To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF ROGER GRAHAM 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 Roger Graham Manton lives at The Old Lamb, 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 is 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 an elderly member of that community, retired, 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. Your Petitioner fears 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 his property. He is 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. (such as reduced valuations by valuers not familiar with the area etc.)

e. The landscape, setting, natural beauty and visual impacts will be altered irreparably for the length of Potter Row e.g. 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.

Your Petitioner wishes to say that it should be always be remembered that the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty was gifted to the British Nation by the British Government, to protect and enjoy for ever, at all cost. Yet unbelievably the present British Government now wish to cruelly renege on that very same protection by refusing to provide complete tunnel mitigation for the AONB... purely on the grounds of cost.

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:

Roger Graham Manton

Date: 15 / 4 / 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Paul Tomlinson, Samata Khatoon and Roger Robinson

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioners are Councillors in the London Borough of Camden representing St Pancras & Somers Town Ward. St Pancras Station lies within the Ward and Euston Station lies adjacent to the South West border. Your first petitioner lives on the Ampthill Estate next to Hampstead Road Bridge and Mornington Crescent. Your second petitioner lives in St Mary’s Flats near Eversholt Street, Euston Road and Euston Station.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioners are particularly concerned that the current plans for Euston do not include an integrated station which will link the various existing and planned transport services - HS2, Network Rail, Crossrail 2 and local transport. The failure to provide an integrated station would cause huge impacts on the residents and businesses of St Pancras & Somers Town Ward.

Your petitioners are further concerned that:

- The new station at Euston will not be built within the existing footprint according to current plans causing higher impacts and a longer construction period;

- There will be significant traffic flows dealing with moving of spoil and building materials causing difficulties for traffic and pedestrians going about their daily business and causing even more problems for the movement of emergency vehicles;

- There will be significant increases of air, noise and dust pollution over decades which will substantially affect vulnerable residents including the very young and old - HS2 has failed to engage adequately on this matter;
• There will be significant loss of open space and mature trees and that HS2 has failed to engage adequately with the local community on this point;

• The mitigation proposed by HS2 thus far has not been satisfactory and has not included fair compensation for urban residents and businesses;

• The work by HS2 on utilities that lie under roads and Council estates will cause severe disruption to travel and walking patterns; the plan by HS2 to relocate the utilities from under Hampstead Road Bridge onto the Ampthill Council Estate should be avoided;

• There will be a significant effect on local schools such as Marie Fidelis, St Aloysius Junior and Infants and that parents may choose not to send their children to the schools due to the severe construction impacts, thus causing loss of income potentially leading to the loss of teachers and a loss to the local economy; and

• There will be significant impacts on local businesses located in Eversholt Street and Chalton Street and other local streets causing loss of economy to the area;

In view of the above concerns, your petitioners ask:

• That the new station at Euston be built within the existing footprint;

• That the new station should integrate the various transport services – HS2, Network Rail, Crossrail 2 and local transport;

• That spoil be removed by rail rather than road;

• That there be fair urban compensation and an independent adjudicator; this would be in keeping with the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee report that stated, ‘Camden is exceptional and needs special treatment...’ due to ‘...disturbance on a scale beyond the experience in most other locations.’;

• That there be enforcement and fines for breaches of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP);

• That there be no loss of open spaces and trees; the current mitigation proposals do not go far enough in terms of accessibility, quality or quantity;

• That the public be able to access readily monitoring information about particulate and gaseous air pollution and that HS2 actively work with community groups to provide adequate air pollution monitoring. This would be in keeping with the House of Commons HS2 Select
Committee report that asked for the ‘aspiration of improving the baseline air quality in Camden.’;

- That an independent inspector be appointed with the necessary powers to monitor and control the expected increase in vehicle and air pollution levels;

- That an independent adjudicator be appointed to help arbitrate disputes; the person should be appointed before work is started and continue throughout the project;

- That the effects of the work on utilities be minimised and controlled so that the effects on schools, businesses and traffic are minimised;

- That an alternative site to the Ampthill Estate be found for the utilities, including a gas main, that are currently located under Hampstead Road Bridge; the bridge is due to be reconstructed and the proposed placing of the utilities through the Estate will cause great inconvenience and disturbance to the residents and other users; and

- That the construction compound on the Ampthill Estate be kept to within the agreed size and operational limits so that disturbance to residents from light, noise and other pollution will be minimised.

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.

Paul Tomlinson

Samata Khatoon

Roger Robinson

16 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London–West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr Mobin Zolfaghari

Declares that:

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

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

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

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

3. Your petitioner's concerns

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.7. I am concerned that this has led to considerable stress and extreme wastage of my time and personal funds.

4. Summary of required action via House of Lords Hearing

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

4.2. Compensation: Currently Wells House Road and other urban areas have no compensation beyond the inadequate ‘Need to Sell Scheme’. Property values are currently so low due to HS2 that owners would not be able to afford to move to other equivalent properties. I am seeking compensation schemes that will assist me. I also need the option of temporary or permanent rehousing if the disruption and pollution proves too much. By loosing the usage of my garden or views, will also require compensation and/or reparation.

4.3. Old Oak Lane Closure: Although some assurances have been discussed between Ealing and HS2 Ltd, nothing has been confirmed to residents. I am seeking mobility & delivery services, 228 bus burning point, confirmation that the road will be kept open for pedestrians.
4.4. WHR sustaining wall: requires reinforcement before work begins. This is made of clinker and is unlikely to withstand the vibrations from HGVs and construction. In addition, the foliage on this wall adds both character and insulation. HS2 wish to replace this with a concrete structure. I wish to be consulted over the design of the wall and would ask for consideration to be given to a plant wall. Currently ownership of the wall is disputed and I ask that OPDC takes ownership of the wall from day one of construction and my shed must not be disturbed.

4.5. Temporary loss of gardens: HS2 has failed to provide a consistent story as to the gardens that have been CPOed for the lowering of Old Oak Common Lane. my Garden and the foundation of my house, need to be photographed before the work begins and all structures and foliage taken or damaged needs to be replaced, as my house is directly next to the lowering Old Oak Common Lane, digging the road 50 feet will damage my house. I temporarily losing my garden, should be compensated for loss of land and, as required, rehoused for that time.

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

4.7. Works entrance on Old Oak Common Lane: I am asking that a new location is found for this that is away from my property.

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

4.9. Conveyors to south of WHR: I am asking that the option to take waste below Old Oak Common Lane in the tunnel built for the new over ground station is used. I strongly object to conveyors close to my home on the south side of WHR.

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

4.11. Supplemeting the Code of Construction Practice: HS2 continues to dismiss noise, air and light and vibration pollution as impacts that will be covered by the Code of Construction Practice. I challenge their current level predictions and also require clarifications and assurances that the construction will not impact on my quality of life. I also need clarification as to what type of sound proofing would be offered and what measures will be taken for ventilation. Again, if it is not possible to retain a quality of life and health, including to be able to safely open windows, I would require options for temporary rehousing. It addition, I want controls of working hours to limit work that creates noise to weekday working hours without loud noise.
4.12. **Area cleaning:** currently Ealing does not enforce strict controls over developer cleanups. I require HS2 to keep roads and pavements clean, to be responsible to cleaning brickwork of private housing, and to control vermin that will come from demolitions.

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

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

4.15. I suffer from a severe disease of rheumatoid arthritis, which means I get very little sleep or no sleep sometimes; therefore lack of sleep causes my behavior more sensitive than other people to usual noise. Suffering from health condition, noise affects me more than other people, I do need to live in a quite surroundings, HS2 is good project for all of us and I support it fully, unfortunately I am unable to tolerate the noise level for five years round the clock, I can not tolerate the noise level of 85db at all, the HS2 believes that normally the noise level in Wells House Road is about 45db; I find that impossible to accept, in my house with windows closed, there is no noise at all day or night. I am asking HS2 either to relocate me while the work is ongoing or buy my house at the reasonable price so I can move.

my children go to school in Acton area, the journey is not straight forward, they have to catch two buses and walk from home and to school some two miles every morning and every evening, they usually wake up at 6.30 AM to get ready and travel to school; when the wall is being build the access to old oak common lane shuts down, frankly i do not see how my children are going to manage the journey?

Secondly i have several health issues, i am regularly under the GP’s attention and closing the access to old oak common lane will completely hampers my communication to and from the doctor and the chemist plus our daily shopping.
Finally the high noise level will severely damages my life because I am very sensitive to loud noises.

In conclusion I wish you to reconsider my circumstances and help me.

May I remind the house that I made my objection to 2013/14 HS2 as an individual petitioner to the house of common in relation to the noise level; unfortunately no action was taken so far, ref number: HOC/01658.

**The prayer**

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Mobin Zolfaghari

Date: 17th April, 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF CENTRAL LONDON COMMERCIAL ESTATES LIMITED

Declares that:

1 The Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, 18 and 47, and related Schedules, of the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”).

2 The Petitioner is Central London Commercial Estates Limited, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Derwent London plc. Derwent London plc is the largest central London-focused real estate investment trust with a property portfolio valued at £5.0 billion as at December 2015 (98% of which is in central London). The portfolio comprises 5.2 million square feet of predominantly commercial floor space and a 1.0 million square feet on-site development programme.

2.1 The Petitioner is the freehold owner of the property at 132 - 142 Hampstead Road (the “Site”) in the London Borough of Camden. The Site is located on the east side of Hampstead Road at its junction with Cardington Street immediately to the south west of the existing railway leading out from the Euston Mainline station. The Site occupies an area of approximately 0.7 hectares. It contains two substantial buildings (at 132 - 140 Hampstead Road) which are currently occupied and in commercial use, a disused petrol station at 142 Hampstead Road and a private service road which runs along the rear of the Site and serves buildings on the Site as well as providing access to Network Rail’s infrastructure.

2.2 The land comprising the Site is shown on the deposited plans as plots 74, 75 and 76. Plot 74 is the private road to the rear of the Site. Plot 75 is the part of the Site occupied by the building at 132 Hampstead Road. Plot 76 is the part of the Site occupied by the building at 140 Hampstead Road and the disused petrol station at 142 Hampstead Road. These plots are subject to compulsory acquisition under the powers of the Bill.

3 The Petitioner’s concerns

The Site

3.1 The Petitioner purchased the Site in 2007 with a view to developing it by way of a mixed use scheme that would realise the potential of the existing buildings and regenerate and enhance the local area. To that end, the Petitioner obtained from the London Borough of Camden planning permission on 4 February 2011 (2010/4683/P) for development comprising the refurbishment, extension and change of use of the existing buildings at 132 – 140 Hampstead Road to provide for a mixed use of offices and flexible storage/light industrial; demolition of the petrol station at 142 Hampstead Road and construction of a new 12-storey residential building (including affordable housing provision) and retail unit; and landscaping and other works, including alterations to the service road. The proposed development made provision for a communal amenity space to the rear of the residential block, a service road running between the commercial and residential blocks and improvements to public accessibility to open space at the south end of the Site.
3.2 The planning officer's committee report recommended the grant of planning permission for the proposed development and concluded, amongst other things, that the proposed development:

- "is in general accordance with the policy requirements of the London Borough of Camden";
- "would provide a sustainable solution for the future of this site which offers valuable affordable housing along with continued employment use"; and
- "succeeds in achieving the main objectives for the site as stated in the adopted Euston Planning Framework by increasing public access to open space and links across the site, respecting the scale, form and character of the surrounding area and providing housing including affordable housing".

3.3 Planning permission for the proposed development was granted by the London Borough of Camden on 4 February 2011, subject to an agreement being entered into under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. On 4 February 2011 the Petitioner entered into a section 106 agreement with the London Borough of Camden relating to the Site.

3.4 The planning permission has been lawfully implemented. This was confirmed in a Certificate of Lawfulness of Existing Use or Development issued by the London Borough of Camden on 2 December 2013 under section 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Land Acquisition

3.5 The Site is within the Act limits and is therefore subject to being acquired compulsorily for the purposes of Phase One of HS2. The Site is listed in Schedule A of the book of reference and is therefore subject to an unrestricted power of compulsory acquisition.

3.6 The ES that accompanied the Bill indicates that the buildings at 132-140 Hampstead Road and the disused petrol station at 142 Hampstead Road will need to be demolished to accommodate the proposed scheme (see Table 1 of section 2.4, Volume 2 'CFA1: Euston – Station and Approach'). The ES goes on to conclude that the loss of the buildings at 132 – 140 Hampstead Road will give rise to significant adverse socio-economic effects (see paragraph 10.4.26 of Volume 2 'CFA1: Euston – Station and Approach'). Although it is not entirely clear from the documents that accompanied the Bill, it is understood that the permanent acquisition of the Site and the demolition of the buildings occupying the Site is proposed to accommodate the western extension and remodelling of Euston station and the widening of the rail corridor, and possibly for a construction compound.

3.7 Whilst the Petitioner supports the principle of Phase One of HS2 it is concerned that the provisions of the Bill insofar as they relate to the Site go beyond what is necessary in the public interest. In particular, the Petitioner considers that there may well be an alternative means of bringing about the redevelopment of Euston Station which:

(a) would enable the provision of both the operational infrastructure required for HS2 and also a beneficial commercial development of the Site, so as to secure the regeneration and enhancement benefits that, but for HS2, would have been achieved by the Petitioner’s proposed development; and

(b) would not require acquisition of the entirety of the Petitioner’s freehold interest as currently proposed.

3.8 The Petitioner also wishes it to be noted that it has direct and relevant experience in promoting development above a major rail infrastructure project, through its work as a development partner under a Collaboration Agreement with Crossrail Limited to
deliver a mixed-use scheme above Tottenham Court Road Crossrail and London Underground Station. The Petitioner believes that there would be scope for the Petitioner delivering an over-site development at or in the vicinity of the Site which could help to achieve the regeneration objectives for Euston in a manner that better meets the objectives of planning policy. The Petitioner has discussed the potential for an over-site development with the Promoter and is willing to pursue those discussions. The Petitioner believes it is well-placed to be a development partner given its direct and relevant experience in promoting an over-site development in connection with the Crossrail project.

3.9 In that context, the Petitioner notes that the report by Sir David Higgins entitled 'HS2 Plus' (the "report"), which was published on 17 March 2014, questions whether the current proposals for Euston Station under the Bill are ambitious enough and suggests that an alternative proposal should be pursued. Specifically, on page 13 the report states:

"...an alternative proposal that the Government could consider is a level deck design, which would enable access from one side of the station to the other, better connecting the station to the local area and the community. It could also create the potential for considerable over-site development, which could combine housing, retail and commercial development. As in St Pancras and King’s Cross, this would maximise both the aesthetic and jobs impact of the development. Further work can and should be done to develop this alternative – and explore, in particular, how the private sector would help deliver a Euston that lasts, without additional contributions from the tax payer."

3.10 In a written statement of Parliament on 17 March 2014, Mr Secretary McLoughlin welcomed the 'HS2 Plus' report and in particular stated that:

"I also agree with the report that more can be made of Euston station. It is a significant opportunity to maximise the economic potential of the line and regenerate a site that has been neglected. It is also a significant opportunity to generate private sector investment that can reduce the overall burden on the taxpayer. I will, therefore, ask HS2 Ltd and Network Rail to develop more comprehensive proposals for the redevelopment of Euston, working with the rail industry and the local community. This work should include proposals for the Euston arch which should never have been knocked down and which I would like to see rebuilt."

3.11 The Petitioner further notes that on 26 March 2014 oral evidence was given to the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee on behalf of the Promoter in response to Questions 113 and 114 concerning the proposals for Euston station following the findings of the report. The representative of the Promoter said:

"The process for making changes to the project during the parliamentary process is set out in Standing Orders. If we come forward with a different Euston proposal, and that leads to a different environmental effect in that area, we will have to provide what is called the supplementary environmental information. That will then be subject to a consultation of a minimum of 42 days, in the same way as the ES consultation was tackled."

... "Once we have decided that we want to make an amendment we will table what is called an additional provision, so that there will be a motion in the House to agree that this additional provision can be made. As part of that process we will provide essentially the ES for the change. That will be subject to a public consultation with those views fed back to the House, and then that change will also be subject to people who are directly and especially affected being able to petition. This will all happen during the Commons Select Committee part of the Hybrid Bill process."
The Petitioner is aware that after publication of the Bill the Promoter published Additional Provisions relating to the Euston area. These Additional Provisions do not overcome the Petitioner’s concerns.

In the light of the clear acceptance by the Promoter that the current proposal for Euston station should be redesigned with a view to creating opportunities for oversite development, and given the procedural consequences that would ensue from any such scheme changes in terms of the ES and public consultation, the Petitioner objects to the compulsory acquisition provisions of the Bill (as it currently stands) insofar as they relate to the Site. In the circumstances, the Petitioner respectfully submits that the acquisition of its entire interest in the Site is not at present adequately justified and that the Site should be removed from the scope of the compulsory acquisition powers of the Bill.

Compensation provisions

As set out above at paragraphs 3.1 to 3.4, having purchased the Site in 2007, the Petitioner had planned to redevelop it. For that purpose, the Petitioner had secured planning permission for a mixed use scheme in February 2011, had entered into agreements to terminate existing occupational leases and was in advanced negotiations with prospective occupiers to take space in the commercial buildings once the consented development had been completed. The redevelopment of the site was programmed to be commenced in June 2012 and completed by September 2014. However, the Petitioner’s redevelopment and investment plans were effectively brought to an end by the Government’s announcement to Parliament in January 2012 that it had decided to proceed with Phase One of HS2 and of the detailed proposed route for that scheme. The Petitioner has evidence that the prospective occupiers of the commercial buildings withdrew from negotiations, or else insisted on terms that were materially worse than market expectations, as a direct result of the January 2012 announcements.

Whilst the Petitioner has made reasonable efforts to mitigate its losses and costs arising from the HS2 proposals, it is clear that those proposals have had a substantial blighting effect on the Site. Consequently the Petitioner has sought to engage with the Promoter with a view to agreeing either a Collaboration Agreement that will enable the redevelopment of the Site or, failing that, an early acquisition of the Site by the Promoter. However, as at the date of the deposit of this Petition, no such agreement has been concluded and the Petitioner is therefore having to assume that an agreement will not be reached.

As to the compensation proposals of the Promoter, the Petitioner notes that on 30 January 2013 it responded to the consultation document entitled “Property and Compensation consultation (London to the West Midlands)”. In that consultation response the Petitioner observed that, despite the Promoter’s recognition that there should be enhanced compensation terms offered to landowners that go beyond what is required in law and its acknowledgment of the significant impact that comes with the construction of a high speed line and the effects on local property markets particularly during the planning, design and construction phase, the “discretionary adjustments” and “wholly additional measures” proposed at that time were confined to residential landowners and hence did not address the situation of owners of commercial properties and contained no measures for mitigating the blighting effect which arose upon the January 2012 announcement. The Petitioner noted that the compensation proposals should recognise the blighting effect of the HS2 announcement by (a) making additional specific provision for compensating commercial landowners for the blighting effect of having to manage their properties under the “shadow” of anticipated compulsory acquisition and (b) providing a clear commitment to the early acquisition of commercial properties most seriously affected by this blight.

Having made those suggestions, the Petitioner was disappointed to see that the compulsory acquisition aspects of the Bill do not contain specific provisions to ensure that commercial landowners are properly compensated for losses suffered in the
“shadow” of anticipated compulsory acquisition. The policy set out in the paper entitled “High Speed Two Information Paper C4: Land Acquisition and Disposal” dated 7 March 2014 does not provide for discretionary measures to compensate commercial landowners for such losses. The Petitioner also notes that the policy document does not provide an express commitment to pursue early acquisition of seriously affected commercial properties such as the Site.

3.18 Whilst the Petitioner has notified the Promoter of its view that there is a basis for claiming all losses incurred in the “shadow” of the anticipated compulsory acquisition of the Site for the HS2 scheme, the Petitioner considers that the Bill should make specific provision in respect of such losses in full so as to put beyond any doubt the entitlement to compensation rather than requiring the Petitioner to rely on the general principles set out in or derived from the Compensation Code, and seeks amendment of the Bill accordingly.

3.19 The Petitioner is therefore concerned that there is no specific provision within the current compensation proposals sufficient to put beyond any doubt its entitlement to recover the full losses and expenses that it will incur in the period up to a compulsory acquisition of the Site. As a result, it is not clear that the core principle of equivalence (i.e. that the owner should be paid neither less nor more than his loss) would be achieved. The Petitioner seeks amendment to the Bill to achieve this.

Events since presentation of the Petition in the House of Commons

3.20 The Petitioner lodged a petition against the Bill with the House of Commons on 15th May 2014.

3.21 The Petitioner was listed for hearing before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on 16th December 2015. However, before the date of the hearing an agreement in principle was reached with the Promoter on 11th December and agreed heads of terms were exchanged by email.

3.22 The agreed terms provided for the Promoter taking steps to secure approval to the acquisition of the Property, on terms. These steps included procuring the approvals of:

(a) The Promoter’s Commercial Panel (“Approval 1”);
(b) The Department for Transport (“Approval 2”); and
(c) The Treasury (“Approval 3”)

(together “the Approvals”).

3.23 It was further agreed that the formal legal documentation for the acquisition of the Property would take place after the relevant Approvals had been obtained.

3.24 It had been expected that Approval 1 would be sought and obtained by mid-January 2016, with Approvals 2 and 3 to be sought shortly thereafter. Approval 1 has now been obtained. Approvals 2 and 3 have not yet been obtained.

3.25 Although the Petitioner has no reason to suppose that the remainder of the Approvals will not be forthcoming, at this time they have not yet been granted. As such the Petitioner is therefore left without a binding assurance enforceable against the Promoter that the agreed means for overcoming the Petitioner’s concerns will be provided.

3.26 As a consequence the Petitioner is depositing this petition.
Conclusions

3.27 The Petitioner therefore asks that the Bill be amended to ensure that all of the
Petitioner’s concerns as set out herein are addressed to the Petitioner’s satisfaction.

3.28 For the foregoing and connected reasons the Petitioner respectfully submits that,
unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, the clauses of and schedules to the Bill
referred to above, so far as affecting the Petitioner, should not be allowed to pass
into law.

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

4 The Prayer

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

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

Signed by Berwin Leighton Paisner LLP

Agents for the above-named Petitioner

Date: ________________________________
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF QUINTAIN CITY PARK GATE BIRMINGHAM LTD

Declares that:

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

2 Your Petitioner

2.1 Your Petitioner is Quintain City Park Gate Birmingham Ltd which is a subsidiary company of Quintain Limited, a British-based property developer which is wholly owned by Lone Star Real Estate Fund IV,

2.2 Quintain Estates and Development PLC was established in 1992 and was a London investment and development specialist, listed on the London Stock Exchange. Quintain Estates and Development PLC was purchased in September 2015 by Bailey Acquisitions Limited, an investment vehicle indirectly controlled by Lone Star Real Estate Fund IV and de-listed from the London Stock Exchange and changed its name to Quintain Limited. Lone Star intends to inject considerable additional capital into Quintain Limited to allow it to accelerate delivery of much needed housing in Wembley. Quintain Limited is a leader in mixed-use development, with a long track record and deep experience in development.

2.3 Your Petitioner has a long term leasehold interest in a large development site located in the Nechells ward in the district of Ladywood, Birmingham. The site is situated in the Digbeth area of Birmingham City Centre between Park Street to the east, Moor Street Queensway to the west, Masshouse Lane to the north and the West Coast Mainline Railway to the
south, and is known as City Park Gate. The site is listed as City of Birmingham Land Parcels 464, 475, 476, 478, and 479 in Volume 4 of the Book of Reference deposited with the Bill (hereinafter referred to as the "Property"). Your Petitioner is identified as having a leasehold interest in the Property in Volume 4 of the Book of Reference. This interest is a 150 year lease obtained from Birmingham City Council, starting from 2010.

2.4 The Property is approximately 1.896 hectares (4.684 acres) in area and comprises mostly derelict former commercial and industrial land, the majority of which is currently used for parking. Birmingham City Council granted on 27th November 2007 an outline planning consent (Planning reference number 2006/07395/PA) on land at City Park Gate (including the Property) for 93,700 sq meters (1,008,600 Sq ft) of development and has entered into a development agreement with your Petitioner to implement that scheme. Prior to the announcement of HS2 Phase 1 and its precise alignment, your Petitioner also obtained another planning consent (Planning reference number 2008/04177/PA) in 2008 for an office scheme incorporating 23,074 sq meters (248,370 Sq Ft) of floor space on part of the proposed City Park Gate site. Both of these consents (the "Planning Permissions") are either fully or partly situated on the Property and were listed as Committed Development in the Environmental Statement deposited with the Bill (the "Environmental Statement") at Volume 2, CFA Report 26: Washwood Heath to Curzon Street at paragraph 2.1.26.

2.5 As set out at paragraph 2.2 above, your Petitioner is a subsidiary of an experienced and successful property development and investment company which has achieved considerable regeneration success with major schemes including Greenwich Peninsula and Wembley, both notable because they have delivered long term regeneration of urban areas around a major public activity hub. There are similarities with the situation around the proposed Curzon Street station and your Petitioner is keen to work with the Promoter and Birmingham City Council to maximise the economic and physical regeneration that could be realised as a result of the proposal to construct the new high speed railway between London and the West Midlands ("HS2 Phase 1").

2.6 Within the context of the HS2 Phase 1 scheme, the Property is located within the west end of the proposed Curzon Street station. Land Parcels
464, 475, 476, 478 and 479 (ie the Property) are subject to the general power of compulsory acquisition at Clause 4 of the Bill. Land Parcels 478 and 479 are also listed in Schedule 5 to the Bill, which states that the purpose for which they may be acquired or used includes but is not limited to the 'Provision of worksite and access for construction' and 'Diversion or installation of, or works to, utility apparatus'.

2.7 As shown on Sheet No.3-118 of the plans which were deposited with the Bill (the "Deposited Plans"), the majority of the Property falls within the limits of deviation of Work Number 3/205 as listed within Schedule 1 to the Bill being 'A railway (5.09 kilometres in length) partly on viaduct commencing by a junction with Work No. 3/203 at its termination, passing south-westwards and terminating at a point 545 metres north-west of the junction of Freeman Street with Park Street; Work No. 3/205 includes a bridge over the Grand Union Canal and a new station (Curzon Street)'. The remainder of the Property (Land Parcels 478 and 479) falls within the limits of land to be acquired or used. Scheduled Work Number 3/228 as listed within Schedule 1 to the Bill (A diversion of a sewer commencing beneath Park Street at a point 20 metres north of the junction of Bordesley Street with Park Street and terminating beneath a point 15 metres west of the western limit of Freeman Street) is also marked on the Deposited Plans as being situated on Land Parcel 476 of the Property.

2.8 In consequence of the proposed acquisition of the Property, your Petitioner and its rights, interests and property stand to be injuriously affected by the exercise of the powers contained within the Bill, particularly those Clauses mentioned above, to which your Petitioner objects for the reasons, amongst others, here stated.

3 Your Petitioner's Concerns

3.1 Your Petitioner supports the principle of the proposal to construct HS2 and welcomes the opportunities that HS2 Phase 1 will bring for Birmingham. Your Petitioner is also particularly supportive of the regeneration opportunities HS2 Phase 1 could bring to the area of Digbeth, with a station at Curzon Street bringing people and businesses to what is currently an underdeveloped and run-down area of the city.

