should be benchmarked against accepted water quality levels.

Your Petitioners are concerned that the Hybrid Bill seeks to undermine long standing and important legal safeguards concerning the safety of drinking water. Your Petitioners request that Clause 31 and schedule 20, which override key legal safeguards that protect public water supplies, be deleted from the Hybrid Bill.

15. Compensation

Your Petitioners submit that the compensation provisions in relation to property that is not compulsory acquired and other matters are not sufficient to compensate your Petitioners adequately for the loss and damage they may incur as a result of construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development.

Your Petitioners request that the Bill should be amended to ensure your Petitioners and other persons outside the safeguarding area who are injuriously affected and adversely affected by loss of value should be entitled to claim compensation.

Your Petitioners submit that an essential principle is that the polluter should pay for pollution incurred as a result of his (the polluter's) activity. Your Petitioners submit that where pollution and damage cannot be mitigated it should be compensated. It is manifestly unfair to expect residents injured as a result of HS2's activity should go uncompensated.

16. Your Petitioners are concerned about the adverse impacts of the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development on fauna and flora. Your Petitioners submit that there should be binding mitigation measures to reduce the adverse impacts on ecology, including but not limited to avoiding ancient woodland, migration routes for wildlife across construction sites and the operational high speed
railway and associated development, and compensatory measures to offset habitat loss and other damage to species.

17. Your Petitioners request that in accordance with the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee Report dated 2 April 2014, a process should be established to **monitor all aspects of environmental protection needed for 60 years.**

---

**The prayer**

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Howard Jacobs

Sandra Jacobs

18 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  
PETITION against the  

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

**THE PETITION OF the Joint Parish Council for Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch and Wappenbury.**

Declares that:
1. A Bill has been introduced into Parliament to provide a railway between London and Birmingham.
2. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

Your petitioner

3. The petitioner is the Joint Parish Council for Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch and Wappenbury.
4. The proposed route of HS2 will pass directly through the parish of Offchurch for a length in excess of 4 kilometres and thus directly affects the area represented by the Joint Parish Council.
5. The petitioners allege that they and their property, rights and interests in their area and the inhabitants thereof would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in their present form and thus accordingly object to the Bill for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Your petitioner’s concerns

6. The Petitioner and the Community have major concerns about the project and its effect on both our environment and lives.
7. There is a real need for the Community to be kept informed and its voice heard. To date, this process has been less than satisfactory, at best adequate.
8. We seek an assurance that future development of the project will be adequately communicated to the Community and its voice and concerns heard and acted upon where appropriate.
9. The Environmental Statement agrees that mitigation measures proposed by the Community would lead to fewer significant environmental effects, but because of the associated increased construction complexity and costs, it concluded that the existing design should be retained.
10. The parish of Offchurch is a rural unspoiled part of Warwickshire and is designated as green belt and a conservation area. The proposed plans as submitted by HS2 Limited will have a significant long term impact, given that the major mitigation proposed by the petitioner has been rejected on cost grounds.
11. The major (only) items thus rejected were:
   - Lowering the track bed height across the parish of Offchurch
   - Offchurch green (cut and cover) tunnel
12. Rejection of these two major items of mitigation places even greater emphasis on the need to provide adequate mitigating measures under the headings set out below.

**Finalising the design**

13. We seek an undertaking that the current design track bed height tolerance of plus 3
metres is not applied to the parish of Offchurch, where the planned track height has already increased by several metres.

14. We seek an undertaking that the Community will be involved in order that the final design be subject to local input.

**Construction**

15. We seek an assurance that the Community will be involved in the finalisation of the draft Code of Construction Practice and associated documents.

16. We further seek an assurance that the resultant construction process is rigorously policed via a process with real effective power to ensure compliance.

**Visibility**

17. We seek an assurance that the Community will be involved in the visibility and aesthetic aspects of the Project.

18. This petition seeks to mitigate the serious damage which HS2 would do to the visual aspect of the Leam valley. It therefore seeks the following undertakings:

- The track bed should be as low in the landscape as possible.
- Bunds, fencing - screening will have a positive and immediate impact upon visibility and are seen as being essential part of the mitigation plan.
- Appropriate screening and planting will have a positive impact on visibility and is seen as being an essential part of the mitigation plan.

**Noise.**

19. We seek an assurance that the Community will be involved in the local noise reduction/suppression aspects of the Project.

20. The object should be that noise levels from the project for both construction and operation are the absolute minimum over and above the current ambient levels. The noise impact from HS2 will be significant for the community of Offchurch and warrants further efforts to mitigate this impact.

**Lighting**

21. We seek an undertaking that the Community will be involved in ensuring that only the minimum lighting for safe working during the construction period will be utilised.

**Construction Traffic**

22. The petitioners seek an undertaking that a number of key roads in the area are barred from HS2 construction traffic use.

23. This includes not only HGV traffic but also personnel transport to and from sites(s) together with deliveries.

These roads within the parish are:

- Welsh Road
- Long Itchington Road
- Hunningham Road
- Village Street.

**Summary.**

24. HS2 will have a significant impact on Offchurch. The Community wishes to be both heard, involved and is concerned to see a tangible improvement in this area of engagement.

25. Please help us to further our requests so that we may all be part of the intended World Class Exemplar Project.
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.

Signature

Name

April 15th 2016

MICHAEL BURGUN, AGENT.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF DANIEL MARCUS
Declares that:

1. The petitioner and its property, rights and interests in its area would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill except the provisions under the cross-headings “Railway matters” and “the Crown”.

The petitioner

2. Your petitioner is DANIEL MARCUS, resident at 21 Cubitt Court, 100 Park Village East, London, NW1 3DL. Your Petitioner is an owner-occupier on the fourth floor of a 10 story newly built block of 41 apartments, completed in 2009, at the end of Park Village East. Your Petitioner is also co-owner with his sister, MIRIAM MARCUS, of a second apartment in the same building, 37 Cubitt Court, on the seventh floor. MIRIAM MARCUS enjoys the rights and benefits of this apartment and rents it out as her sole source of income. They both overlook Granby Terrace bridge, The Old Engineering Works and the open railway cutting, called Camden Cutting, leading to Euston, 250 meters away part of a significant area of redevelopment. Both apartments may specially and directly be affect by the bill.

The property

3. Cubitt Court is a mixed block owned and managed by Nottinghill Housing Association comprising of 3 floors of housing for the physically handicapped, one floor for housing association tenants and 7 floors of leaseholders flats. Your Petitioner is a leaseholder that bought his one bedroom, 52 square meter apartment in August 2010 and co-purchased their second apartment of a similar size in December 2010. Although born in London and raised in Swiss Cottage, your Petitioner spent many years abroad for work having lived for 20 years in France. Your Petitioner feels very privileged to have been able to buy this apartment and has spent 5 wonderful years enjoying living in it and the area around it. He is 56 years old and in a same-sex partnership for the past 8 years. His husband is 41 years old. Both work long hours and often work from home. Both run their own small business, your Petitioner weaving fabric and his husband as a massage therapist who begins work at 1PM returning home at 11PM every weekday night and at 7PM during the weekend. Your Petitioner’s sister is an unmarried 58 year old and is vulnerable. Once a teacher, she is now unemployed. She moved back in with her mother and rents her apartment to provide herself with an income. She doesn’t claim from the State and thanks to this apartment, her sole source of income, she is self-sufficient. Our neighbourhood is quiet and peaceful allowing your Petitioner to work and rest from his stressful life. With relatively little through-traffic, we benefit from the space and light and air that the railway cutting creates while accepting the limited intermittent noise the trains produce during the daytime. Running ones own business is both exhilarating and nerve racking. Often we worry that we won’t make it to the month’s end when all the bills are due. Our only place of refuge is our apartment to which we are very attached. It is haven in a busy and tough city.
Your petitioner’s concerns are

4. Heavy construction threatens us for almost ten years (2016-2025) and the wider community for at least eighteen years (2016-2033). Cubitt Court is squarely placed adjacent to one of the principal construction zones. The building is less than 10 meters away from Granby Terrace Bridge, The Old Engineering Works and the proposed exit for the spoil from the Camden Cutting area where the new railway lines will be built, the destruction and eventual rebuilding of Granby Terrace Bridge and Hampstead Road Bridge and the demolition of the buildings adjacent to the Cutting on the south side of Granby Terrace.

The work that will take place in the 750 meter length of the Cutting will exit from The Old Engineering Works in plain site and sound of our homes, whose rooms front Park Village East and directly overlook the Cutting. This will make it an incredibly intense work site for many years.

In addition, the ES Vol 5 Draft Code of Construction Practice CT-003-000 sections 5.2.6 to 5.2.10 allow much of the work in the Cutting to be exempt from normal working hour restrictions and to take place 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Much of the construction work will take place within a few meters of our front door and under our windows yet there is little compensation on offer and inadequate mitigation.

There is nothing shielding us from the construction works. The Cutting is a large open area with hard sound reflective surfaces; works anywhere in the Cutting will create significant impacts. At the south side of the Cutting, we are completely exposed to the full brunt of the works. These impacts, in what’s referred to under the general title of habitability, will include noise, dust, vibration, ventilation, air pollution, loss of safe access routes, visual impact, construction traffic, bridge closures, and congestion. The neighbourhood will be a construction site for a decade.

The human cost of the HS2 construction has not been considered seriously by HS2. Your Petitioner often works from home. Because of his work his husband wakes late. Between 2016 and 2025 their lives will be seriously disturbed. It is unrealistic to think that life goes on as normal while a The Old Engineering Works, Granby Terrace Bridge and the condemned buildings in Stanhope Street are demolished. Then this area is excavated, tracks built and on the north side a 12 meters high, 3 meters thick retaining wall is being demolished and a 35 meter high one being built in its place and everything happening literally under their noses. The basic human right to the peaceful enjoyment of property is being removed by ten years of disruptive construction in the Camden Cutting.

HS2 does not recognise that ten years of construction is not a temporary disturbance and have not taken the necessary measures to ensure our basic right to the peaceful enjoyment of our properties, whatever they may be.

Table 19 in the AP3 ES predicts periods of up to 36 months where the ‘significance criteria’ will be exceeded in the Camden Cutting neighbourhood and most particularly our building, which is in such a close proximity to one of the principal construction zones.

The SES & AP3 ES Section 14 describes some of the noise and vibration that we will experience and includes the statement in 14.3.14 that ‘The mitigation measures, including noise insulation where necessary in the affected parts of these buildings, will reduce noise inside all dwellings to a level where it should not significantly affect residents.’ This is completely untrue since our windows are already double glazed to modern standards of sound proofing and the building as a whole is built to the most modern and up to date noise standards. Nevertheless, we can still hear traffic and work outside which was proven when Thames Water had to dig up the road below us to replace a water pipes. Starting work early, the noise was clearly audible and woke us up. Imagine building a railway under our noses day-in and day-out.
The night time noise during the construction phase will be a particular issue for us. There are no comparable projects in the UK where such a level and duration of night time noise has been created so close to an apartment building. The Environmental Statement takes no account of this and mitigation that is proposed is inadequate.

The SES & AP3 ES recognises 'residual' significant negative impacts on our neighbourhood but does not propose solutions except secondary insulation, implying that we are to put up with the severe disruption without mitigation or compensation.

Lack of proper compensation

5. With our apartments’ grandstand position overlooking some of the key works of HS2 construction, the top of the cutting, the secondary works compound, Granby Terrace bridge, the exit to the cutting’s works for lorries and the demolition of the buildings surrounding the cutting, it is clear that Miriam Marcus will not be able to rent out her apartment for long periods of time and will loose all her income. She is not eligible for compensation under the present arrangement and therefore will be grievously and unfairly affected by HS2’s construction.

Regarding this matter, following my petition to the House of Commons Select Committee and in HS2’s response to the question subsequently raised by the Select Committee, dated 2 February 2016, HS2 state, “the Promoter has not seen any evidence to indicate that rental incomes have been negatively depressed as a result of HS2 Ltd and believes that it is important to maintain the ‘owner-occupier’ status as the foundation of eligibility for all discretionary compensation. However, we are, of course, willing to have discussions with all affected parties and apply specific discreet discretionary measures where considered appropriate.”

This raised two issues;
(i) What is this ‘evidence’ that HS2 have in regards to rental incomes not being ‘negatively depressed’ as a result of the construction?
(ii) Why is compensation for many cases, open to “discussions with all affected parties” and that HS2 is the only and final arbitrator in these matter allowing themselves to dole out “specific… measures” when they “consider it appropriate?”

The sale of Miriam Marcus’s apartment is also affected by their rules. She is not eligible under the Need to Sell Scheme because she is not an ‘owner-occupier’.

If your Petitioner doesn’t wish to live in his apartment, he is not eligible for compensation if he cannot rent it out for a fair rent because of work taking place or the areas general blight.

The Need to Sell Scheme comes into affect for properties purchased before 11 March 2010. Since our properties were purchased after this date, we are once again at the mercy of HS2. They stated in a letter to your Petitioner dated 26 February 2016, “with regards to your query regarding eligibility to apply for the NTS scheme, the guidance states that there may be cases where purchases were completed after 11 march 2010, but the purchasers remained unaware of the proposals for Phase One”. In our case, we didn’t receive notification from the solicitor following their search that Cubitt Court fell into the category of a building in imminent danger because of construction. We might very well be eligible for compensation by only if HS2 consider it so.

For all compensation matters, we are at the sole mercy of HS2, with no clear pre-determined rights.

Insufficient communication by HS2

6. HS2 has not communicated sufficiently in a way that takes on-board your Petitioners concerns and in a way that feeds into the process by proposing changes through its documentation, to ways the project will be managed and executed.
In the above mentioned letter dated 26 February 2016 addressed to your Petitioner on this matter they state. "HS2 engaged extensively... with the local community... This included the Camden Cutting Group, of which... you are a member... Five local sub-group meetings took place during June and July 2015... that you attended ..."

Your petitioner attended many meetings and he wants to ensure all parties that nothing we raised was ever agreed upon before AP3 was released and in AP3 none of our suggestions were upheld. It was clear to us, by this factual evidence that HS2 was not interested in engaging seriously with us on important areas such as mitigation, habitability and compensation.

Further evidence is in the fact that your Petitioner is now sending in their second petition. Nothing has been settled, no agreement has been reached as to how we are going to live through this monumental construction blight or how we are going maintain the value of our properties in all situations, which is our right as citizens of this country. Nothing except a leaflet enabling us to get double-glazing in a building that is already double-glazed but will also be rocked by the construction downstairs that no secondary insulation can avoid.

The Relief Sought by your Petitioner

7. For the reasons given in this petition, your Petitioner respectfully ask that the proposed scheme be varied in the following respects and that appropriate amendments to the Bill be made accordingly:

Working Hours should be more closely controlled than proposed by HS2

Noise, dust, vibration, ventilation, air pollution, loss of safe access routes, visual impact, construction traffic, bridge closures, and congestion should be more closely controlled and mitigated than proposed by HS2

Your Petitioner asks that the noise thresholds for rehousing should be lower than the limits in the CoCP. These limits are based on BS5228 and are used for typical construction projects where disturbance is temporary, not ten years. Normal life cannot go on during ten years of excessive noise. Normal life includes sleeping, socialising, working or just being at home and getting some rest. Normal life includes being able to open our widows.

Your Petitioner asks that given the exceptional nature and duration of the HS2 construction project (10 to 18 years or more) that acceptable noise limits follow standards for permanent conditions, not those for typical construction works.

Specifically in regards to vibration, your Petitioner asks that HS2 adopt the vibration standards proposed in the Draft Camden Local Plan 2015 Appendix 2 which give a lower limit at night time.

Specifically in regards to air quality, your Petitioner asks that independent monitoring of air quality be done before construction begins.

Your Petitioner asks that air quality is monitored continuously during construction and that work is stopped if pollution levels exceed those recommended by European legislation.

Rail should be used instead of road for transport of spoil and construction materials, which will go some way to assuring a more habitable environment than if we have hundreds of lorries exiting the cutting under our window.

Where construction traffic must use roads it should be more closely controlled than proposed by HS2 and increases in permanent traffic on residential roads should be
Your Petitioner asks that mitigation, such as temporary rehousing or compensation to the full value of the apartment should be provided if our property is made uninhabitable following London Borough of Camden (LBC) standards.

Construction Compounds access should be modified to avoid residential streets such as Park Village East and Stanhope Street.

Specifically in regards to the Granby Terrace Construction Compound, which will contribute to making our neighbourhood into a construction site. The use of this area extends either side of the working hours described in the ES, further increasing disruption to residents. Your Petitioner asks that the size this local satellite is minimised and made smaller than proposed by HS2. The main compound at the Temperance Hospital site is only a 10 minute walk away, and deliveries of plant and materials should only be allowed via the main construction compound or at Euston Station, not via this satellite compounds.

Local Environment Management Plans should involve local residents and HS2 should work together at a locally based office to mitigate issues.

In order to protect the interests of local residents LBC should retain Section 60/61 powers under the Town and Country Planning Act and other measures for enforcement should be taken.

The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) should make definite commitments working in conjunction with those affected in our neighbourhood.

Clause 47 of the Bill should be deleted.

Fair compensation must be available.

Your Petitioner asks that if temporary rehousing is agreed, it should be within the locality, of an equal standard to our current housing, and that we are given the choice to make our own arrangements, and that HS2 are to pay all costs associated with rehousing and with the vacant property.

As I understand, HS2 has said that compensation is not required in urban areas because intervening buildings will shield residents from the noise of the works. A visit to my apartment building will show that there are no intervening buildings and that all the residents of my block will be exposed to the full impact of one of the largest construction sites in Europe.

Your Petitioner asks that an Independent Compensation Commission be established to draw up a fair compensation scheme and administer it.

Your Petitioner asks that compensation include cases such as my sister’s that through no fault of their own will lose the sole income source they possess, which will cause them severe mental anguish and unnecessary stress.

If your Petitioner wants to move house during the next 10 years or his sister wants to sell hers, they do not qualify under the NTS and would suffer considerable loss to their hard won assets. Your Petitioner asks that the Need To Sell scheme is modified to compensate us at the full market rate, as and when we wish to sell our apartments.
Conclusion

8. As a citizen of this democratic country and given you Petitioner's circumstances, he believes he has the right to know how he is going to be affected by this monumental construction project before it is signed into law and not be at the mercy of HS2 once the law is passed. Your Petitioner asks the Honourable Lords to intervene and to help him maintain as peaceful as possible an existence for himself and his family and if this is not the case, to enable him to move or rent without having to bear any financial burden or penalty or need to wait until construction is finished. At his age, or any for that matter, it is not right to impose a 10 years nightmare on him and his family without the rights that he speaks of above.

The prayer

9. 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.

DANIEL MARCUS

Signature..............................................................
18 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-2016

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London –West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

ANTHONY CONNOR, NIGEL WALFISZ, GAIL ROMANES and ELEANOR FAWCETT

Declares that;

The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by

1. Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway mentioned in paragraph 1 above. They include provision for the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, the compulsory acquisition of land and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. They include clauses which would disapply and modify various enactments relating to special categories of land including burial grounds, consecrated land, commons and open spaces, and other matters, including overhead lines, water, building regulations and party walls, street works and the use of lorries.

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

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

4. The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill ("Phase One of HS2") are specified in clauses 1 and 2 of and Schedules 1 and 2 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 and Schedules 2 and 3 to the Bill.

5. Your first Petitioner is Anthony Connor, an owner of a property in Dinerman Court, your second Petitioner is Nigel Walfisz, a partner of MGR Weston Kay whose offices are adjacent to the planned construction site, your third Petitioner is Gail Romanes who owns a property on Alexandra Place and your fourth petitioner is Eleanor Fawcett a resident of the Alexandra and Ainsworth Estate all
of whom will be directly affected by the construction plans around Alexandra Place.

6. The petitioners are all founder members of SHOUT2, (South Hampstead Opposition to Underground Tunnelling by HS2) a group representing approximately 1,360 units, over 3,000 residents and several businesses from Alexandra Place, Loudoun Road, Dinerman Court, Robert Morton House, Boundary Road Estate, Rowley Way Estate, Ainsworth Way, Mary Green Abbey Road, Abbey Road Estate and Mortimer Crescent. The group was established soon after receiving the initial correspondence from HS2 in November 2013 with a view to raising the concerns of all the communities of the above residential areas which are affected by the planned construction of the Alexandra Place ventilation shaft.

7. According to the information provided by HS2, the construction period of a ventilation shaft for the railway on Langtry Walk alongside the northern part of Alexandra Place will be more than four years with more than 100 two way heavy vehicle movements per day at peak times resulting in considerable noise, air, surface pollution and environmental damage for the immediate area of the construction. This is of particular concern to elderly residents of which there are many in the blocks directly adjoining Alexandra Place, or those with respiratory or asthma problems. Because HS2 did not commission their own in advance of these plans, the expected increase in emissions from one or two a week to up to 100 HGVs a day for 2.5 years led your Petitioners to commission their own Environmental Assessment on the effects of this new diesel vehicle traffic from independent experts which showed ‘Substantial Adverse’ results in the receptors in Alexandra Place. We will present this report as a key document at our hearing with the Committee.

8. The present plan for the construction of the shaft and headhouse will take 5 years and entail the complete closure of the northern half of Alexandra Place to residents for at least 2.5 years of the build phase with all parking facilities presently available for residents rescinded for the period, but with access still allowed for contractors vehicles around all the current one way street. Particular concerns relate to Dial-a-Ride and ambulance access to Robert Morton House, an older people’s home on Alexandra Place. A total of 146 residential units will be thus adversely affected.

9. The planned road closure and restricted access for the four blocks directly adjoining and with access from Alexandra Place, and the constant heavy vehicle traffic planned will severely affect both property values and resale potential for all existing owners and owner occupiers in each block affected during the course
of the intervention shaft construction and thereafter the tunnelling directly underneath the blocks in the area.

10. During the construction, there will be a subsequent loss of parking facilities for residents living on Alexandra Place with no alternative spaces offered by HS2 and a loss of at least six parking spaces for residents in Dinerman Court Car Park, which will also affect values and sale potential of these properties.

11. There will also be a direct effect on local company MGR Weston Kay LLP who as an important part of the local community have over 100 employees. The present plans involve the HGVs loading and unloading on Alexandra Place directly outside the main air intake for their underground office and leading to their possible relocation outside the borough of Camden before the construction begins, resulting in a loss of rent and rates revenue for the Council with 12,000 square feet of empty and un-rentable office space.

12. The work will result in the loss of several independent commercial premises including several small community shops together with the accommodation and workshops above them on Langtry Walk which runs directly alongside the north side of Alexandra Place.

13. There will in addition be a severe impact on access to buildings within the locality and diversions for pedestrians and vehicles. This route forms a key access point from public transport and local shops to the Alexandra and Ainsworth Estate particularly to the South Hampstead Overground station and the only bus route (31) running on Belsize Road to Camden Town. This will affect particularly the elderly people resident in Robert Morton House (sheltered accommodation on Alexandra Place) and school children who use this route as a safe route to school. (George Eliot Primary School and nursery, and Quintin Kynaston Secondary School) The HS2 plans include a ‘temporary pedestrian diversion’ which will mean these elderly people and children having to directly cross the path of the HGVs each day on their way to and from shops or schools.

14. There are also serious concerns about the potential impact of the tunnelling and subsequent vibrations of the high speed trains themselves directly beneath the Grade II* listed structures of the Alexandra and Ainsworth Estate due to the complex and unusual foundation and structural design incorporating ‘anti vibration mountings’ (acknowledged in HS2 ES Cultural Heritage Baseline Report Vol5 CRA3 para 4.3.5). For any such risks to this or any of the other blocks within the zone laid out in the Bill and to prove any subsequent damage, the HS2 team notified the group during the meeting in January 2014 that individual owners themselves would be responsible for obtaining separate structural surveys before the works commenced and again after completion in order to prove damage resulted from the tunnelling or operation of the railway and that for such surveys, HS2 would not be liable for the cost. This should be noted when
seen in the context of the Grade II* listed Alexandra & Ainsworth estate. The Alexandra & Ainsworth estate is specifically mentioned in Schedule 17 of the Bill.

15. Historic England has recently granted listed status to the Loudoun Road housing, shops and craft workshops that HS2 Ltd want to demolish and replace with the vent shaft.

16. For all the above severe blight that will be afflicted on residents of the area for at least five years, no compensation is currently envisioned by HS2 as no buildings are planned for compulsory purchase apart from the shops and units on Langtry Walk, the freehold of which is owned by Camden Council.

17. Your Petitioners recognise that Parliament has decided to proceed with the HS2 railway by giving the Bill a Third Reading but believe that the residents directly affected by the construction of the Alexandra Place ventilation shaft will be injuriously affected by the Bill unless measures are implemented to attempt to minimise the impact on the area concerned. We would therefore respectfully submit that the Bill should be amended or that undertakings should be required of HS2 before work commences as follows.

18. That either the Euston Express or High Speed UK plans are adopted for the construction of the railway which would not need the twenty plus years of disruption across Camden currently planned and be much cheaper.

19. That if the current plan is adopted, than no vent shaft be built at Alexandra Place as the distance between the other two shafts planned for Adelaide Road and Canterbury Road is 2.7 KM which is within the 3KM limit needed for ventilation, emergency services access and also HS2s own access requirements as detailed in the Arup Report to HS2 titled High Speed Two Tunnel Shafts Options dated December 2010 which was accepted by them and the Secretary of State.

20. If however the planned shaft is approved by this House as currently planned, then in order to minimise pollution resulting from the planned closure of Alexandra Place from the 100 HGV movements planned around this quiet narrow one way residential street for deliveries of materials and spoil removal, that instead, Loudoun Road between the Fairfax Road roundabout and Alexandra Road be closed to traffic for the duration of the construction in a similar way that Network Rail effected alongside South Hampstead Overground rail station on several occasions over previous years, the longest period being for nearly two years.

21. Alexandra Place would then not need to be closed and traffic management of these vehicles could be controlled by HS2 via a queue process North to South along Loudoun Road requiring them to arrive consecutively at a drop off/pick up area directly alongside the construction site rather than directing them to, and holding these vehicles in Alexandra Place. This would greatly reduce the
disruption and pollution that will be caused by the planned construction and impose much less vehicle emissions on residents and businesses alike.

22. That the disposal of spoil is made via a temporary rail siding on either the West Coast Main Line, London Midland or Overground rail tracks which directly adjoin the construction site.

23. That HS2 be required to commission and fund structural surveys by independent surveyors for all the blocks mentioned before work commences so that any pre-existing faults are clearly identified and can be compared with any subsequent damage caused after completion of the tunnelling by HS2.

24. That a clear construction management system is implemented by the nominated contractors enabling local community involvement and immediate actions taken if any contraventions of the construction code are breached.

25. That double glazing and noise insulation is provided by HS2 to mitigate against the substantial dust, vehicle emissions and noise that will result from the construction whatever traffic plan is implemented.

26. That a simple and fair compensation process is made available for owners in the four residential blocks who wish to, or need to sell their properties during the construction period which have access from Alexandra Place, namely Dinerman Court, Robert Morton House, Alexandra Place North and Alexandra Place South. These residents will be directly affected by the five years of construction resulting in blight, dirt, noise and restricted vehicle access but will not receive compensation in the present plan unless by way of compulsory purchase of their properties.

27. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights and interest of your Petitioners and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

The petitioners Anthony Connor, Nigel Walfisz, Gail Romanes and Eleanor Fawcett therefore ask the House of Lords that they or someone representing them Anthony Connor, Nigel Walfisz, Gail Romanes and Eleanor Fawcett 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 Anthony Connor, Nigel Walfisz, Gail Romanes and Eleanor Fawcett remains, etc.

Anthony Connor

Nigel Walfisz

Gail Romanes

Eleanor Fawcett

13th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  
PETITION against the  
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF NICK HURD MP, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOR RUISLIP NORTHWOOD & PINNER  

Declares that:  

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

2 The Petitioner is the Member of Parliament for Ruislip Northwood and Pinner (hereinafter referred to as 'the Petitioner') and has a constituency office within the area that will be affected by the Bill. The Petitioner visits many constituents on a weekly basis and holds regular surgeries which draw individuals from across the constituency to access the assistance and interventions of their elected MP. The Petitioner is injuriously affected by the scheduled works, as the traffic congestion and road closures resulting from the construction of HS2 in Harefield and Ickenham will cause problems in carrying out his job within his constituency. Access will be difficult when crossing the constituency with delays as a result of diversions and closures. A significant number of The Petitioner's constituents are persons who live in properties located within close proximity of the high speed railway and associated construction sites and will therefore be injuriously affected by the works authorised by the Bill. The petitioner represents the views of the residents and businesses that are affected by the Bill and in particular those residents who are not able to petition themselves.  

3 The Petitioner alleges that their constituents' property, rights and interests in Ickenham and Harefield 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.  

Introductory  

4 The Petitioner considers that the Environmental Statement did not adequately assess the impacts on the areas' roads, schools, employment, ecology, air quality, local services, emergency services, drainage and flooding. It was prepared with great haste and the most adverse effects were never discussed at Community Forums.  

5 The Petitioner objects to the way public consultation has been undertaken and reported prior to the deposit of the Bill. Information provided by the Promoter has been piecemeal, incomplete and difficult to access for the Petitioner's constituents. The Petitioner's constituents have attempted to engage with the Promoter through the Community Forum process, through formal consultations and through direct communication but have often not had their questions fully answered or seen suggestions result in adequate changes to the proposed scheme. The Petitioner's constituents therefore feel that they still lack information about important aspects of the proposed railway and its construction that are likely to have adverse impacts on them.
The Petitioner alleges that the Government should have carried out a Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment prior to its decision to proceed with the HS2 Scheme in January 2012. Furthermore, the Petitioner considers that the Environmental Statement fails to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. The HS2 proposal will cause harm to the open countryside and Green Belt land, which is arguably contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Insufficient time has been allowed for comprehensive consideration of the Environmental Statement consultation responses and there has been a wholly inadequate summary of these responses which has overtly omitted vast amounts of very significant information which should have been included.