3.2 Your Petitioner is, however, gravely concerned that the some of the proposals contained within the Bill undermine rather than support the
regeneration of Digbeth and Eastside and would give rise to significant adverse consequences for your Petitioner and your Petitioner submits to your Honourable House that the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law in its current form. More particularly, your Petitioner is concerned that:

3.2.1 the land acquisition proposed in the Bill is excessive in that it proposes the acquisition of the Property in its entirety without proper justification; and

3.2.2 elements of the development proposed in the Bill do not include appropriate design mitigation and as such will give rise to unacceptable impacts on the future viability of development of the Property. The design is inefficient in that it fails to maximise the regeneration opportunity of the site and the surrounding area. In particular, the design should provide for and accommodate the development of the airspace to enable the Petitioner to bring forward timely investment through development, thereby harnessing its experience and expertise and access to funding which are essential ingredients of successful development. Such development would improve connections into Digbeth and bring forward the optimum development solution for a site which is located in the centre of Birmingham.

3.3 These concerns are explained in more detail below.

3.4 Your Petitioner petitioned the House of Commons Select Committee in relation to the concerns set out above and appeared before the Select Committee on 1 September 2014. Whilst several members of the Committee asked questions about the land take approach taken in respect of the Property in the Bill and, as the transcript records, raised concerns about "missed opportunities for Birmingham", no further action has been taken or contact made by HS2 since September 2014 to address the concerns of the Petitioner and no further reference to the Property was raised in the reports of the Select Committee.
Proposed acquisition of the Property

3.5 Your Petitioner recognises that the Promoter may need to acquire land compulsorily in order to deliver the HS2 Phase 1 proposals. However, your Petitioner is frustrated by virtue of having originally acquired the site with the intention of investing in the Birmingham City Centre regeneration proposals. The Bill as it stands will effectively extinguish the Planning Permissions, thus undermining plans by your Petitioner to redevelop the Property and consequently the future regeneration of the area.

3.6 With that in mind, your Petitioner respectfully submits that the limits of deviation and limits of land to be acquired or used are drawn very widely in relation to the Property in that they cover the whole site including subsoil and airspace, when only the surface level part of the Property is properly required on a permanent basis for the provision of the new Curzon Street station and the new railway.

3.7 The Environmental Statement describes the new Curzon Street station and states at paragraph 2.2.24 that "The upper concourse western entrance of the station will front onto Moor Street Queensway at ground level, with a connection to Moor Street station". It is this entrance which will be situated on the Property. The sloping topography of the land where the new Curzon Street station will be located means that this western entrance of the station leading onto the 'Upper Concourse' is the highest point of entry and is envisaged to be one storey at ground level.

3.8 Your Petitioner respectfully submits that development above this 'Upper Concourse' would still be possible ("Over Site Development") and would make efficient use of a space which will otherwise be wasted. However, the Bill does not currently commit the Promoter to undertake Over Site Development. The HS2 Information Paper on "Regeneration, compulsory purchase policy and over site development" states that "the Bill does not seek approval for any OSD" which it describes as [emphasis added]:

"Over site development (OSD) describes commercial and residential development that can be built over and around the permanent operational structures of the Proposed Scheme (such as stations) and is not related to the operation of HS2 (such as offices, shops or homes)."
3.9 As the space above the Upper Concourse situated on the Property (the "Over Site Property") is not properly required for the provision of the railway and the station itself, and its use will not be related to operation of HS2 Phase 1, your Petitioner respectfully submits that a more targeted approach to the acquisition of the Property is therefore both appropriate and necessary. Such an approach should exclude the Over Site Property from the acquisition of the Property and ensure that the necessary rights and interests to undertake Over Site Development would remain with your Petitioner, allowing your Petitioner to retain and utilise those rights in the future and develop this part of the Property.

3.10 The benefits of enabling such Over Site Development on the Property by your Petitioner are significant for the wider area. The area around the proposed station at Curzon Street, including the Property, has been identified by Birmingham City Council as a priority area for investment and regeneration. Birmingham City Council has set out a vision for what this area could look like after the arrival of HS2 Phase 1 in a document entitled 'The Birmingham Curzon HS2 Masterplan for Growth', published for consultation in February 2014 (the "Curzon Street Masterplan"). The Foreword to the Curzon Street Masterplan states clearly that Birmingham City Council's objective is to capitalise on the opportunities that HS2 will bring, and enabling such Over Site Development to be undertaken by your Petitioner would promote the four key objectives of the Curzon Street Masterplan by:

3.10.1 capturing and promoting growth;

3.10.2 enabling Curzon Street station to become a world-class landmark by adding the potential for a world class architectural design of a taller element to the station building;

3.10.3 better integrating the Curzon Street station with the city fabric; and

3.10.4 enhancing connections between Digbeth and the City Core and Eastside, by forming additional connections between Paternoster Place, Station Square and Curzon Promenade.

3.11 Over Site Development on the Property would also extend business activity across Moor Street Queensway to grow the City Core, which has
been a long standing objective of the current Birmingham Unitary Development Plan and remains an objective of the emerging Birmingham Development Plan Pre-Submission version (December 2013) - City Centre Spatial Plan (the "Emerging Plan"), the Big City Plan and Curzon Street Masterplan. By delivering additional commercial floor space and business occupiers into the junction of Eastside, City Core and Digbeth there would be additional activity at this key node point. Over Site Development on the Property could be designed to address all three sides, touching down around Curzon Station, thereby enhancing the connection to Digbeth and activity within Digbeth, which is a key objective of the Curzon Street Masterplan proposals.

3.12 Although the Planning Permissions will not now be developed as originally envisaged due to the proposals contained within the Bill, the Property continues to be identified as a Development Site within the Emerging Plan. The Property is also within the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP Enterprise Zone, in respect of which the City Council is required to encourage and help facilitate development. Delivering additional commercial development within the Enterprise Zone would enable the City Council to realise additional Business Rates income which it could invest in additional regeneration initiatives, enabling it to capitalise on the regeneration opportunity to greater effect. Your Petitioner would bring its expertise to bear and would bring in private sector investment which could help deliver developments to further enhance the regenerative capability of HS2 Phase 1.

3.13 Your Petitioner strongly objects to powers of acquisition being sought which are far in excess of what is actually required for the new HS2 Phase 1 railway and station. There is no compelling case within the public interest for acquisition of all of the Property, particularly when the Over Site Development will remain an important development site and all opportunities to realise that development should be explored, for the reasons set out above. Your Petitioner respectfully submits that as a major real estate developer and the current owner of the Property it is best placed to bring forward any Over Site Development and should be the proper beneficiary of such an opportunity.

3.14 Retention of the Over Site Development rights by your Petitioner would also reduce the injurious affection your Petitioner will suffer as a result of
the proposals contained in the Bill. As a result of no longer being able to implement the Planning Permissions, your Petitioner would have to forego the profit reward anticipated from development on the Property through a scheme that has taken considerable effort, time and financial investment. The ability to retain the Over Site Property and related Over Site Development rights would lessen the impact of this loss upon your Petitioner's business, ensure future development of the Property to the benefit of the wider area and potentially reduce the cost to the Promoter in acquiring the Property.

3.15 Your Petitioner is therefore seeking undertakings from the Promoter that the compulsory purchase of the Property will be limited so that only those parts which are required permanently at ground level for the provision of the Upper Concourse should be compulsorily acquired, leaving the Over Site Property and related Over Site Development rights to be retained by your Petitioner, subject to such rights and restrictions as may be agreed between the Promoter and your Petitioner.

3.16 Should such undertakings not be forthcoming, your Petitioner humbly seeks that your Honourable House amends the Bill to restrict the powers of compulsory acquisition to differentiate between those parts of the Property which are properly required on a permanent basis for the provision of HS2 Phase 1 and those elements of the Over Site Property and related Over Site Development rights which are only required by the Promoter on a temporary basis for construction of the Works authorised by the Bill.

**Inefficient/Poor Design**

3.17 Your Petitioner has concerns that the current station outline design fails to make the best use of space to the south of the station and the proximity to Moor Street station, while neglecting connections into Digbeth. The currently proposed piecemeal and confused approach fails to deliver a comprehensive development that would maximise development potential of the Property and fails to take advantage of all opportunities to integrate the Property and the new Curzon Street station with the wider area and the wider regeneration proposals.
**Link to Moor Street station**

3.18 Your Petitioner is concerned that the designs submitted as part of the Environmental Statement do not demonstrate an adequate link between the new Curzon Street station and Moor Street station. Such a link is key to ensuring proper connectivity from the High Speed network to the National Rail network and improving Birmingham’s potential. An adequate pedestrian link is also essential to maximise the growth envisioned as a result of HS2 Phase 1 and the new station and, in turn, the true development value of the Property, in particular the potential for viable Over Site Development.

3.19 Your Petitioner respectfully submits that the proposed 'covered walkway' connection as illustrated in the Environmental Statement is unattractive and inadequate, and not befitting of a (potentially international) High Speed station.

3.20 Your Petitioner therefore respectfully requests that your Honourable House amends the Bill to incorporate provision for a more direct link from the Property and the proposed concourse at the proposed Curzon Street station to the existing adjacent Moor Street station concourse and platforms.

**Compensation**

3.21 *Clause 18* of the Bill details the method to be adopted for quantifying compensation for injurious affection, Your Petitioner will, as has been detailed above, be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill and the HS2 Phase 1 development. However, as outlined above, your Petitioner is concerned that it has lost its ability to recover fully the money invested in the Property as the amount payable under the “Compensation Code” is unlikely to permit your Petitioner to recover all of the costs incurred in relation to the Property.

3.22 In particular, your Petitioner is concerned about ‘shadow losses’ associated with your Petitioner being required to hold the Property before all or part of it is transferred to the Promoter, such losses having accrued from the announcement of the plan to locate a station in the proximity of the property and continuing while the Bill passes through your Honourable House. At this point the Property is neither developable nor saleable.
3.23 Your Petitioner is concerned that there is no specific provision within the current compensation proposals sufficient to put beyond any doubt its entitlement to recover the full losses and expenses (including but not limited to loss of developer's profit and additional holding costs) that it will incur in this 'shadow' period up to any compulsory acquisition of the Property. As a result, it is not clear that the core principle of equivalence (ie that the owner should be paid neither less nor more than his loss) would be achieved.

3.24 Rather than requiring your Petitioner to rely on the general principles set out in or derived from the Compensation Code, your Petitioner respectfully requests therefore that your Honourable House amends the Bill to make specific provision in respect of claiming these losses so as to put beyond any doubt the entitlement to such compensation.

Conclusion

3.25 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 rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.

3.26 Your Petitioner submits that the Bill fails adequately to safeguard and protect the interests of your Petitioner and should not be allowed to pass into law without these issues being addressed.

4 The prayer

Your 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.

Berwin Leighton Paisner LLP

Agents for the above-named 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 Friends Life Limited and AXA Real Estate Investment Managers Limited

Declares that:

1 The Petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1 to 19, Clause 48, Schedule 1 (including works numbers 205, 205A, 205B, 208, 208A, 209, 209A, 209B, 210 and 211), Schedule 15 and Schedule 16 of the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill (hereinafter referred to as "the Bill").

2 Your Petitioners

2.1 Your first Petitioner is Friends Life Limited ("First Petitioner") (company number 04096141 whose registered office is at Pixham End, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1QA) and your second Petitioner is AXA Real Estate Investment Managers Limited ("Second Petitioner") (company number 03961977 whose registered office is at 155 Bishopsgate, London, EC2M 3XJ) (together the "Petitioners").

2.2 Your First Petitioner is the freehold owner of a significant part of a large development site in east Birmingham known as Washwood Heath. The Washwood Heath site as a whole comprises 64 hectares (159 acres) of employment land. The area of the Washwood Heath site owned by your First Petitioner ("the Site") extends to approximately 25 hectares (63 acres) and is managed and operated by your Second Petitioner. The Site is located within Community Forum Area 26 (CFA26) of the Environmental Statement assessing the environmental effects of the Bill. It was the former manufacturing base of LDV commercial vehicles and is currently cleared and ready for development.

2.3 The land comprising the Site is shown on the deposited plans as plots 192, 195 and 217. The Bill authorises the compulsory acquisition of all 64 hectares (159 acres) of land at Washwood Heath including the Site. Part of the Washwood Heath site has been identified for the line from the stem of the Y network to Curzon Street station, but the majority is for the purposes of the rolling stock maintenance depot ("RSMD") for the entire phase one fleet of rolling stock, associated balancing ponds and land required during construction.

2.4 Your Petitioners object to the works proposed to be carried out as referred to above at the Site. 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.

3 Your Petitioners’ concerns
3.1 The Bill authorises the compulsory acquisition of all 64 hectares (159 acres) of land at Washwood Heath, including the entire Site. The plans accompanying the Environmental Statement indicate that whilst part of the Site is to accommodate the permanent RSMD tracks and associated facilities, part of the Site is to be used for the temporary stockpiling of materials and the location of compounds associated with the construction of the RSMD and the adjoining Bromford Tunnel. Despite the entirety of the Washwood Heath site being authorised for permanent acquisition, the land assigned for such construction purposes will only be required temporarily by HS2 during the construction of the RSMD itself, which is scheduled to be completed by 2026.

3.2 The Site is identified as best quality employment land in a Core Employment Area in the emerging Birmingham Development Plan. It is a strategically critical employment site in Birmingham where there exists a clear and significant shortage of employment land on a city wide basis and particularly in the best quality category. Acute socio-economic deprivation exists in the locality. The Washwood Heath area remains one of the most deprived areas in the country, with over 13,000 people in the vicinity looking for work and particularly high levels of youth unemployment. The opportunity to create jobs at Washwood Heath should therefore carry significant weight.

3.3 Your First Petitioner purchased the LDV site by way of a sale and leaseback in 2003. LDV was subsequently placed into liquidation in May 2009 and the lease was forfeited in November 2010. As soon as the site was returned by the receivers in November 2010 your Second Petitioner commenced work on the redevelopment proposals for the Site, including the demolition of existing buildings, the breaking out of substantial concrete foundations and below ground structures, clearance of the Site and preparation of the ground for redevelopment.

3.4 However through the inclusion of this extensive area of employment land in the Bill, the entire Washwood Heath site is blighted and effectively prevented from attracting inward investment or beneficial new development. Your Petitioners have invested substantial capital in site clearance and preparation works to make the Site ready for redevelopment, and both funding and a development partner were in place to deliver the scheme. In 2012-13 advanced discussions with Kuehne + Nagel, one of the world’s largest logistics businesses, about locating a significant facility at the Site which would have generated a significant number of jobs for local people, were halted when the plans for HS2 were made public.

3.5 A regeneration opportunity exists to comprehensively masterplan and redevelop the Washwood Heath site with modern buildings for employment uses delivering thousands of jobs for Birmingham. The Site represents a very valuable resource within Birmingham and an opportunity to attract new investment and jobs, and to deliver them more speedily than would be the case if the land were acquired and then sold following completion of the HS2 works.

3.6 Your Petitioners initially petitioned the House of Commons Select Committee for the complete relocation of the RSMD and associated works to an alternative site to release the whole Washwood Heath site for redevelopment and maximise the jobs that could be delivered. After AXA’s appearance in front of the House of Commons Select Committee on 3 and 4 September 2014, the Committee Chairman issued the following statement on 16 December 2014:

“We do not believe there is enough evidence to support the move of the rolling stock maintenance depot from Washwood Heath. We impress on HS2 the need to adjust the scheme so that there is minimum land take and for the shortest time with sensible placing of balancing ponds and a hand-back..."
configuration that after construction will attract maximum business use of the
residual site...We reiterate our general view, which applies to rural areas but
also elsewhere that land take should be the minimum as far as possible. In
particular, where there are investors who have an interest in a site and may
want, basically, to put their money where their mouth is, we should not be
detracting from that.”

3.7 The House of Commons Select Committee First Special Report of Session 2014-15
then further stressed the Committee’s direction to conduct a “...review to minimise
the temporary and permanent use of land by the Promoter at Washwood Heath
and to maximise opportunities for other employers to establish themselves as soon
as possible following construction...”.

3.8 Accepting that the Select Committee had decided against the complete relocation
of the RSMD, your Petitioners engaged technical rail, construction, planning and
drainage experts to produce an alternative condensed RSMD configuration at
Washwood Heath (the “AXA Scheme”) in order to maximise redevelopment
opportunities and the number of jobs that could be delivered at the site.

3.9 Following direction from the House of Commons Select Committee (see paragraphs
3.6, 3.7, 3.14, 3.15 and 3.20), HS2 have in principle agreed to reductions in the
land to be permanently acquired for the track, ancillary buildings and drainage
pond elements of the RSMD. Whilst HS2 has offered a qualified assurance to limit
the extent of land permanently required for the RSMD so that it does not encroach
onto a delineated protected area of roughly 19 hectares, your Petitioners (1) do not
consider that the level of commitment provided by HS2 for these purposes is
sufficient and (2) will provide expert evidence to suggest that further extension of
this protected area could be achieved from viable amendments to HS2’s current
depot layout proposals.

3.10 With regards to the extent of land at Washwood Heath temporarily required by HS2
for construction purposes, despite clear directions from the House of Commons
Select Committee (see paragraphs 3.6, 3.7, 3.14, 3.15 and 3.20), HS2 have failed
to meaningfully engage with your Petitioners to explore and agree reductions in the
area of land required (and have refused to further engagement until 2018). Your
Petitioners have applied considerable efforts to drawing up viable construction
proposals, supported by expert evidence, which could result in reductions to the
area of the Site temporarily required by HS2 for construction activities by 10-20 Ha
compared to the Bill scheme (see paragraph 3.17). Such reductions in the land
acquired by HS2 for construction purposes would increase the amount of land
available for redevelopment within the next two to three years, considerably
accelerating the delivery of much needed jobs in the area and significantly reducing
the socio-economic opportunity cost associated with HS2’s activities at Washwood
Heath.

3.11 Socio-economic analysis suggests that between 1,200 and 1,400 jobs could be
delivered on the 19 hectares protected under the assurance offered by HS2. This
figure could be increased by between 70 and 80 jobs for every additional hectare
released. HS2’s current temporary land take proposals would only deliver
approximately 300 of those jobs before 2026, with the remainder being delivered
sometime after 2026. In contrast, AXA’s construction proposals could deliver
between 700 and 1,400 jobs within the next 5 years depending on the extent of
land released. The opportunity cost of foregoing this accelerated delivery of jobs
would be between approximately £100 million and £200 million (based on a 60
year NPV).
3.12 Your Petitioners therefore strongly object to the extent of land at the Washwood Heath site that HS2 propose to acquire under the Bill, both permanently for the delivery of the RSMD, and temporarily to accommodate the associated construction works.

3.13 Between 6 February 2015 and 10 September 2015, seven meetings were held between HS2 and your Petitioners’ representatives to consider the AXA Scheme and explore how permanent and temporary land take could be minimised at Washwood Heath. Unfortunately throughout these discussions HS2 sought to avoid objectively considering the AXA Scheme as an alternative to that proposed under the Bill and failed to give due regard to the employment creation benefits that would result from land take reductions. Beyond minor amendments, HS2 declined to make any meaningful modifications to the Bill scheme or make any concessions to significantly reduce land take.

3.14 Your Petitioners brought their concerns regarding HS2’s unwillingness to adjust the Bill scheme to the attention of the House of Commons Select Committee. When invited back to appear in front of the Select Committee on 26 November 2015, your Petitioners and HS2 drafted a joint statement (the “Agreed Statement”), in which the parties agreed to:

"...use best endeavours to reach agreement on design for the RMSD at Washwood Heath and to minimise permanent and temporary land take and maximise employment and economic opportunities at Washwood Heath whilst achieving an effective long-term depot for HS2."

3.15 With this objective in mind, the Agreed Statement set out a timetable for discussions between HS2 and your Petitioners and stated that following these discussions the parties would report back to Select Committee with an updated position. The Agreed Statement was endorsed by the House of Commons Select Committee. Under this agreed framework HS2 and AXA rail engineering, drainage and construction experts engaged in detailed technical discussions between December 2015 and January 2016. During the meetings that ensued, HS2 agreed in principle to a number of track design and configuration amendments proposed by your Petitioner, as well as the reduction in the size and more efficient layout of the RSMD balancing ponds.

3.16 Although your Petitioners welcome HS2’s adoption of these proposals into their design, there remain further viable track layout solutions that could significantly reduce permanent land take. For example, in technical discussions held to date, HS2 have insisted on unjustifiably generous radii length, switch distancing and stabling requirements. Despite your Petitioners providing evidence to show that more space-efficient specifications would be both operationally viable and avoid the wider socio-economic opportunity cost associated with profligate land take, HS2 have refused to consider incorporating them into their RSMD proposals.

3.17 There also remain possibilities to reduce the area of land at Washwood Heath temporarily required by HS2 for construction purposes. Your Petitioners have put a number of proposals to HS2 by which either (1) the area of the site upon which construction activities will take place could be considerably reduced such that the area of land not used (roughly 10 Ha) could be developed early to provide much needed jobs; (2) some of this condensed construction area could be relocated to land on the adjoining Saltley Business Park which is within Bill limits, resulting in the early release and development of roughly 12 Ha of land at Washwood Heath; or (3) all the construction activities could be relocated to the entirety of the Saltley Business Park which your petitioners suggest will become available if the existing tenants do not renew their leases given the uncertainty about the future of the
business park in light of Hansteen's (the current owner of the park) material detriment claim. This could result in the release of roughly 20 Ha of land for early development.

3.18 HS2 have failed to meaningfully engage on the clear opportunities available to reduce temporary land take required for construction in order to facilitate the early development of land for regenerative uses. This approach contrasts with HS2's willingness to fully engage collaboratively on the detailed design matters relating to the RSMD track layout and associated drainage. Your Petitioners will provide expert construction evidence explaining how significant land savings could be achieved by measures including the reduction of spoil stockpiling footprints, the increase in offsite disposal rates and the reduction of construction compound areas, and how a number of activities could be relocated to Saltley Business Park.

3.19 On the morning of the Petitioners' final appearance at the House of Commons Select Committee on 4 February 2016, HS2 offered your Petitioners an Assurance (the "Assurance"). This Assurance has not been accepted by your Petitioners as it lacks sufficient commitment from HS2 to limit the area of land required by them both temporarily and permanently. Most notably, the Assurance fails to impose an obligation on HS2 to apply any further effort to limit the land to be acquired by them for temporary construction works, and lacks a firm commitment on HS2 to limit the land required for permanent works based on the efficiencies agreed to during technical rail and drainage meetings.

3.20 In the House of Commons' Select Committee Second Special Report published on 22 February 2016, the House of Commons Select Committee directed that the Promotor should:

"...using its reasonable endeavours, continue to seek to reduce further the extent of land (whether for permanent or temporary use) including land required for construction and associated works and/or the duration of which the land is required in order to maximise the prospect of early development and job creation".

3.21 This reflected an agreed statement between HS2 and your Petitioners submitted to the Select Committee. Despite the House of Commons Select Committee's repeated calls for HS2 to apply efforts to further reduce the extent of land required for both temporary and permanent use at Washwood Heath, HS2 have failed to fully consider a number of viable and significant land efficiency savings that could be made by the adoption of amendments to their current track layout, drainage and construction proposals. Furthermore, HS2 have provided no firm commitments to reductions in land take that they have already agreed to in principle.

3.22 Your Petitioners received a letter from Professor Andrew McNaughton of HS2 dated 8 March 2016 in which it was stated that HS2 would only apply efforts to reduce temporary land take during the forthcoming detailed design process, which will not commence until the second quarter of 2018. Your Petitioners have made it clear that they are disappointed in this stance and do not see that it is compliant with the spirit or letter House of Commons Select Committee's direction of 22 February 2016 which stated that HS2 "should use its reasonable endeavours to continue to seek to reduce further the extent of land (whether permanent or temporary) including land required for construction and associated works" (emphasis added).

3.23 The HS2 C4 Land Acquisition and Disposal Policy states that HS2 will only take land temporarily rather than permanently if the Secretary of State considers it to be economic to do so which HS2 states must mean that the cost of acquiring the land temporarily must not be materially greater than acquiring it permanently. Your
Petitioners are continuing to meet with HS2 to discuss valuation principles and potential mechanisms to secure temporary rather than permanent acquisition of Site to facilitate rapid development and job delivery post-construction.

3.24 In light of the above-mentioned concerns, your Petitioners seek a direction from the Select Committee requiring HS2 ahead of detailed design to consider and agree options for further reductions in both the permanent land required for the RSMD and the land temporarily required for construction purposes by reducing the land area required and/or by the relocation of construction activities to alternative locations and to accept such reductions prior to detailed design in order that land take can be minimised and development for reasonable employment development can be commenced.

4 The prayer

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

AND the Petitioners remain, etc.

Berwin Leighton Paisner LLP

Agents for the above-named petitioners

18 April 2016
to the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF  Residents of Woodhall, Robert Street  

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are residents of Woodhall, Robert Street, a Local Authority-owned block of flats which is located close to the proposed Main Construction Site on a residential street which is required for utility works and which will be heavily used by construction and other traffic during the construction of the scheme (a period of 18+ years).

i) Name: Ursula Brown

ii) Name: Irene Harris

iii) Name: Mohammed Abdi

iv) Name: Jose C. Pereira

v) Name: Zvezdana Crossfield

vi) Name: Sandra Chu

vii) Name: Nasrin Akhter

viii) Name: Nahid Bhuiyan

ix) Name: Marcella Daymer

x) Name: Nayateh Gitaau

xi) Name: ABDUL

xii) Name: Doris Corbett

xiii) Name: Balkis Osman

xiv) Name: Lipi Begum
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Residents of Woodhall, Robert Street

 Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are residents of Woodhall, Robert Street, a Local Authority-owned block of flats which is located close to the proposed Main Construction Site on a residential street which is required for utility works and which will be heavily used by construction and other traffic during the construction of the scheme (a period of 18+ years).

i)Name... 

ii)Name... 

iii)Name... 

iv)Name... 

v)Name... 

vi)Name... 

vii)Name... 

viii)Name... 

ix)Name... 

x)Name... 

xi)Name... 

xii)Name... 

xiii)Name... 

xiv)Name...
3. Your petitioners’ concerns:

3.1 Utilities works which would involve digging up Robert Street to install a 42 inch water main and divert existing utilities

3.2 The demolition of the National Temperance Hospital and establishment of a Main Construction Compound opposite the entrance to Robert Street

3.3 The use of Robert Street as a major route for construction traffic and diverted traffic over a period of ten years (2017-2026)

3.4 The use of Robert Street as a taxi route for a period of eight years (2026-2033)

3.5 The creation of a new signalled junction with Hampstead Road and an extended Cobourg Street

3.6 This work will increase traffic in Robert Street, create noise, dust and air pollution, and put at risk the mature trees which line the Street.

3.7 Your petitioners are concerned that the works in and around Robert Street create an increased risk of accidents at local road junctions, and that congestion caused by the works would mean delays in attendance by emergency services

3.8 Your petitioners are concerned at the impacts on bus services along Hampstead Road, which would make it difficult for your petitioners to access shops, hospitals and other services in Camden Town and beyond

3.9 Your petitioners are concerned that there is no adequate mitigation and no compensation offered for the serious adverse effects of these works over a very long timespan.

Your petitioners request that

(a) the construction timetable be rethought to minimise adverse effects on residents, and to minimise the length of time during which these will be experienced;

(b) that spoil and supplies be delivered and removed by rail, not road;

(c) that any residual spoil/supplies that cannot be moved by rail should be restricted to the national road network and avoid residential streets such as Robert Street;

(d) that Woodhall be assessed for noise mitigation;

(e) that there be live, transparent air quality monitoring in Robert Street with immediate action if legal limits are breached

(f) that street trees be safeguarded

(g) that traffic management measures be put in place to prevent taxis and other traffic using Cobourg Street from using Robert Street as a taxi feeder or dispersal route or as a rat run

(h) That no works begin in the Euston area until satisfactory plans are in place to avoid these adverse impacts.
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.
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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.
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To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF KATHERINE SYKES

Declares that:

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

Your petitioner

2. The petitioner is the owner occupier of a property in Regent’s Park Road, Primrose Hill, London, NW1 7SY ("the Property") which will be affected by the scheduled works.