General Concerns

The Petitioner has identified several specific significant concerns which are set out below. This list is by no means exhaustive, and due to the inadequacy and inaccuracies of the Environmental Statement prepared by HS2, it is inevitable that that the construction of HS2 will disrupt the lives of the Petitioner and his constituents in ways which are not yet known.

Tunnel Extension

The HS2 route is currently planned to run in a tunnel from Euston to the West Ruislip Portal where it emerges and runs over ground until it reaches the Chiltern Tunnel South Portal. Through this overground section of the works, the scheme requires the construction of the large earthworks (approx. 3M cum.) 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. These works make this one of the most expensive sections of the proposed line with the viaduct itself likely to be over £50.00m. The Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker to do construction works which are estimated to take 10 years to complete and will impact on the Petitioner and his constituents for that period of time. This will include vastly increased traffic, especially of HGVs on the already over congested local roads for motorists and pedestrians, as well as the creation of dust, noise and serious disruption for the Petitioner’s constituents living across the area during the construction phase.

The Petitioner believes that an extended tunnel through Ickenham and under the Colne Valley lakes would remove the need for much of the surface-level construction work and so eliminate the worst effects of the scheme for local residents, protecting the area and removing the need for a viaduct over the Colne Valley.

Given all the concerns and issues arising from the overland route in Ickenham and the Colne Valley, the Petitioner believes that the additional costs, if any, of an extension of the London tunnelling would be justified.

The following paragraphs set out in more details the Petitioner’s justification for a tunnel.

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

Construction Works

13 The Petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and its associated development including, but not limited to, the siting of three constructions sites in Ickenham, heavy volumes of construction traffic, the dumping of spoil on green belt land, a construction compound on ancient farmland with a concrete factory, de contamination plant, lorry parks and storage of fuel.

14 The Petitioner requests your honourable House to require that the nominated Undertaker is subject to binding site specific mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of these works. These binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to restrictions on noise, dust and vibration and restricting HGV movements to less than 550 per day.

15 The nominated Undertaker should also mitigate the impacts on visual amenity through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, dust dampening, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.

Noise

16 The Petitioner understands from the Environmental Statement that there will be significant adverse noise impacts as a direct result of the overground high speed railway in Ickenham and Harefield during the construction of the works. The Petitioner and his constituents will suffer adverse effects from construction traffic and sites in Harvil Road, Breakspear Road South and Ickenham High Road for a period of up to ten years.

17 The Petitioner is concerned that the noise thresholds chosen by HS2 Ltd do not reflect current World Health Organisation standards or the latest research which shows adverse health impacts from prolonged exposure to noise above World Health Organisation limits.

18 The Petitioner requests your honourable House to require the nominated undertaker to ensure that operation of the high speed railway does not exceed 40dB, the threshold identified by the World Health Organisation as appropriate for ensuring no long term health issues for persons living nearby.

19 The Petitioner requests your honourable House to require the nominated Undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that no noise can be felt in the residential dwellings and there are no other adverse effects.

20 The Petitioner also requests your honourable House to require that there should be binding mitigation measures on the nominated Undertaker including effective noise mitigation and monitoring system in place before commencement and during construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development, together with the provision of adequate compensation measures.
Viaduct

21 The proposed line passes through the Petitioner’s constituency via a viaduct across the Colne Valley, with tunnel portals at each end. The proposed viaduct will be 10-15m metres overhead, with trains passing up to 36 times an hour at 320 km/hr. The viaduct will cross large bodies of water which is likely to have more noise implications than if it was travelling over land and the tunnel portals at each end will create their own noise impacts. There is also the impact of noise from the trains themselves to consider, and from the overhead equipment.

22 The Petitioner believes that a tunnel extension would remove the majority of the significant noise effects acknowledged in the Environmental Statement. It would remove impacts to hundreds of properties and allow the Colne Valley to remain a relatively tranquil environment. In the event that your Honourable House sees fit to require that the tunnel is not extended, the Petitioner requests that the design of the viaduct ensure appropriate noise mitigation on both sides of the viaduct to maintain the tranquillity of the Colne Valley as much as possible, and to ensure equal protection for residents on either sides of the viaduct in both Harefield and Denham. The Petitioner also requests that the proposed viaduct should be of best design. Despite assurances, the Petitioner remains concerned that this will be “designed by accountants” with a greater priority attached to cost than legacy. That would be a big missed opportunity.

Construction Traffic

23 The Petitioner is gravely concerned about the inadequacy of measures proposed to mitigate the effects of construction traffic throughout Ickenham and his constituency. The siting of three construction sites in Ickenham up to 10 years, with other constructions sites in nearby Harefield and site signalisation will cause significant disruption and congestion to Ickenham suburban roads by HGV traffic, which are already heavily congested during morning and evening peak times by local traffic and through traffic from commuters across North West London - Breakspear Road South, Harvil Road, Swakeleys Road, Ickenham High Road, Ickenham Road. A number of side roads such as Copthall Road West, St Georges Drive, Greenacres Avenue, Thornhill Road, Ivy House Road, Warren Road are also already affected by 'rat running'. The Petitioner and his constituents are concerned that they will be adversely affected when travelling to their jobs, taking children to schools and the safety of their children walking to school.

24 The Petitioner is also concerned that the Promoters were not aware of how the roads selected for construction traffic operate in reality. Your Petitioner considers that some of these roads cannot physically accommodate the quantity of traffic associated with the construction phases. Not only will this have a negative impact on other road users, but it could complicate and extend the construction programme for the Nominated Undertaker.

25 The Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the adverse effects of the heavy volume of traffic and congestion, site signalisation and the adverse effects of air pollution, noise, and vibration by re-evaluating the construction plans and amending the Code of Construction Practice to strictly enforce the measures and to ensure construction traffic does not exceed 550 HGVs a day. The Petitioner also requests that every opportunity should be taken to use haul roads rather than public roads.
26 The Petitioner believes that a tunnel extension would remove the need for construction traffic in and around Ruislip and Ickenham and therefore also remove the associated significant environmental and economic effects.

Concrete Segment Factory

27 The Petitioner requests the nominated Undertaker looks seriously at requesting the proposed contractors to relocate the concrete segment factory on Harvil Road outside the Borough. This will help to reduce the earthworks required to create the factory site and storage area and reduce the number of construction sites in the Petitioner’s constituency.

Health and Welfare

28 The Petitioner is gravely concerned that the emergency services will be unable to provide timely support to his constituents’ families and property due to road congestion during the construction period. The roads in Ickenham provide access to Mount Vernon Hospital and Harefield Hospital which has a dedicated Heart Attack Centre used for emergencies from outer north-west London; according to the Trust speed of treatment has shown to be crucial to survival in these cases. The Petitioner request your honourable House to require that the nominated Undertaker will at all times during the construction works, maintain adequate access through Ickenham for emergency services.

Road Safety

29 Junctions on Swakeleys and Ickenham High Roads are already identified as accident black spots with multiple accidents per year. There are four schools in Ickenham and cycle paths on Ickenham High Road. There are elderly care homes on Ickenham High Road and Ickenham Road. West Ruislip station used by many thousands of persons per day is a highly congested area of commuter traffic and cyclists. Your Petitioner is seriously concerned that the addition of HS2 HGV construction traffic on the local roads will further jeopardise the safety of all road users. HS2 HGV traffic should only use haul roads and not have access to our local roads.

Environment

30 The Petitioner’s constituents make extensive use of the recreational facilities afforded by the London Borough of Hillingdon and the Colne Valley and are very concerned about the following impacts of the high speed railway:
   a) Diversions of public rights of way will restrict their use and, in some cases, are diverted onto busy roads, e.g. Breakspear Road South, with no footways, thereby representing a danger to the walkers’ lives.
   b) The impacts on Uxbridge and Ruislip Golf courses which may require their temporary or permanent closure.
   c) Adverse effects on the ecology, in particular on the bat and owl populations.
   d) The use of the green belt areas of Ickenham between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South as spoil dumps.

31 The most effective mitigation for all these impacts is the full tunnel as requested above.
32 Should your honourable House not find in favour of such a tunnel, your petitioners request that your nominated undertaker be required to construct such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from Ickenham by rail.

HOAC

33 Hillingdon Outdoor Activities Centre ("HOAC") has been operating since 1990 and, since 1992 has been doing so as an outdoor and environmental youth education charity. It now provides leisure and educational activities for some 22,000 users each year, from a wide range of geographical areas and backgrounds. Approximately 44,000 visits are made to HOAC every year. Many of HOAC’s activities are water-based and are carried out on Harefield No.2 Lake in the Colne Valley Park.

34 The Petitioner is aware that HOAC will have no option but to close during the construction of the works authorised by the Bill and, owing to the viaduct crossing the lakes, it will not be able to return afterwards. The closure of the site will result in the loss of staff and its customer base.

35 The Petitioner believes that an extension to the tunnel will remove the impacts on HOAC and allow it to fully function through the construction phases.

36 If this honourable House does not see fit to extend the tunnel under the Colne Valley, the Petitioner and his constituents are deeply concerned about the possible loss of HOAC given that there are significant planning risks associated with the proposals for a relocation to Denham, with no planning application yet submitted and therefore no guarantee that HOAC can be satisfactorily relocated. The Petitioner requests assurances from the Undertaker that HOAC will not be closed.

National Grid Feeder Station

37 The Petitioner, along with Harefield residents, would like to see a clear statement of expectation that the Promoter should move the proposed Power Feeder Station further away from South Harefield and that it should be fully screened. After months of study, residents have not been given any substantial reason why a move is not possible. The default setting should therefore be to move it.

Air Pollution

38 The Petitioner and his constituents are concerned that unless the railway is constructed in a tunnel a significant amount of HGV traffic arising from three major construction sites will be directed through Ickenham and will converge on Swakeleys Road, a roadway already exceeding minimum EU standards for health and used by the Petitioner and its members’ schoolchildren, walking to Vyners School. The latest Bill provisions recognise that the HS2 traffic on Ickenham High Road will cause air pollution to exceed minimum EU standards. Scientific research shows that diesel pollutants – particulate matter and NOx emissions—cause long term harm to health.
Vibration

39 The Petitioner is concerned about the effects of vibration arising from the operation and construction of the high speed railway and associated development including heavy construction traffic. In addition to the Petitioner and his constituents' concerns for their properties, the ward of Ickenham and Harefield includes ancient buildings and structures which are situated close by.

Drainage and flooding

40 The Petitioner is also concerned that there is an increased risk of surface water flooding from placement of excavated material and construction of works between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South. The Petitioner believes that the Bill as it stands makes no provision to safeguard the Petitioner's constituency's roads and properties from flooding and groundwater contamination and the provisions necessary for their protection have been omitted from it. The Petitioner requires the nominated Undertaker to commission a detailed independent assessment of the risks of surface water flooding or the implications on groundwater contamination which can form the basis of comprehensive mitigation proposals.

Proposed Railhead at Ickenham

41 The Petitioner requests your honourable House to require the nominated Undertaker to ensure that the proposed railhead at Ickenham be operational as soon as possible and well in advance of any tunnelling works, in order to minimise the transportation of spoil and materials by roads and the dumping of spoil in green belt areas of Ickenham between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South.

Sustainable Placement Areas

42 The Petitioner is concerned about the vast quantity of spoil that is to be dispersed in the constituency. The Petitioner requests your honourable House to require that the nominated undertaker adheres to the recent Hillingdon Traffic Study Interim Statement (dated April 2016) and continues to look fully at options for reprogramming construction sequencing and reducing and reusing excavated material, as well as maximising as far as reasonably practicable the volume of material to be moved by rail. The Petitioner also request that as well as seeking to reduce non-peak HGV volumes it significantly reduces the amount of material to be sustainably placed in the Borough.

Local Transport Services

43 The Petitioner is concerned that the proposals for HS2 will cause significant disruption to existing bus, rail and underground services. The U1, U9 and U10 bus routes are vital links for many of the Petitioner's older constituents and these services will be greatly impacted by the increased traffic congestion levels. The extensive construction works and railhead required at West Ruislip are a particular cause for concern as the LT Central Line and Chiltern railway are used by your petitioner's constituents to travel to their places of work. the Petitioner requests your honourable House to require assurances from the nominated Undertaker that the Petitioner's transport services will not be disrupted during construction works.
Landscape

44 The Petitioner understands from the Environmental Statement that there will be significant adverse impacts on the landscape in Ickenham and Harefield both during the ten year construction phase and from the dumping of excavated materials. The Petitioner believes that as the Bill stands it makes no provision to protect the landscape character of the local area and requests your honourable House to amend the Bill so as to provide protection to the Petitioner's constituents.

The Community and Environment Fund and the Local Economy Fund

45 Given the wider social, environmental and economic impacts of HS2 on the area the Petitioner is concerned that his constituents will not be able to satisfactorily access the funds that have been set aside on a route-wide basis (i.e. the Community and Environment Fund and the Local Economy Fund). The Petitioner has concerns that a) the size of the these funds (£40 million) may not be sufficient to cover the number of bids and b) that the funds may go to those less impacted by HS2 because the Promoter has not accepted the recommendation of the Commons Select Committee to ring fence the funds on a geographical basis.

Compensation

46 The Petitioner submits that the compensation provisions in relation to property that is not compulsory acquired and other matters are not sufficient to compensate the Petitioner's constituents for the loss and damage they may incur as a result of construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development. Many households in the Petitioner's constituency will be affected by blight from construction sites and construction traffic for up to ten years and are unable to sell their properties at un-blighted price.

47 The Petitioner requests your honourable House to amend the Bill to ensure the Petitioner and his constituents outside the safeguarded area who are injuriously affected and adversely affected by loss of value to their properties should be entitled to claim compensation.

Heathrow Spur

48 The Petitioner is of the view that there is no business case for the Heathrow spurs and there is no positive cost benefit case for the disruption during construction or operation as part of Phase Two of the HS2 project. The Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended so that passive provision for the spurs is removed. The Petitioner requests your honourable House to require that the nominated Undertaker takes the opportunity to use the costs savings from the dismissal of the Heathrow spurs to build the Colne Valley tunnel as requested.
49 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect the Petitioner and his constituents’ rights and interests and for which no adequate provision is made to protect the Petitioner’s constituents.

50 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.

On behalf of Nick Hurd MP

Nick Hurd MP

18 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF AYLESBURY TOWN COUNCIL

Declares that:

1. Aylesbury Town Council is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner Aylesbury Town Council is a local authority that represents almost 59,000 residents, many of whom will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill. Significant parts of the area for which the Town Council is a local authority will also be injuriously affected.

The Town Council’s area includes roads which are liable, according to the Environmental Statement, to be interfered with or used by construction traffic during the construction phase; properties subject to temporary or permanent compulsory acquisition; footpaths that will be removed; and areas of green space that will be lost. Aylesbury Town Council is therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Adverse impacts on homes at Hawkslade and Walton Court, west of Aylesbury

Despite receiving strong representations from Parish and Town Councils about the significant effects of the proposed HS2 line on homes in Hawkslade and Walton Court, the House of Commons Select Committee saw no reason to change the published scheme, beyond asking "the Promoter to collaborate with local authorities and reach an understanding on a proposed linear park."

The HS2 line will pass within 180 metres of the nearest properties in Hawkslade. At the point where it is nearest to these homes, it is ‘at grade’ having emerged from the Aylesbury South Cutting. The overhead line equipment will therefore be approximately 8 metres above ground level, and as a consequence, residents - whose homes look out to the line - will have their visual and auditory landscapes changed forever.

Efforts to mitigate these effects have focussed on noise impacts with the Promoter proposing sound barriers some 5 metres high. These may limit internal noise but will do little to reduce effects in gardens or local open space. Perhaps more importantly, very little beyond the 5 metre barriers has been proposed to mitigate visual intrusion.

Aylesbury Town Council asks that the existing Aylesbury South Cutting be extended north by up to 400 metres so that the line emerges from cutting at a point where residential properties are further from the line and so less impacted. HS2 Ltd suggested that this could
not be achieved because of flood risk and water course issues. Advice from the County Council, as local lead flood authority, suggests that these are not valid obstacles.

Building the line deeper, as suggested, would generate extra spoil to create higher bunds to extend the cutting as the land profile falls away, and therefore minimise transport costs. The Town Council also asks that a narrow "green bridge" be provided over the cutting. Not only would this improve mitigation for residents but would also enhance access from areas south and west of the line to the proposed linear park. It would also obviate the need for the footbridge planned in the proposed scheme.

Flood risk and drainage

Aylesbury Town Council believes that the town faces a set of unique challenges and problems when presented with HS2. A significant number of residents across the west of Aylesbury will be affected by HS2 with the line running close to many homes, through an area of severe flood risk, past properties that sit within the safeguarded zone for construction.

The Town Council, however, does not believe that the major impacts HS2 will have on Aylesbury and its residents is properly recognised, understood or mitigated by the Promoter. That is despite strong representations made by the Council to the House of Commons Select Committee. The Committee appeared to be convinced by some verbal assurances from the Promoter about the management of flood risk.

Aylesbury Town Council are less persuaded, as since their Select Committee appearance in November 2015, the area concerned - known locally as the Willows - has suffered flooding again, as has Marsh Lane in Stoke Mandeville. Both areas are prone to floods from Stoke Brook that also runs close to the HS2 line. The Town Council believes that further work is needed to demonstrate that HS2 will not exacerbate flood risk across Aylesbury.

Aylesbury Town Council considers that the current measures do not go far enough and contend that the Promoter will need to develop and implement a much more comprehensive package of infrastructure, in conjunction with the County Council and the Environment Agency, to ensure that the risk of flooding is minimised. The Council therefore asks the Lords Select Committee to help secure an undertaking from the Promoter that it will not only mitigate and minimise flood risk but also achieve betterment for this affected area.

The Council is also concerned that the Promoter has failed to properly consider ongoing maintenance of flood or drainage infrastructure. The Town Council expects, at minimum, a written assurance from the promoter that they will be responsible for maintaining and upgrading these features in perpetuity. Aylesbury Town Council is concerned that without adequate maintenance, over time they will cease to operate effectively.

Bored tunnel through the Chilterns

The House of Commons Select Committee received a very large number of petitions seeking an extended bored tunnel throughout the entirety of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This position was not universally shared by all, and the final report of the House of Commons Select Committee acknowledges this, at Paragraph 106, stating, “We note that communities in and around Stoke Mandeville would not have welcomed greater intrusion of the railway potentially resulting from certain longer tunnel options as proposed by Chiltern petitioners.”
Despite much debate about the tunnel, Aylesbury Town Council remain unconvinced that extending the bored tunnel to the edge of the Chilterns AONB could be achieved without significant adverse impacts across Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury. These would arise from the creation of an extensive construction compound for the northern tunnel portal, on the edge of Stoke Mandeville village and close to the proposed maintenance loops. This very large site would be needed to support boring operations that would run 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for almost the entire construction period. Such an undertaking would need a large workforce and thousands of additional traffic movements on an already congested road network.

On this specific issue Aylesbury Town Council, therefore shares a position with the Promoter and requests that the Bill remains unamended by the Lords Committee.

**Effects on businesses and other enterprises**

Across Aylesbury there are a number of business centres, often largely populated by small or medium enterprises (SME’s), some of which are owner managed businesses, who are tenants of their premises. There are also a number of start-ups, single businesses and social enterprises that rent land or buildings from a landlord.

Aylesbury Town Council is worried that both the construction and operation of the proposed railway, including additional traffic movements, will have major adverse effects on businesses across the area, undermining their viability and making future planning nearly impossible. This is particularly true for the tenanted businesses across Gatehouse, Griffin Lane and Rabans Lane, but its impacts are also likely to be felt further afield.

Any business close to a construction site, such as at Fleet Marston, or on a construction route – almost every major route across Aylesbury – is likely to struggle with congestion, noise and air pollution. Aylesbury Town Council is also concerned that the impacts of construction across the area will make the town centre much less attractive to visitors, leading to a loss in footfall and business. It could also reduce the capacity of a business to recruit and retain staff.

Similarly, doubt over the future of tenancies, mean that many social concerns and charities are unable to plan ahead and make key changes to their facilities. Aylesbury Town Council therefore asks the Lords Select Committee to recommend that the Promoter deals with businesses in the same way as the House of Commons Select Committee suggested for schools (Paragraph 3S3). This would enable businesses to receive compensation for demonstrable adverse effects, such as reduced footfall, that affect the viability of a business or its capacity for employing staff.

**Community engagement**

Aylesbury Town Council, along with many others, made representations to the House of Commons Select Committee about the Promoter’s track record on consultation and engagement which it felt left a lot to be desired. The Committee’s response was to refer to “HS2 Ltd’s mixed record of public engagement” and the report of the Parliamentary and Health Services Ombudsman “which found serious failings in HS2’s engagement with a community in Staffordshire which will be particularly severely affected” (Paragraph 346).

Paragraph 347 states that, “as the project moves towards commencement, considerate engagement and helpful provision of information will be even more important. HS2 Ltd will need to pay attention to communicating and explaining its decisions.” The Town Council cannot stress
enough the huge importance of improved consultation and engagement, rather than the one-way information flow experienced to date.

Aylesbury Town Council believes that the best progress has been achieved in areas where community champions (sometimes Councillors, sometimes local residents) have stepped forward to act as intermediaries. The Town Council asks the Lords Committee to recommend this model to HS2 Ltd as a viable and effective method of future consultation and engagement, where the Promoter employs or funds local people as conduits or community champions.

Transport impacts

Aylesbury Town Council, in common with Stoke Mandeville, and Coldharbour Parish Councils and others, are very concerned about the impact of construction traffic on Aylesbury and the surrounding area. The Lords Committee would certainly benefit from a site visit to Aylesbury to witness first-hand how susceptible the town’s traffic network is to minor changes. Major congestion or closure on one radial route, has significant impacts on trips on every other radial route into and out of the town.

The Promoter’s latest position is that to construct the rail line across Aylesbury will mean construction traffic using the A413 from Great Missenden, the A4010 from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough, the A418 from Thame, the A41 from Bicester, the A413 from Buckingham, the A418 from Wing and Berton and the A41 from the M25. The Town Council asks the Lords Committee to note that this affects every radial route to and from Aylesbury.

A further consequence of additional construction traffic is the assessment that a large number of junctions on routes across the town will suffer extra congestion. This could lead to increased use of minor and residential roads across Aylesbury as alternatives to the main routes, colloquially known as ‘rat-running’. The Promoter’s Transport Assessment assumes there is no ‘reassignment’ of traffic from main to minor roads, maintaining instead that every driver waiting on a congested route would choose to wait in the traffic queue rather than find a different route.

The Town Council therefore has little confidence in the Transport Assessment and the assumptions it uses, and believes that the true impacts will be much greater, creating effects across a much wider area and potentially changing travel patterns and behaviour for many months and years.

The Promoter has suggested that it cannot use the existing railway from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough to Aylesbury, already used for freight, to import and export materials and equipment, but the Council believes it has failed to properly explain why this is not an option. The Town Council therefore asks the Lords Select Committee to insist that HS2 Ltd properly review the use of rail as an alternative to road for moving materials and equipment.

If the Promoter can demonstrate that rail is not a viable alternative to road, then Aylesbury Town Council urges the Lords Select Committee to instruct Government to instead make a contribution towards local road infrastructure, to accelerate the delivery of planned link roads around the town. This would not only support local calls for infrastructure before growth but could be refunded when planned growth begins to be built.
Realignment of A4010, including roundabout junction with Lower Road

Aylesbury Town Council believes that the realignment of the A4010 in the proposed scheme, shows what local groups have achieved when engaging with HS2 Ltd. They support the planned realignment but also would like to see the junction with Lower Road moved further north.

The Council understands that the point was not taken forward earlier because the County Council, as highway authority, was still negotiating about the extension of the road, but believes that moving the road closer to Aylesbury, north of the business park and Stoke Mandeville Auto Centre, would be a better solution.

It would limit effects on homes and businesses on Lower Road, and could support the future growth of Aylesbury. The Town Council asks that the alignment be changed to support these improvements.

General noise and visual impacts

Aylesbury Town Council remains concerned that any proposals to minimise general noise and visual impacts during the construction period depends upon a Code of Construction Practice that exists in draft form only. The Council argues that this makes it impossible to be confident about its contents. To address this the Town Council expects that once the Code of Conduct Practice is finalised it should be subject to consultation, giving those affected an opportunity to review the standard of protection proposed.

Aylesbury Town Council also expects, not unreasonably, that involvement in the development of Local Environment Management Plans, that translate the Code of Construction Practice into local actions, should not be restricted to planning and highway authorities but include local communities. The Lords Select Committee is asked to help secure such an undertaking.

Mitigation proposed to minimise the noise and visual effects during the operational phase of the scheme is described as a combination of earth bunds and screening barriers. The Council remains concerned that the height of barriers through the area, varies so considerably.

Aylesbury Town Council therefore urges the Lords Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that screening barriers across the area are of a uniform height, perhaps at 4 metres. This standard should be applied consistently to avoid 'gaps' where noise impacts would be greater.

Compensation matters

Aylesbury Town Council is aware that compensation matters were discussed at length during the House of Commons Select Committee, and the Government responded by replacing the Exceptional Hardship Scheme with the Need to Sell scheme. It is difficult to know if this change has enabled more individuals and families to secure adequate compensation.

The Town Council does not believe the change goes far enough and still fails to recognise the blight felt by individuals living in homes, rented accommodation; or running / working in businesses impacted by the proposals. There are still too many examples of individuals and families who are struggling to secure any compensation despite being blighted or unable to sell their home at a reasonable price.
Aylesbury Town Council urges the House of Lords Select Committee to critically review the current compensation proposals and recommend changes to the Government that are fair, equitable and reasonable.

**Community and Business Compensation Funds**

Aylesbury Town Council accepts that the Government proposes to establish specific compensation funds for communities and businesses, affected by HS2. However, the initial figure of £30 million for these funds was far too small, a fact recognised by the House of Commons Select Committee who recommended “that the funding envelope of both funds should be substantially increased. We suspect the Government is aware that the amounts are too low” (Paragraph 350).

In response the Government increased funding to £40 million, which the Town Council still believes is a derisory amount. The Council supports the view argued by Buckinghamshire County Council that, at a minimum, the total funding envelope for community and environment projects and for business and local economies should be at least £150 million. This is still less than 1% of the total cost of the Phase 1 project between London and Birmingham.

Aylesbury Town Council believes that any community, such as Aylesbury or Stoke Mandeville, disadvantaged by the Bill with no compensating economic advantage or accessibility improvement, should have access to a generous fund that supports successful applications for enhanced mitigation, improved facilities or additional compensatory measures.

The Town Council asks the House of Lords Select Committee to press the Government hard on this issue to secure a substantial increase in the allocation with specific ring-fenced funds for certain communities to avoid bidding wars.

**4. The prayer**

The petitioner Aylesbury Town Council therefore asks the House of Lords that its Roll B Agent, Marcus Rogers, 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 Aylesbury Town Council remains, etc.

Marcus Rogers, Roll B Agent

17 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF COLDHARBOUR PARISH COUNCIL

Declarers that:

1. Coldharbour Parish Council is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner Coldharbour Parish Council is a local authority that represents almost 5,000 residents, many of whom will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill. Significant parts of the area for which the Parish Council is a local authority will also be injuriously affected.

The Parish Council's area includes roads which are liable, according to the Environmental Statement, to be interfered with or used by construction traffic during the construction phase; properties subject to temporary or permanent compulsory acquisition; footpaths that will be removed; and areas of green space that will be lost. Coldharbour Parish Council is therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Specific noise and visual impacts

Mitigation proposed to minimise the effects of noise during the operational phase of the scheme is described in the Environmental Statement as a combination of earth bunds and screening barriers. Coldharbour Parish Council is concerned that the height of barriers on the line of route through the Parish, varies so considerably, especially as noise impacts are directly linked to barrier heights.

The Parish Council contends that across the area screening barriers should be of a consistent uniform height. While five metres may be too high in some circumstances a consistent four metre barrier seems reasonable and is the Parish Council's ask of the Lords Select Committee, subject to appropriate design standards.

Coldharbour Parish Council share the concerns of neighbouring Councils about inadequate visual mitigation and landscaping across the area. The National Trust achieved an agreement with the Promoter over its 'Green Banks' scheme to screen the railway from Hartwell House. The Parish Council believes it deserves at least an identical, if not better, offer from HS2 Ltd bearing in mind on Coldharbour, east of the line permanent residents are affected, rather than temporary guests to the west.
Coldharbour Parish Council contends that the village must be appropriately screened and mitigated, with an expectation that extensive tree planting is carried out close to Fairford Leys before construction to ensure planned screening is as effective as possible. Such planting must be designed in consultation with the Council and the local community and be sensitive to the local environment.

Properties on the northern edge of Coldharbour will suffer the greatest visual intrusion from HS2, as the line emerges into the Thame Valley and towards the proposed viaduct. The Promoter has advised that little mitigation can be provided because of the landscape, topography and natural environment. This apparently gives these residents little recourse. The Parish Council asks the Lords Select Committee to request the Promoter identify options for better mitigation in this area.

**General noise and visual impacts**

Coldharbour Parish Council remains concerned that the proposals to minimise general noise and visual impacts during the construction period depends upon a Code of Construction Practice that exists in draft form only. It argues that this makes it impossible to be confident about its contents. To address this the Parish Council expects that once the Code of Conduct Practice is finalised it should be subject to consultation, giving those affected an opportunity to review the standard of protection proposed.

Coldharbour Parish Council also expects, not unreasonably, that involvement in the development of Local Environment Management Plans, that translate the Code of Construction Practice into local actions, should not be restricted to planning and highway authorities but include local Councils and communities. The Lords Select Committee is asked to help secure such an undertaking.

Mitigation proposed to minimise the noise and visual effects during the operational phase of the scheme is described as a combination of earth bunds and screening barriers. The Council remains concerned that the height of barriers through the area, varies so considerably.

Coldharbour Parish Council therefore urges the Lords Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that screening barriers across the area are of a uniform height, perhaps at 4 metres. This standard should be applied consistently to avoid 'gaps' where noise impacts would be greater.