Your petitioner’s concerns

3. The location of your Petitioner’s Property is such that it is almost completely surrounded by areas in which works are scheduled to take place. In addition, your Petitioner understands that Regent’s Park Road will be used for construction and other traffic and will suffer “serious adverse effects” as a result. Indeed, owing to new proposals for diverted traffic flow, it appears that Regent’s Park Road might become a major artery for traffic running from south London to north; this would completely alter the current character of the road and also have significant implications for the future viability of Primrose Hill village.

4. The close proximity and all-encompassing nature of so much of the construction work, and the associated traffic, is a very significant concern and your Petitioner is fully expecting to suffer from significant disturbance due to noise, dust, pollution and vibration and from general loss of amenity. In short, your Petitioner feels that neither her property nor Primrose Hill will be anything like as comfortable or pleasant to inhabit once HS2 construction work begins. Gaining access to and from the property and/or the village is also likely to be a challenge once work begins.

5. The impact of HS2 on Primrose Hill will be very severe owing both to Primrose Hill’s unique and special nature and to its close proximity to so many of the works. Primrose Hill is a small village and unlike any other in London. The name ‘Primrose Hill’ refers both to Primrose Hill village and Primrose Hill itself ("The Hill"), which is a royal park attached to the Regent’s Park. A leafy conservation area consisting mostly of houses built in and around 1840-50, the village is known for its quiet, tranquil quality and prolific greenery. It contains an abundance of trees in its streets. Its small high street is filled with small independent boutiques, coffee shops and restaurants. One of the least urban parts of London, it presents a stark contrast to neighbouring, bustling Camden. External access to the village is limited as it bordered by Regent’s Park, the Regent’s Canal, London Zoo and The Hill to the south and west, and the railway to the north and east. The Regent’s Canal is a conservation area in its own right. Most of Primrose Hill village’s
streets are narrow and used for access only; the only through road is Regent’s Park Road – the village High Street - which itself is not very busy and is rarely used for any vehicle heavier than a single decker bus. Perhaps owing to its narrow streets, and the relative lack of traffic, Primrose Hill village has a strong community ethos. Street parties and fetes are held several times a year, there are regular community events and other get-togethers, and a monthly magazine (‘On the Hill’) is distributed free to all villagers. The Hill itself is one of the least formal of the royal parks and is much used by families and groups of friends for games and picnics in the summer. It is popular with dog-walkers, exercisers and sunbathers and its less maintained areas contain wild grasses and flowers, such as bluebells and cow parsley. In some areas, the Hill has more of a feel of a large meadow than a royal park and with the cries of London Zoo’s exotic birds in the background, it is sometimes easy to forget that the Hill is actually in London. The Promoter’s plans for HS2 not only puts all this under threat but, owing to the extended nature of the proposed works, brings into question Primrose Hill’s future viability as a thriving community.

6. Your Petitioner asks your Honourable House to note in particular the following:

a) Primrose Hill is a quiet, highly sought after residential area. It is London’s last remaining village: a friendly, neighbourly and contented community.

b) Construction works (not including utility diversions) will be executed throughout much of the village (eg tunnelling underneath Gloucester Avenue and the construction of the vent shaft at Adelaide Road) and its perimeter (eg satellite construction compound and demolition of the retaining wall at Park Village East and the construction of the twin bore tunnel portal at Parkway). Many of the streets in Primrose Hill and adjacent areas are earmarked for utility works. Two tunnel boring machines will operate from south of the Parkway portal. The retaining wall in Park Village East will be demolished and rebuilt. At present, HS2 proposes to remove all waste material by road, rather than rail. This will mean that a massive amount of HGV and other traffic will run right through the village, and all round its edges; heavy construction vehicles will clog up and pollute the area and traffic will be diverted through quiet residential streets.

c) Property values are high, ranging from £1.2 million for a two bedroom flat on Regent’s Park Road to £14 million for a 6 bedroom house on Regent’s Park Road. Some property owners in Primrose Hill (eg those in Gloucester Avenue/Darwin Court) have been unable to sell their homes for months. Blight will peak once the works commence and this will continue until 2033 and beyond, when the construction works are finally completed. At present there is no compensation on offer: meaning that an individual’s ability to dispose of their property at any time during the continuance of the works (currently 18+years) is severely limited.

d) The extent to which works will be executed outside normal working hours: HS2 Ltd has confirmed that works will be executed 24/7 - at night, over weekends and during holiday periods – just the periods when everyone is entitled to quiet enjoyment of their homes. Construction noise is inherently disturbing to sleep patterns and to health. Whilst HS2 Ltd is obliged to pay compensation to the rail operating companies for any disruption to their services, no such compensation is contemplated for local residents and businesses.

e) The duration of time that the local community will be affected, from 2016 to 2033 and beyond is unprecedented. In other words, the proposed works and their impacts will affect an entire
generation of people. This is especially important when one considers the physical and mental health impacts of 24 hour construction work, very heavy traffic and toxic air: for the vast majority of people there is no compensation on offer and no option to escape.

f) The cumulative impact of the noise, dust, vibration, ventilation, air pollution, loss of safe access routes, loss of amenity and daylight, construction traffic, bridge closures, congestion and works being executed at anti-social times.

g) The Environmental Statement and Construction Code of Practice do not provide certainty of any effective mitigation for our neighbourhood, so fair compensation is required as an alternative.

h) The Promoter must ensure that people are able to move if they want to. Your Petitioner believes that it is completely inequitable to deny people the chance to sell their property, cash in what is probably their life savings, and move away if they decide to marry, have children or retire or for any other reason that is entirely personal to them.

Lorry Holding Area at the Zoo Car Park

7. Your Petitioner is concerned about HS2 Ltd’s proposed acquisition of the zoo car park located at Gloucester Slips to provide an expanded lorry holding area for the construction of the high speed station at Euston and its approach (in the throat and cutting).

8. HS2 Ltd proposes to considerably expand and re-landscape the car park. This will involve cutting down the existing trees and greenery and concreting over large areas of grass. At present, the zoo car park is screened by abundant trees and greenery and is often quiet, so any increase in vehicles will be much noticed. HS2 Ltd’s plans will significantly impact both the visual landscape and the general air quality in the area.

9. The zoo car park is not an appropriate location for a lorry holding area as it is in a Conservation Area adjacent to Regent’s Park and the Regent’s Canal. It is also located directly opposite a school. Children are deposited and picked up by the school bus and their parents every day. Every day, whole classes of children cross the edge of the zoo car park to get to Regent’s Park, where they enjoy outdoor sports and games. HS2 Ltd’s own figures recognise that air quality at this point is more than twice legal limits already – the establishment of a lorry holding area here will inevitably make matters far worse.

10. An important population of hedgehogs lives in the zoo car park – as many as 80 have been identified. Hedgehogs are an endangered species, among the UK’s priority for conservation, and have died out from all London parks since the 1970s-80s. It is inconceivable to think that this vulnerable population could withstand the daily and nightly comings and goings of hundreds of mega tonne HGVs over many years and thus it would appear that the establishment of a lorry holding area at the zoo car park would hasten the hedgehogs’ extinction.

11. The zoo car park, located on Prince Albert Road, is only a few metres away from your Petitioner’s property and is directly en route to your Petitioner’s nearest bus or tube stops. Large numbers of HGVs stalling or travelling to or from the zoo car park and Prince Albert Road will severely increase her exposure to noise and air pollution and significantly impact her health and wellbeing. Your Petitioner understands that part of Prince Albert Road will be used for HGV traffic; meaning that ordinary traffic will be diverted onto
Regent's Park Road.

12. The zoo car park is located close to the top end of Parkway. The Parkway junction is always busy and sometimes gridlocked. It is impossible to imagine how the junction could possibly operate with the addition of many hundreds of HGVs per day.

13. Your Petitioner requests your Honourable House to compel HS2 Ltd to relocate their lorry holding area to an area of less ecological and environmental sensitivity, well away from any conservation area and well away from any area in which children learn and play. If this is not possible, your Petitioner requests your Honourable House to compel HS2 Ltd to impose strict limits on the number of HGVs and other vehicles that may use the zoo car park on a daily basis. These should be as low as possible bearing in mind the context of the environment.

14. HS2 has said that the zoo car park “will be required on a 24 hour basis to support works during and outside of core working hours in the Euston area.” Your Petitioner requests your Honourable House to compel HS2 Ltd not to use the zoo car park at sensitive times, including peak hours for school delivery and collection; school games; evenings, nights and weekends.

15. Your Petitioner requests your Honourable House to compel HS2 Ltd to impose strict limits on the number of HGVs and other vehicles that may use Prince Albert Road on a daily basis. These should be as low as possible bearing in mind the context of the environment.

**Enormous increase and uncertainty regarding Euston construction traffic**

16. Of particular concern to your Petitioner is the enormous increase and uncertainty regarding traffic relating to the Euston construction. HS2 Ltd “conservatively” proposes that an excessive volume of HGV vehicles will be needed to transport materials, spoil and plant to and from their Euston site. Your Petitioner notes that the AP3 SES Transport Assessment increases the Euston HGV volumes by twenty thousand HGVs by 2026 and one third of a million by 2033 over the previous Environmental Statement, making a new total by 2026 of over a million, and one and a third million by 2033. Your Petitioner notes particularly that spoil is increased by 21% to two and a half million tonnes. Your Petitioner understands that this quantity is approximately two thirds of the spoil which was sustainably transported to the sea nearby from the English end of the Channel Tunnel. According to the SES, demolition and construction waste will amount to a further one million tonnes, 26% more than identified in the original Bill scheme.

17. HS2 Ltd has no current plans to transport any materials, spoil or plant by rail, which means it is intended that all transportation will take place by road. AP3’s new proposed timescale means that this will continue for at least 18 years. Much, if not all, of this can be avoided.

18. Your Petitioner considers that the use of rail for the delivery and removal of all construction related materials, spoil and equipment would overcome a considerable number of issues arising from the scheme from road safety to noise and air pollution. The SES assumes removal of waste material by road with only an unspecified limited volume that could be moved by rail. Your Petitioner asks your Honourable House to require that the Promoter adopts the principle that rail haulage is used for the delivery and removal of all construction related materials, spoil and equipment unless transport by rail is manifestly impractical in particular circumstances. This has been achieved in the construction of Crossrail and would reflect best
practice.

19. Your Petitioner is seriously concerned about the lack of specific information available regarding vehicle numbers and routes. Both your Petitioner and several of her colleagues and neighbours have asked senior members and area directors of HS2 Ltd for this information but have consistently been told that it is not available. HS2 Ltd have indicated that actual numbers and routes will formulated by “the contractor”, negotiated with Camden and TfL, and will almost certainly bear no resemblance to the Transport Appraisal in the Environmental Statement.

20. Your Petitioner is however aware that as a result of AP3, she will be impacted by increased HGV traffic. According to the SES, her road will suffer “serious”, “significant” or “major” “adverse effects” from construction traffic. This will also result in “significant adverse effects for NO₂.” At a community information session in 2015, HS2 Ltd confirmed that there is no precise definition to the phrase “serious adverse effects” and, moreover, no upper limit to the amount of vehicles that could be construed as “serious”. This is of vital importance to your Petitioner, given that her property is only a few metres away from HS2 Ltd’s proposed lorry holding area at the zoo and that she is adjacent to or surrounded by several routes which are either 1) designated as construction routes; or 2) designated as the location of utility works; or 3) will bear the impact of traffic diverted away from other routes as a result of road closures, construction work, or HGV usage.

21. Your Petitioner feels that this situation is wholly unsatisfactory. Your Petitioner is concerned about the routes that HS2 Ltd propose that HGV vehicles will take and the effect that this will have on ordinary traffic. HS2 Ltd has not stated where it expects ordinary traffic to go if it is blocked by construction work, HGV traffic, utility diversions or related road closures. However, your Petitioner believes that this traffic will be displaced down quiet residential streets, in particular Regent’s Park Road.

22. Your Petitioner understands that there will be up to 1,500 HGV movements to and from Euston and its approaches every day at peak. Whilst your Petitioner understands that HS2 Ltd intends that a large percentage of these journeys will be made on the Euston Road, she also understands that this might be opposed by TfL. Euston Road is already very crowded and gridlocked at certain times of the day. It also boasts air pollution levels which are 4 times higher than EU legal limits. If for any reason HS2 construction traffic cannot be routed on Euston Road, it appears that there is no current plan for where it might go instead. Potential alternatives, such as Albany Street, Prince Albert Road and Camden High Street – all of which are used by residents - have not been assessed for this purpose in the SES.

23. Your Petitioner requests that your Honourable House compels HS2 Ltd to provide an assessment of impacts for a scenario in which, due to over congestion, much or most of their Euston Road HGV traffic is distributed onto other routes and junctions.

24. Your Petitioner requests that your Honourable House compels HS2 Ltd to provide details of the impacts of HGV construction, including traffic, on Primrose Hill’s local bus routes, C2 and 274, as these run down Albany Street and Parkway respectively, both of which have been designated as major HGV construction routes in the SES.

25. Your Petitioner asks your Honourable House to ensure that HS2 Ltd gives a binding undertaking that Regents Park Road shall not be subject to major traffic related severance for non-motorised users. In addition, your Petitioner asks your Honourable House to ensure that the Promoter works with the Mayor
of London to extend the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) to the whole of the area of Euston and its neighbouring areas, including Primrose Hill, which will be used by HS2 construction traffic. The Promoter should be required to fund this, if required.

26. Your Petitioner asks your Honourable House to compel HS2 Ltd to provide Air Quality monitoring throughout Primrose Hill and its immediate environs, to be agreed with the community and Camden Council, and to be funded, installed, maintained by HS2 Ltd and accessible to the public in real-time, from 12 months before commencement and throughout the period of construction.

27. Your Petitioner is concerned about the lack of assessment for cumulative impacts, both within the proposed works for HS2 and on other construction projects carried out within the area within the same timeframe, such as Crossrail 2 and asks your Honourable House to compel HS2 Ltd to undertake a full assessment, and open it up for public consultation and scrutiny, before any works actually take place.

28. A proper assessment of the full intra-project cumulative impacts should be issued for public consultation before your Petitioner can be sure that any traffic mitigation is sufficient.

29. The House of Commons Select Committee’s overall solution for Camden, that residents should rely on HS2’s assurances to Camden Council (as yet unknown), is a completely inadequate safeguard of the interests of the citizens of Camden as a whole. The Petitioner understands that no progress has been made in relation to traffic planning and impacts at all yet.

Traffic on Regent’s Park Road

30. Your Petitioner is particularly concerned about the use of Regent’s Park Road for construction traffic as she believes that neither the road nor the buildings on it will be able to withstand the pressure of dozens or hundreds of daily HGV journeys. Regent’s Park Road is a quiet residential road with a 20 mph speed limit, containing regularly spaced speed bumps. On the very rare occasions when a heavy lorry, perhaps transporting a skip, travels past your Petitioner’s Property, the walls, windows and floors at the front of the Property all vibrate. Your Petitioner feels that her Property, which was built in 1840 and lies on very shallow foundations, is not sufficiently robust to withstand the impact of large quantities of HGVs and other construction traffic passing by every day for many years.

31. Your Petitioner is also concerned about the use of Regent’s Park Road for diverted traffic. As stated above, your Petitioner is aware that she will suffer "significant adverse effects" as a result of AP3 both in terms of noise nuisance and toxic NO2, PM10, PM2.5 emissions, but is not clear what the split will be between HGVs and increased amounts of ordinary traffic.

32. Notwithstanding that it is the widest road in Primrose Hill village, Regent’s Park Road is still essentially a village high street, typically full of pedestrians, cyclists, mothers pushing prams and people walking their dogs. In recent years the Camden Butterfly Conservation Society has established two habitats for butterflies on Regent’s Park Road, both of which would be damaged if the essentially quiet nature of the road was to change.

33. Your Petitioner respectfully asks your Honourable House to compel HS2 Ltd to provide a binding undertaking that no part of Regent’s Park Road will be used 1) for HGVs or other construction traffic and 2) for any diverted traffic. This simple measure would help your Petitioner immensely; would reduce air
pollution considerably; would help to maintain the special peace and tranquillity of Primrose Hill village; and help to ensure that none of the independent village shops are forced out of business. It would also help to prevent accidents.

Utility works

34. Your Petitioner will also be impacted by proposed utility works in and around Primrose Hill village and the wider Euston area. Your Petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd provides an assessment on the impact of utility works on residents, including their duration and impact upon habitability, and residents’ ability to access emergency services and public transport. Your Petitioner also requests that HS2 Ltd provides detailed information pertaining to the cumulative impact of utility works on traffic and other disturbances including noise and air quality.

Compensation

35. The case for proper compensation for people affected by HS2 construction works is compelling. HS2 is a project of unprecedented scale and duration, and will affect more than an entire generation of people in Primrose Hill. Massively increased traffic movements, dramatic increases of air pollution, dust noise and vibration will all make Primrose Hill a less attractive place to live and work. The Promoter must ensure that people are able to move if they want to, as opposed to being obliged to satisfy the narrowly defined tests in the “need” to sell scheme. Your Petitioner believes that it is completely inequitable to deny people the chance to sell their property, cash in what is probably their life savings, and move away, if they decide to marry, up/down size or retire or for any other reason that is entirely personal to them. People have every right to receive full market value for their property if they sell.

There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights and interest of your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

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.

Signed

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

The Petition of DARWIN COURT RESIDENTS AND LEASEHOLDERS ASSOCIATION

Declares that:

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

2) Your Petitioners are the Darwin Court Residents and Leaseholders Association, Darwin Court, Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 7BG.

The Association was formed in 1978 to protect and further the general interests of Residents, Lessees and Owner-Occupiers of Darwin Court, comprising five blocks of 104 private flats in Camden, all of which the Bill will directly and specifically affect.

At an Extraordinary General Meeting of the Association on 23 April, 2014, the Association authorised Annabel Leventon to prepare a petition on the Bill. On 20 May, 2014, the Committee of the Association approved the petition which had been prepared; and authorised Annabel Leventon to present the Petition and for payment for lodging the petition to be made by a cheque from the Association.

3) Your Petitioners’ Concerns

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. Our concerns are:

a) the effect on Darwin Court of HS2 tunnelling beneath and beside us:

Your petitioners are deeply concerned about the possible damage to the structure of Darwin Court, built in the seventies, with no deep pile foundations, and with underground car parking full of pipes and boilers. The buildings are at serious risk from settlement and also from noise, vibration and damage once the trains are running. Tunnel and rail construction will continue night and day seven days a week. Your petitioners ask for a full and independent study of the immediate possible effects of tunnel construction and also of the cumulative effect over the long term of the tunnels and the running of the trains on the fabric of our buildings, of possible subsidence, noise (carried vertically in these seventies' blocks), vibration caused by the trains, damage caused by that vibration and the possible damage to, or even destruction of, the buildings themselves.
Compensation should be given if any damage or subsidence is caused to the buildings during construction and for a specified period after completion.

If residents have to move out while the tunnelling takes place, or our road becomes impassable from heavy traffic or blocked by construction works and works to sewers, etc., we should be compensated for temporary loss of our homes.

We should be compensated for any damage caused to the underground garages and/or the cars in those garages as a result of vibration or damage during the construction period and for a reasonable time afterwards.

Your petitioners should be entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes, especially at night. Any tunnelling works should be confined to normal working hours.

We request that HS2 keep within the existing Euston Station footprint, as originally planned, and that they guarantee the renovation of the present Station as part of their remit.

The ignored but excellent Double Deck Down concept would not only achieve both these objectives, it also proposes to start the tunnels closer to Euston, which would allow both tunnels to go under existing railway tracks. Your petitioners urgently request that you ensure all tunnelling should do this and that a full independent study should be carried out on Euston Design's Double Deck Down scheme.

b) The present severe blight caused by the plan to tunnel beneath Darwin Court:

London has a huge property boom at present, but Darwin Court is stagnant. Local estate agents confirm that whereas property values in the area have increased in the last year, Darwin Court has suffered a 20% loss. They attribute this to the threat of the tunnels beneath the blocks. Mortgages are being refused to would-be buyers. No compensation is being offered for this blight.

Your Petitioners believe that it is unjust that no compensation is on offer for the obvious loss of value to their property, when frequently this constitutes their only savings.

The Need To Sell scheme: The prospect of 20 years of construction traffic, the fear of pollution, the anxiety about the safety of the buildings themselves constitute real reasons to leave that are not covered by the “Need to Sell” scheme.

The Select Committee for the House of Commons recommended a relaxing of the Need to Sell criteria. We request HS2 commute this scheme to a “Want to Sell” scheme, without detailed investigations into our financial or family circumstances.
c) The effect on our community of 20 years of construction traffic, noise and pollution caused by the present plans to bring HS2 into Euston.

The residents of Darwin Court comprise a mix of the elderly and new young families, all of whom will be adversely affected by at least eighteen years of noise, vibration, pollution and safety risks imposed by huge numbers of extra lorries in the neighbourhood. Many older people prefer – or need – to travel by bus rather than underground. It may become impossible for them to get to and from Darwin Court when the buses are on diversion for years at a time.

The Promoter’s plan, to commandeer the Zoo Car Park as a holding area for HGV vehicles, will cause road closures and re-routing of buses. At present, Gloucester Avenue is a quiet residential street, a cycle route with little traffic, along which children go to and from school. It will be severely disrupted by extra traffic trying to avoid the congestion caused by the HGVs and road closures, and it risks becoming a rat run, posing a threat to pedestrians, children, cyclists and residents, from noise, air pollution and road accidents.

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

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

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

Your Petitioners ask you to ensure measures are put in place to protect their health.

We request that HS2 commit (as Double Deck Down suggests and can achieve) to removing all spoil and construction material by rail, not road or conveyor belt. This would reduce traffic problems to a minimum.

d) Use of Darwin Court private garden as a construction site

Your Petitioners are concerned at the Promoter’s requisition of the private garden at Darwin Court to use as a construction site. We ask you to provide compensation for all residents and leaseholders of Darwin Court for the loss of this amenity.
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.

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

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF PAUL ANTHONY AND ROSEMARY LOUISE ELIZABETH HOLLOWAY

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner is Paul Anthony and Rosemary Louise Elizabeth Holloway, resident at Meadowside, 3 St Mary’s Close, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LD, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

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

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
environmental benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wildlife access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.
g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.
h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.
i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.
j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the
dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Anthony Michael Jepson - Agent

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Richard Wolfe and Linda Wolfe

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

2. Your petitioners

Your Petitioners are Richard Wolfe and Linda Wolfe, resident at Ballinger Meadow, Herbert’s Hole, Ballinger, Great Missenden, HP16 9LQ, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed H52 line. Your Petitioners live in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3.1 Your Petitioners’ concerns

Your Petitioners are pensioners residing in a rural area between Ballinger and South Heath, approximately one kilometre from the proposed line. To reach the shops, trains and amenities at Great Missenden, Prestwood and Wendover your Petitioners must travel through South Heath, the village within which, under current plans, the high speed trains will emerge from a tunnel and travel north overground. Your Petitioners are regular walkers and riders through South Heath and will be adversely affected during both the construction and operation of H52.

Given that the tunnel portal is to be constructed within South Heath, the noise, dust and heavy traffic during construction will threaten the physical and mental health of everyone residing in or near South Heath. Once the train is operational the noise levels will continue to adversely affect people who live in and regularly move through the village. The Promoters’ claims that only a few houses in South Heath will be affected by noise flies in the
face of common sense and your Petitioners hope that the House of Lords will persevere in determining the true effects of construction and operational noise on the area.

Your Petitioners are also users of footpaths GM 12, 13 and 16 which will be severed during construction and their value as tranquil countryside walks permanently destroyed by HS2 as it is currently proposed.

Your Petitioners are the owners of an additional property in Ballinger that was on the market for eight months in 2015 before being withdrawn and have experienced first-hand the lowering of property values caused by the proposed construction of the train overground in the immediate area.

Heavy traffic generated on Frith Hill and the A413 near Great Missenden during the construction period is of particular concern to Your Petitioners given their health needs as pensioners. Both roads must be used for access to emergency and other hospital facilities at Stoke Mandeville and High Wycombe.

HS2 admits in the Environmental Statement that there will be significant negative effects on wildlife in the Central Chiltern area, including stating that that the line will have a significantly damaging effect on the already-scarce barn owl population. Your Petitioners currently enjoy the thrilling site of barn owls hunting on fields adjoining their property, which lies well within 3 km “kill corridor” wherein HS2 admits that the entire breeding population of barn owls is likely to be destroyed.

All of the adverse effects above would be mitigated by the extension of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB.

Your Petitioners moved their family to Ballinger in 2001 from a conservation area nearby, specifically to enjoy the beautiful rural views, walks, and wildlife of the surrounding Chilterns extending from Amersham to Wendover, believing that this environment would be preserved by the obligation of all public bodies to protect the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as stipulated in the The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Ministers and the House of Commons have failed to carry out this duty to protect, so it is now up to the House of Lords to do so.

It is impossible to justify an exception to this duty to protect by saying that a higher national interest is at stake. Whatever the national interest, the duty to protect may be fulfilled by allocating a relatively modest sum of money to extend the tunnel through the AONB, a sum that represents less than one half of one percent of the overall HS2 budget and also represents a tiny fraction of the £14 billion contingency amount built into the project. Taking the line through the Chilterns never should have been proposed without allocating sufficient budget to protect the AONB through tunnelling.
Your Petitioners know from the experience in the House of Commons that the Promoters will oppose further tunnelling by attempting to portray themselves as the protectors of the public purse against the Petitioners who would selfishly seek to cost the entire nation more money. We plead with your Lordships to see through this disingenuous posturing by the Promoters who are about to spend more than £60 billion of the tax payer’s money on their project. According to press reports last year HS2 already had 46 employees earning more than the Prime Minister and was paying salaries overall at double the national average. Simply bringing the HS2 salary bill down to average levels would generate sufficient savings many times over to finance the tunnel needed to protect the AONB.

The mitigation-only remit of the Lords Select Committee is based on the premise that the Promoters are correct in claiming HS2 is necessary in order preserving the economic well-being of the nation and that it will have enormous benefits for the economic development of other regions, especially the north of England. The very modest additional cost of protecting the Chilterns with short extension of tunnelling must therefore be evaluated in the context of these massive benefits to other areas.

Just as you are being asked to take into account all the intangible benefits claimed to accrue to other regions and the nation as a whole from the building of the trainline, it is your Petitioners’ plea that your Lordships will similarly take into consideration all the intangible benefits that will accrue to Chilterns residents, businesses and visitors from an extension of the tunnel through the AONB. You will be presented with evidence from our elected representatives and other groups that that these benefits more than outweigh the additional costs of tunnelling.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the 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 it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as in-obtrusive 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.
l. 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

m. 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

n. 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

o. 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that your 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.

Richard Wolfe & Linda Wolfe
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Chiltern Ridges HS2 Action Group  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner ('Your Petitioner') is Chiltern Ridges HS2 Action Group, ('CRAG'), a company limited by guarantee, formed in 2011 to represent the interests of residents within The Lee, Potter Row, Swan Bottom, South Heath, Ballinger and other neighbouring areas in Buckinghamshire, and covering areas included as CFAs 9 and 10 in Vol 2 of the HS2 Phase one Environmental Statement ('ES') issued by the Department for Transport ('DfT') and HS2 Ltd, all of which residents (hereinafter called 'Petitioner’s Residents') the Bill will, in some way, specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, of the proposed HS2 line.  

CRAG was established in order to support action to conserve, protect and improve the physical and natural environment of the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ('AONB') which will itself be specially and directly affected.  

CRAG has engaged directly with HS2 Ltd and its engineering consultants regarding their proposals for the line in this area and in particular regarding CRAG’s proposals for a tunnel continuing from the currently intended tunnel so as to secure a full tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB and these proposals, including those designated as T2, have also been specifically considered and addressed by DfT in Volume 2 CFA 9 of the ES referred to above and later developed by HS2 Ltd as T3i.  

Your Petitioner, CRAG, and the rights interests and property of the Petitioner's Residents who your Petitioner represents, are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
3. Your petitioner's concerns

(1) Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
As already indicated CRAG was established in order to support action to conserve, protect and improve the physical and natural environment of the Chiltern AONB and is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

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

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

It has been estimated that the landscape value of this area is of the order of £500 million to £750 million. The value of the damage to this national asset as a result of the construction of HS2 through it will be enormous.

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

Your Petitioner 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 undertakes and publishes a full cost benefit analysis of the environmental impacts for such AONB section

(2) The 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) 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 extension of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local
authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.
j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.
n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.
o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.
p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.
q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.

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

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413
b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that 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) .........................................................................................

Name ............................................................................................

(and add "Agent" if appropriate)

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

Date.................................................. 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF ALAN and Janet Joyner

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioners are Alan and Janet Joyner, resident at 7 Martin Dell Cottages Ballinger Road, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LA, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners live in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioners, as residents of this part of the AONB, are concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.
environmental benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wildlife access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.
g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.
h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.
i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.
j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the
dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

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

Anthony Michael~epson - Agent

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

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

THE PETITION OF George Everatt Barnaby and Sheila Patricia Barnaby

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioners are George Everatt Barnaby and Sheila Patricia Barnaby, resident at Flint Cottage, 3 Well Cottages, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LA, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners live in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Anthony Michael Jenson - Agent

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

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

THE PETITION OF MICHAEL PATRICK WYCOMBE HURD  

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Michael Patrick Wycombe Hurd, resident at Masters House, Crocketts Lane, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9JR, 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.
environmental benefits.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the
dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

............................................................
ANTHONY MICHAEL JEPSON - AGENT

[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 GILLIAN OWEN-CONWAY

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner is Gillian Owen-Conway, resident at Pond Cottage, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Great Missenden Bucks, HP16 9JY, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as 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 09.30 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains etc.

..............................................................
ANTHONY MICHAEL JEPSON - AGENT

[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] 17th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CHARLES OWEN-CONWAY

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner
   Your Petitioner is Charles Owen-Conway, resident at Pond Cottage, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Great Missenden Bucks, HP16 9JY, 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.
environmental benefits.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the
dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

.......................................................... ANTHONY MICHAEL JEPSON - AGENT

[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]17th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF JILL JONES  

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

Your Petitioner is Jill Jones, resident at Bakehouse, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9JP, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.  

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

3. Your Petitioner's concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  

Your Petitioner's property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner's enjoyment of 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 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 and by your Petitioner. The adoption of this proposal would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated.

Your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

j. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.3 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

COLIN REGINALD SULLY (Agent)
15th APRIL 2016
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CAROL OSBORNE

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Carol Osborne, resident at Highview, Sly Corner, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9LD, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

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

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioner’s property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner's enjoyment of 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.

-------------------

**COLIN REGINALD SULLY (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 JOHN WALKER AND VICTORIA WALKER

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is John and Victoria Walker, resident at Rocketer, Rocky Lane, Wendover, Bucks, HP22 6PR, 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 400 m from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes this area, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner’s enjoyment of the property, its surroundings and its value. Your Petitioner is also concerned about the noise impact as the trains pass by on large and high viaducts.

Your Petitioner uses Rocky 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 this 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 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 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 re-examined 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.

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

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

COLIN REGINALD SULLY (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 SIMON NAPIER-MUNN  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

Your Petitioner is Simon Napier-Munn, resident and freeholder at Keltoi, Swan Bottom, The Lee, Bucks, HP16 9NH, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

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

3. Your Petitioner's concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  

Your Petitioner's property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner's enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
You Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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

This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your Petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated.

Your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

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

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

c. That provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve 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
13th APRIL 2016
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CAROLYN WIDERA

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Carolyn Widera, resident at Autumn House, 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 wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.

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

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

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

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

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

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

j. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.3 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413
b. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
d. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

4. The prayer

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

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

COLIN REGINALD SULLY (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 JACQUELINE NAPIER-MUNN  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

Your Petitioner is Jacqueline Napier-Munn, resident and freeholder at Keltoi, Swan Bottom, The Lee, Bucks, HP16 9NH, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.  

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  

Your Petitioner’s property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner’s enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.  

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.  

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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

This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your Petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3I proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them and by your Petitioner. The adoption of this proposal would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated.

Your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

j. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.3 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413
b. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
d. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

4. The prayer

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

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

COLIN REGINALD SULLY
13th APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF JOHN POPE

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is John Pope, resident at 1, Rose Cottage, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9JL, 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 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 and by your Petitioner. The adoption of this proposal would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.
3.2. Alternative Mitigation

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated.

Your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

a. That further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental and social benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. That provision is made for constructing Green Bridges where there are established rights of way, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
d. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
e. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.
f. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.
g. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
h. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.
i. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.
j. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.3 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A413
b. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
d. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

4. The prayer

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

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

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

COLIN REGINALD BULLY (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 SHERYL POPE  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

Your Petitioner is Sheryl Pope, resident at 1, Rose Cottage, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9JL, 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:

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 ARABELLA NORTON

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Arabella Norton, resident at Mulberry House, Oxford Street, Lee Common, Bucks, HP16 9JP, who the Bill will affect both during construction of the proposed HS2 line and after completion.

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

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioner's property is located less than 2 km from the line of the proposed railway works between South Heath and Wendover in Buckinghamshire. As the line passes The Lee, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two viaducts and on embankments. This intrusion into the landscape both during construction and operation of the railway will seriously impact on your Petitioner's enjoyment of his property, its surroundings and its value.

Your Petitioner uses Kings Lane, Potter Row, Rocky Lane, Frith Hill and Leather Lane to access local services, including the railway, shops and health services, as well as for gaining access to the A413 and beyond. The use of sections of these roads for construction traffic and the congestion caused in the Chilterns area between Wendover and Gt Missenden will directly and specifically affect your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is a regular user of footpaths in the area, including those near Kings Lane, for recreational purposes. The proposed works to the south of Kings Lane and the use of land below Hunts Green for temporary storage of materials will result in your Petitioner losing a vital recreational facility.
Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect for many years and was attracted to the area by the fine landscape and the excellent opportunities afforded for a wide range of recreation.

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

This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities for which your Petitioner moved to this area and currently enjoys, and that lead to the AONB being visited over 55 million times a year by visitors from London and other area. Your Petitioner is further concerned that building HS2 on the surface will have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in which he lives during and for a period after its construction, and permanently and seriously reduce the ability of your Petitioner to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which he lives.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and in particular traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your Petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line for regular access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, and to the A413. Your Petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

Your Petitioner emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB, then the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated.

Your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

j. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.3 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and other measures

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effectiveness of the current CoCP and further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the CoCP legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413
b. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
c. In constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
d. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.
e. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
f. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

4. The prayer

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

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

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

COLIN REGINALD SULLY (Agent)

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF THE LEE PARISH COUNCIL  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

Your petitioner is The Lee Parish Council, a local authority situated to the east of the Misbourne valley representing approximately 700 residents, all of which (hereinafter called ‘Petitioner’s Residents’) will be in some way directly and specially affected, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line.  

The Lee parish is located in the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (‘AONB’) which will itself be specially and directly affected.  

The Lee Parish Council has regularly discussed the impact of the project on the village and its residents at its bi-monthly meetings. Its members have participated in the Community Forum process with representatives of HS2 Ltd since their inception in 2011. In addition The Lee Parish Council has submitted detailed consultation responses to the 2011 national consultation on High Speed Rail, the 2013 Draft Environmental Consultation and the 2014 ES Consultation. Your Petitioner and a great many Petitioner’s residents also petitioned against the Bill during its passage through the House of Commons.  

The Lee Parish Council fully supports The Chiltern Ridges HS2 Action Group’s (CRAG) proposals for a tunnel continuing from the currently intended tunnel so as to secure a full tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB.  

Your Petitioner, The Lee Parish Council, and the rights interests and property of the Petitioner’s Residents who your Petitioner represents, are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

3. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  

Given its location in the Chilterns AONB The Lee Parish Council is very concerned about the serious and injurious effects of the currently intended proposals for HS2 regarding this part
of the AONB. This is the only AONB that the proposed route of HS2 passes through between London and Birmingham. Your petitioner requests that it is given special consideration.

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 many of your Petitioner’s Residents moved to this area and currently enjoy, 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 the Petitioner’s Residents live during and after its construction and will permanently and seriously reduce your Petitioner’s residents enjoyment of the natural benefits of the area in which they live.

Your Petitioner is also seriously concerned about the daily disruptions to the Petitioner’s Residents lives 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’s Residents need to use the narrow lanes and roads which cross and will be affected by the construction of the proposed line for regular access to Great Missenden, Wendover and, in particular, 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 them for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner requests that the entire Chilterns AONB be protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The 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 many of the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

Your Petitioner requests that an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
Your Petitioner requests that if the proposal for a full tunnel throughout the AONB is rejected, then the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented.

Construction impacts

4. Roads, traffic and congestion management

Your petitioner is gravely concerned about the inadequacy of measures proposed to mitigate the effects of construction traffic and the intended diversions and road closures throughout the section of the proposed line which is in the AONB and in the Misbourne Valley in particular. Your Petitioner’s Residents need to regularly drive through the AONB across the proposed line to reach places of employment, to access shops and recreational and medical facilities, to access Great Missenden and Wendover and the rail stations located in these two villages and to gain access by car or train to London and other areas outside the AONB. They will therefore be significantly, directly and seriously impacted by traffic congestion throughout the area for the duration of the construction works.

Your Petitioner’s Residents regularly use the network of narrow lanes in the AONB which cross or run adjacent to the proposed line, including Leather Lane, Frith Hill (South Heath leg) Potter Row, Kings Lane, Bowood Lane and Chesham (Rocky) Lane, for the above and for recreation and leisure purposes and regard these as a characteristic feature of the area which should be protected in accordance with the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

Your Petitioner is also concerned that traffic seeking to avoid congestion during the construction period will inevitably place a further burden on the roads through this community, which are already under pressure and disrepair.

Your Petitioner therefore requests that HS2 Ltd be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by amending the Code of Construction Practice to enforce the measures set out hereunder and, for the avoidance of doubt, your petitioner would like to clarify that even if a full length tunnel proposal is accepted then certain road restrictions outlined below are appropriate and will still need to be applied:-

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, straightening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes

c. 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 so as to avoid the creation of the proposed temporary spoil dump at Hunts Green.

e. Requiring contractors in the AONB to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping standards and providing local authorities with the power to inspect such works and if appropriate sanction them.

f. Ensuring that during construction, nominated undertakers are responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, are returned to its original size and character and that all damage is repaired.

g. Operating a ‘Park and Ride’ scheme to transport construction workers along the trace, and securing its use by not providing parking for contractors employees at the construction compounds or in their vicinity.

h. Setting up a residents hotline through which they may raise any issues of concern during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the local roads. The local and highway authorities should have access to all reports, to ensure that all such issues are properly addressed and remedied within a reasonable length of time.

5. Noise during construction and train operation

Your Petitioner is concerned about the effects of noise arising from the construction of the high speed railway and associated development including heavy lorry traffic.

Your Petitioner is also concerned that the operation of the high speed railway will give rise to noise in this tranquil area of the AONB. Noise will severely impact upon the use and enjoyment of the properties of Petitioner’s Residents as well as on the neighbourhood’s general amenity.

Your Petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd should be compelled to specify and require the use of 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 properties and there are no other adverse effects of a kind that either reduces residents’ quality of life or the value of their properties. This should include the provision of suitable sound barriers which ensure compliance with World Health Organisation’s (‘WHO’) acceptable peak sound levels, particularly along the open and raised sections of the line, including viaducts and embankments.

Your petitioner is concerned that HS2 Ltd has not set proper noise thresholds and has ignored national policy and the views of the World Health Organisation in this area and that the impacts of ground-borne noise have not been properly considered or explained and that the limit set for ground-borne noise does not reflect recent best practice or experience.
Your petitioner therefore requests that HS2 Ltd be instructed to issue revised noise thresholds covering exposure to noise, in rural and urban areas, during the day and night, which reflect World Health Organisation guidelines, including those on peak noise (60db max pass-by outside, giving 45db inside); that HS2 Ltd be required to similarly set noise threshold limits for construction which are in line with World Health Organisation recommendations and that local authorities be provided with enforcement powers to order the cessation of construction activities in the event such anticipated exposures are breached. Further that HS2 Ltd be obliged to commit to designing the high speed railway to operate and operating the same in such manner that the revised noise thresholds are not breached.

Your petitioner requests that the speed of the trains be reduced, in accordance with the recommendations of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance with the World Health Organisation noise mitigation standards.

Your Petitioner requests that there should be binding mitigation measures, including an effective noise mitigation and monitoring system in place before commencement and during construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development.

These binding mitigation and monitoring measures should be decided by a panel of independent experts on the basis of independent expert evidence. For example the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee’s report entitled “HS2 and the Environment thirteenth Report of Session 2013-2014” dated 7 April 2014 recommended an independent body to monitor and publically report on all aspects of environmental protection needed for 60 years. Binding mitigation measures should therefore include but not be limited to full noise barriers and noise insulation for buildings and re-housing.

6. Dust and dirt during construction and train operation

Your Petitioner is concerned about dust and dirt produced both during construction and subsequent operation of the high speed railway and associated development and the effects of this on the properties of your Petitioner’s Residents and the environmental quality of the neighbourhood.

Your Petitioner is concerned that there are no binding mitigation measures in place in relation to emissions, especially in light of the proposed siting of the temporary spoil placement areas, prevailing wind directions and the amounts of earth to be moved.

Your Petitioner submits that in relation to dust there should be a comprehensive and binding management plan, with a clearly defined protocol and authority for the monitoring of its implementation by the local authority.
Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker provides forecasts showing the quantity and type of emissions that the construction will create based on the guidance on planning for mineral extraction in plan making and the application process issued 6 March 2014.

Your Petitioner requests that there is a requirement upon HS2 Ltd to undertake additional mitigation measures if dust becomes a nuisance to the adjacent properties and the neighbourhood. Your Petitioner submits that provisions should be made to ensure that the nominated undertaker takes responsibility for the reimbursement of your Petitioner’s Residents reasonable additional expense caused by dust and dirt.

Your petitioner requests the best means available for minimising noise, dust and/or vibration both during construction and operation are utilised.

Furthermore your petitioner requests that noise, dust and vibration monitoring equipment is installed at the construction and spoil sites for the duration of construction, that a monitoring programme is agreed with the Local or County Authority and that it is implemented with ability for the Authority to impose sanctions for breach and that finance be provided for this purpose. If monitoring shows that the noise, dust or vibration thresholds are exceeded, mitigation should be immediately required to be undertaken with sanctions for breach.

7. Air Quality

Your Petitioner is concerned about the potential adverse impacts on air quality as a result of the construction and operation of the high speed railway line and associated development. Your petitioner is particularly concerned about the air quality impacts of the Temporary Spoil Placement Area at Hunts Green Farm.

Your Petitioner requests that before construction commences there should be an air quality baseline monitoring study undertaken benchmarked against the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 and a copy of the relevant report should be provided to the Local Authority.

8. Working hours

Your petitioner objects to the working hours set out in the draft Code of Construction Practice. Your Petitioner’s Residents live near to construction sites and construction traffic routes and will therefore be directly affected by construction works and traffic for many years. The draft Code of Construction Practice provides HS2 Ltd with a broad discretion to undertake construction activities during unsocial hours with no independent powers either of oversight or enforcement.

Your Petitioner requests that working hours in the evening and weekend are curtailed and that Environmental Health Officers from Chiltern District Council be empowered to enforce
such requirements. No work should be undertaken outside construction core hours, other than at the discretion of local authority with justification being required.

9. Code of Construction Practice ('CoCP')

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. Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaker's ongoing accountability is also unspecified. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how lead contractors or their subcontractors will be made to comply or redress and/or appropriate action that might be available in the event that such contractors do not comply with the Code. Assessment in the environmental statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and its strategies will be fully effective. However, the Code has no legal status.

The standards set out in the environmental statement and the Code of Construction Practice is of "reasonableness" and "reasonable endeavours". Your Petitioner submits 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 and Community Forum Area. Measures should be subject to independent assessment, be verifiable and capable of challenge. This should also apply to noise and other deleterious effects that fall to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

Your Petitioner submits 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. Your petitioner requests that measures be taken and changes be made in the Bill or the Code of Construction Practice or by requiring binding undertakings from the Promoter to address the various concerns of your Petitioner as listed above.

10. Emergency Services

Your Petitioner is gravely concerned that the emergency services will be unable to provide timely support to your Petitioner's Residents due to road congestion during the construction period, and point out in particular that the A413 and A404 carry ambulances to the local A&E department at Stoke Mandeville, as well as all HS2 traffic to and from the AONB.

Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter enter into discussions with the relevant highway authority, South Central Ambulance Service, Buckinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service and Thames Valley Police and provide a comprehensive traffic management plan which will enable the continued operation of traffic, including emergency services traffic, and provide
an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.

The Promoter should also be required to consider by risk assessment whether, with many construction sites operating in the area, it should have such contingencies in place in the event of any industrial accidents.

**11. Finance for monitoring**

Your Petitioner is concerned about the absence of any measurable independent method of monitoring compliance by contractors and other bodies in connection with the above concerns relating to noise, vibration, dust, air quality and other construction issues.

Your Petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd be required to establish a ‘One stop shop’ operated by an appropriate Local authority in order to receive and deal with complaints and concerns of the residents both during and after construction.

Your Petitioner requests that the Local Authority should be provided with funding to undertake this responsibility, for monitoring and generally dealing with issues of non-compliance and enforcement.

**Long-term impacts**

**12. Visual impact - tree planting**

Your petitioner is concerned about the visual impacts in the AONB of the construction of works authorised by the Bill.

Your petitioner requests that tree planting is carried out prior to the commencement of any construction to ensure that screening is increasingly effective prior to construction and that such planting be designed in consultation with the local community to be in keeping with the surrounding environment.

**13. Visual impact - electricity pylons**

Your Petitioner is gravely concerned that the building of the line coupled with the existing electricity pylons and overhead lines alongside the line will create an unacceptable visual impact along the AONB section of the line from South Heath to Wendover in particular and that these, when coupled with raised embankments, viaducts, temporary spoil placement areas, raised bridges, the overhead line equipment that would supply power to the trains, acoustic and other fencing, will lead to significant detrimental landscape impact and create a major eyesore within the AONB. Your petitioner is further concerned that the work required to move such pylons has not been fully assessed or subject to any public consultation process.
Your Petitioner requests that, in the event that running the line through a continuous tunnel below the AONB is not accepted, then, as a minimum, the Nominated Undertaker should be instructed to permanently remove the electricity pylons along this section of the line (some of which are to be removed temporarily in any event) and that instead the power supply for this section be installed below ground.

14. Cumulative effect of damage and disruption between South Heath and Wendover

Your petitioner is concerned particularly about the inevitable cumulative long-term effect of environmental damage and disruption in the area between South Heath and Wendover. The destruction of ancient woodlands, loss of farmland and landscape, loss of visual amenity, impact of noise, the cuttings, embankments and viaducts severely impact on this area of the Chilterns AONB. Your petitioner observes that severe disruption to traffic will also arise from the proposed works at Wendover, in relation to the proposed Cut and Cover tunnel.

Your Petitioner strongly objects to the diversions and closure of public rights of way in the area which are important facilities for both local residents and visitors to the area.

To mitigate the impact in this area, in addition to the other specific remedies referred to in this petition, your Petitioner accordingly requests:

a. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there are established rights of way, including making these ‘Green Bridges’, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but for access for wild life, particularly given that this is part of the AONB. Your Petitioners request that such Green Bridges, both of sufficient number and in appropriate locations, should be included to mitigate habitat fragmentation and facilitate species movement.

d. That the speed of the trains be reduced in accordance with the recommendations of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report, in order to help mitigate the environmental impact.

e. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of high quality design and to be as visually pleasing as possible, with complete enclosure where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides.

f. 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.

15. Spoil and temporary placement at Hunts Green

Your Petitioner has a number of concerns about the predicted impact of the proposals for waste management and the way in which volumes of waste have been calculated.
Your Petitioner regards the use of ‘temporary’ placement in the AONB (at Hunts Green) as a contravention of the provisions protecting the AONB in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This large scale impact on the landscape is incompatible with its status as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. A temporary spoil heap, if created behind Hunts Green, will take years to repair and will, in any event, create an unacceptable scar on the AONB.

The creation of a temporary placement area in this location will also mean significant adverse impacts on people and property in the surrounding area as well as local biodiversity given the potential for dust to spread across a wide area.

Your Petitioner accordingly requests that the plans for the Hunts Green Temporary Spoil Dump be omitted and that HS2 Ltd be required to formulate an effective waste disposal strategy reflecting relevant legislative requirements. Such arrangements should include for spoil removal from the area to be by rail or pipeline.

Your Petitioner also points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, the amount of spoil created by constructing this section of the line will be substantially reduced and that, as it would also all be removed via the Wendover exit of the tunnel, arrangements could more effectively be made for it to be moved to suitable destinations by rail or pipeline.


Your Petitioner submits that, notwithstanding the recent changes made by the Promoter, the compensation provisions for property that is not compulsory acquired and other matters will not be sufficient to compensate your Petitioner’s Residents adequately for the loss and damage they will inevitably incur.

Your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended to ensure your Petitioner’s Residents who are injuriously affected and adversely affected by loss of value should be entitled to claim compensation for the full amount of loss attributable to the building of HS2. In particular, arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments, the Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.

17. Restoration of land after use for construction

Your Petitioner is concerned that land occupied and utilised by contractors during construction will not be immediately cleared and restored upon completion to a satisfactory standard for the AONB and that in the worst case that it will simply be abandoned by the contractors.

Your Petitioner requests that the Code of Construction Practice be amended to incorporate a requirement for contractors in the AONB to restore land without delay following the completion of each section of construction to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local
authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors failing to meet appropriate standards in acceptable timescales.

18. Community funds

Your Petitioner reminds the Committee that the communities bordering the proposed route of the line through the AONB between Amersham and Wendover gain nothing from the building of the railway but are expected to bear the brunt of railway construction for many years and subsequently the intrusion of its operation. These communities will be significantly affected during the railway's construction, with every aspect of community life being disturbed and such construction and operation of HS2 will not only radically change the nature of the area on a permanent basis, but also lead to a severe loss of biodiversity (including in hedgerows), adverse health effects on residents residing near the proposed route and a negative impact on the visitor economy.

Your Petitioner therefore requests that the Committee require the Promoter to provide funding in the amount of £500,000 each to Lee Parish Council, Great Missenden Parish Council and Wendover Town Council to enable specialised assistance in identifying key priorities for mitigating the community impacts of HS2 and investing in community facilities in the area to reduce the adverse impacts identified above.

19. Other Bill issues

Your Petitioner expects to be able to consult on the final version of the CoCP and any other relevant documents that are produced, prior to construction taking place.

Your Petitioner generally requests that measures be taken and changes be made in the Bill and the Code of Construction Practice and by obtaining binding undertakings from the Promoter to address and remedy the various concerns of the Petitioner as listed in this petition in the most appropriate manner.

20. Full Tunnel proposal

The Petitioner emphasises that the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 4 to 19 above would in large measure be unnecessary and the impacts would be significantly mitigated if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel through the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3 above.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended as requested above, the relevant clauses so far affecting your Petitioner should not be allowed to pass into law.
21. The prayer

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

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

............................................................................................................................
John Ford
Chairman, The Lee Parish Council
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 Chinnery and Patricia Daphne Chinnery

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

2. Your petitioners
Your Petitioners are, Richard Chinnery and Patricia Daphne Chinnery, resident at 1, Cornerwood Cottage, Swan Lane, The Lee, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9NT, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners live in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioners’ concerns

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

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

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

Your petitioners are also seriously concerned about the disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioners need to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and need to use the roads for access to 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 petitioners further regard this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere. Your petitioners believe that the pleasure of walking in the area of the Misbourne valley where surface line construction takes place will be effectively destroyed.

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 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. would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

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

a. That, if the additional tunneling is not accepted, then the design of the line along the section of the track between South Heath and Wendover Dean be revisited and deeper cuttings, with suitable sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate be adopted 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.

b. That provision is made for constructing bridges for all 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.

c. 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.

d. 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.

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 Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoils 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.

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

h. 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.

i. 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.

j. 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.

k. 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.

l. 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.

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

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

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the periods when the permitted routes are not busy or being used for school access.

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

c. Constructing access roads for the contractors and their vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads avoiding linking the same with the existing junctions and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.

d. 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

e. 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.

f. 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 and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

g. That the Promoter makes provision to ensure that during working hours medical emergencies receive a prompt response

h. 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

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

4. The prayer

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

Richard Chinnery

10th April 2016

Patricia Daphne Chinnery
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF JUDITH SYER

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner is Judith Syer, a pensioner resident at and freehold owner of Patchwicks, The Lee, Bucks HP16 9LZ, whom the Bill will specially, directly and injuriously affect, both during construction and after completion of the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Your Petitioner’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

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, 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, other areas
and abroad, have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and, for an extended period after its construction, permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area in which they live or the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area.

Your petitioner has lived in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) for over 20 years. Your petitioner was attracted to the area by the beautiful and protected landscape and by the excellent, wide range of facilities, including for access, walking and cycling, which would be available to your petitioner leading to a peaceful, happy and, hopefully, healthy retirement.

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, vibration, traffic movements, congestion, access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner uses on a daily basis Leather Lane, Potter Row, Kings Lane, Frith Hill and/or Rocky Lane to access local services, including the station, shops, health services, taking/collecting grandchildren to/from school, as well as for gaining access to the A413 for other Buckinghamshire towns such as High Wycombe, Wendover, Aylesbury etc and beyond. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area. Regular closure of these roads and their use by construction vehicles during the period of construction of the works authorised by the Bill will result in your petitioner being isolated from these services and in delays which will increase the time, cost and stress for your petitioner to access them.

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

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated. Your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by the provision of a full tunnel, 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. Previous proposals had these cuttings at 9 metres deep.

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

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there are established rights of way, thus reinstating all footpaths which are scheduled to be severed, 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 which under current proposals are not met.

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 while within the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and 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, described 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, the Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations 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. 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 your Petitioner will ever pray, etc.

JUDITH SYER
17th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

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

THE PETITION OF Christopher John Owen Syer  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

Your Petitioner is resident at Patchwicks, The Lee, Bucks, HP16 9LZ, and one whom the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.  

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  

Your Petitioner as a resident of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB. In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.  