**Transport impacts**

Coldharbour Parish Council, in common with Aylesbury Town and Stoke Mandeville Parish Councils and others, are concerned about the impact of construction traffic on Aylesbury and the surrounding area. The Lords Committee would certainly benefit from a site visit to the area to witness first-hand how susceptible the town’s traffic network is to minor changes. Major congestion or closure on one route, has significant impacts on trips on every other radial route into and out of the town.

The Promoter’s latest position is that to construct the rail line across Aylesbury will mean construction traffic using the A413 from Great Missenden, the A4010 from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough, the A418 from Thame, the A41 from Bicester, the A413 from Buckingham, the A418 from Wing and Bierton and the A41 from the M25. The Town Council asks the Lords Committee to note that this therefore affects every radial route to and from Aylesbury.
A further consequence of additional construction traffic is the assessment that a large number of junctions on routes across the town will suffer extra congestion. This could lead to increased use of minor and residential roads across Aylesbury as alternatives to the main routes, colloquially known as 'rat-running'. The Promoter’s Transport Assessment assumes there is no 'reassignment' of traffic from main to minor roads, maintaining instead that every driver waiting on a congested route would choose to wait in the traffic queue rather than find a different route.

The Parish Council therefore has little confidence in the Transport Assessment and the assumptions it uses, and believes that the true impacts will be much greater, creating effects across a much wider area and potentially changing travel patterns and behaviour for many months and years.

The Promoter has suggested that it cannot use the existing railway from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough to Aylesbury, already used for freight, to import and export materials and equipment, but the Council believes it has failed to properly explain why this is not an option. The Parish Council therefore asks the Lords Select Committee to insist that HS2 Ltd properly review the use of rail as an alternative to road for moving materials and equipment.

If the Promoter can demonstrate that rail is not a viable alternative to road, then Coldharbour Parish Council urges the Lords Select Committee to instruct the Government to instead make a contribution towards local road infrastructure, to accelerate the delivery of planned link roads around the town. This would not only support local calls for infrastructure before growth but could be refunded when planned growth begins to be built.

**Flood risk and drainage**

Coldharbour Parish Council supports Aylesbury Town Council in its concerns over flood risk and drainage. The Council does not believe that the major impacts HS2 will have on Aylesbury and its residents is properly recognised, understood or mitigated by the Promoter.

Coldharbour Parish Council recognise that since the Town Council’s Select Committee appearance in November 2015, the affected areas – the Willows and Marsh Lane in Stoke Mandeville – have flooded again. Stoke Brook, the cause of these floods, also runs close to the HS2 line. The Council agrees that further work is needed to demonstrate that HS2 will not exacerbate flood risk across the area.

Coldharbour Parish Council supports other petitioners in their request for an undertaking from the Promoter to not only mitigate and minimise flood risk but also achieve betterment for this affected area, and at minimum, a written assurance from the promoter that they will be responsible for maintaining and upgrading these features in perpetuity. Like others, the Council is concerned that without adequate maintenance, over time they will cease to operate effectively.

**Adverse impacts on homes at Hawkslode and Walton Court, west of Aylesbury**

Coldharbour Parish Council supports Aylesbury Town and Stoke Mandeville Parish Councils on this matter. It is disappointed that despite representations from Councils about effects of the proposed HS2 line on homes in Hawkslade and Walton Court, the Commons Select Committee saw no reason to change the published scheme, beyond asking “the Promoter to collaborate with local authorities and reach an understanding on a proposed linear park.”
Coldharbour Parish Council support the ask for the existing Aylesbury South Cutting to be extended north by up to 400 metres so that the line emerges from cutting at a point where residential properties are further from the line and so less impacted. It also agrees that a narrow "green bridge" should be provided over the cutting.

Bored tunnel through the Chilterns

The House of Commons Select Committee received a large number of petitions seeking an extended bored tunnel throughout the whole of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This position was not universally shared by all, and the final report of the House of Commons Select Committee acknowledges this, at Paragraph 106, "We note that communities in and around Stoke Mandeville would not have welcomed greater intrusion of the railway potentially resulting from certain longer tunnel options as proposed by Chiltern petitioners."

Coldharbour Parish Council supports Aylesbury Town and Stoke Mandeville Parish Councils on this matter and believes there would be significant adverse impacts including the need for a large workforce and thousands of extra traffic movements on a congested road network. The Council therefore requests that the Bill remains unamended by the Lords Committee.

Effects on businesses and other enterprises

Across Aylesbury there are a number of business centres, often largely populated by small or medium enterprises (SME's), some of which are owner managed businesses, who are tenants of their premises. There are also a number of start-ups, single businesses and social enterprises that rent land or buildings from a landlord.

Coldharbour Parish Council supports the concerns of neighbouring Town and Parish Councils about the construction and operation impacts of the proposed railway, including additional traffic movements, on businesses across the area. The Parish Council shares the Town Council's worries that both the town and local centres will become much less attractive to visitors, leading to a loss in footfall and business.

The Parish Council therefore also asks the Lords Select Committee to recommend that the Promoter deals with businesses in the same way as the House of Commons Select Committee suggested for schools (Paragraph 353). This would enable businesses to receive compensation for demonstrable adverse effects, such as reduced footfall, that affect the viability of a business.

Community engagement

Coldharbour Parish Council, along with many others, made representations to the House of Commons Select Committee about the Promoter's track record on consultation and engagement. The Committee's response was to refer to "HS2 Ltd's mixed record of public engagement" and the report of the Parliamentary and Health Services Ombudsman "which found serious failings in HS2's engagement with a community in Staffordshire which will be particularly severely affected" (Paragraph 346).

Paragraph 347 states that, "as the project moves towards commencement, considerate engagement and helpful provision of information will be even more important. HS2 Ltd will need to pay attention to communicating and explaining its decisions." The Parish Council cannot emphasise enough the importance of improved consultation and engagement, rather than the one-way information flow experienced to date.
Coldharbour Parish Council has seen the best progress achieved in areas where community champions (sometimes Councillors, sometimes local residents) have stepped forward to act as intermediaries. The Parish Council urges the Lords Committee to recommend this model to HS2 Ltd as an effective method of future consultation and engagement, where the Promoter employs or funds local people as conduits or community champions.

Realignment of A4010, including roundabout junction with Lower Road

Coldharbour Parish Council believes that the realignment of the A4010 in the proposed scheme, shows what local groups have achieved when engaging with HS2 Ltd. They support the planned realignment but also would like to see the junction with Lower Road moved further north.

They understand that it was not taken forward earlier because the County Council, as highway authority, was still negotiating about the extension of the road, but believes that moving the road closer to Aylesbury, north of the business park and Stoke Mandeville Auto Centre, would be a better solution.

It would limit effects on homes and businesses on Lower Road, and could support the future growth of Aylesbury. The Council asks that the alignment be changed to support these improvements.

Compensation matters

Coldharbour Parish Council acknowledges that compensation matters were discussed at length during the House of Commons Select Committee, and the Government responded by replacing the Exceptional Hardship Scheme with the Need to Sell scheme. It is difficult to know if this change has enabled more individuals and families to secure adequate compensation.

The Parish Council does not believe the changes go far enough and still fail to recognise the blight felt by individuals living in homes, rented accommodation; or running / working in businesses impacted by the proposals. There are still too many examples of individuals and families who are struggling to secure any compensation despite being blighted or unable to sell their home at a reasonable price.

Coldharbour Parish Council urges the House of Lords Select Committee to critically review the current compensation proposals and recommend changes to the Government that are fair, equitable and reasonable.

Community and Business Compensation Funds

Coldharbour Parish Council recognises that the Government plans to establish specific compensation funds for communities and businesses, affected by HS2. However, the initial figure of £30 million for these funds was far too small, a fact recognised by the House of Commons Select Committee who recommended “that the funding envelope of both funds should be substantially increased. We suspect the Government is aware that the amounts are too low” (Paragraph 350).

In response the Government increased funding to £40 million, which the Parish Council still believes is a derisory amount. It supports the view argued by Buckinghamshire County Council that, at a minimum, the total funding envelope for community and environment projects and for business and local economies should be at least £150 million. This is still less than 1% of the total cost of the Phase 1 project between London and Birmingham.
Coldharbour Parish Council believes that any community, disadvantaged by the Bill with no compensating economic advantage or accessibility improvement, should have access to a generous fund that supports successful applications for enhanced mitigation, improved facilities or additional compensatory measures.

The Parish Council asks the House of Lords Select Committee to press the Government hard on this matter to secure a substantial increase in funding with specific allocations for certain communities to avoid bidding wars.

4. The prayer

The petitioner Coldharbour Parish Council therefore asks the House of Lords that its Roll B Agent, Marcus Rogers, 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 Coldharbour Parish Council remains, etc.

Marcus Rogers, Roll B Agent

17 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF STOKE MANDEVILLE PARISH COUNCIL

 Declares that:

1. Stoke Mandeville Parish Council is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner Stoke Mandeville Parish Council is a local authority that represents more than 6,000 residents, many of whom will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill. It also owns land that will be compulsorily purchased for the purposes of the Bill, and significant parts of the area for which the Parish Council is a local authority will also be injuriously affected.

The Parish Council's area includes roads which are liable, according to the Environmental Statement, to be interfered with or used by construction traffic during the construction phase; properties subject to temporary or permanent compulsory acquisition; footpaths that will be removed; consecrated human remains, artefacts and monuments be excavated; a large area used for maintenance loops in perpetuity removed; and areas of green space lost. Stoke Mandeville Parish Council is therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Adverse impacts on homes at Hawkslade, west of Aylesbury

Despite receiving strong representations from Parish and Town Councils about the significant effects of the proposed HS2 line on homes in Hawkslade, specifically at Oat Close and Isis Close, the House of Commons Select Committee saw no reason to change the published scheme, beyond asking “the Promoter to collaborate with local authorities and reach an understanding on a proposed linear park.”

The planned railway line passes within 180 metres of the nearest properties in Hawkslade. Indeed, at the point where the route is nearest to these homes, it is 'at grade' having emerged from the Aylesbury South Cutting. At this point, therefore, the overhead line equipment will be approximately 8 metres above ground level, and as a consequence, residents - whose homes look out to the line - will have their visual and auditory landscapes transformed forever.

Efforts to mitigate these effects have concentrated primarily on the noise impacts with the Promoter proposing sound barriers some 5 metres high. These may limit internal noise but do little to reduce effects in gardens or local open space. Perhaps more importantly, very
little beyond the 5 metre barriers has been proposed to mitigate visual intrusion on these homes.

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council continues to ask that the existing Aylesbury South Cutting be extended north by up to 400 metres so that the line emerges from cutting at a point where residential properties are further from the line and so less deleteriously affected. HS2 Ltd suggested that this could not be achieved because of flood risk and water course issues. Advice from the local lead flood authority suggests that these may not be valid obstacles.

Building the line slightly deeper, as suggested, would generate extra material to create higher bunds to extend the cutting as the land profile falls away, and therefore minimise transport costs. The Parish Council also asks for a narrow “green bridge” be provided over the cutting at the closest point to homes at Hawkslade. Not only would this enhance mitigation for residents but would also improve access from areas south and west of the line to the proposed linear park. It would also obviate the need for the footbridge planned in the proposed scheme.

Realignment of A4010, including roundabout junction with Lower Road

The inclusion of the realigned A4010 in the proposed scheme, often referred to as the Stoke Mandeville bypass, is testament to the work of the Stoke Mandeville community in meetings with the Promoter. Stoke Mandeville Parish Council therefore supports the planned realignment in all but one aspect, the northern junction with Lower Road.

This petitioning point was not progressed at the House of Commons Select Committee because the County Council, as highway authority, was still negotiating about the extension of the road. These issues have subsequently been agreed and therefore the Parish Council has chosen to bring this matter to the House of Lords Select Committee.

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council is pleased that the realigned road is still an integral part of the Bill but remains convinced that moving the road closer to Aylesbury, north of the business park and Stoke Mandeville Auto Centre, would be more beneficial. Such a simple change would not only reduce impacts on homes and businesses on Lower Road, but would also support the future growth of Aylesbury, offer an opportunity to provide Booker Park School with a dedicated access away from the residential area and could help improve access to Stoke Mandeville Hospital. The Parish Council asks the Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that the road alignment be changed to support such key improvements.

Specific noise and visual impacts

Impacts on schools across Stoke Mandeville

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council remain extremely concerned about the impacts of construction and the operation of the railway on schools within the Parish - Stoke Mandeville Combined School and Booker Park School. The former is a primary school in the centre of the village, more than one hundred years old, with 207 children between four and eleven years of age on roll. It also accommodates a Hearing Impaired Department (HID), a twelve place specialist unit for primary age children with severe hearing difficulties, one of only two in Buckinghamshire.

Booker Park School is located off Kynaston Avenue and caters for primary aged pupils with Special Educational Needs including profound and multiple learning difficulties or with
behavioural, emotional and social difficulties who live within Buckinghamshire and travel to the school daily. Both schools use outdoor learning regularly as part of their work and both need excellent and consistent auditory environments to support their pupils.

The Environmental Statement originally deposited with the Hybrid Bill states that airborne noise from operation of the railway will increase both day and night time noise in the vicinity of Marsh Lane and on Chestnut Way beside Stoke Mandeville Combined School, and will create a significant noise effect for Booker Park School. It acknowledges that this extra noise is likely to disturb outdoor teaching activities or teaching in the classroom when windows are open. In the unique circumstances for these two schools, the Parish Council believe that such impacts are unacceptable.

The Council's concerns were reported to the Commons Select Committee with the request that the Promoter be required to provide enhanced mitigation to ensure that the auditory environment for both schools is maintained, if not improved. The Council is not convinced that the Committee's response about extra screening and bunding of the A4010 will help alleviate noise impacts at Booker Park School.

No improvements were proposed or recommendations made for Stoke Mandeville Combined School at the Commons stage. The Parish Council therefore asks the House of Lords Select Committee for a more positive intervention that requires the Promoter to give an undertaking that effective screening and landscaping will be provided to maintain the current internal and external auditory environments.

Risborough Road gap

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council notes that much of the visual intrusion caused by the scheme is planned to be mitigated by a limited array of landscaped earthworks, but that in the area around the stopping up of Risborough Road, there are currently no plans to provide landscaping or any form of screening. This leaves a significant area on both east and west sides of the route, including Stoke House, Thornbrook House and other properties on both Risborough Road and Old Risborough Road exposed to both visual intrusion and noise.

Whilst the Promoter has made provision for some limited planting in this area, the Parish Council remains concerned that adequate mitigation may take up to 60 years to grow. The Council believes something more effective must be in place before the railway is operational, and therefore asked the Lords Select Committee to insist that the Promoter identifies and adopts a more creative and effective approach to address this concern.

Maintenance loops

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council petitioned the Commons Select Committee about the inadequacy of the sound barrier proposed beside the maintenance loops. In this area the line is on embankment and protected by only three-metre high barriers. The Select Committee's response provided some comfort, since it stated that the Promoter should "take another look at screening and noise mitigation of the Stoke Mandeville maintenance loops for those in nearby communities. In any event, residents should receive as much certainty as possible about the height of the railway at this point. We asked that there be some demonstration of the effects of passing over high-speed points" (Paragraph 110).