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

Your petitioner's primary concern is that of property blight. After living for twenty-four years in a large house in The Lee with about an acre of garden, your petitioner and his wife who are both retired, wish to downsize. Although The Lee is outside the compensation area, nevertheless the whole village is blighted and it is impossible for any house to sell at a price anywhere near its pre-HS2 value. Your petitioner thus applied to put on a very small extension, with a view to adding a second front door and dividing the house, so that part of it could be occupied by live-in help, or possibly other family members, who would be able to assist with maintaining the house and garden. Both this and a second application for planning permission have been rejected, as has a subsequent appeal.

It is ironic that whilst the visual impact of HS2 is regarded in some quarters as acceptable, this minor addition to a house, conceived only as a necessary response to HS2, is not. Your petitioner and his wife are now trapped in a property too large for them, possibly for the rest of their lives. It will become an ever-increasing burden as they continue to grow older, yet they are denied both compensation and the means of a rational response to the impact of HS2.

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

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

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

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there are established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve 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, which will be visible from your petitioner's house, are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.

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

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

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

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

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

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl
Gillian 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.

Christopher John Owen Syer
17th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Christopher David Glyn-Jones

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Christopher David Glyn-Jones, resident at Hillyers, Chiltern Road, Ballinger, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire HP16 9LH, who will be 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's residence is approximately 1.6 kilometres North East of the proposed South Heath portal of the tunnel, much of the intervening ground being open fields which provide only limited attenuation of sound. Currently both traffic on the more distant A413 Missenden bypass and trains on the Chiltern Line are often clearly audible from Ballinger. It is reasonable to suppose that the sound of HS2 combined with the proposed frequency of service will be seriously disruptive, even as far as Ballinger.

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 road from Ballinger, through South Heath, to the A413 for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to London and all other areas. Access to the A413 is already heavily congested during the morning rush hour and use of these roads by construction traffic is likely to add very significantly to the problem.

Furthermore, Your Petitioner and his family will lose recreational access to large areas of the AONB which will be enclosed both during and after construction of the cutting between South Heath and Wendover, while pollution, from dust, fumes and noise, will be a problem during the construction phase; the dust and fumes are of particular concern to the petitioner who suffers from asthma and chronic sinusitis; noise from the trains, once running, will have a seriously adverse impact on the peace for which this area is noted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

q. That 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.

Christopher David Glyn-Jones

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

Colin Sully(Agent)

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

ALLAN FORBES WHITTOW AND JANET MARGUERITE WHITTOW

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners

The Petitioners are householders and residents of 29 years at Concord in the hamlet of Kings Ash in the parish of The Lee, on the Ridgway Link trunk footpath to Wendover, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), having chosen to live here because of the AONB qualities and level of statutory protection guaranteed. They would be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

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

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioners believe that there have been serious shortcomings in the process as implemented by the Government which, while not invalidating the House of Commons’ right to proceed with the HS2 project, do invalidate their claim to have handled it in a professional manner (and may explain The Economist’s conclusion this week that smaller scale projects would be a better way to increase rail capacity):

- No upfront definition of the problem that needs addressing: HS2 remains a political solution still looking for a problem – witness the frequent changes in justification as each in succession was found wanting: financial returns, CO2 and traffic reduction, reviving the North, reducing overcrowding on trains (what about London commuters?)

- No alternatives considered or evaluated against specified objectives.
• No sensitivity analysis to reveal the impact of forecasts and assumptions not being met

• Failure to reflect environmental concerns (eg Aarhus principles). No Cost Benefit Analysis to reflect all the economic implications of the project – so implementation decisions, eg additional tunnels, has been assessed only on the government cash impact, ie landscape saved/lost excluded

• Unjustifiable initial assumption that nobody would be affected (or compensated !) beyond 200M, so the route was chosen to (just) miss specific buildings !

• Petitioning restricted to those with a personal direct locus standi – it is fine to discourage armchair petitions, but this limitation is quite inappropriate when considering a valued national or at least London/South East regional resource: the annual number of visits to the Chilterns is roughly equivalent to the whole population of England. [No more than two or three parkkeepers actually live in Kensington Gardens, but nobody suggested Crossrail should therefore run on the surface there. Even fewer people actually live on the A303 where it runs past Stonehenge.]

Long Tunnel

Your Petitioners contend that tunneling through the whole of the Chilterns AONB is the most logical and economic way to preserve the Chilterns, rather than adding piecemeal fixes in some of the more developed areas – though it is the least populated and most rural areas that are the most attractive to visitors and the most valuable to the nation as a whole. It would also save the punishing curves and gradient changes in the current proposed route. With a proper assessment of the environmental value preserved, and the saving of almost all compensation and unsightly/ineffective mitigation efforts, a full bored tunnel would improve the value of the project and its Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR – currently barely break-even, and well below that expected of more modest infrastructure projects).

HS2 Ltd have accepted that tunneling through the rest (the final 40%) of the Chilterns AONB is feasible from both a construction and operating perspective, can be done within the timescales envisaged for the project, would provide significant benefits to local communities and businesses, and of course would be environmentally much better than their proposed scheme. We are talking about a fairly small area of often open countryside, so to tunnel only 60% achieves significantly less than 60% of the landscape protection, its tranquility and beauty, of a full tunnel.

Requiring the construction of an extended bored tunnel from the current proposed northern outlet at Hyde Heath to well north of Wendover, based on T3i proposals as developed by HS2 Ltd would remove most of the objections to HS2 raised for the route across the Chilterns, and therefore save most of the
costs of damage to the environment and property values, whether or not HS2 Ltd already plan compensation and mitigation.

The Petitioners also fear that Government policy may inadvertently make the whole project a waste of money: if they try to conceal the capital cost (at least £100bn even at today’s prices) by financial arrangements to keep it off the PSBR figures by outsourcing provision of rolling stock etc under some form of PFI or operating contract, it is likely the contractor, like today’s train operators, will have every incentive to run only those trains they can fill at high prices, leaving the expensive track seriously underutilized, reducing the arguably over-optimistic benefits from the project and therefore making the whole project a huge loss-maker.

These considerations may enable their Lordships’ House to make worthwhile improvements to the Bill and any subsequent implementation.

The Petitioners’ concerns during the **construction phase** can be summarised as: the adverse impact on the local road network (both Rocky Lane which would become a rat-run even if properly denied to construction traffic, and the A413 which is already very heavily used and often congested) causing delays in travelling to shops and accessing emergency services; the reduction in property values for owners seeking to realise investments in their homes; and the noise, dirt, and Public Right of Way disruption that will be generated by the works. The Petitioners therefore seek their Lordships’ agreement to support proposals such as those from Cheryl Gillan MP and others for the setting up of an independent Chilterns review group with the authority and funding to determine and enforce a Code of Construction Practice to manage the volume and scope of construction traffic that the nominated undertaker is allowed (both times of day and roads/lanes banned), protecting existing routes and lanes (including reinstatement afterwards), avoiding any links to A413 that might lead to further congestion, and considering any other problems identified by citizens or requests from the nominated undertaker. Local Authorities should be reimbursed for extra costs incurred during construction.

The Petitioners concerns during the **operational phase** can be summarised as: the disruption to sleep caused by obstrusive noise generated by passing trains in late evenings and early mornings; the visual and noise impact of the proposed Small Dean and Kings Ash/Durham Farm Viaducts and associated embankments with noise barriers reducing the appeal of this part of the AONB; and associated impact on property values for current and future generations.

The petitioners propose that a fully bored tunnel through the whole of the rest of the AONB would be an effective solution to all the construction and subsequent phase impacts.

Failing a decision for a fully bored tunnel, your petitioners propose that **mitigation provisions** be imposed which ensure the best possible (though
largely inadequate) mitigation measures are provided and also incorporated in
the BCR projections for HS2. These should at a minimum include

- Lowering the track levels across the AONB
- Sound-proof box covers on viaducts
- Substantial (say 100m each side) native tree planting next surface sections
- Bunds and soundproofing to minimize noise – even at extra intrusion on
the landscape
- ‘Green Bridges’ to facilitate tree cover and wildlife access across the track
- Arrangements/facilities to minimize road transport of spoil by using rail,
belt or pipeline – note that the amount of spoil is far more for an open
cutting than a tunnel, and that a tunnel’s spoil can be excavated using the
tunnel whether bored from both ends or one way as seems preferable

The Petitioners note that the original proposal’s Compensation proposals were
unjustifiably restrictive and intrusive, being limited by the type of property and
ownership, the personal circumstances or owners/occupiers, distance from the
track, a minimum time on the market etc. They beg to remind the house of Lords
that Compensation means leaving the victim no worse off, at least in financial
terms, than before the event. The only criterion should be the financial loss due
to the project. Some of the restrictions have been eased, and HS2 Ltd have
indicated they intend to be more flexible in considering applications.
Improvements are welcome, but should be made available as of right rather than
relying on the munificence or goodwill of the project’s proposers. The Need to
Sell scheme illustrates the problem, and should be rewritten as Wish to Sell.
While there no need to go beyond fair compensation, the promoter may wish to
consider whether a standard formula might save time and administration if it was
enough to persuade many property owners to accept it and save the hassle of
individual claims: independent local valuers should be appointed to advise the
promoter on such or similar schemes.

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.

Signed

Allan Forbes WHITTOW Janet Marguerite WHITTOW

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF PAUL AND HILARY APICELLA  

 Declares that:  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

Your Petitioner is Paul and Hilary Apicella, residents at The Old Post House, The Lee, 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 approx. 1,000m 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 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.

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

BARNABY USBORNE (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 Neville Hugh Morton and Rosemary Morton  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioners  
Your Petitioners are Neville Hugh Morton and Rosemary Morton, resident at 53, Dobbins Lane, Wendover, HP22 6DL, 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 Petitioners’ concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioners as residents of Wendover and its environs in the Chilterns AONB are concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.  

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

Your petitioners are also seriously concerned about the disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your Petitioners contend that the use of 6-metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Your petitioners need to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and need to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioners further regard this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and are also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

Your Petitioners request that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3I proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

Your Petitioners request that an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full AONB tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.2. Your Petitioners accordingly emphasise that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioners request that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

Hierarchy of Mitigation

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover by boring or mining be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with improved mitigation and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries, and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there are established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wildlife access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of 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 point 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.

j. 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.

k. 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.

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

m. 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.

n. 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.

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

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

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

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

[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]

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Anna Mary Ludlow

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner is Anna Ludlow, resident at 3 Furzefield Lane, Lee Gate, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9NR, 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 chooses to live in this part of the Chilterns AONB because it is uniquely quiet and beautiful – a sanctuary within easy reach of London – and considers the peace and rural character of the AONB surroundings to be more important in a home than the greater space and comfort which could have been available elsewhere in a suburb for the same cost. Therefore, your petitioner chose to purchase a tiny, cramped cottage in order to enjoy living in the sanctuary of the AONB.

Your Petitioner is, therefore, very 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 Conventions.

Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section means that the noise of frequent high speed trains and the visual impact of the railway viaducts will destroy the very qualities of tranquillity and beauty which make this area a sanctuary.

Your Petitioner contends that the presence of the railway and the operation of the high speed trains in the area will seriously reduce the ability of all residents of the area to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live, and will deter the people who make up the over 50 million visits per year to the area from visiting, reducing the options available in the UK for visitors seeking beauty spots to visit.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to normal living 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 and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and destinations to the west. In particular, your petitioner has to make frequent car journeys to Gloucestershire to visit very ill relatives and likely delays to journey times raise considerable concern. 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 contends that the character of the Chilterns AONB is such a valuable national asset that it should be protected for the enjoyment of the whole UK population, and requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.
3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Anna Ludlow

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

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

THE PETITION OF Nigel Philip James Pollard

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Nigel P J Pollard, resident at 3 Furzefield Lane, Lee Gate, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9NR, 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 has made a significant sacrifice to be able to live in this part of the AONB, electing to live in a cramped cottage with a tiny garden, half the size of what could have been bought for the same amount in a suburban estate, and has made the sacrifice for the sake of being able to live in silent and beautiful countryside, but with good access to work clients in the South East.

Your Petitioner is, therefore, very 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, and that the noise of the planned frequent high speed trains will give the area an urban character.

Your Petitioner contends that this altered character of the area will seriously reduce the ability of all residents of the area to enjoy the natural benefits of the area in which they live, and will deter the people who make up the over 50 million visits per year to the area from visiting, forcing those visitors seeking peaceful excursions from London and other nearby towns to have to travel much further to get away from urban noise.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to normal living 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 and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and destinations to the west. 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 contends that the character of the Chilterns AONB is a valuable national asset and is well worth protecting for the enjoyment of the UK population, and requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3i proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spill 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
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.

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

Nigel P J Pollard

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

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

THE PETITION OF ROGER DAVID ELLIS

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner, Roger David Ellis, is resident at St. Annes, Blackthorne Lane, Ballinger,  
Bucks. HP16 9LN, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

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

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

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

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A 413 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 it is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where
appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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.

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

Roger David Ellis

15th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF ANNE FIONA ELLIS  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner, Anne Fiona Ellis, is resident at St. Annes, Blackthorne Lane, Ballinger, Bucks. HP16 9LN, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.  

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.3 Your petitioner further requests that the nominated 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.

Anne Fiona Ellis

15th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

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

THE PETITION OF ROGER TURNER  

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Roger Turner for Dr G M Turner Will Trust, resident at Park Farm, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9LT, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.  

I farm at Park Farm and surrounding area and I am concerned at the land take and access restrictions to the land I farm.  

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.  
Being able to continue farming in the manner that we have been with the parcels of land being opposite sides of the proposed HS2 line.  

The disruptions to the farm will result from the construction of the line and the dust, hours of work, vibration, traffic movement, congestion and access problems 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 accessing all parcels of land farmed at the bottom of Leather Lane and along the A413 at Little London.
Your petitioner is very concerned by the effect on the AONB as a whole. The loss of the peace and tranquillity in this beautiful landscape which will be lost now and for future generations and impact on the large and diverse wildlife population living in it.

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

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

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with larger sound barriers and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be extended to the south and north of Wendover.
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wildlife access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent
embankments be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.
g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.
h. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump are substantially reduced and minimised and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.
i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.
j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as inobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.
o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.
p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.
q. That an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
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.

---------------------------------

Roger Turner

15th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF GERALD RICHARD ANTONY TOMKINS and MARIAN DOROTHY TOMKINS

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

2. Your petitioners
Your Petitioners are Gerald Richard Antony Tomkins and Marian Dorothy Tomkins, 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 Petitioners are both retired and are married. They are aged 77 and 76 years respectively. They have resided at Winslydale, Sly Corner, Lee Common, Gt.Missenden, HP16 9LD for 27 years and are the joint freehold owners. They are approximately two kilometres from HS2 line. This property enjoys a tranquil and safe location and will be directly affected during construction and operation of HS2.

Your Petitioners, are 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 Petitioners are residents of this part of the AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB.

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

Your 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 Petitioners are very concerned about the traffic problems which will arise during the course of construction. As they have become older they will increasingly rely on help from their family. One of their sons resides at Hazlemere near High Wycombe and another resides at Monks Risborough. In order to travel from Lee Common to Hazlemere or Monks Risborough or vice versa it is necessary to use the Frith Hill roundabout on the A413 at Great Missenden. Inevitably motorists will look for alternative routes which will also become congested. The nearest hospitals are at High Wycombe and Amersham and Stoke Mandeville which is the only one with an A & E department. In order to reach them your Petitioners will have to cross the A413 at some point. In the event of an emergency a long detour or traffic congestion could seriously delay an ambulance on route to the A & E department at Stoke Mandeville. Your first named Petitioner has mobility problems and attends the Chiltern Hospital at Great Missenden for hydrotherapy every week. It is impossible to reach there without using the A413. Your Petitioners nearest library is at Great Missenden which can only be reached by using the above mentioned Frith Hill roundabout.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed
railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND Your Petitioners remains, etc.

GERALD RICHARD ANTONY TOMKINS MARIAN DOROTHY TOMKINS

Dated the 15th day of April 2016.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Bryan Hart

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioners is Bryan Hart, resident at Furzefield Farm, Furzefield Lane, Lee Gate, Great Missendens, 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 the construction period and permanently and seriously reduces 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 caused to cyclist in the area during the construction process. The petitioner is a keen cyclist who frequently uses the Lane and paths affected by the construction the deposits of clay and debris from construction traffic will seriously impact the many hundreds of cyclists who use these access routes weekly. In addition there are several national cycle events held annually along the A413 and adjoining roads that will be adversely affected by construction traffic with detrimental impacts to commercial and recreational interests. HS2 Ltd through the Select Committee in the House, have assured the Petitioner that they will comply with Construction Methods statements for clearing roads but their mitigations are self-managed and inadequate given the scale of the project and the predicted traffic volumes on the A413. The Petitioner asks that an independent monitoring organisation be set up to record incidents where non-compliance can be remedied and prosecuted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by
construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the
railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust
and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and
controlled and that air quality is maintained
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the
AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing
with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and
temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that
local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary
sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be
responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after
construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and
character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during
working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the
Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary
additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to
put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime
in the area, during construction
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern
arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any
damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access
to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable
length of time.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Bryan Hart
17th April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF CLLR SEB BERRY (GREAT MISSENDEN WARD, CHILTERN DISTRICT COUNCIL)
Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill, because he was elected to Chiltern District Council in 2011 and again in 2015 and has devoted his period in office to serving his village and ward residents blighted by the promoter’s scheme. Your petitioner has worked part-time since his election in order to represent the village on HS2 issues to the best of his ability and because the demands placed on all directly affected local representatives as a direct result of the promoter’s scheme are exceptional. Prior to the commencement of the Commons petition process, your petitioner participated in unsatisfactory formal bilateral meetings with the promoters of the Bill to discuss mitigation measures for Great Missenden village and played an active role making the case for improvements to the scheme during the flawed Community Forum process.

2. Your petitioner represents Great Missenden Ward residents who will be very directly and injuriously affected by the proposed 8 year local construction period and operation of the railway, and yet he was denied locus standi during the Commons AP4 hearings held in January 2016. The promoter argued successfully that an individual Ward Councillor (and indeed all Great Missenden resident petitioners) had no right to present the case for further changes to the AP4 scheme on the grounds that a similar case could be made by the Local Authority/ies.

3. Great Missenden village residents and businesses regret therefore that as a result of the agreement later reached in the committee corridor between the promoter and Bucks County Council, that no such opportunity was given to Chiltern District Council to formally address the Commons committee on the severe community, business and social impacts of the revised scheme on communities to the West of the railway and in particular on the key AONB commercial hubs of Great Missenden and our neighbouring village of Prestwood.
4. Your petitioner considers that the AONB railway route, design and construction contradicts Paragraphs 115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires developers to ensure that “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty” and fails to discharge the duty imposed on the Secretary of State for Transport pursuant to section 85(1) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to “have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.”

5. Great Missenden is central to the wider AONB economy, including tourism. Your petitioner is concerned at the lack of any attempt by the promoter to consider the negative impact of the scheme on the AONB tourist industry and on Great Missenden in particular. Great Missenden is situated in the very heart of the Chilterns AONB and its >50 village businesses (almost all independent businesses) and wide range of health, education, local transport and other services reflect the significance of the village to the AONB and to the communities within it. Great Missenden has a population of 2,500, making it by far the largest of the Misbourne valley and ridge top villages directly impacted by the promoters’ scheme in this part of the AONB.

6. Great Missenden is also a tourist and day tripper destination in its own right. The village is home to the internationally famous Roald Dahl museum, which attracts over 80,000 visitors to the village per annum, including approximately 12,000 school children in organised school trips and yet the promoter has consistently failed to consider the negative impact of its scheme on our crucial local tourist economy.

7. Your petitioner is concerned that the measures contained in AP4 will worsen levels of congestion and rat-running in the village, with direct negative impacts on the tourist economy and the long-term financial viability of businesses in the village. It is worth emphasising that no group or individual locally actually petitioned the Commons for the tunnel portal to be moved to South Heath. To this extent the Chairman of the Commons Select Committee’s 21st July 2015 statement asserting that “the case has been made for an extension of the bored tunnel to the northern end of the South Heath green tunnel,” came as a surprise. The fact that the promoter had been working on the C6 option prior to the Commons Select Committee’s 21st July 2015 decision to rule out all AONB long tunnel options and even the REPA proposal of a short tunnel extension to Leather Lane north of Great Missenden and prior to any local group or resident petition hearing, came as a total shock to local people.
8. The promoter acknowledges that the C6 scheme’s reliance on a new haul road from the Link Rd roundabout will result in a "major adverse significant impact" at the A413/Link Rd junction. This represents a very significant worsening of the impact as reported in the scheme’s original Environmental Statement.

9. Despite the private agreement reached in January 2016 between the promoter and Buckinghamshire County Council to consider options for moving the haul road further north, at the time of writing it is unclear whether the promoter has provided all of the necessary baseline information which the Highways Authority needs to try to develop alternative solutions, all subject to local consultation.

10. I am disappointed that this crucial issue for our village was not aired properly during the Commons Select Committee phase of the Bill, despite concerns being expressed by Committee members about the impact of the revised scheme on the village of Great Missenden, nor do I have confidence that in practice Bucks CC will be in a position to deliver an alternative given the onerous conditions insisted upon by the promoter in the January agreement. At the HS2 Summit hosted by Bucks CC on 24 March 2016 and attended by the promoter, the Leader of the Council spelt out that the portal haul road conditions set by HS2 Ltd were onerous. He said “these were going to be very difficult to deliver given the time, finance restraints, land acquisition and other resources including officer time.”

11. In particular it is unclear why the promoter has insisted that it is not prepared to pay more for a more environmentally and socially acceptable alternative site for the portal haul Rd ie well to the north of Great Missenden village.

12. Your petitioner is concerned that the addition of the access road satellite compound immediately adjacent to the A413, the repositioning of electricity pylons, the relocation of two material stockpiles to the new access road, the requirement for 10.6 ha of additional land for the construction of the new portal access road on land directly opposite the village centre and the 8 year operation of the main Chiltern north portal satellite compound, will have a severe visual impact on sight-lines from the village centre, plus associated noise and air quality impacts on people living, working in and visiting Great Missenden.
13. Your petitioner is dismayed that despite the promoter's claim in July 2015 that C6 would benefit people "in" Great Missenden, the Bill largely ignores the impacts of the revised scheme on the largest population centre in the Community Forum Area 9 area by failing to consider the socio-economic impacts of the scheme for businesses in the village and in particular its impacts on tourism.

14. Your petitioner believes that the only practicable solution to the noise, transport, local economy, environmental destruction and other negative impacts of the promoter's scheme is a fully bored tunnel throughout the entire AONB. That is the only measure that would fully deliver the Prime Minister's promise to develop HS2 in the "most environmentally friendly way possible." A full AONB tunnel is the only way to protect Great Missenden village and the central Chilterns area in its entirety, delivering very significant environmental advantages including (but not limited to) minimal disruption to our community and to its vital local businesses and services, no loss of jobs, no loss or severance of farmland, a significant reduction in noise issues, much reduced impact on wildlife and local biodiversity, limited damage to the vital AONB tourist economy and amelioration of stress, anxiety and depression among local residents.

15. If a full AONB tunnel is rejected, I ask that the Committee looks again at the position of the "C6" tunnel portal site and considers moving it northwards well away from Great Missenden village and South Heath, accepting however that even the REPA C5 option is not a panacea for this area and that a short tunnel is an inferior alternative to a full AONB tunnel.

16. Your petitioner further requests that Members of the Committee visit our village for a public meeting with members of the village association and our business community and also to visit the extended C6 portal site area, including the proposed new access road, before reaching a decision on the extended tunnel issue.
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that he, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Cllr Seb Berry (Great Missenden Ward, Chiltern District Council)
15th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Philippa Jane Hart
Declares that:
1. The petitioner (‘Your Petitioner’) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Philippa Jane Hart – resident at Furzefield Farm, Furzefield Lane, Lee Gare, Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9NR, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

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

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

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

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

Your petitioner’s daughter is a keen horse rider. She is a member of a local Pony Club and in the past six months has passed her Road Rider Safety exam. Although only 13 she is a competent rider is now allowed her ride on the roads around the village. The yard where her horse is stabled is surrounded by fields, but there is no public right of way to these fields, and riders have to go onto the road to access any countryside. With care the roads are reasonably safe to ride on - but they will become lethal once the lanes around the village becomes a rat run to avoid the construction traffic and jams on the A413, particularly Rocky Lane/Chesham Lane which is already the main route between Wendover and Chesham. Many riders will take their lives in their hands just setting foot outside their yard. Once they do have access to the countryside, they will also find that access to many of their favourite hacks are restricted - and in the future it would be suicidal to hack near the the HS2 line with the intermittent roar of the trains terrifying the horses!

Your petitioner is a portrait photographer and the majority of her work is photographing families and young children. She is absolutely passionate about community and people, and in particular the people and characters that work together to make The Lee the unique community that HS2 will almost certainly destroy.

The effects of HS2 both in the short and long term will have a catastrophic effect on our community. In the short term the construction will put off people buying property in the village. At best the properties that HS2 have purchased will stay rented, at worst
they remain empty. Those who would like to sell might end up renting their properties.

Already key contributors to our village who are planning for their retirement are having to make the difficult decision to sell and move now – rather than in a few years time when their properties could potentially become white elephants, particularly the larger ones. The drain on our community has already begun. It does not take much imagination to accept that families who move into a community in the short term do not necessarily tend to feel the need to "invest" in the community they have moved to. They might turn up at an event but they are less likely to volunteer to help.

It only takes a few active members of the community to leave the village, particularly retired householders who historically have more time to volunteer, for the house of cards to come tumbling down. Within a few years some of our most special events could end - and once they have gone it is unlikely they will come back.

Similarly the applications for both Leeside Nursery and Lee Common primary school are likely to be affected because of those living out of catchment choosing not to make the journey to the Lee - and your petitioner can assure you that it is these extra "out of catchment" pupils on which these schools rely to keep their numbers viable. Losing our schools would overnight rip the heart out of our community.

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

Your predecessors passed legislation in 1965 to make the Chilterns an AONB. They did this for a reason and I beg you to respect their decision-making and not allow our unique community and countryside to be destroyed. Please please please recommend that the only way HS2 passes through the AONB is in a tunnel.
3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a full tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by
construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response.
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

PHILIPPA JANE HART

17th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

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

THE PETITION OF Stephanie Garner  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly affected by the Bill in relation to the proposed development of the Euston throat and railway cutting along Mornington Terrace within the Borough of Camden.  

2. The petitioner is the joint owner-occupier with Neil Garner of 10 Mornington Terrace, London NW1 7RR. The property is a five story Victorian terraced house located close to the Euston throat and directly adjacent the railway cutting, fifty metres south of the Mornington Street Bridge.  

3. The proposed Bill specially and directly affects us in a number of ways:  

General concerns  

1) We have concerns that the demolition and rebuilding required to facilitate the design of the HS2 two tier tunnel system within the Camden Cutting area will have a direct and severe impact on the quality of our family life.  

Sub surface safeguarding and communication  

2) Our first concern is very specific to our location and involves the demolition of Mornington Street Bridge and construction of temporary bridge crossing the cutting between Mornington Terrace and Park Village East. Our house is one of 4 terraced properties on the Mornington Terrace side identified as the site for sub surface anchors for the construction of the temporary bridge and has been under Notice of Compulsory Purchase since November 2013. We have been advised that the anchors will be secured via horizontal bore holes directly underneath our house or the adjacent properties at a depth of approximately 9 metres. Our property was built with shallow foundations on London Clay in 1859 and is subject to seasonal fluctuations due to the rise and fall of the water table. In addition, we have been led to believe that the sub surface of the adjacent road is in-filled with unstable components, created during the original railway cutting construction. Added to this, a tributary of the river Fleet runs only a few feet below our Terrace, so these combined features give us additional concerns about sub-surface works, which might destabilize our house.  

3) Despite numerous attempts through the HS2 helpline requesting further information and informal discussions with HS2 contracted surveyors in the area, we have not been able to obtain any details of this proposed sub surface work, the exact location of the temporary bridge, the specific location of the proposed bore holes, the methods of construction, the level of ground borne noise/vibration, whether we will be required to vacate our property during the installation of the anchors, whether the anchors will be removed once the permanent bridge is rebuilt and what level of compensation will be available to
us for this potentially very disruptive and damaging work. We request that HS2 commissions a full structural survey of our house along with the adjacent properties as soon as possible. We are very concerned in the complete lack of communication, information, engagement and assurances from HS2 with regards to this proposed excavation work.

4) The Notice of Compulsory Purchase of November 2013, albeit at sub-surface level, has acted to compromise the value and marketability of our property, created undue stress and significantly impacted on our intended retirement plans. We urgently require further information from HS2.

**Noise and air pollution**

5) At mid April 2016, we were informed by postal leaflet, that HS2 will be identifying properties that will be eligible for noise insulation and will provide some mitigation against this. As our property’s proximity is directly adjacent to the cutting, it is highly likely that we will be eligible for such mitigation. Whist we welcome efforts to mitigate against construction noise, we would emphasize that it is important to maintain the integrity and character of the house when installing such noise insulation and to ensure that such insulation is effective. Despite our Central London location, Mornington Terrace is a fairly peaceful and quiet road, being a one-way street and having limited through traffic. We have lived in our current house for 12 years and before that, lived further along Mornington Terrace from 1987, giving us a very close connection and familiarity with the area. We volunteered our property for noise monitoring in our rear garden, and while all the arrangements were put in place (and a small fee paid to us for the inconvenience), no monitoring devices were installed by HS2. We have heard that this happened to other neighbouring properties, which gives us concerns that HS2 have not collected sufficient data on current levels of noise in the area and as such their plans for mitigation may be drawn from incomplete information. The current noise mitigation proposes arrangements for front facing windows and doors only, however, we would ask that further noise monitoring is undertaken on the direction of HS2 at the rear of the properties as the geography of the houses between the southern end of Mornington Terrace and Albert Street has created a natural amphitheatre, which results in sound amplification, and is it highly likely that we will also experience excessive noise at the rear of our property.

6) In terms of air pollution, we have not received any satisfactory assurances that sufficient concern has been given to the severe impact that the construction works will have on air quality. I have had chronic asthma all my adult life and while this is currently managed through regular medication, an identifiable change in the quality of air will be significantly detrimental to my health. The proposed work outside our property will see the demolition of the Mornington Street Bridge, the demolition of part of the Mornington Terrace retaining wall opposite our property and all of the retaining wall on Park Village East, across the cutting. I am certain that the demolition of these structures will create significant pollutants, significantly carbon-based and diesel particulates, due largely to their proximity to the coal powered and diesel locomotives for the past 170 years. Negative effects on health are not always immediately evident and can take time to present themselves. I would like further assurances from HS2 that every effort will be made in mitigation against any additional air pollution caused through these works and details provided of how this might be achieved in relation to our specific location.
Conservation and habitat

7) Mornington Terrace is a tree-lined road with a carefully managed mature London Plane tree population. While The Environmental Statement includes a commitment for new tree planting, we have not received any assurances that efforts will be made to save existing mature trees. In relation to our property, there are two mature trees close to the existing Mornington Street Bridge and two trees close to the proposed location of the temporary bridge. We would like some assurances from HS2 that efforts will be made to locate the temporary bridge so as not to disturb these existing trees and to take consideration of other existing trees in the area during the demolition process.

8) We are aware that there has been considerable concern in relation to the local animal habitats and the Commons Select Committee identified the importance of the local hedgehog community in the area surrounding Regents Park Zoo car park. As a family, we have been members of ZSL for almost 20 years, and my husband is a Fellow of ZSL and we ask that every effort is made to maintain all existing habitats that form part of ZSL boundaries, including our local population of pipistrelle bats which have roosted at our property. As a resident within an urban environment, we really value our green spaces and natural habitats and we would like assurances from HS2 that both flora and fauna are fully considered within any proposed local construction decisions.

Traffic, and parking

9) The extensive works to the local area will have a serious impact on traffic on our road, where vehicles will be redirected from traditional through routes. In addition, the positioning of compounds along Mornington Terrace will limit residents parking, leaving us unable to park near our home. We request that HS2 give careful thought be given to traffic management, consideration made to residents parking. We also hope that the proposed use of the existing rail facilities to remove spoil and thus reduce the need for heavy vehicles is seen as a viable alternative to high volume heavy good vehicles in our vicinity.

Compensation

10) It is assumed that because we live in an urban area, that we will be more tolerant and expectant of construction disruption than those in rural environments. This has been reflected in disparity of treatment within the compensation scheme. We request that there is parity of compensation between the urban and rural communities and as identified by the Commons Select Committee, the Borough of Camden should be regarded as special as it does bear the brunt of the duration and ferocity of works and its consequent disruption. We feel that in our present location, we will face the full force of the construction impact and should receive acknowledgement of this through the compensation scheme. As indicated in point 3), no indication as to the level of compensation for the subsurface safeguarding has been provided.

In summary

11) In submitting this petition, we have had to base our concerns on a great deal of speculative information as HS2 has failed to provide us with significant detail on the likely impact on our private home environment and personal health and
wellbeing on which to enable a robust defence. We believe that it should be of utmost importance to preserve quality of life during and post construction and request that this consideration is not marginalized by HS2 in favour of any economic gain.

4. 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.

Signed
Date 17.04.2016
NAME STEPHANIE GARNER
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF John Neve and Susan Neve

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners live at 111 Albert Street, which is approximately 100 metres from the Camden Cutting where major construction works are planned over a period of up to nine years. We are therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your Petitioners and their interests are injuriously affected by the Bill as passed by the House of Commons for reasons outlined below. If the Bill were to be passed by the House of Lords in its present form, our interests and our enjoyment of life would be significantly blighted for many years to come.

4. Following representations made to HS2 Ltd and to the House of Commons Hybrid Bill Select Committee, we have received formal assurances from the Secretary of State that:

   (i) The cellars belonging to our house will not be required for the utilities works planned for Albert Street, and that in any case the Bill does not include powers to acquire the cellars, and as such the cellars cannot be acquired under Compulsory Purchase;

   (ii) The powers of the Bill in relation to Albert Street north will only be exercised for the purpose of, and in connection with, the diversion of utilities. After the completion of these works, the street will no longer be used as a construction route unless the Promoter is required to do so by the London Borough of Camden.

5. We welcome these assurances insofar as they go, but remain unhappy about the incorrect issue of the Compulsory Purchase Order Notice in relation to our cellars and extremely concerned about the potential continuing use of our street for construction traffic, even after the planned utilities work has been completed in 2018. Our concern on the latter point is compounded by the fact that recently amended maps showing Utilities Traffic Routes and Construction Routes imply continuing use of our street for construction traffic beyond 2018. This appears to be incompatible with the assurance referred to above, and we ASK that all the relevant maps be
corrected insofar as they apply to our street.

6. More generally, we remain extremely concerned about the impacts that the planned construction works in the Camden and Euston areas will have on our street and our immediate neighbourhood. These impacts are described in the AP3 Environmental Statement and include: noise and air pollution from construction activity in the nearby Camden Cutting; the risk that our street will be used by construction traffic, despite the assurance referred to at 4(ii) above; and the very major impact on the wider area around us of the predicted hundreds of heavy goods vehicles a day during the lengthy construction period. We fear adverse effects on the quality of our lives and our health, and an inevitable negative impact on the value of our property and our ability to sell if so desired.

7. Whilst we appreciate the various mitigation measures that have been identified and proposed by HS2 Ltd, and the assurances that have been provided, including to Camden Council, they do not address what for us is the fundamental problem – that the route into Euston as currently designed, and the current plans for Euston station, will have a truly devastating effect on both us and our neighbours. As the former Cabinet Secretary, Lord Turnbull, noted in the Second Reading debate on the Bill on 14th April, HS2’s proposals, as they affect Camden, are “horrible”.

8. We believe that there is now an urgent need for a thorough review of other, less damaging, options for bringing the proposed high speed line into Euston. We are aware that such options exist and have seen no evidence that they have been properly assessed by HS2 Ltd. We therefore ASK that the committee recommend that the government now urgently commission a full technical, economic and socio-environmental assessment of all the options for bringing HS2 into Euston. Competing schemes should be judged according to their ability to minimise adverse impacts on the community during the construction phase and to deliver a fully-integrated new station at Euston within the footprint of the existing station. Pending the completion of this work, HS2 Ltd should not be authorised to continue with construction plans beyond Old Oak Common. As the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee concluded, “Camden is exceptional and needs special treatment”.

9. Whatever scheme is eventually adopted, we further ASK that much stronger mitigation measures and improved compensation arrangements, as advocated in the petitions of the Albert Street North Residents Association and the Camden Cutting Group, should be adopted and implemented by HS2 Ltd.

10. The prayer:

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

11. And the petitioners remain, etc.

John Neve and Susan Neve April 18, 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF STEVEN LAMBERT

Declares that:

1. Steven Lambert.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner, Steven Lambert, is a resident of Coldharbour, living at 5 Grosvenor Way, Aylesbury HP19 7BE. He is the owner of this detached house that faces open countryside owned by the National Trust and maintained by a tenant farmer. Your Petitioner has lived in this house for seven years as their family home.

His property is no more than 350m from the construction and operational site of the rail line and your Petitioner contends that due to the open nature of the land, he will face a significant loss of the market value of the property and will suffer noise and air pollution as a result of the railway's construction and operation.

As a Buckinghamshire County and Aylesbury Vale District Councillor, your Petitioner responds to a variety of requests for advice and support from his constituents across the area, many of whom are also affected by the Bill's impacts on their land, home, or livelihood. Living so close to the scheme, your Petitioner’s rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill. Steven Lambert is therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Specific noise and visual impacts

Local 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. Your Petitioner is concerned that the height of barriers on the line of route across the western side of Aylesbury, varies considerably, especially as noise impacts are directly linked to barrier heights.

He contends that across the whole area of Aylesbury and Stoke Mandeville, such 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 your Petitioner’s request of the Lords Select Committee.
Your Petitioner shares the concerns of local Councils about inadequate visual mitigation and landscaping across the area. The National Trust secured an agreement with the Promoter over its ‘Green Banks’ scheme to screen the railway from Hartwell House. Your Petitioner believes Coldharbour deserves at least an identical, if not better, offer from HS2 Ltd bearing in mind that east of the line permanent residents are affected, rather than temporary guests to the west.

Your Petitioner wants to see the village appropriately screened and mitigated, expecting that extensive tree planting close to Fairford Leys happens before construction to ensure screening is as effective as possible. Such planting must be designed in consultation with Councils and the local community and be sensitive to the local environment.

Properties on the northern edge of Coldharbour, including the Petitioner’s own home will suffer the greatest visual intrusion from HS2, as the line emerges into the Thame Valley and towards the proposed viaduct. HS2 Ltd has stated that little mitigation can be provided because of the landscape, topography and natural environment. Your Petitioner asks the Lords Select Committee to instruct the Promoter to identify options for better mitigation in this area and implement the best possible solution.

Adverse impacts on homes at Hawkslade and Walton Court, west of Aylesbury

Despite receiving strong representations from Parish and Town Councils about the 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.”

HS2 will pass within 180 metres of the nearest properties in Hawkslade. Where nearest to these homes, it is ‘at grade’ having emerged from the Aylesbury South Cutting, and the overhead line equipment will be approximately 8 metres above ground level. As a result, 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.

Your Petitioner 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 less impacted. HS2 Ltd suggested that this could not be achieved because of flood risk and water course issues. Advice from the County Council, suggests that these may not be valid.

Building the line deeper, as suggested, would create extra spoil to support higher bunds to extend the cutting as the land falls away, and therefore minimise transport costs. Your Petitioner 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

Your Petitioner believes that Aylesbury faces a unique mix of issues and problems when presented with HS2. A large number of residents in his County ward 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.

Your Petitioner, however, does not believe that the significant effects HS2 will have on Aylesbury and its residents is properly recognised, understood or mitigated by the Promoter. That is despite strong local representations to the House of Commons Select Committee. The Committee appeared to be persuaded by some verbal assurances from the Promoter about the management of flood risk.

Your Petitioner remains less than convinced, because since his Select Committee appearance in November 2015, the area concerned - known locally as the Willows - has suffered flooding again. He believes that further work is needed to demonstrate that HS2 will not exacerbate flood risk across Aylesbury.

Your Petitioner considers that the current measures do not go far enough and contends 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. He 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.

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 Petitioner supports 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.

Transport impacts

Your Petitioner, in common with local Councils and others, is 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. Your Petitioner asks the Lords Committee to note 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.

Your Petitioner 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 your Petitioner believes it has failed to properly explain why this is not an option. He 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 your Petitioner 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.

**Effects on businesses and other enterprises**

Across Aylesbury there are a number of business centres, populated in the main by small or medium enterprises (SME’s), and they are tenants of their premises. In and around the town there are also a number of start-ups, single businesses and social enterprises that rent land or buildings from a landlord.

Your Petitioner supports the concerns of the local Town and Parish Councils about the construction and operation impacts of the proposed railway, including additional traffic movements, on local businesses. Your Petitioner is also concerned that both the town and local centres will become much less attractive to visitors, leading to a major reduction in footfall and business.

Your Petitioner 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 353). This would enable businesses to receive compensation for demonstrable adverse effects, such as reduced footfall, that affect the viability of a business.
Compensation matters

Your Petitioner 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 Petitioner 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.

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 Steven Lambert 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 Steven Lambert 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 JOHN ALLEN

Declarations:

1. John Allen is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner, John Allen, is a resident of Stoke Mandeville, living at 30 Lower Road, Stoke Mandeville, which is situated adjacent to the northern roundabout junction connecting the realigned A4010 with Lower Road.

Living in such close proximity to the scheme, with the initial prospect of compulsory acquisition of his land and property by the Promoter, his rights and interests are injuriously affected by the Bill. John Allen is therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

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, proves what local groups have achieved working with HS2 Ltd. Your Petitioner, as owner of Elmfield (30 Lower Road) supports the planned realignment but wants to see the junction with Lower Road moved further north.

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 your Petitioner has chosen to ask the matter is considered by the House of Lords Select Committee.

Your Petitioner 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, including his own home (Elmfield, 30 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. Your Petitioner asks the Select Committee to secure an undertaking from the Promoter that the road alignment be changed to support such key improvements.

**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 Petitioner supports 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.

**4. The prayer**

The petitioner John Allen 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 John Allen 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 William & Trine Miller  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your Petitioners live at 66 Gloucester Crescent, which is approximately 100 metres from the Camden Cutting where major construction works are planned over a period of up to nine years. We are therefore specially and directly affected by the Bill.  

3. Your Petitioners and their interests are injuriously affected by the Bill as passed by the House of Commons for reasons outlined below. If the Bill were to be passed by the House of Lords in its present form, our interests and our quality and enjoyment of life would be significantly blighted for many years to come.  

4. First and foremost, we are extremely concerned about the impacts that the planned construction works in the Camden and Euston areas will have on not just our street but our immediate neighbourhood and Camden as a whole. These impacts are described in the AP3 Environmental Statement and include: noise and air pollution from construction activity in the nearby Camden Cutting; the risk that our narrow residential street will be used on a regular basis as a diversion for both general and construction traffic when either Parkway, Regents Park Road, Oval Road or Jamestown Road are closed on a temporary basis, are too great and would be intolerable. But most of all the overall long term closure of and restrictions on major roads in the Camden area will have an unimaginable impact on the wider area around us bringing most of Camden, from the West End to Hampstead to a standstill for years. We fear adverse effects on the quality of our lives and our health, and the inevitable negative impact on the value of our property and our ability to sell if we finally felt we had to escape the long term chaos that will be brought to our lives by the many years of planned construction for HS2.  

5. Whilst we appreciate the various mitigation measures that have been identified and proposed by HS2 Ltd, and the assurances that have been provided, including to Camden Council, they do not address what for us is the fundamental problem – that the route into Euston as currently designed, and the current plans for Euston station, will have a truly devastating effect on both us and our neighbours for years. As the former Cabinet Secretary, Lord Turnbull, noted in the Second Reading debate on the Bill on 14th April, HS2’s proposals, as they affect Camden, are “horrific”. The wording that the HS2 Environmental Statement gives to the impact that these
works will have on the area doesn’t come close to the true reality and likely impact that the construction of the Euston part of HS2 will have on the area. We have witnessed first hand how the simple and temporary closure on just one of the main North/South roads that bring traffic from the West End and through Camden to the North can have on the rest of the borough. For example, if you close just one road, like Albany Street, for just three hours, the Hampstead Road and Camden High Street come to a grinding halt and every road off them backs up to the Euston Road and beyond. Another example, if you simply restrict the movement of traffic on Regents Park Road then Prince Albert Road and Albay Street are brought to a stand still and the traffic backs up all the way to Great Portland Street. HS2 are proposing not to close or restrict one road but all of these roads and not for a matter of hours but for years. We ask the question, where will all of this traffic go and what impact will it have on peoples health and the local economy? There is no point giving assurances when the Environmental Statement doesn’t even come close to the true reality of the situation and the overwhelming impact on traffic noise, pollution and congestion that will take place across the entire borough stretching from Hampstead all the way back into the West End. In addition to this, how are HS2 ever going to get the many thousands of trucks out of the construction site and onto the roads of Camden and keep them moving when the roads will be at a stand still for most of the day already?

6. I have a young family and dog and we use and access both Regents Park and Primrose Hill from Gloucester Crescent at least twice a day. As far as we can see from the Environmental Statement, accessing these parks will at times be almost impossible and at others, require us to cross congested roads, barricades and construction and its associated works and vehicles.

7. We believe that there is now an urgent need for a thorough review of other, less damaging and in some cases considerably better options for bringing the proposed high speed line into Euston. We are acutely aware that such options exist however we have seen no evidence that they have been properly assessed by HS2 Ltd. We therefore ask that the committee recommend that the government urgently commission a full technical, economic and socio-environmental assessment of all the options for bringing HS2 into Euston. Competing schemes should be judged according to their ability to minimise adverse impacts on the whole community during the construction phase and to deliver a fully-integrated new station at Euston within the footprint of the existing station. Pending the completion of this work, HS2 Ltd should not be authorised to continue with construction plans between Old Oak Common and Euston. As the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee concluded, “Camden is exceptional and needs special treatment”.

8. 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.

9. And the petitioners remain, etc.

William and Trine Miller

April 18, 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF THE WEST LONDON LINE GROUP

Declares that:

1. The petitioner and those whose interests the petitioner represents are specially and directly adversely affected by:

   (a) the apparent withdrawal without amendment from the Bill of the original Clause under ‘Works’ and numbered 1.3(a);

   (b) the continuing lack of explicit mention within the Bill that the HS2 station box at Old Oak Common is to be surmounted by platforms to be served by London Overground (LO), Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) and other future rail services on the West London Line (WLL) so as to fulfil properly the fourth of the four Guiding Principles published by HS2 in July 2013; and

   (c) the lack of direct rail services to the South Midlands.

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioner is a voluntary passenger support group that represents the interests of current and future users of the West London Line.

   The Group continues to focus on the future optimisation of the West London Line and its integration with other rail services, especially HS2 and the Elizabeth Line at Old Oak Common, which is in the area of the Group’s prime concern. The Group has worked closely on this with Transport for London (TfL), the Old Oak and Park Royal Mayoral Development Corporation (OPDC) and the Grand Union Alliance (GUA).

   We are very concerned that the current wording of the Bill specifically adversely affects present users of the West London Line – and not rail passengers as a whole, nor the public in general.

   While the Group possesses no land, buildings or other such tangible property at risk from the provisions of the HS2 Bill, the Group greatly fears the adverse effects on any or all of its reputation, its financial support, and its continued existence as a direct result of the Bill being implemented as currently worded.

   We would contend that these adverse impacts will be no less personal, valuable or tragic – and no more quantifiable – than those such as the loss or impairment of a favourite view, a stretch of attractive landscape, an historic structure or ancient woodland, that may be cited by other Petitioners.
There appears to be no indication in the supporting information within the petitioning kit or elsewhere that the words ‘specially and directly affected’ are only to extend to financial deprivation or the loss of tangible assets. We believe that our concerns in relation to the interests of those whom the Group represents have a force and validity commensurate with those of other Petitioners who may suffer financial and/or other types of loss as a result of this Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

The Group continues to seek improvements in facilities, services, connections and interchanges for all present and future users of the West London Line, many from existing and new residential and business communities in the West London Line corridor and others from farther afield.

In this regard, the West London Line Group fully supports the development of transport facilities that can have interchange with and/or be connected to the West London Line, such as the Elizabeth Line and HS2.

However, the Group is particularly concerned to find that the present proposed arrangements for interchange between both these two key rail developments and the West London Line will result in passengers on the West London Line represented by this Group being specially and adversely affected, as opposed to other rail users.

We would like the present Bill to include:

(a) the original Clause 1.3(a) amended to permit the installation of a short piece of track between the east end of the HS2 platforms at Old Oak Common and the West London Line north of Westway Circus;

(b) additional wording to secure:
   
   i. the restitution of Little Wormwood Scrubs Park upon completion of the above works;

   ii. the installation above the HS2 station box at Old Oak Common of sufficient platforms to be served by rail services on the West London Line (WLL), so as to fulfil properly the fourth of the four Guiding Principles published by HS2 in July 2013 and to allow for future growth in terms of passenger demands;

   iii. the installation above these platforms of a new cultural venue to provide a suitable community gain for West London Line users under the planning permission to be granted for HS2 works in the Old Oak Common area;

   iv. the construction of up to four intermediate HS2 ‘way-stations’ with passing loops between Old Oak Common and Birmingham, including an interchange with East West Rail at Claydon.
4. *The prayer*

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that its Chairman, representing the Group in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity 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.

---

Mark Balaam  
Chairman  
West London Line Group  

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Alex Benasuli and Justin Dennis

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners are Alex Benasuli and Justin Dennis, the owner occupiers of 92 Albert Street NW1 7NE London. Our Section of Albert St falls within the Act. Our house lies a little over 100 metres from the Camden Cutting in which up to nine years of construction works are planned. We are approx. 10 metres from Delancey Street whose traffic, noise and pollution impacts have been described as severe as a result of the proposed works yet we have received no offers of compensation or specific mitigation measures.

3. If the Bill were to be passed by the House of Lords in its present form, our properties and our enjoyment of life would be significantly blighted for many years to come. Blight includes noise and air pollution as well as general quality of life as well as the ability for us to sell our property at an unblighted price.

4. Following representations made to HS2 Ltd and to the Houses of Commons Hybrid Bill Select Committee, we have received formal assurances from the Secretary of State that:

   (i) The cellars belonging to many of our houses will not be required for the utilities works planned for Albert Street North, thus overriding Compulsory Purchase Order Notices which had previously been wrongly served by HS2 Ltd. This assurance is satisfactory in its current form

   (ii) Albert Street North will be required as a Construction Route for the project only until 2018 and only insofar as is needed for the utilities works planned for the street, thus overriding the maps in the AP3 Environmental Statement which indicated that Albert Street North would be a Construction Route for the duration of the wider construction works. This assurance is partially satisfactory. We ASK that to make this assurance more complete that all references to Albert Street beyond 2018 be removed from all official documentation, including and in particular, all maps.
5. Nevertheless we remain extremely concerned about the impacts of the planned construction works for the Camden and Euston areas will have on our street on our immediate neighbourhood. These impacts are described in the AP3 Environmental Statement and will last for many years. They include:

(i) Hundreds of heavy goods vehicles a day on adjacent streets - creating noise, air pollution, accident risk and additional vehicle congestion in an already congested area. Congestion and gridlock are major issues that have not been thought through. Major arteries are to be severely affected between Central and North London including Hampstead Road where the flyover is to be removed and rebuilt and the junction near Gloucester Gate where Parkway, Delancey Streets meet along with 6 other roads that connect points North and West (including Kentish Town, Archway, Parliament Hill, Belsize Park, Primrose Hill, Hampstead etc) to Camden Town and Central London). Euston Road is to have lane closures for many years. Against this backdrop, there have been separate announcements of super cycle highway lane reconstructions on Delancey and other streets whose impact from HS2 HGV traffic has been described as severe. There are proposals to limit the access to and through traffic on the Outer Circle of Regents Park. This would force even more traffic onto roads already designated as HS2 Construction Traffic Routes (CTRs). In the current form the traffic analysis and impact is at best not credible and unfathomable and at worst dangerous. We **ASK** that an independent and unbiased agency conduct a traffic impact analysis, that takes into account not only HS2 impacts but other proposals as well.

(ii) Noise and air pollution from construction activity in the Camden Cutting

(iii) Despite all these impacts and many more, the details of which would overwhelm this petition, we have been offered no direct compensation or assurances that we would be able to sell our property at an unblighted price.

6. The various mitigation measures and assurances that have been offered to us and to other local residents by HS2 Ltd and Camden Council are welcome but they are not nearly enough. During the House of Commons petitioning process, the Select Committee produced a statement that acknowledges that the impacts for Camden and its residents are exceptional and deserve special treatment" as a result of the route into Euston as currently designed. However, thus far no additional measures have been produced. Therefore we **ASK** that mutually agreed upon mitigation measures be discussed and offered in detail **BEFORE** final approval is granted and works begin. If such measures are not offered or not possible we **ASK** that Euston be reconsidered as the terminus for HS2 or that Old Oak Common be the temporary terminus until a more detailed plan that protects Camden and its residents is established. The leverage for these additional requirements and assurances is now, not after final approval is given.
7. We ASK the committee to order commission a study that specifically analyses the social and economic costs of HS2 on the residents and businesses in Camden and to factor that into additional mitigation measures and to be included in the overall costs.

8. One important example of an impactful mitigation is to ASK for a significant decrease in the volume of HGV traffic to and from the construction site. As such, it is critical that the great majority of spoils to be removed from the area be done so by rail and not HGVs.

9. We ASK that compensation for urban dwellers affected the scheme to be made more fair. Most important, the Need to Sell scheme should be made more explicitly available to us, to my Albert Street neighbours and to other affected Camden residents. Put simply, we ASK for a guarantee that we are able to sell our properties at unblighted prices. If HS2 ltd and the Government are satisfied with the mitigation measures they have produced, then they should have no problem guaranteeing an unblighted price should we need to sell over the decade plus that the construction works are to take place.

10. On these and all other matters, we share the concerns more fully set out in the petition by the Camden Cutting Group and the Albert Street North Residents Association (ASNRA). We wish to be associated with their various ASKs.

11. 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.

12. And the petitioners remains, etc.

Alex Benasuli

Justin Dehnis, April 15, 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Bronwen Jenkins and Dominic Buttimore 109 Albert Street London NW1 7NB

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are residents of 109 Albert Street (Albert Street North) approximately 150 metres from the Camden Cutting where extensive and disruptive construction work is planned to take place over at least the next nine years, with extensive work to Euston station lasting into the 2030s.