The Parish Council is disappointed to report that it has heard nothing from the Promoter about any progress made on this point, and has yet to be invited to attend any
demonstration about noise from trains passing over high-speed points. It therefore feels it has little choice but to petition the Lords Select Committee on these matters.

The Lords are asked to note that the maintenance loops need a wider trackbed than other parts of the route because they comprise the high speed lines and two siding tracks. The lower height sound barriers will therefore be further away from the operational tracks, reducing their effectiveness. Stoke Mandeville Parish Council therefore asks the Lords Select Committee to insist that the Promoter progresses the overdue actions with all haste and accedes to the Council's request for more effective noise and visual mitigation of the maintenance loops.

General noise and visual impacts

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council remains concerned that any proposals to minimise general noise and visual impacts during the construction period depends upon a Code of Construction Practice that exists in draft form only. The Council believes that this makes it impossible to be confident about its contents and leaves it unable to test the efficacy of its proposals. To address this the Parish Council asks that once the Code of Conduct Practice is finalised it should be subject to consultation, giving those affected an opportunity to review the standard of protection proposed.

The Parish Council also expects, not unreasonably, that involvement in the development of Local Environment Management Plans, that translate the Code of Construction Practice into local actions, should not be restricted to planning and highway authorities but include local Councils and communities. The Lords Select Committee is asked to help secure such an undertaking.

Mitigation proposed to minimise the noise and visual effects during the operational phase of the scheme is described as a combination of earth bunds and screening barriers. Stoke Mandeville Parish Council remains concerned that the height of barriers through the Parish, varies so considerably, despite strong representations to the House of Commons Select Committee and getting the suggestion that positive changes could be made.

The Parish Council therefore urges the Lords Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that screening barriers across the area are of a uniform height, perhaps at 4 metres as suggested by the Commons Select Committee. This standard should be applied consistently to avoid 'gaps' where noise impacts would be greater.

Bored tunnel through the Chilterns

The House of Commons Select Committee received a significant number of petitions seeking an extended bored tunnel throughout the entirety of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This position was not universally shared by all, and the final report of the House of Commons Select Committee acknowledges this, at Paragraph 106, stating, "We note that communities in and around Stoke Mandeville would not have welcomed greater intrusion of the railway potentially resulting from certain longer tunnel options as proposed by Chiltern petitioners."

Despite much debate about the tunnel, Stoke Mandeville Parish Council remain unconvinced that extending the bored tunnel to the edge of the Chilterns AONB could be achieved without significant adverse impacts across Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury. These would arise from the creation of an extensive construction compound for the northern tunnel portal, on the edge of Stoke Mandeville village and close to the proposed maintenance
loops. This very large site would be needed to support boring operations that would run 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for almost the entire construction period. Such an undertaking would need a large workforce and thousands of additional traffic movements on an already congested road network.

On this specific issue Stoke Mandeville Parish Council, therefore shares a position with the Promoter and requests that the Bill remains unamended by the Lords Committee.

**Effects on businesses and other enterprises**

Within Stoke Mandeville Parish there are a number of small centres of business, primarily comprising small owner managed businesses, many of whom are tenants of their premises. There are also a number of single businesses and social enterprises that rely on renting land and buildings from their landlord.

The Parish Council is therefore concerned that both the construction and operation of the proposed railway will have significant adverse effects on such small businesses, undermining their ongoing viability and making future planning nigh on impossible. This is particularly true for the tenanted businesses at Layby Farm and for Animal Antiks who rent land off Risborough Road.

The physical location of Layby Farm Business Park means that it will be almost surrounded by works during the construction period with heavy traffic passing along two sides of the site, creating noise and air pollution. The businesses at Layby Farm have evolved to become mutually dependent units, relying on each other to attract visitors and business. The Parish Council believes that the impacts of construction will make the centre much less attractive to visitors, leading to a loss in business.

Similarly, doubt over the future of tenancies, mean that concerns like Animal Antiks, who provide animal assisted learning for children and young people at risk, are unable to plan for the future and make important changes to their facilities. The Parish Council therefore urges the Lords Select Committee to recommend that the Promoter deals with businesses in the same manner as the House of Commons Select Committee suggested for schools (Paragraph 353). This would enable tenant businesses to receive compensation for demonstrable adverse effects, such as reduced footfall, that affect the viability of a business.

**Old church site (St Mary the Virgin)**

The 12th century church of St. Mary the Virgin in Stoke Mandeville found east of the Risborough Road (A4010), was first built in 1170 and remained in use until 1866 when a new church was built nearer the village centre, although occasional burials continued until 1908. Stoke Mandeville Parish Council is therefore understandably concerned about the impacts of construction works on this heritage site, since the high speed rail line and maintenance loops will pass directly through the site.

Whilst the ruined church building was demolished in 1966 for safety reasons the site is owned and preserved by the Parish Council. The building ruins are now buried under earth and vegetation, with only about twelve tombstones visible. The Parish Council is aware, however, that there were certainly more than 1800 burials in the immediate vicinity, with some reports suggesting this figure may be much higher. As such the Council, supported by the Bucks Archaeological Society, believes that this is one of the most archaeologically important sites impacted by HS2 between London and Birmingham.
This issue has been discussed in a number of bilateral meetings held between the Promoter and the Parish Council, and the Council believed that progress had been made, with the most recent meeting discussing possible sites for relocation. But this meeting was more than 9 months ago, and the Parish Council is now concerned that the Promoter has failed to advise of any further progress or offered any undertaking on this critically important matter. Stoke Mandeville Parish Council therefore asks the Lords Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that it will:

a) Carry out a comprehensive archaeological investigation of the Stoke Mandeville heritage site that accords with a 'Site Specific Written Scheme' developed in conjunction with the local authorities, English Heritage, Bucks Archaeology Society, Stoke Mandeville Parish Council and the community of Stoke Mandeville. This investigation will ensure that dignity is maintained, especially for descendants of those buried on the site.

b) Ensure all remains from burials, gravestones, the church building and other artefacts revealed by the investigation are housed in a purpose built vault / memorial building above ground level in landscaped grounds located on the village side of the track. This site and an endowment will be gifted to Stoke Mandeville Parish Council by the Promoter.

c) Adequately compensate the Parish Council for the loss of the old church site.

Transport impacts

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council, in common with Aylesbury Town and Coldharbour Parish Councils and others, are very concerned about the impact of construction traffic across the area. A collective view of petitioners is that the Lords Committee would benefit from a site visit to Aylesbury to see first-hand how susceptible the town's traffic network is to minor changes. Major congestion or closure on a single route, has major impacts on journeys on every other radial route into and out of the town. This is particularly important for access to Stoke Mandeville Hospital.

The Promoter's latest position is that to construct the rail line across Aylesbury will mean construction traffic using the A413 from Great Missenden, the A4010 from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough, the A418 from Thame, the A41 from Bicester, the A413 from Buckingham, the A418 from Wing and Bierton and the A41 from the M25. The Parish Council asks the Lords Committee to note that this therefore affects every radial route to and from Aylesbury.

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council are concerned about the proposal to use the A4010, from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough, as a construction route to access Stoke Mandeville and suggested to the Commons Select Committee that the existing railway from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough to Aylesbury, already used for freight, could be used to import and export materials and equipment. The Promoter discounted this without proper explanation. The Parish Council therefore asks the Lords Select Committee to insist that HS2 Ltd properly review the use of rail as an alternative to road for moving materials and equipment.

If the Promoter can demonstrate that rail is not a viable alternative to road, then Stoke Mandeville Parish Council urges the Lords Select Committee to instruct the Government to instead make a contribution towards local road infrastructure, to accelerate the delivery of planned link roads around the town. This would not only support local calls for infrastructure before growth but could be refunded when planned growth begins to be built.
Flood risk and drainage

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council supports Aylesbury Town Council in its concerns over flood risk and drainage. The Council does not believe that the major impacts HS2 will have on the area and its residents is properly recognised, understood or mitigated by the Promoter.

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council recognises that since Select Committee appearances in November 2015, the affected areas -- the Willows in Aylesbury and Marsh Lane in Stoke Mandeville -- have flooded again. Stoke Brook, the cause of these floods, also runs close to the HS2 line. The Council agrees that further work is needed to demonstrate that HS2 will not exacerbate flood risk across the area.

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council supports other petitioners in their request for an undertaking from the Promoter to not only mitigate and minimise flood risk but also achieve betterment for the affected areas, and at minimum, a written assurance from the promoter that they will be responsible for maintaining and upgrading these features in perpetuity. Like others, the Council is concerned that without adequate maintenance, over time they will cease to operate effectively.

Community engagement

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council, along with others, made representations to the House of Commons Select Committee about the Promoter’s track record on consultation and engagement which it felt left much to be desired. The Committee’s response was to refer to “HS2 Ltd’s mixed record of public engagement” and the report of the Parliamentary and Health Services Ombudsman “which found serious failings in HS2’s engagement with a community in Staffordshire which will be particularly severely affected” (Paragraph 346).

Paragraph 347 states that, “as the project moves towards commencement, considerate engagement and helpful provision of information will be even more important. HS2 Ltd will need to pay attention to communicating and explaining its decisions.” The Parish Council cannot emphasise enough the importance of improved consultation and engagement, rather than the one-way information flow experienced to date.

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council believes that the best progress has been achieved in areas where community champions (sometimes Councillors, sometimes local residents) have stepped forward to act as intermediaries. The Parish Council urges the Lords Committee to recommend this model to HS2 Ltd as a viable and effective method of future consultation and engagement, where the Promoter employs or funds local people as conduits or community champions.

Compensation matters

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council acknowledges that compensation matters were discussed at length during the House of Commons Select Committee, and the Government responded by replacing the Exceptional Hardship Scheme with the Need to Sell scheme. It is difficult to know if this change has enabled more individuals and families to secure adequate compensation.

The Parish Council does not believe the changes go far enough and still fail to recognise the blight felt by individuals living in homes, rented accommodation; or running / working in businesses impacted by the proposals. There are still too many examples of individuals and
families who are struggling to secure any compensation despite being blighted or unable to sell their home at a reasonable price.

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council urges the House of Lords Select Committee to critically review the current compensation proposals and recommend changes to the Government that are fair, equitable and reasonable.

Community and Business Compensation Funds

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council acknowledges that the Government proposes to establish specific compensation funds for communities and businesses, affected by HS2. However, the initial figure of £30 million for these funds was far too small, a fact recognised by the House of Commons Select Committee who recommended "that the funding envelope of both funds should be substantially increased. We suspect the Government is aware that the amounts are too low" (Paragraph 350).

As a response the Government increased funding to £40 million, which the Parish Council still contends is a derisory amount. The Council supports the view argued by Buckinghamshire County Council that, at a minimum, the total funding envelope for community and environment projects and for business and local economies should be at least £150 million. This is still less than 1% of the total cost of the Phase 1 project between London and Birmingham.

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council believes that any community, such as Stoke Mandeville or Aylesbury, disadvantaged by the Bill with no compensating economic advantage or accessibility improvement, should have access to a generous fund that supports successful applications for enhanced mitigation, improved facilities or additional compensatory measures.

The Parish Council asks the House of Lords Select Committee to press the Government hard on this point to secure a substantial increase in funding with specific allocations to certain communities to avoid bidding wars.

4. The prayer

The petitioner Stoke Mandeville Parish Council therefore asks the House of Lords that its Roll B Agent, Marcus Rogers, 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 Stoke Mandeville Parish Council remains, etc.

Marcus Rogers, Roll B Agent

17 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF STOKE MANDEVILLE ACTION GROUP

Declares that:

1. Stoke Mandeville Action Group is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner Stoke Mandeville Action Group, is an association of local residents in Stoke Mandeville, established in June 2010 representing the interests of thousands of residents directly or indirectly affected by the Bill. Their rights, interests and, in some cases, property are injuriously affected by the Bill. Stoke Mandeville Action Group is therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Adverse impacts on homes at Hawkslade, west of Aylesbury

Despite receiving strong representations from Parish and Town Councils about the significant effects of the proposed HS2 line on homes in Hawkslade, specifically at Oat Close and Isis Close, the House of Commons Select Committee saw no reason to change the published scheme, beyond asking “the Promoter to collaborate with local authorities and reach an understanding on a proposed linear park.”

The HS2 line will pass within 180 metres of the nearest properties in Hawkslade. At the point where it is nearest to these homes, it is ‘at grade’ having emerged from the Aylesbury South Cutting. The overhead line equipment will therefore be approximately 8 metres above ground level, and as a consequence, residents - whose homes look out to the line - will have their visual and auditory landscapes changed forever.

Efforts to mitigate these effects have focussed on noise impacts with the Promoter proposing sound barriers some 5 metres high. These may limit internal noise but will do little to reduce effects in gardens or local open space. Perhaps more importantly, very little beyond the 5 metre barriers has been proposed to mitigate visual intrusion on these homes.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group asks that the existing Aylesbury South Cutting be extended north by up to 400 metres so that the line emerges from cutting at a point where residential properties are further from the line and so less impacted. HS2 Ltd suggested that this could not be achieved because of flood risk and water course issues. Advice from the local lead flood authority suggests that these are not valid obstacles.
Building the line deeper, as suggested, would generate extra spoil to create higher bunds to extend the cutting as the land profile falls away, and therefore minimise transport costs. The Action Group also asks that a narrow "green bridge" be provided over the cutting at the point closest to homes at Hawkslade. Not only would this improve mitigation for residents but would also enhance access from areas south and west of the line to the proposed linear park. It would also obviate the need for the footbridge planned in the proposed scheme.

**Realignment of A4010, including roundabout junction with Lower Road**

The inclusion of the realigned A4010 in the proposed scheme, often described as the Stoke Mandeville bypass, is testament to the work of Stoke Mandeville in meetings with the Promoter. Stoke Mandeville Action Group supports the planned realignment in all but one matter, the northern junction with Lower Road.

This petitioning point was not taken forward at the House of Commons Select Committee because the County Council, as highway authority, was still negotiating about the extension of the road. These issues have subsequently been agreed and therefore the Action Group has chosen to bring this matter to the House of Lords Select Committee.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group is pleased that the realigned road is still an integral part of the Bill but remains convinced that moving the road closer to Aylesbury, north of the business park and Stoke Mandeville Auto Centre, would be more beneficial. Such a simple change would not only reduce impacts on homes and businesses on Lower Road, but would also support the future growth of Aylesbury, offer an opportunity to provide Booker Park School with a dedicated access away from the residential area and could help improve access to Stoke Mandeville Hospital. The Action Group therefore asks the Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that the road alignment be changed to support such key improvements.

**Specific noise and visual impacts**

**Impacts on schools across Stoke Mandeville**

Stoke Mandeville Action Group remain concerned about the impacts of construction and the operation of the railway on schools in the area - Stoke Mandeville Combined School and Booker Park School. The Combined School is found in the centre of the village, with 207 children between four and eleven years of age on roll. It includes a Hearing Impaired Department (HID), a twelve place specialist unit for primary age children with severe hearing difficulties, one of only two in Buckinghamshire.

Booker Park School is located off Kynaston Avenue and caters for primary aged pupils with Special Educational Needs including profound and multiple learning difficulties or with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties who live within Buckinghamshire and travel to the school daily. Both schools regularly use outdoor learning as part of their work and need excellent and consistent auditory environments to support pupils.