3. Your petitioners concerns are that as residents the effects of this major project on our lives have not been properly assessed and as such, cannot be properly mitigated. If the Bill passes as presently envisaged it will affect and blight our lives, and the childhoods of our children.

4. Whilst the Environmental statement relating to the Bill as passed by the House of Commons outline many negative effects HS2 will have, including noise, vibration, air pollutions, additional HGV traffic we are concerned that the full effects of this on us as residents close to the works have not sufficiently been assessed. The statement does not recognise the historical nature of the streets surrounding the works and how the community and buildings will be affected.

5. It is true that some assurances and mitigation have been introduced, but these are the bare minimum and do not sufficiently meet our concerns. If the project has any hope of proceeding smoothly it needs the support of the people living with it.

6. There have been calls (Lord Turnbull for one) for a comprehensive review of the alternatives for bringing HS2 trains into Euston. This is clearly necessary as a matter of urgency and we support these views.

7. We therefore ASK that the committee recommend that the Government should commission an independent technical, economic and socio-environmental evaluation of the alternative options for bringing HS2 into Euston and for the redevelopment of Euston station on an integrated basis rather than the piece-meal and devasting plan proposed. We would like to see a proper consideration of the ideal using Old Oak Common, an area that
would benefit from infrastructure investment.

8. 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(s), etc.

Name: BRONWEN JENKIN Signature

Name: DOMINIC BUTHIMORE Signature
Petition against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

The petition of Mary and Edward Burd, 100 Albert Street, London NW1 7NE

declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are resident at 100 Albert Street NW1 7NE, some 100 - 150 metres from the Camden Cutting where up to nine years of continuous construction activity are proposed, the work at Euston station continuing until 2033. We will thus be seriously affected by the works and the manner in which they are being proposed to be implemented.

3. Along with other residents and neighbours we have received assurances from HS2 Ltd., following detailed and extensive representations to both the House of Commons and HS2 Ltd themselves, that:

   a. our cellars, previously covered by a Compulsory Purchase Order will not now be required for utilities work, and these Compulsory Purchase Orders are now overridden; and

   b. the need for Albert Street North (in which our house sits) to be used as a Construction Route will expire after 2018, (and this use will be only for utilities works planned for the street) and therefore the maps in the AP3 Environmental Statement indicating that the road would be a Construction Route for the whole construction period, are now inaccurate, overridden and redundant.

4. While welcoming these small concessions by HS2 Ltd. in our street, more general concerns remain. The works will have a baleful impact on our immediate neighbourhood with a detrimental affect on our well-being as residents to enjoy quietly our homes and properties for the years ahead. This through primarily but not exclusively:

   a. Heavy goods traffic. The volume of heavy construction traffic on already highly congested roads (Parkway has been reported as being 93% congested already) will create unacceptable noise, air pollution, accident potential, and disruption levels to pedestrian and vehicular movement.

   b. The construction work itself. The construction period has been stated to run for a period of eighteen years. This cannot by any measure be regarded as ‘temporary’, least of all to those of our age (76 & 77). The continuous noise and air pollution for that length of time will be intolerable.

   c. The re-routing of utilities. Over and above the disruption caused by the works themselves (see b. above), the need for diversionary utilities works will spread the epicentre of noise and disruption over a much wider area than that of the railway...
works themselves. This would cause unbearable congestion and disruption on its own; added to all the other traffic movements, the area is likely to be entirely gridlocked, affecting not only our personal journeys, but access by the emergency services. How possible will it be to maintain the limited concessions we have won in respect of Construction Route traffic in these circumstances?

d. **Property sale.** We have lived in our house here in Albert Street for over fifty years, and have no current plans to move. But we may wish to do so in the future, and for all the reasons set out above, we will inevitably be faced with considerable difficulty in selling at all, and a markedly reduced property value if we do.

5. The assurances that we and others have received are welcomed as far as they go, but have little more value than polishing the glasses on the Titanic when it comes to making any real impact on the impending disaster that Camden is about to face. We have not mentioned at all the huge disruption envisaged around Euston and the Hampstead Road, the massive loss of housing, green open space and trees, all for a project whose overall benefit is far from apparent.

6. The fundamental problem is the basic design of this part of the route together with the station itself. If HS2 Ltd is to be believed, the current scheme is the only possible one. This is palpably not the case. There are several alternative approaches that have been put forward, not by woolly fantasists, but in good faith by respected professionals that minimise all this disruption. We do not believe that HS2 has made any serious unbiased or transparent assessment of these schemes, nor their impact on the costs, but rather have dismissed them out of hand with. Although we have asked, we are not aware of any study on the costs and benefits of any scheme, not even the current proposals.

7. Accordingly, as a priority, we **ASK** the committee to propose a fundamental rethink of the design of the line from Old Oak Common to and including Euston Station. This will need time but need not delay the construction of the line North of Old Oak Common, which is in any case possibly likely to be commissioned and operable before the final run of line to Euston.

8. We also **ASK** the committee to request a full and transparent cost benefit analysis of selected schemes to test their viability. If a less disruptively engineered solution can be found, it will almost certainly be less expensive, a fact which might carry little weight with HS2 Ltd, but would surely be of interest to the Government.

9. Enforcement. There is more than a suspicion that the the preliminary enabling works currently being undertaken do not comply with existing agreements, with the engines of vehicles being left running etc.,. We fear that this will become commonplace when the main works start. We therefore **ASK** the committee request that a local enforcement officer be appointed, available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to enforce agreements, and that they should have sufficient powers to penalise HS2 Ltd by fines or other sanctions if the agreements are breached.

10. We have indicated above (6.) that there has been a total lack of transparency and meaningful dialogue from HS2 Ltd about any of their proposals, despite requests from groups and individuals and failed promises from HS2 Ltd. If there are misunderstandings, it is not surprising as there appears to have been no attempt to engage with any of the individuals and groups affected, particularly since the time of the Hearings in the House of Commons. We therefore **ASK** the committee to request that HS2 Ltd set up a full liaison and consultation programme with regular progress meetings, and create a forum where all issues of significance to the local community can be discussed.
11. The compensation terms for the disruptions and losses as a consequence of the works are both inadequate and inequitable, in that rural residents are favoured over the urban. The only compensation for urban householders is the 'Need to Sell Scheme'. This is very restrictive, and requires the householder to show a 'compelling reason' to sell. A householder should be free to sell their property for any - or no - reason without suffering financially as a consequence of the activities of a third party - i.e. HS2 Ltd - who should in equity be required to make good any financial shortfall that arises. We therefore **ASK** the committee to recommend that the compensation package be overhauled and the bias against the urban residents be removed.

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

13. And the petitioners remain etc.

EDWARD BURD

MARY BURD
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Jeremy Bradshaw

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner lives in Albert Street North which at its closest point is about 100 metres from the Camden Cutting in which up to nine years of construction works are planned; and would be directly and specially affected by the Bill.

3. Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill as passed by the House of Commons for reasons outlined below. If the Bill were to be passed by the House of Lords in its present form, my property and my enjoyment of life would be significantly blighted for many years to come.

4. Following representations made to HS2 Ltd and to the Houses of Commons Hybrid Bill Select Committee, I have received formal assurances from the Secretary of State that:

   (i) The cellars belonging to my house will not be required for the utilities works planned for Albert Street North, thus overriding Compulsory Purchase Order Notices which had previously been wrongly served by HS2 Ltd;

   (ii) Albert Street North will be required as a Utilities Traffic Route for the project only until 2018 and only insofar as is needed for the utilities works planned for the street, thus overriding the maps in the AP3 Environmental Statement which indicated that Albert Street North would be a Construction or Utilities Route for the duration of the wider construction works.

5. I welcome these assurances but remain extremely concerned about the impacts the planned construction works for the Camden and Euston areas will have on the street and on my immediate neighbourhood, which will have a seriously detrimental effect on my well-being as a resident. These impacts are described in the AP3 Environmental Statement and will last for many years. They include:
Hundreds of heavy goods vehicles a day on adjacent streets - creating noise, air pollution, accident risk and additional vehicle congestion in an already congested area and one which has many young children;

Noise and air pollution from construction activity in the Camden Cutting;

Heavy construction work and construction traffic for up to two years on the street due to rerouting of utilities;

For all these reasons, reduced ability to sell my properties if I should wish to do so, and reduced property values.

6. Various mitigation measures and assurances have been offered to me (see para 4 above) and to other local residents by HS2 Ltd, and a number of assurances have been provided to Camden Council. These are welcome as far as they go, but taken together they do not address the fundamental problem – that the route into Euston as currently designed, and the plans for Euston station as provided for in Additional Provision 3, will create intolerable impacts in terms of magnitude and duration for residents on our street and in the adjoining neighbourhood.

7. Accordingly, I ASK the committee to recommend a fundamental rethink of the design of the route into Euston and of the redevelopment of Euston station with a view to radically reducing the negative impacts of the current plans as noted above. There are several alternative design options in existence for both the station and for the route into Euston, including Euston Express. Lack of transparency on the part of HS2 Ltd and the government has meant that we do not know to what extent these options have been seriously considered. The government has previously refused Freedom of Information requests for such information. My strong impression is that serious consideration of alternative options has not taken place. HS2 Ltd and the government should now make public such analyses they have done on alternative options. HS2 Ltd’s current plan for Euston station and the approach route into it, along with potential alternative options, should be subject to a comprehensive to comparative technical, economic, financial and socio/environmental evaluation. In this evaluation, proper weight should be given to the interests and well-being of the residents and businesses of Camden, bearing in mind the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee’s conclusion that “Camden is exceptional and needs special treatment”. It is exceptional in the sense that no other Central London location is so detrimentally affected, because all other Central London locations are being tunnelled underneath. The question is why Camden is not being tunnelled, or in some other way spared the impacts that other Central London locations do not have to suffer?

8. Furthermore, I ASK the committee to recommend that until this comparative evaluation has been undertaken and considered by the government and by Parliament, there should be no construction work started between Old Oak Common and Euston.

9. I have an additional ASK affecting Albert Street North. It has been suggested by HS2 Ltd that the published maps cannot be changed to reflect the assurance that Albert Street North Residents Association has been given regarding Albert Street as a Utilities Traffic Route (see para 4 (ii) above). ANSRA has been told this is unnecessary since the assurance overrides the
maps. However, I find that the maps HAVE been changed in a number of respects in the past few months and these changes include changes to the route designation for Albert Street North which do NOT reflect the assurances we were given. To be explicit, Albert Street North should not be marked as a Utilities Traffic Route BEYOND 2018, and nor as a Construction Route at any time. It is currently marked as a Utilities Traffic Route until YEAR 18. (See HS2 Maps PI 1308 to PI 1312). On further Maps e.g. PI 1316(14) to PI 1316(20) and PI 1316(26) to PI 1316(30) Albert Street North is also shown as a Construction Route, which ASNRA was assured it would never be. I ASK for the maps to be correctly revised in regard to my street.

10. I have one final ASK. HS2’s intentions for Camden have already blighted properties close to the proposed Camden Cutting. I therefore ask for an improved compensation arrangements, especially in the Need to Sell scheme such that properties on Albert Street North would be more explicitly eligible to benefit from the scheme and that potential vendors would not have to show “compelling reason” if they wished to take advantage of it.

11. The prayer:

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

12. And the petitioner remains, etc.

Jeremy Bradshaw

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Albert Street North Residents Association  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your Petitioners are Albert Street North Residents Association (ASNRA), its officers and members. All members of ASNRA are residents of Albert Street North (the section between Delancey Street and Parkway, NW1), which at its closest point is about 100 metres from the Camden Cutting in which up to nine years of construction works are planned; and each resident would be directly and specially affected by the Bill. The text of this petition has been approved by members of ASNRA in accordance with a resolution passed at a meeting of ASNRA on 13 May 2014.  

3. Your Petitioners and their interests are injuriously affected by the Bill as passed by the House of Commons for reasons outlined below. If the Bill were to be passed by the House of Lords in its present form, our properties and our enjoyment of life would be significantly blighted for many years to come.  

4. Following representations made to HS2 Ltd and to the House of Commons Hybrid Bill Select Committee, we have received formal assurances from the Secretary of State that:  

   (i) The cellars belonging to many of our houses will not be required for the utilities works planned for Albert Street North, thus overriding Compulsory Purchase Order Notices which had previously been wrongly served by HS2 Ltd;  

   (ii) Albert Street North will be required as a Construction Route for the project only until 2018 and only insofar as is needed for the utilities works planned for the street, thus overriding the maps in the AP3 Environmental Statement which indicated that Albert Street North would be a Construction Route for the duration of the wider construction works.  

5. We welcome these assurances but remain extremely concerned about the impacts the planned construction works for the Camden and Euston areas will have on our street and our immediate neighbourhood, which will have a seriously detrimental effect on our well-being as
residents. These impacts are described in the AP3 Environmental Statement and will last for many years. They include:

(i) Hundreds of heavy goods vehicles a day on adjacent streets - creating noise, air pollution, accident risk and additional vehicle congestion in an already congested area;

(ii) Noise and air pollution from construction activity in the Camden Cutting;

(iii) Heavy construction work and construction traffic for up to two years on our street due to rerouting of utilities; and the possibility that, in spite of the assurance given on construction traffic (see para 4 (ii) above), our street may be used for construction traffic for many more years if Camden Council were so to decide in order to reduce pressure of HGV traffic on adjoining streets;

(iv) For all these reasons, reduced ability to sell our properties if we should wish to do so, and reduced property values.

6. Various mitigation measures and assurances have been offered to us (see para 4 above) and to other local residents by HS2 Ltd, and a number of assurances have been provided to Camden Council. These are welcome as far as they go, but taken together they do not address the fundamental problem - that the route into Euston as currently designed, and the plans for Euston station as provided for in Additional Provision 3, will create intolerable impacts in terms of magnitude and duration for residents on our street and in the adjoining neighbourhood.

7. Accordingly, we ASK the committee to recommend a fundamental rethink of the design of the route into Euston and of the redevelopment of Euston station with a view to radically reducing the negative impacts of the current plans as noted above. There are several alternative design options in existence for both the station and for the route into Euston. Lack of transparency on the part of HS2 Ltd and the government has meant that we do not know to what extent these options have been seriously considered. The government has previously refused Freedom of Information requests for such information. Our strong impression is that serious consideration of alternative options has not taken place. HS2 Ltd and the government should now make public such analyses they have done on alternative options. HS2 Ltd's current plan for Euston station and the approach route into it, along with potential alternative options, should be subject to a comprehensive comparative technical, economic, financial and socio/environmental evaluation. In this evaluation, proper weight should be given to the interests and well-being of the residents and businesses of Camden, bearing in mind the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee's conclusion that "Camden is exceptional and needs special treatment".

8. Furthermore, we ASK the committee to recommend that until this comparative evaluation has been undertaken and considered by the government and by Parliament, there should be no construction work started between Old Oak Common and Euston.
9. Against the possibility that the House of Lords may not accept our request for a full rethink of the plans for Euston, we strongly urge the committee to recommend a range of additional mitigation measures, covering in particular:

(i) Volume of HGV traffic to and from the construction site. We attach high importance to reducing the amounts of spoil from the site and materials into the site being transported by HGVs, with the great majority being carried by rail. We will be watching closely for the revised spoil and materials transport plan promised by the Secretary of State by the end of May.

(ii) A stronger monitoring and adjudication regime to cover HGVs, and noise and air pollution from the construction site.

(iii) Improved compensation arrangements, especially in the Need to Sell scheme such that properties on Albert Street North would be more explicitly eligible to benefit from the scheme and that potential vendors would not have to show “compelling reason” if they wished to take advantage of it.

10. On these and all other matters, we share the concerns more fully set out in the petition by the Camden Cutting Group which represents our interests as well as those of other residents close to the Camden Cutting. We wish to be associated with their various ASKs.

11. We have one additional ASK affecting Albert Street North. We have been advised by HS2 Ltd that the published maps cannot be changed to reflect the assurance we have been given regarding our street as a Construction Route (see para 4 (ii) above). We are told this is unnecessary since the assurance overrides the maps. However, we find that the maps HAVE been changed in a number of respects in the past few months and these changes include changes to the route designation for Albert Street North which do NOT reflect the assurance we were given. To be explicit Albert Street North should NOT be marked as a Construction OR Utilities route beyond 2018. We ASK for the maps to be correctly revised in regard to our street.

12. 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.

13. And the petitioners remain, etc,

Mary Burd, Chair of ASNRA
John Neve, Treasurer of ASNRA

April 15, 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Sir Tim Lankester and Patricia Lankester

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners are residents of Albert Street North. Our house, No 103, is about 100 metres from the Camden Cutting in which up to nine years of construction works are planned; we would be directly and specially affected by the Bill.

3. Your Petitioners and their interests are injuriously affected by the Bill as passed by the House of Commons for reasons outlined below. If the Bill were to be passed by the House of Lords in its present form, our well-being and enjoyment of life would be significantly blighted for many years to come.

4. The Environmental Statement relating to the Bill as passed by the House of Commons documents in detail the many negative impacts the promoter’s proposals will have on ourselves and on the Camden community. These involve: noise; vibration; air pollution; additional HGV traffic and consequent extra accident risk and congestion throughout Camden from which we will suffer. These negative impacts will last for nine years for our street and for adjoining streets and for much longer insofar as the works at Euston station will, on current plans, continue into the 2030s. They will worsen the quality of our lives, and for the duration of the construction work reduce the value of our property and make it difficult to sell if we were so minded.

5. The promoters have considered the negative impacts and in response to representations from us and others in Camden have offered a
range of assurances and mitigation measures. But these only scratch at the surface and will not fundamentally change our situation for the better.

6. What the promoters have signally failed to do is consider the cumulative impacts taken as a whole. In the second reading debate on the bill in the House of Lords on April 14th, former Cabinet Secretary described the promoter’s proposals as they affect Camden as “horrific”. He went on to say that no satisfactory plan for mitigation has been devised, and nor in his opinion could it ever be under the existing HS2 Ltd plan. Lord Turnbull was correct on both counts. He went on to call for a comprehensive review of alternative options for bringing HS2 trains into Euston.

7. We strongly support the position taken by Lord Turnbull. It is evident that the promoter’s current plan has been overly engineering-driven without proper concern for social and environmental - or indeed economic and financial - factors; and despite many requests they have failed to show any evidence of having looked seriously at alternative design options.

8. We accordingly ASK the committee to recommend that the government should commission a technical, economic and socio-environmental evaluation of alternative options for bringing HS2 into Euston and for the redevelopment of Euston station on an integrated basis rather the piece-meal and extremely destructive plan proposed by the promoters. This review should cover existing proposals such as the Euston Express plan proposed by Lord Berkeley and the idea of an interim terminus at Old Oak Common. Until this review is completed, there should no further preliminary works in the area between Old Oak Common and Euston.

9. The petitioners 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.

10. And the petitioners remains, etc,

Tim Lankester  
Patricia Lankester  
April 15, 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Victor Correia

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner is the proprietor of, Ferreira Delicatessen, 40 Delancey Street, London NW1. He and his family own and manage the business. The business is located on the corner of Albert Street North and Delancey Street. It is a successful and thriving grocery store, which also makes and sells sandwiches and other take-away foods, as well as selling food and drink for consumption at outside tables. Your Petitioner and his family members have owned and worked in the store for the past 25 years. Our annual turnover in 2014/15 was £583,568. The majority of customers are “walk-in” residents from local streets. The store is less than 100 metres from the Camden Cutting where, if the current HS2 Ltd plan is executed, there will be major works from 2017 to 2026. There will also be up to two years’ of works on Delancey Street and Albert Street North relating to the diversion of utilities. HS2 Ltd are predicting a significant increase in HGV traffic on Delancey Street for the whole construction period and on Albert Street North for the two years for utility works.

3. Your Petitioner and his interests are injuriously affected by the Bill. If the Bill were to be passed in its present form, there would be significant harm done to your Petitioner’s interests for the nine years of construction in the Camden Cutting.

4. Our principal concern is to do with the impact of HGV movements on our business. The additional HGV traffic on Delancey and Albert Streets will inevitably reduce the attractiveness of our location for customers as result of
which we expect to lose customers to other competing stores in Camden Town. Extra noise and pollution and increase accident risk will deter some potential customers from using our store. And we are very concerned about HGVs turning from Albert Street North onto Delancey Street: our business is located exactly on the corner where HGVs will turn. On account of the extra traffic on Delancey and HGVs turning from Albert St North onto Delancey Street, we can expect fewer customers for our out-of-doors seated café area.

5. It is impossible to predict with any accuracy how much we will be affected. But we know we will be, and we are sure that HS2 Ltd must know this too. We will gain no benefit from HS2. We do not see why we should suffer loss so that others can benefit from it.

6. When we asked the House of Commons select committee to recommend compensation for our business, we were advised by Mr Mould that, if we found we were adversely affected, we should go to the Small Claims Court (SSC). On reflection, we consider this advice completely lacking in empathy, and completely unrealistic. How could we possibly prove to the SSC that we had been adversely affected when there are many factors that affect a retailer’s sales? Are we, a small business, expected to pay for consultants to try to isolate the effect of the HS2 project works from other factors that may influence our business?

7. We would like to request that:

- The government should commission a full-scale technical, economic and socio-economic review of alternative options for bringing HS2 trains into Euston so that the negative impacts on Delancey Street, Albert Street North and the rest of Camden are radically reduced;
- If it is finally decided to proceed with the current plan for bringing the HS2 trains into Euston, the transport materials and spoil in connection with the project works should be primarily by rail, not road;
- Likewise, if the current plan is eventually and regrettably confirmed by the government, we should be awarded an ex gratia payment, to be negotiated between HS2 Ltd and ourselves, to compensate us in advance for prospective loss of business.
8. The Petitioner asks the House of Lords that he, or someone representing him be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

9. And the Petitioner remains, etc

Victor Correia

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

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

THE PETITION OF  
Elizabeth Blanche Birch

 Declares that:

1. The petitioner and her family are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

Your Petitioner and Her Home

2. I live with my son Anthony Ellis, aged 30, and daughter Blanche Ellis, aged 28, at 32 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PZ, part of the Regents Park Conservation Area. We filed two petitions and appeared before the House of Commons Select Committee in November 2015. We are members of the Park Village East Heritage Group (PVEHG) and support the petition put in on behalf of all of the residents in the road and adopt it in so far as necessary. This petition sets out my, and my family’s, personal perspective and concerns.

3. I am a member of the Commercial Bar, not now practicing as an advocate but sitting as arbitrator and mediator. I work from home for much of the time, although I have Chambers in Gray’s Inn. The location, at Park Village East (“PVE”), affords a comfortable lifestyle when working at home and easy access to Chambers for either travelling in or receiving papers by courier. I am 63 years of age.

4. My son is an academic pursuing research in the field of Classics and writing a book and, when he is here, he often works at home. My daughter is an artist and a singer-songwriter. She also works from home.

5. Park Village East (“PVE”) is a road immediately adjacent to the section of the existing railway line leading into Euston (what has been called the Euston Throat), and immediately adjacent to the proposed section of the high speed line which is designated by the Promoter as “Community Forum Area (CFA) 1 – Euston – Station and Approach”.

6. Our home at 32 PVE is a semi-detached house towards the south end of PVE, very close to Mornington Street Bridge and between that bridge and Granby Terrace Bridge, the latter lying a little to the south of our house. I bought this house in 2006 because it afforded a very quiet, elegant and beautiful residence in a Georgian house with a remarkably large and peaceful garden for its location and with space for the children to return to when they had finished their university studies. Park Village East is
presently a quiet residential street, as acknowledged in the HS2 first draft Environmental Statement. It comprises low built family villas of character. Each is individual in its design. Although it lies close to the train line, at what is called the Euston Approach, because the lines are deep in the cutting with a high retaining wall built at the turn of the century when the railway was last widened, and with substantial trees and plantation between the retaining wall and the roadside, we actually get very little operational noise from the train. Many of my visitors don’t even know that I live close to the train line.

7. These Grade II* Regency villas, built in the first quarter of the 1800s, are delicately built on very little foundations. Together with Park Village West, which lies just behind PVE (the two villages interlink by sight in places through the large gardens of each), the villages are part of a highly significant development, architecturally and historically, designed by John Nash as part of his overall scheme for Regents Park. They lie within a conservation area. As mentioned, they have very substantial gardens, which is very unusual for this part of London and we and our neighbours are all people who enjoy and use our gardens to the full during the spring, summer and autumn months. All of the gardens have very mature trees and there is a lot of wild life in the gardens including woodpeckers, wrens, bats, all the small birds and even sparrow hawks. In our garden we have a willow tree, a fig tree and a Paulownia tree and our neighbours have some ginkgo biloba trees. All of these mature trees support the birds and other wildlife to an extent that is very unusual in London. When we are in our garden, it is very peaceful and like being a world away from the busy city. During the summer months I often work in the garden when the weather is fine. All of this is part of John Nash’s original vision of a “rus in urbe”, country in the town.

8. The villas in PVE are all Crown property and the families living here have long leases from the Crown. Those leases contain very specific provisions to preserve the character of the houses and the area. Everyone has to decorate the exterior of their houses within a particular period of 6 months of the same year, every 5 years, with a stipulated colour (crown cream) and to a standard which is overseen by the Crown’s agents. No alterations are allowed to the structure, for example to the window frames or shutters and no one is allowed to put up window boxes. If a window pane cracks it has to be replaced with especially thin glass (consistent with the age of the buildings) that has to come from a special manufacturer in Birmingham. Of course, double and triple glazing is not permitted. Inevitably, one drawback of the provisions is that the houses cannot be as well insulated as a modern house, but the result is an unusually beautiful area with its Georgian character well preserved.

9. Most of the houses in PVE have a driveway and this applies to our house where we keep two cars off the road, one which I use and the other is a large estate mostly for the childrens’ use or for when we need to move large items.

10. The Promoters of the Bill have admitted that Park Village East and its residents will suffer “major adverse effects” in a number of respects by reason of the construction works authorized by the Bill. In fact the extent of the adverse effects will be beyond tolerance during the period of construction as described in more detail below and will also have a
permanent effect on this very special conservation area because of large buildings which are to be built on the opposite side of the road, which will be out of scale and style with the delicate and pretty Regency villas designed and built by John Nash.

11. The proposed engineering and construction work will have a devastating effect on my, and my family’s, health and daily life, my work and my income. Further there is bound to be a cumulative effect on the stability and value of my property, which is a substantial asset.

Your Petitioner’s Concerns

12. PVE will be one of the worst, if not the worst, affected streets in the country (other than those where actual demolition is to take place). I believe that my house (and the other houses in PVE) will be uninhabitable during the engineering and constructions work. However existing provisions for compensation and mitigation are wholly inadequate and almost non-existent.

13. I believe that Park Village East is in a very special position (over and above the rest of Camden, and of the UK overall), due among other things, to the scale of engineering work and construction to be carried out in the road over an 8 year period. There will be road closures for very long periods of time, preventing us from using our driveway and the noise and dust will be tremendous (the highest volume anticipated on the entire line). All of this engineering work is to be done right on the doorstep, as described below.