The Environmental Statement originally deposited with the Hybrid Bill states that airborne noise from the railway’s operation will increase both day and night time noise in Marsh Lane and on Chestnut Way by Stoke Mandeville Combined School, and will create a significant noise impacts for Booker Park School. It acknowledges that this extra noise will disturb outdoor teaching activities and inside learning when windows are open. In the unique
circumstances for these two schools, the Action Group believe that such impacts are unacceptable.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group’s concerns were reported to the Commons Select Committee with the request that the Promoter be required to provide enhanced mitigation to ensure that the auditory environment for both schools is maintained, and ideally enhanced. The Action Group is not convinced that the Committee’s response about extra screening and bunding of the A4010 will alleviate noise impacts at Booker Park School.

No improvements were proposed or recommendations made for Stoke Mandeville Combined School at the Commons stage. The Action Group therefore asks the House of Lords Select Committee for a more positive intervention, requiring the Promoter to give an undertaking that effective screening and landscaping will be provided to maintain the current internal and external auditory environments.

Risborough Road gap

Stoke Mandeville Action Group Council notes that the visual impacts of the scheme are planned to be mitigated by a limited array of landscaped earthworks, but that in the area around the stopping up of Risborough Road, there are currently no plans to provide landscaping or any form of screening. This leaves a large area on both east and west sides of the route, including Stoke House, Thornbrook House and other properties on Risborough Road and Old Risborough Road exposed to both visual intrusion and noise.

Whilst the Promoter has made provision for limited planting in this area, the Action Group are concerned that adequate mitigation may take up to 60 years to grow. Something more effective must be in place before the railway is operational, and the Action Group therefore asks the Lords Select Committee to insist the Promoter identifies and adopts a more creative and effective approach to address this concern.

Maintenance loops

Stoke Mandeville Action Group petitioned the Commons Select Committee about the inadequacy of the sound barrier proposed by the maintenance loops. In this area the line is on embankment and protected by only three-metre high barriers. The Select Committee’s response provided some comfort, since it stated the Promoter should “take another look at screening and noise mitigation of the Stoke Mandeville maintenance loops for those in nearby communities. In any event, residents should receive as much certainty as possible about the height of the railway at this point. We asked that there be some demonstration of the effects of passing over high-speed points” (Paragraph 110).

The Action Group is unhappy to note that it has heard nothing from the Promoter about progress made on this point, and has yet to be invited to attend any demonstration about noise from trains passing over high-speed points. It feels it has little choice but to petition the Lords Select Committee on these issues.

The Lords are asked to note that the maintenance loops need a wider trackbed than other parts of the route because they comprise both the high speed lines and two siding tracks. The lower height sound barriers will therefore be further away from the operational tracks, reducing their effectiveness. Stoke Mandeville Action Group asks the Lords Select Committee to insist that the Promoter progresses the overdue actions with all haste and accedes to the Council’s request for more effective noise and visual mitigation of the maintenance loops.
General noise and visual impacts

Stoke Mandeville Action Group remains concerned that any proposals to minimise general noise and visual impacts during the construction period depends upon a Code of Construction Practice that exists in draft form only. The Action Group contends that this makes it impossible to be confident about its contents and leaves it unable to test the efficacy of its proposals. To address this the Action Group asks that once the Code of Conduct Practice is finalised it should be subject to consultation, giving those affected an opportunity to review the standard of protection proposed.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group also expects, not unreasonably, that involvement in the development of Local Environment Management Plans, that translate the Code of Construction Practice into local actions, should not be restricted to planning and highway authorities but also include local Councils and communities. The Lords Select Committee is asked to help secure such an undertaking.

Mitigation proposed to minimise the noise and visual effects during the operational phase of the scheme is described as a combination of earth bunds and screening barriers. Stoke Mandeville Action Group remains concerned that the height of barriers through Stoke Mandeville, varies so considerably, despite strong representations to the House of Commons Select Committee and getting the suggestion that positive changes could be made.

The Action Group therefore urges the Lords Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that screening barriers across the area are of a uniform height, perhaps at 4 metres as suggested by the Commons Select Committee. This standard should be applied consistently to avoid 'gaps' where noise impacts would be greater.

Bored tunnel through the Chilterns

The House of Commons Select Committee received a large number of petitions seeking an extended bored tunnel throughout the whole of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This position was not universally shared by all, and the final report of the House of Commons Select Committee acknowledges this, at Paragraph 106, “We note that communities in and around Stoke Mandeville would not have welcomed greater intrusion of the railway potentially resulting from certain longer tunnel options as proposed by Chiltern petitioners.”

Despite debate about the tunnel, Stoke Mandeville Action Group is unconvinced that extending the bored tunnel to the edge of the Chilterns AONB could be achieved without significant adverse impacts across Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury. These would arise from the creation of an extensive construction compound for the northern tunnel portal, on the edge of Stoke Mandeville village, close to the proposed maintenance loops. This very large site would be needed to support boring operations running 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for almost the entire construction period. Such an undertaking would need a large workforce and create thousands of additional traffic movements on a busy road network.

On this specific issue Stoke Mandeville Action Group, therefore shares a position with the Promoter and requests that the Bill remains unamended by the Lords Committee.

Effects on businesses and other enterprises

In Stoke Mandeville there are a number of small centres of business, largely consisting of small owner managed businesses, many of whom are tenants of their premises. There are
also a number of single businesses and social enterprises that rely on renting land and buildings from a landlord.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group is concerned that both the construction and operation of the proposed railway will have major adverse effects on such small businesses, undermining their viability and making future planning almost impossible. This is particularly true for the tenanted businesses at Layby Farm and for Animal Antiks who rent land off Risborough Road.

The location of Layby Farm Business Park means that it will be almost surrounded by works during the construction period with heavy traffic passing by two sides of the site, creating noise and air pollution. The businesses at Layby Farm have evolved to become mutually dependent units, and rely on each other to attract visitors and business. The Action Group believes that the impacts of construction will make the centre less attractive to visitors, leading to a loss in business.

Similarly, doubt over the future of tenancies, mean that concerns like Animal Antiks, who provide animal assisted learning for children and young people at risk, are unable to plan ahead and make key changes to their facilities. Stoke Mandeville Action Group therefore urges the Lords Select Committee to recommend that the Promoter deals with businesses in the same manner as the House of Commons Select Committee suggested for schools (Paragraph 353). This would enable tenant businesses to receive compensation for demonstrable adverse effects, such as reduced footfall, that affect the viability of a business.

**Transport impacts**

Stoke Mandeville Action Group, in common with others, are very concerned about the impact of construction traffic across the area. Your Petitioners believe that the Lords Committee would benefit from a site visit to Aylesbury to see first-hand how susceptible the town's traffic network is to minor changes. Major congestion or closure on a single route, has major impacts on journeys on every other radial route into and out of the town. This is particularly important for access to Stoke Mandeville Hospital.

The Promoter's latest position is that to construct the rail line across Aylesbury will mean construction traffic using the A413 from Great Missenden, the A4010 from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough, the A418 from Thame, the A41 from Bicester, the A413 from Buckingham, the A418 from Wing and Bierton and the A41 from the M25. The Action Group asks the Lords Committee to note that this therefore affects every radial route to and from Aylesbury.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group are concerned about the proposal to use the A4010, from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough, as a construction route to access Stoke Mandeville. Your Petitioners suggested to the Commons Select Committee that the existing railway from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough to Aylesbury, already used for freight, could be used to import and export materials and equipment. The Promoter discounted this without proper explanation. The Action Group therefore asks the Lords Select Committee to insist that HS2 Ltd properly review the use of rail as an alternative to road for moving materials and equipment.

If the Promoter can demonstrate that rail is not a viable alternative to road, then Stoke Mandeville Action Group urges the Lords Select Committee to instruct the Government to instead make a contribution towards local road infrastructure, to accelerate the delivery of
planned link roads around the town. This would not only support local calls for infrastructure before growth but could be refunded when planned growth begins to be built.

Flood risk and drainage

Stoke Mandeville Action Group supports local petitioners in their concerns over flood risk and drainage. The Action Group does not believe that the major impacts HS2 will have on the area and its residents is properly recognised, understood or mitigated by the Promoter.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group recognises that since Select Committee appearances in November 2015, the affected areas – the Willows in Aylesbury and Marsh Lane in Stoke Mandeville – have flooded again. Stoke Brook, the cause of these floods, also runs close to the HS2 line. The Action Group agrees that further work is needed to demonstrate that HS2 will not exacerbate flood risk across the area.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group supports other petitioners in their request for an undertaking from the Promoter to not only mitigate and minimise flood risk but also achieve betterment for the affected areas, and at minimum, a written assurance from the promoter that they will be responsible for maintaining and upgrading the relevant features in perpetuity. Like others, the Action Group is concerned that without adequate maintenance, over time they will cease to operate effectively.

Community engagement

Stoke Mandeville Action Group, along with others, made representations to the House of Commons Select Committee about the Promoter’s track record on consultation and engagement which it felt left much to be desired. The Committee’s response was to refer to “HS2 Ltd’s mixed record of public engagement” and the report of the Parliamentary and Health Services Ombudsman “which found serious failings in HS2’s engagement with a community in Staffordshire which will be particularly severely affected” (Paragraph 346).

Paragraph 347 states that, “as the project moves towards commencement, considerate engagement and helpful provision of information will be even more important. HS2 Ltd will need to pay attention to communicating and explaining its decisions.” The Action Group cannot emphasise enough the importance of improved consultation and engagement, rather than the one-way information flow experienced to date.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group believes that the best progress has been achieved in areas where community champions (sometimes Councillors, sometimes local residents) have stepped forward to act as intermediaries. Your Petitioners urge the Lords Committee to recommend this model to HS2 Ltd as a viable and effective method of future consultation and engagement, where the Promoter employs or funds local people as conduits or community champions.

Compensation matters

Stoke Mandeville Action Group acknowledges that compensation matters were discussed at length during the House of Commons Select Committee, and the Government responded by replacing the Exceptional Hardship Scheme with the Need to Sell scheme. It is difficult to know if this change has enabled more individuals and families to secure adequate compensation.

Your Petitioners do not believe the changes go far enough and still fail to recognise the blight felt by individuals living in homes, rented accommodation; or running / working in
businesses impacted by the proposals. There are still too many examples of individuals and families who are struggling to secure any compensation despite being blighted or unable to sell their home at a reasonable price.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group urges the House of Lords Select Committee to critically review the current compensation proposals and recommend changes to the Government that are fair, equitable and reasonable.

**Community and Business Compensation Funds**

Stoke Mandeville Action Group is aware that the Government plans to set up compensation funds for communities and businesses, affected by HS2. However, the initial allocation of £30 million was far too small, a fact recognised by the House of Commons Select Committee who recommended “that the funding envelope of both funds should be substantially increased. We suspect the Government is aware that the amounts are too low” (Paragraph 350).

The Government subsequently increased funding to £40 million, which the Action Group still believes is insufficient. It supports the view argued by Buckinghamshire County Council that, at a minimum, the total funding envelope for community and environment projects and for business and local economies should be at least £150 million. This is still less than 1% of the total cost of the Phase I project between London and Birmingham.

Stoke Mandeville Action Group believes that any community, disadvantaged by the Bill with no compensating economic advantage or accessibility improvement, should have access to a generous fund that supports successful applications for enhanced mitigation, improved facilities or additional compensatory measures.

Your Petitioner therefore asks the Lords Committee to push the Government hard on this matter to secure an increase in funding with specific allocations to certain communities to avoid bidding wars.

**4. The prayer**

The petitioner Stoke Mandeville Action Group therefore asks the House of Lords that its Roll B Agent, Marcus Rogers, 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 Stoke Mandeville Action Group remains, etc.

Marcus Rogers, Roll B Agent

17 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF STOKE MANDEVILLE COMBINED SCHOOL

Declares that:

1. Stoke Mandeville Combined School is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner Stoke Mandeville Combined School, is the local village primary school in Stoke Mandeville, with 207 pupils on roll aged between 4 and 11 years. It is sited on the corner of Lower Road and Marsh Lane, and its playground and playing field are approximately 400m from the proposed line. As such the school’s rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill. Stoke Mandeville Combined School is therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Specific noise and visual impacts

Stoke Mandeville Combined School are very concerned about the impacts of construction and the operation of the railway on its site. The Combined School is on Lower Road in the centre of Stoke Mandeville village, with 207 children between four and eleven years of age on roll. Importantly, it includes a Hearing Impaired Department (HID), which is a twelve place specialist unit for primary age children with severe hearing difficulties, one of only two units in Buckinghamshire.

The school regularly uses outdoor learning and relies on excellent and consistent auditory environments to support its pupils. But, the Environmental Statement originally deposited with the Hybrid Bill states that airborne noise from the railway’s operation will increase both day and night time noise in Marsh Lane and on Chestnut Way by the school. It also acknowledges that this extra noise will disturb outdoor teaching activities and inside learning when windows are open. The Governors believe that such impacts are unacceptable.

These concerns were reported to the Commons Select Committee by the Parish Council, who asked that the Promoter be required to provide enhanced mitigation to ensure that the auditory environment is maintained and enhanced. Unfortunately, no improvements were proposed or recommendations made for the Combined School. Governors therefore ask the House of Lords Select Committee for a more positive intervention, requiring the Promoter to give an undertaking that effective screening and landscaping will be provided to maintain the current internal and external auditory environments.
General noise and visual impacts

The Governors at Stoke Mandeville Combined School are concerned that any proposals to minimise general noise and visual impacts during the construction period depends upon a Code of Construction Practice that exists in draft form only. They contend that this makes it impossible to be confident about its contents. To address this the Governors asks that once the Code of Conduct Practice is finalised it should be subject to consultation, giving those affected an opportunity to review the standard of protection proposed.

Stoke Mandeville Combined School also expects, not unreasonably, that involvement in the development of Local Environment Management Plans, translating the Code of Construction Practice into local actions, should not be restricted to Councils but include local communities. The Lords Select Committee is asked to help secure such an undertaking.

Mitigation proposed to minimise the noise and visual effects during the operational phase of the scheme is described as a combination of earth bunds and screening barriers. The Governors remain concerned that the height of barriers through Stoke Mandeville, varies so considerably, despite strong representations to the House of Commons Select Committee and getting the suggestion that positive changes could be made.

Stoke Mandeville Combined School therefore urges the Lords Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that screening barriers across the area are of a uniform height, perhaps at 4 metres as suggested by the Commons Select Committee. This standard should be applied consistently to avoid 'gaps' where noise impacts would be greater.

Bored tunnel through the Chilterns

The House of Commons Select Committee received a very large number of petitions seeking an extended bored tunnel throughout the entirety of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This position was not universally shared by all, and the final report of the House of Commons Select Committee acknowledges this, at Paragraph 106, stating, "We note that communities in and around Stoke Mandeville would not have welcomed greater intrusion of the railway potentially resulting from certain longer tunnel options as proposed by Chiltern petitioners."

Despite much debate about the tunnel, Stoke Mandeville Combined School does not believe that extending the bored tunnel to the edge of the Chilterns AONB could ever be achieved without major adverse impacts across the area. These would arise from the creation of an extensive construction compound for the northern tunnel portal, on the edge of Stoke Mandeville village and close to the proposed maintenance loops. This very large site would be needed to support boring operations that would run 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for almost the entire construction period. Such an undertaking would need a large workforce and thousands of additional traffic movements on an already congested road network.

On this specific issue Stoke Mandeville Combined School, therefore shares a position with the Promoter and requests that the Bill remains unamended by the Lords Committee.

Transport impacts

The Governors at Stoke Mandeville Combined School, are very concerned about the impact of construction traffic across the village. Your Petitioners believe that the Lords Committee would benefit from a site visit to Stoke Mandeville to see first-hand how susceptible the traffic network is to minor changes. Congestion on one route, has major impacts on
journeys on every other route to and from Aylesbury. This is particularly true for Lower Road, giving access to Stoke Mandeville Hospital.

Stoke Mandeville Combined School are concerned about the proposal to use the A4010, from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough, as a construction route to access all parts of Stoke Mandeville. Your Petitioners believe the Parish Council's request to the Commons Select Committee that the existing railway from High Wycombe and Princes Risborough to Aylesbury, already used for freight, be used to import and export materials and equipment is reasonable and sensible. The Governing Body asks the Lords Select Committee to insist that HS2 Ltd properly review the use of rail as an alternative to road.

If the Promoter can demonstrate that rail is not a viable alternative to road, then the Combined School urges the Lords Select Committee to instruct the Government to instead make a contribution towards local road infrastructure, to accelerate the delivery of planned link roads around Aylesbury. This would not only support local calls for infrastructure before growth but could be refunded when planned growth begins to be built.

Community and Business Compensation Funds

Stoke Mandeville Combined School knows that the Government plans to set up funds for communities and businesses, affected by HS2. They believe that the initial allocation of £30 million was far too small, a fact recognised by the House of Commons Select Committee who recommended “that the funding envelope of both funds should be substantially increased. We suspect the Government is aware that the amounts are too low” (Paragraph 350).

The increase in funding to £40 million, is regarded as derisory, and supports the view that, at a minimum, the total funding envelope for community and environment projects and for business and local economies should be at least £150 million. This is still less than 1% of the total cost of the Phase 1 project between London and Birmingham.

Stoke Mandeville Combined School, disadvantaged by the Bill with no economic advantage or accessibility improvement, should have access to a fund that supports applications for enhanced mitigation, improved facilities or extra compensatory measures. Your Petitioner therefore asks the Lords Committee to press the Government hard on this issue to secure an increase in funding with specific allocations to certain communities to avoid bidding wars.

4. The prayer

The petitioner Stoke Mandeville Combined School therefore asks the House of Lords that its Roll B Agent, Marcus Rogers, 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 Stoke Mandeville Combined School remains, etc.

Marcus Rogers, Roll B Agent

17 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF NICHOLAS AND VICTORIA BARTMAN

 Declares that:

1. Nicholas and Victoria Bartman are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners, Nicolas and Victoria Bartman, are Stoke Mandeville residents, living at Thornbrook House, Risborough Road, Stoke Mandeville HP22 5UT. The property has been owned by the family for nearly 70 years and Nicholas was born and brought up here. HS2, if built, will run some 50 metres from the Petitioners’ boundary.

Living in such close proximity to the scheme, your Petitioners’ rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill. Nicholas and Victoria Bartman are therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Specific noise and visual impacts

Risborough Road gap

Your Petitioners note that the visual impacts of the scheme are planned to be mitigated by a limited array of landscaped earthworks, but in the area closest to Risborough Road, there are currently no plans to provide landscaping or any form of screening. This leaves a large area on both east and west sides of the route, including the Petitioners’ property at Thornbrook House, Stoke House, and properties on Risborough Road and Old Risborough Road exposed to both visual intrusion and noise.

Although the Promoter has made provision for limited planting in this area, your Petitioners are concerned that adequate mitigation may take up to 60 years to grow. Something more effective must be in place before the railway is operational, and your Petitioners therefore ask the Lords Select Committee to insist the Promoter identifies and adopts a more creative and effective approach to address this concern.
Maintenance loops

Your Petitioners also believe the sound barrier proposed by the maintenance loops is inadequate. In this area the line is on embankment and protected by only three-metre high barriers. The Lords are asked to note that the maintenance loops need a wider trackbed than other parts of the route because they comprise both the high speed lines and two siding tracks. The lower height sound barriers will therefore be further away from the operational tracks, reducing their effectiveness.

Your Petitioners ask the Lords Select Committee to insist that the Promoter takes forward the overdue actions with all haste and accedes to the request for more effective noise and visual mitigation of the maintenance loops.

Marsh Lane noise and visual impacts

Your Petitioners are aware that the mitigation proposed to minimise the noise and visual effects during the operational phase of the scheme is described as a combination of earth bunds and screening barriers. They are very concerned that the height of these bunds and barriers, varies so much across the area, despite strong representations to the House of Commons Select Committee and receiving a suggestion that positive changes may be made.

Your Petitioners therefore urge the Lords Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that screening barriers across the area are of a uniform height, perhaps at 4 metres as suggested by the Commons Select Committee. This standard should be applied consistently to avoid 'gaps' where noise impacts would be greater.

Your Petitioners are concerned that proposals to minimise general noise and visual impacts during the construction period depends upon a Code of Construction Practice that exists in draft form only. They believe that this makes it impossible to be confident about its plans and it should therefore be subject to further consultation once finalised, to give those most affected an opportunity to comment.

Bored tunnel through the Chilterns

The House of Commons Select Committee received a large number of petitions seeking an extended bored tunnel throughout the whole of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This position was not universally shared by all, and the final report of the House of Commons Select Committee acknowledges this, at Paragraph 106.

"We note that communities in and around Stoke Mandeville would not have welcomed greater intrusion of the railway potentially resulting from certain longer tunnel options as proposed by Chiltern petitioners."

Your Petitioners support the views of local Councils, believing an extended tunnel would create significant adverse impacts across Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury and therefore requests that the Bill remains unamended by the Lords Committee.
Specific compensation issues

Your Petitioners are directly affected by HS2 but believe their personal circumstances have been disregarded by the Promoter, who in their view, has treated them rather poorly throughout the process to date. Initially your Petitioners believed that they would be living next to a high-speed railway but would not lose any land. They were, however, later advised by HS2 Ltd that part of their land would need to be compulsorily acquired for the purposes of the scheme.

Your Petitioners have two grievances about this matter. Firstly, that the area of land required by the Promoter should have been formally safeguarded as soon as the need had been identified, which would enable your Petitioners to serve a Blight notice. The Promoter has acknowledged that this should have happened but has never sought to rectify this error.

Secondly, the area of land required by the Promoter does not represent 25% or more of your Petitioners’ property. As such they are not eligible for a Statutory Blight Claim and are required to wait some 15 years to bring a claim for compensation. Your Petitioners submit that this is wholly and morally wrong and that any land take of the property in such close proximity to the track should automatically trigger Statutory Blight. Part of the field to be taken is 50 metres from the centre of the railway line, whilst your Petitioners’ garden and house is 120 metres from the line, with a panoramic view of HS2 which across the area is also well above ground level.

Your Petitioners brought these matters to the attention of the House of Commons Select Committee at their appearance on 26 November 2015, and at that time were pleased with the outcome, since the Committee upheld the grievances. Indeed, the transcript from the hearing reads as follows:

“SIR PETER BOTTOMLEY
'That's an unfair way of putting it. What I believe is the promoter should think again, talk with the petitioners and treat it as though it's a blight notice that should have been accepted and the equivalent, or pretty close to that, is what's settled. That's what I was trying to say'.” (Paragraph 506)

“MR CLIFTON-BROWN
'So I think these petitioners have been treated unfairly on two counts and I think, myself, Chairman, that these petitioners, because of these errors, deserve to be treated as if this were a properly served blight notice.'” (Paragraph 513)

“CHAIR
'I think the Committee's view appears to be that we would expect the promoter to do the right thing, to go away and do what we consider the right thing. If they don't agree with the petitioner an acceptable situation, then can I say from here that we would expect to order a proper settlement? ‘“ (Paragraph 532)

The Promoter has ignored the Committee's comments, instead advising your Petitioners that, as a consequence of further design work, the land is no longer required. Your Petitioners contend that this was known at the time of the Select Committee appearance and yet the Committee members still recommended that the case should be treated as if it
were a properly served blight notice, so they could be granted full Statutory Blight compensation.

Your Petitioners therefore ask the Lords Select Committee to act upon the recommendations of the House of Commons Select Committee and rectify the situation, by requiring the Promoter to grant full Statutory Blight compensation for the land and property. If, in the unlikely circumstances that this was unachievable, your Petitioners might consider withdrawing this petition should HS2 Ltd provide an undertaking that the garden and field would not be taken now or at any time in the future.

4. **The prayer**

The petitioners Nicholas and Victoria Bartman therefore ask the House of Lords that their Roll B Agent, Marcus Rogers, 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 Nicholas and Victoria Bartman remain, etc.

Marcus Rogers, Roll B Agent

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

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

THE PETITION OF DAVID JACK STARR  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner is resident at 30 Brudenell Drive in the parish of Stoke Mandeville, Buckinghamshire, and is the Deputy Chairman of Stoke Mandeville Parish Council. As a councillor, your petitioner represents the residents of Hawkslade ward of Stoke Mandeville parish who are specially and directly affected by the construction and operation of the proposed scheme.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

The line at Hawkslade  

The proposed line of route passes less than 200 metres from properties in Hawkslade ward. At the point where the route is nearest to the properties, it is emerging northbound at grade from Aylesbury South Cutting. At this point, overhead line equipment will be some 8 metres above ground level. As a result, residents will be adversely affected by both noise and visual intrusion into their landscape.  

Current efforts to mitigate the effects of this intrusion are focused mainly on noise with the promoter proposing noise barriers some 5 metres high. This is clearly inadequate to properly mitigate the generated noise effects. In addition, virtually nothing other than the proposed noise barriers has been done to mitigate the visual intrusion.  

Your petitioner proposes that the Aylesbury South Cutting be extended by up to 400 metres so that the scheme emerges from the cutting at a point where residential properties are further from the line and so less deleteriously affected.  

By using spoil from building the line slightly deeper to build bunds to extend the cutting as the land profile falls away, additional costs will be minimised since there will be less need to transport the spoil off site. Additionally, your petitioner proposes that a narrow “green bridge” be constructed over the cutting at the point nearest to the most affected properties to not only increase the mitigation for residents but to also offer improved access to areas to the south and west of the line to the proposed linear park. Such a construction will also obviate the need for the footbridge currently planned in the proposed scheme.
The impact of construction and operation on the commercial entities in the parish of Stoke Mandeville

Within the parish of Stoke Mandeville there are a number of small centres of business populated largely by small owner managed businesses, many of whom are tenants of their premises.

As a parish councillor, your petitioner is naturally concerned that the construction and operation of the scheme will have a deleterious effect on those small businesses. This applies particularly to the tenanted businesses on Layby Farm.

The physical location of this business centre means that it will be virtually surrounded by works during the construction phase with heavy traffic effectively passing along two sides of the premises, noise and air pollution. The centre's businesses have evolved as mutually dependent units each relying on the others to attract visitors. It is likely that the effects of construction and operation will make the centre a much less attractive place to visit.

Accordingly, your petitioner would welcome consideration being given to a scheme to compensate tenant businesses for loss of footfall due to no fault of their own or that of their landlords.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

DAVID JACK STARR

Date:
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF PAUL WALTER

Declares that:

1. Paul Walter is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner, Paul Walter, is a resident of Stoke Mandeville, living in a Grade II Listed property - Old Moat Farmhouse, Marsh Lane, Stoke Mandeville HP22 5UZ - approximately 300m from the proposed rail line.

Living in such close proximity to the scheme, his rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill. Paul Walter is therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Marsh Lane noise and visual impacts

Your Petitioner is aware that the mitigation proposed to minimise the noise and visual effects during the operational phase of the scheme is described as a combination of earth bunds and screening barriers. He is concerned that the height of these bunds and barriers, varies so much across the area, despite strong representations to the House of Commons Select Committee and receiving the suggestion that positive changes may be made.

Your Petitioner therefore urges the Lords Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that screening barriers across the area are of a uniform height, perhaps at 4 metres as suggested by the Commons Select Committee. This standard should be applied consistently to avoid 'gaps' where noise impacts would be greater.

Your Petitioner is concerned that proposals to minimise general noise and visual impacts during the construction period depends upon a Code of Construction Practice that exists in draft form only. He believes that this makes it impossible to be confident about its contents and to address this asks that once the Code of Conduct Practice is finalised it should be subject to consultation, giving those affected an opportunity to review the standard of protection proposed.
Bored tunnel through the Chilterns

The House of Commons Select Committee received a large number of petitions seeking an extended bored tunnel throughout the whole of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This position was not universally shared by all, and the final report of the House of Commons Select Committee acknowledges this, at Paragraph 106,

"We note that communities in and around Stoke Mandeville would not have welcomed greater intrusion of the railway potentially resulting from certain longer tunnel options as proposed by Chiltern petitioners."

Despite debate about the tunnel, your Petitioner is not convinced that extending the bored tunnel to the edge of the Chilterns AONB could be achieved without significant adverse impacts across Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury. These would arise from the creation of an extensive construction compound for the northern tunnel portal, on the edge of Stoke Mandeville village and close to the proposed maintenance loops.

This very large site would be needed to support boring operations that would run 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for almost the entire construction period. Such an undertaking would need a large workforce and thousands of additional traffic movements on an already congested road network.

On this specific issue your Petitioner, therefore shares a position with the Promoter and requests that the Bill remains unamended by the Lords Committee.

Realignment of A4010, including roundabout junction with Lower Road

Your Petitioner believes that the realignment of the A4010 in the proposed scheme, shows what local groups have achieved when engaging with HS2 Ltd. He supports the planned realignment but also would like to see the junction with Lower Road moved further north.

It is understood it was not taken forward earlier because the County Council, as highway authority, was still negotiating about the extension of the road, but your Petitioner believes that moving the road closer to Aylesbury, north of the business park and Stoke Mandeville Auto Centre, would be a better solution.

This would limit effects on homes and businesses on Lower Road, and could support the future growth of Aylesbury. Your Petitioner asks that the alignment be changed to support these improvements.

Compensation matters

Your Petitioner accepts that compensation matters were discussed at length during the House of Commons Select Committee, and the Government responded by replacing the Exceptional Hardship Scheme with the Need to Sell scheme.
Your Petitioner does not believe this change goes far enough and still fails to recognise the blight felt by individuals living in homes, rented accommodation; or running / working in businesses impacted by the proposals. There are too many examples of individuals and families who are struggling to secure any compensation despite being blighted or unable to sell their home at a reasonable price.

Your Petitioner asks the House of Lords Select Committee to critically review the current compensation proposals and recommend changes to the Government that are fair, equitable and reasonable.

4. The prayer

The petitioner Paul Walter therefore asks the House of Lords that his Roll B Agent, Marcus Rogers, 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 Paul Walter remains, etc.

Marcus Rogers, Roll B Agent

17 April 2016