14. For the reasons set out in the PVEHG Petition and for the additional reasons set out in this petition I asks for the following relief:

- I ask first and foremost for a special provision that I (and my neighbours in PVE) should be included within the “Express Purchase” Scheme which is available to those in the country (many of whom will suffer substantially less impact than residents in PVE) but which is denied to those in urban areas regardless of need and special circumstances

- Secondly, on the evening of the hearing before the House of Commons Select Committee, HS2 offered only some PVE residents (Nos 6 to 24) an assurance that they would be rehoused during the period(s) when access is denied to their driveways (but not during the period of construction overall). This assurance was not extended to Nos. 26 to 36 which will be similarly impacted, and this includes our house. The reason given before the House of Commons Select Committee was that those at the south end of the road would have less far to walk to their cars. This is despite the fact that HS2 has no proposal for where we could park our cars. I ask, as a secondary request, that HS2 be required to at least extend the rehousing assurance to all the houses in PVE and, in particular, to my home at No. 32 PVE. Further, that rehousing should be for the full period of engineering works in PVE as it will
be intolerable for us to live there while work is carried out involving up to 90dB both day and night. The extent of the work is such that we should not be thrown back on the code of construction which would have us moving out for short periods from time to time, whenever we were finally able to make out a case that the noise had exceeded a certain level for more than a certain number of consecutive days. Such an arrangement will leave us abandoned to a game of cat and mouse with the contractor during which time our lives would be in a mess and we would be unable to properly do our work.

- I ask, also, that HS2 be directed to remove the ancilliary building proposed to be built beside Mornington Street Bridge and the intervention building proposed to be built at Granby Terrace Bridge. They will seriously affect the conservation nature of the area and neither of these buildings are required for the railway. Their purpose is to facilitate a future oversite development which it is likely will never receive planning permission for the reasons set out below. Buildings should not be allowed to be built under this legislation which would be seriously deleterious to a conservation area. The proposed building on the south side of Mornington Street Bridge will be more or less opposite my house and will obstruct both my view and my light and be extremely unsightly.

- If any such building is to be permitted, it should be directed to be capped at street level.

15. I naturally share numerous other concerns regarding the effect of construction of HS2 with other residents in the Camden area, and particularly in the cutting or Euston Throat area. However, other groups have addressed the wider implications of HS2 and the alternatives to the destruction of the Camden area and I will not repeat them here save to say that I support their petitions.

**The Promoter’s proposals affecting Park Village East - Summary**

16. Presently, existing railway lines run along the side of PVE in a cutting which is about 8m below street level. A retaining wall separates these lines from the street. The depth of the cutting means that noise from the railway in normal operation is scarcely noticeable.

17. HS2’s proposals involve demolishing the existing retaining wall and creating a new retaining structure with a permanent cantilevered overhang under the eastern footway to PVE, comprising a major steel / concrete structure under the roadway itself. The new wall will be constructed within just a few metres of most houses.

18. The existing line is about 8 metres below street level. The new lines will ultimately lie about 18 metres below street level, partially under the road (PVE) itself. Very extensive excavation is therefore required.

19. The proposed works will involve gigantic rigs being placed on the roadside immediately adjacent to these delicately built houses. These rigs will cut
trenches to a depth of about 100 feet under the road and immediately adjacent to your Petitioners' house. A new barrette wall (a very substantial steel structure) will be inserted into the trench to hold back the ground that the houses stand on. The proposal also depends upon the insertion of permanent ground anchors which will run under the houses and through most of the long gardens. Some of these ground anchors may be temporary and, as presently proposed, the one under your Petitioners' house may be one of those. Construction plant will then remain on the road – seemingly for many years – while work proceeds on the new railway lines beneath which is to include the construction of a steel box for the new trains, provision for a classic line known as Line X, a new tunnel portal, a ventilation shaft, and two other buildings that HS2 has decided that it requires. Each of the three buildings are very substantial structures that are proposed to be 8 metres above street level (so very out of scale with the villas) and there is to be a concrete deck built on the PVE side of the tracks intended for over site development running up to Mornington Bridge. I will say more about that below.

20. The proposals mean that the road will be closed for use by residents for periods measured in years.

21. This work involves not only construction, but also substantial demolition. It includes, in particular, demolition of Mornington Street Bridge (which directly abuts PVE and is almost opposite my house) and Granby Terrace Bridge a little to the south of my house. From the Environmental Statements, this will occur over an extended period and it appears to be the noisiest process on the entire line. The old retaining wall which runs the full length of PVE will also be demolished.

22. Much of the construction and demolition work will be conducted at night and at weekends (what is termed as “outside core working hours”). This is said by HS2 to be necessary so that the existing railway lines can be operated during the day. Construction equipment and HGV movements will be going on continuously while PVE residents are trying to sleep.

23. PVE will be at the epicentre of a construction site that will continue until about 2033 – in effect, into my old age and beyond the time when I am likely to be able to continue living here. In short, HS2 will transform PVE from a quiet and rural-like residential street into the epicentre of a massive construction site, inaccessible by road and with relentless noise at night and day for several decades.

24. HS2 itself acknowledges that the residents of PVE will experience “multiple adverse effects” as a result of the work. In practical terms the combination of all the engineering and construction work will make it impossible for us to enjoy our home and garden for many years. Indeed, it is hard to see how we can sensibly remain living here and yet we are to be driven from our houses with no compensation. Needless to say PVE is entirely blighted (HS2 have accepted this in principle).
25. It has to be said that HS2 have at all times maintained that they will not finalise the full programme and detailed design for the dive under at PVE until a contractor is appointed. For this reason, they say that core samples of the earth in PVE have not been taken. This gives rise to two problems. Firstly, it will not be until after a firm decision has been taken by Parliament to proceed with the scheme in its present form that anyone will consider the effect of the works on the historic houses in PVE. Secondly, as residents, we have been trying to meet a moving target because the design of the work has changed at each stage of the petitioning process. Most recently, in September 2015, AP3 set out a much worse scenario for PVE than previously. Answers to RFI's made following that new scheme have all been qualified with a statement that the design is only at an early stage and firm answers cannot be given eg as to how the movement of utilities will be handled and what that will mean for the residents, what the sequence of work will be, what the likely programme would be etc. Some questions remain entirely unanswered (not even a stab in the dark). All of this goes to the question of how realistic the present indication is that the work will take 8 years when it was initially estimated at 4 years, then increased to 6 years in September 2015 and increased to nearly 8 years by the time of the hearing before the Select Committee in November 2015. It is not known, for example, whether the noise and vibration tables have been reworked to take account of the increased amount of work indicated in recent months. At times ludicrous and patently unworkable answers (even obvious to the lay person) have been given, and then withdrawn when challenged as such. It is clear that HS2’s plans for the Euston Throat are still, despite all the delays, in great disarray.

**Consequence of the Promoter’s proposals – Vehicle access**

26. During this work, PVE will be closed to vehicles for very substantial periods of time. HS2 has not been clear about the relevant timescale. SES2 para 5.3.187 indicates that PVE will be closed to vehicles in sections between its junction with Parkway to about 30m south of Mornington Street Bridge (ie to No. 36) from 2017-2022. SES2 Para 8.4.39 states:

> The disruption to Park Village East will extend over a six year period, but vehicular access to individual properties will be provided whenever possible, although access to individual properties may have to be restricted for a period of up to 12 months during the principal works to the retaining wall structures.

(The original ES had proposed only four years, but timelines subsequently produced by HS2 during the petitioning process in the House of Commons suggest this may now be up to eight years). It goes on to state:

> 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.

27. During these very long periods of road closure, we will have no access to our driveway. Similarly, there will also be no road access for rubbish collection, post and other deliveries, tradesmen, and so forth. Particularly, for me, there will be no easy access for couriers bringing boxes of papers
(as they frequently do) or for me to get these papers to a taxi when I have a hearing or into my car when I need to take them to Chambers.

28. Although, at an early stage, it was proposed by HS2 that we might be provided with space to park our cars in the Regents Park Zoo car park, they have now decided that they require that for a lorry park. Consequently, there is presently no proposal for where we would park our cars and HS2 simply said, before the House of Commons Select Committee, that they hoped that Camden would make some provision. However, it is plain that other residents' cars, generally parked on the street south of PVE/Stanhope Street, are also to be displaced because of lorries operating in both directions on the narrow road in the approach to PVE from the south. Further, road access across the bridges will not be possible because they are to be demolished during the works and only reconstructed at the end of the construction process. Consequently, it is a hopeless wish on the part of HS2 that Camden might find somewhere for our cars to be parked within any reasonable distance. This will impact similarly, but differently, for other of my neighbours, some of whom have small children and others are elderly and need to be able to receive groceries on regular order. Indeed, if I am unable to use my car, I would also need to be able to receive groceries by delivery.

29. I am also concerned about arrangements for emergency access. HS2's Response Document refers to a "blue light system". HS2's evidence, before the House of Commons Select Committee, was that equipment on the road would be moved and acoustic barriers made removable to allow fire, ambulance or police to get to the houses. It is obvious that this would take some time with the presence of rigs and other heavy equipment on the road and the delay is likely to be substantial in critical circumstances. Further, these emergency vehicles would be driving alongside a possibly 100 metre open trench and it has not been established by HS2 that they can, anyway, provide sufficient width to make this dangerous manoeuvre possible on the house side of their trench. When challenged on real issues of this kind, HS2 resorts to an unconvincing mantra that details will be worked out later. In reality, they have no sound proposal for emergency access. As far as I understand it, the so-called "blue light system" simply means that when a fire engine, police or ambulance arrive at the end of the road and show a blue light, the contractor will start to move the heavy equipment out of the road to make access. That is not the same thing as making access available for emergency vehicles during the course of the works. Essentially these houses and their residents will be placed in a vulnerable position for at least 8 years while the work is being carried out.

Consequence of the Promoter's proposals
Noise, Night Noise and Vibration

30. SES2 para 14.3.13 states that "the following residential buildings are forecast to experience noise levels higher than the noise insulation trigger levels as defined in the draft CoCP", and lists all individual houses in PVE including my home. Moreover,

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.

14.3.19 The direct construction noise effects on the acoustic character of the areas around the residential communities identified in Table 19 are considered to be significant.

31. The table there referred to (SES2 at pages 295-296) confirms that my home will be subject to construction noise by day, and both construction noise and vibration at night, for extended periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Noise</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Demolition of buildings in the station approach, utility diversions, bridge construction, barrette retaining wall construction, cantilevered road and parapet construction, earthworks excavation, construction traffic with typical and highest monthly noise levels around 80dB and 90dB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Noise and Vibration</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Mornington Street Bridge demolition, construction of new bridge piers with typical and highest monthly noise levels around 95dB and 105dB. Combined noise and vibration: 3 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Noise</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Utility diversions, barrette retaining wall construction, cantilevered road and parapet construction, earthworks excavation, construction traffic with typical and highest monthly noise levels around 75dB and 85dB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Noise</td>
<td>Night</td>
<td>Mornington Street Bridge demolition, construction of new bridge piers with typical and highest monthly noise levels around 95dB and 105dB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these categories and periods of time for excess noise and vibration relate to our home, with its close proximity to Mornington Street Bridge.

The stated noise levels of 80-90 dB (first row in the table above) are higher than anywhere else on the line. The second row in the table shows a period of night-time working when there will be both noise and vibration combined. I believe that the house will be uninhabitable during those periods, which appear to be separate periods of time, totalling 4 years in all. Of course, there will also be other noise throughout the period of construction and demolition which hasn’t been shown on that table including constant movement of lorries and materials both day and night. Even now we have night-time noise from the cutting where Network Rail purports to be taking core earth samples for HS2 and that is substantially disturbing but probably doesn’t even feature on HS2’s charts.

32. SES2 para 14.3.33 accepts that despite mitigation measures,
“the effects on the acoustic character in the following local residential community areas are considered to be significant: Park Village East; ... [other streets]”.

33. The reality is that the effects will not merely be "significant" – they will be intolerable for those of us living so close to these works and I rely on the evidence produced by PVEHG (of which I am a member) in relation to the effect on residents of some similar, but probably more minor work done in Newcastle.

Consequence of the Promoter’s proposals

Traffic and parking

34. The number of forecast HGV’s, trucks and other construction traffic in the surrounding roads, and indeed in the whole of Camden will be so bad that it has been argued by some that they will be prisoners in their own homes. Concentrating on PVE, two construction compounds are proposed, one at the north end (opposite Nos. 6-10 PVE) and the other by the Carriage Sheds close to Granby Terrace Bridge (and close to No. 36 PVE). These compounds will be lit at night (5.3.44), they will have buildings on them which may be stacked up to six storeys (5.3.45) and they will be in use for six years, from 2018 to 2024, and support about 40 personnel (5.3.69). In relation to traffic, para 3.3.16 states that

The main construction traffic access to the Stage A works will be via the National Temperance Hospital entrance, but with substantial use of the Carriage Shed and Park Village East satellite compound and the Park Village East (north) satellite compound.

So road traffic including HGVs and lorries, and consequential noise, will plainly exacerbate the engineering and construction works at either end of the road, in what is presently a quiet residential street.

Habitability and Health Issues

35. I believe that for a substantial number of years my home will be effectively uninhabitable. The combined "multiple adverse effects", including night working, noise, vibration, bright lights at night, and road closure will make life, work and sleep impossible.

36. The effect on the quiet enjoyment of our home, including the garden which we use all the time, and the amenity of off-street parking, will be far beyond what should be tolerated without fair and proper recompense. The only compensation available is on the Need to Sell Scheme which has been well demonstrated yet again recently, by our neighbours Nick and Evelyn Carn, to be operated by HS2 as a “financial hardship” scheme despite the comments made about it by the House of Commons Select Committee. This fails to recognise the realities of our specific case which is that we have blighted property which we cannot sell and we are facing an onslaught of disruption to our lives from a decade of engineering and construction work which no one should be forced to live through (by the government or anyone
else). In this case it is the government, and it should be forced to face up to its responsibilities. A failure to do so is a breach of our human rights.

37. Beyond this, our family has an additional problem in that we are unfortunately asthmatics and, specifically, allergic to dust. I have suffered with Pneumonia in the past, resulting in her my left lung being partially inoperative. The size and space of the property in a quiet residential road with the spacious garden behind, with a rural aspect of substantial and mature trees and planting, has enabled the family to live reasonably healthily (with medication) in central London, away from major pollution.

38. It is clear that there will be substantial dust, fumes and pollution arising from the engineering and construction works, quite apart from the noise and vibration, and there is no doubt that the health of all of the family will be seriously adversely affected by the proposed engineering works in PVE.

39. Being concerned as to what would happen if HS2 forced us to “sit it out” in PVE throughout the works (what feels like an unusual version of punishment and imprisonment!) I was advised that I could make an application under section 9 of a Decision Document dated April 2014. That section provides:

“Atypical properties and special circumstances

9.1.1 In chapter 6 of the September 2013 consultation document we set out our thinking with regard to atypical properties and special circumstances. It was noted that in certain specific cases it may be desirable for Government to supplement its discretionary schemes with further assistance for owner-occupiers living in atypical properties or special circumstances.

9.1.2 Though the measures outlined in this document are designed with flexibility and inclusiveness in mind, there will inevitably be some instances where it is appropriate for Government to go further. We intend to avoid unfairly disadvantaging certain individuals and to ensure that all those who take advantage of discretionary measures for HS2 are given the assistance or support they need.

9.1.3 HS2 Ltd will therefore work directly with property owners of atypical properties or those who are experiencing special circumstances in order to consider how their needs can best be met while protecting the interests of the taxpayer.

9.1.4 Though it has been suggested that this approach may not offer sufficient flexibility, we would like to reassure individuals facing such circumstances that we are committed to providing fair and appropriate access to compensation and all necessary support to those directly affected by HS2. Our approach to atypical properties and special circumstances fully reflects that commitment.”

40. That document refers to “Special Circumstances” but says nothing about health or medical grounds and seems to be more concerned with atypical properties than my circumstance. Having no other choice, I asked my GP to make a report, as advised by HS2, and I filed an application on 31st December 2016. The application was acknowledged very briefly and I then heard nothing for three months. After a substantial amount of chasing by both email and telephone (all ignored), I eventually made such a fuss recently that HS2 finally paid attention and appears now to be taking some active steps to consider my application. I have considerable doubts about the suitability and transparency of the process, which is
apparently to be determined on the sole basis of a report by a firm of
engineers appointed and briefed by HS2. The suitability of such a firm to
report on issues of health has to be called into question and it has yet to
be confirmed that I will be entitled to see the report that they produce.
Accordingly, I reserve my position to address the select committee on this
issue if necessary. I believe that such applications should be considered
and ruled on by an independent person or body, not in the pocket of HS2.

41. The suggestion made in the Promoter's Response Document (November
2015) that dust can be "managed" and that such "controls and measures"
will be enforced against the contractor is unrealistic. Before the House of
Commons Select Committee, it was said that the dust would be managed
by the use of a hose pipe on site. It is ludicrous to suggest that the dust
arising from the demolition of a bridge at close quarters, or from the
demolition of the substantial retaining wall (also at close quarters) or from
digging a 30 metre trench (also at close quarters) can be eliminated by the
use of a hose pipe. The use of the words "controls and measures" and
"good housekeeping" and "... will be enforced" are pure mantra and
meaningless.

42. The Promoter's statement that "... it is generally accepted that dust does
not penetrate the lungs to cause respiratory health problems" is equally
ludicrous. It has long been the case that asthmatics have been advised by
health practitioners to reduce the use of carpets in homes (to avoid the
collection of dust), and to use special mattress and duvet covers for the
same purpose. Further, since it has been confirmed by tests that I am
allergic to dust, I cannot see how HS2 can maintain that dust will not cause
a health issue. My own GP has expressed enormous surprise at such a
suggestion. HS2 does not, of course, state what their source is for such
surprising statements.

43. The Promoter does accept that dust can cause eye, nose and throat
irritation and "lead to nuisance effects". It is true that I do suffer from all of
those symptoms if exposed to dust or other allergens but I would dispute
that they are merely "nuisance effects". Eye swelling problems are very
hampering in work and life generally and in my experience have to be
treated with steroid drops for one or two months to recover and the
problem, once started often reoccurs several times. Throat symptoms are
particularly distressing as they can result in difficulty breathing and I have
prior experience of that. Indeed, a heavy dose of dust or other allergen
frequently gives rise to a swelling of my face to such an extent that I am
unable to see and ultimately results in a severe drop in blood pressure and
collapse. I have been admitted to hospital on previous occasions as a
result.

44. The promoter also accepts that anxiety may be caused by the perceived
health effects of dust, particularly by people with existing respiratory
conditions such as asthma. It is certainly the case that the present attitude
of HS2 in relation to this issue is causing much anxiety and stress in our
family.

45. In the absence of a satisfactory outcome to my application, I will address
the Select Committee fully on this issue.
HS2’s Mitigation Measures

46. HS2 proposes to mitigate the effects of noise by using secondary glazing on the windows of living and sleeping spaces facing the work. However, this will not work in the Nash houses because many windows have shutters and, in the case of my house, I have casement windows opening inwards. Further, the effect of any such mitigation measures will be reduced by the fact that the glazing already there is much thinner than normal for the reasons set out above. Also, the doors and windows are not close fitting, as the buildings are very old. I have met representatives of some of the secondary and primary glazing firms (including ones which I believe HS2 would intend to use) and they have all said that there is no satisfactory way to use secondary glazing. Primary double and acoustic glazing could be used, although it would substantially change the aesthetic look of these Georgian Houses and there would be a question of permission from the Crown to do this. However, those firms have also said that double glazing, even with special acoustic glass could not reduce a noise of 90dB to a level of noise that is considered acceptable for living or sleeping purposes under the generally accepted standards. Of course, the value of the properties would also be diminished by changing the glazing in that way.

47. Further, any noise and dust will equally penetrate through the windows and doors at the back of the property. These properties are not terraced and they have large spaces between each house. The noise and dust will penetrate between the houses and, indeed, as I have the army barracks on Albany Street at the back of my property, the noise will reverberate against the hard surfaces and bounce back. In reality, all of the windows, front, back and side would need to be treated for noise and dust reduction. As I have already indicated this would still not achieve an acceptable level of noise.

48. PVEHG produced an expert at the House of Commons Select Committee. He gave evidence (which was not disputed by HS2) that the gardens at PVE will be unusable during the period of the work.

49. For all these reasons, I do not believe that the promoter can effectively mitigate the noise and dust that will be created during this project.

50. Finally, it should be noted that like all mitigation and remedial measures proposed by HS2, the residents are required to make all the arrangements for noise reduction, pay for it out of their own pocket and then seek to recover it from HS2. Since HS2 has a habit of not responding to correspondence, it is obvious that this will result in the residents being out of pocket for a considerable period of time and having to expend their own valuable time not only making all the arrangements but also chasing HS2 for payment.

Relief Sought from the Select Committee

51. For the reasons we set out above, I respectfully request the Select Committee to require the promoter to make a special provision that the
benefit of the Express Purchase Scheme is available to our family and our neighbours.

52. I therefore respectfully request that the government should either include PVE in the surface safeguarded area, or provide a binding commitment that the properties at PVE should be deemed eligible for the Express Purchase Scheme or should be able to benefit from compensatory measures equivalent to the Express Purchase Schemes.

53. In any event, a full rehousing option should be available for all houses in PVE, including my house which should cover the whole of the period of the works. Suggestions have been made by HS2 personnel that we might be rehoused from time to time in a Bed and Breakfast arrangement. This is entirely unacceptable and they should be required to provide suitable alternative accommodation ie a house of similar size, with the same number of bedrooms, bathrooms and other amenities and with good garden amenities. This will not be easy to find, but that emphasises the appropriateness of offering the express purchase scheme to those in PVE as a special circumstance.

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 the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Elizabeth Birch
32 Park Village East, London NW1 7PZ

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

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

THE PETITION OF FASHION BY DESIGN LTD TRADING AS ANDREW GARDNER  

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioners is Fashion by Design Ltd trading as Andrew Gardner, The Tanyard, Tring Road, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6ND who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners business is 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 Fashion Limited trading as Andrew Gardner, The Tanyard, Tring Road, Wendover, Buckinghamshire HP22 6ND. Andrew Gardner has been trading in Wendover since 1976. For the last 40 years the business has sold high quality Men’s & since 1985 Ladies clothing. The business has no web business. Our customers (which number over 3000) visit the store for one to one service; we are effectively a one-stop shop selling a huge range of different clothing. We employ 10 staff, with an average 18 years experience in the industry. The business is located at the bottom of the High street, which is close to the proposed route of HS2. Andrew Gardner brings many customers into the town who then go on to use other specialist shops, local restaurants and services, Andrew Gardner is a destination store of choice for many, customers travel from all across the country, although the majority are from four counties (Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Hertfordshire) plus the London conurbation. Your petitioner therefore submits that the noise and dust in the construction phase will severely affect this beautiful town and the vibration and air pollution caused by the close proximity of extremely large construction vehicles will discourage customers from making the journey to shop in Wendover.  

3. Your Petitioners concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioner as a business owner in Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals
In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two large and intrusive viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

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

This will inevitably lead to severe disruption and loss of business, as Wendover will lose its charming nature for the duration. Many of our 3000 loyal customers will find it difficult to travel into Wendover and therefore choose to take their business elsewhere. Those travelling from the west of the proposed railway may well be affected by major diversions. Many of our local customers may also seek out a shopping environment that takes them away from the town. (Indeed quite a number of customers have already moved away due to the threat of HS2 or having sold property to HS2 along the route).

The longer the disruption lasts, the harder it will be to persuade them to return. This impact will result in reduced profits for your petitioner, lowering the value of the businesses and make it more difficult to sell. HS2 will have a detrimental effect on your petitioner because the proposed construction phase is so long, also the route runs right along the A413 corridor, disrupting traffic all the way.

Your petitioner believes that they will be directly and specially affected by the proposed construction of HS2 as the general feeling of wellbeing in Wendover will be lost. I would ask their Lordships on the select committee where they would choose to shop – in a town in the middle of one of the largest transport construction sites in Europe or in a peaceful market town within the Chilterns AONB.

Your Petitioner contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Your petitioner and his customers need to use the narrow lanes and
roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the vital link road the A 413 for London and all other areas.

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

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

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, huge savings would be made by avoiding the need for: 2 viaducts, 4km of cuttings, 1.7km of embankments, 1 cut-and-cover tunnel, 6 compounds(net), 8 bridges, 7 pylon moves, 8 demolitions (homes/farms) detriment to 5 community assets, protection of 1,432 homes from harmful noise and over 4,000 people from property blight.

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

Hierarchy of Mitigation

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

b. That 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.

c. 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. 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.

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

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

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

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.

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

TIM GUY Director Fashion by Design Ltd

16th April 2016]
PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF WENDOVER CHAMBER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioners is the members of Wendover Chamber of Trade and Commerce, c/o Numbers Ltd, 32 High Street, Wendover, HP22 6EA who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners business is in Wendover adjacent to that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

Wendover Chamber of Trade and Commerce has been in existence for over 25 years, it represents 60 members with diverse trading interests creating and helping business opportunities and related events for Wendover. Many of the businesses are on or near Wendover High Street, very close to the proposed route of HS2. Wendover is a historic market town and in 2014 we celebrated the 800th anniversary of the granting of a charter by King John. Wendover is not only conducive to a flourishing business environment but also attracts many local visitors and tourists to its specialist shops, restaurants, pubs, services, and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Wendover is a destination of choice for many in the conurbation and its hinterland. Wendover’s ancient High Street features many fifteenth century and other buildings which have no foundations so they are very susceptible to damage. Your petitioner therefore submits that the noise and dust in the construction phase will be channelled directly down the hill into the town and the vibration and air pollution caused by the close proximity of extremely large construction vehicles will discourage not only customers but also tourists.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident and/or business owner in Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently
intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.

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

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

This will inevitably lead to severe disruption to and loss of business as Wendover will lose its charming nature for the duration. Many regular loyal customers will find it difficult to travel into Wendover and may therefore choose to take their business elsewhere. The longer the journey disruption lasts, the harder it will be to persuade our customer to return. During the construction phase of the proposed railway line, this unique area and will be destroyed and will deter many tourists and customers for years to come. This impact will result in reduced profits for your petitioners, lower value of their businesses and make them difficult to sell. During the construction of the 1997 Wendover bypass your Petitioner found a significant loss of trade and consequently profit, and it has taken considerable time to rebuild the confidence and diversity we lost. HS2 will have a far greater detrimental effect on your petitioner because the proposed construction phase is much longer than that of the bypass. Your petitioner believes that it will be directly and specially affected by the proposed construction of HS2 as the general feeling of well-being in Wendover will be lost. We fear retail businesses in the High Street will close (indeed the threat of HS2 is already having a significant effect on business investment) and property in the immediate area will not be saleable for some time after the construction phase is complete. It will take many years for confidence in the area to return. Despite all the adverse effects to businesses, there is no compensation scheme for your petitioner’s businesses.
Your Petitioner contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Your petitioner and his customers need to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the vital link road the A 413 for London and all other areas.

Your Petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover, by requiring the construction of an extended tunnel, based on the T3I proposals, as developed by HS2 Limited, to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel. The extended tunnel proposals have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable. This proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums, and is supported by them. The adoption of this proposal, which is jointly submitted and will be presented with others, would substantially remove the adverse effects complained of in the remainder of this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

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

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, huge savings would be made by avoiding the need for: 2 viaducts, 4km of cuttings, 1.7km of embankments, 1 cut-and-cover tunnel, 6 compounds(net), 8 bridges, 7 pylon moves, 8 demolitions (homes/farms) detriment to 5 community assets, protection of 1,432 homes from harmful noise and over 4,000 people from property blight.

It makes the majority of the mitigation proposed, in large measure unnecessary as so many of their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented.

Hierarchy of Mitigation

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

b. 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.

c. 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. 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.

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

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

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

b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A 413 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 A 413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by.
construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained.
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response given the traffic congestion that will on the main emergency routes.
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area. during construction.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a timely manner.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

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

TIM GUY Agent for Wendover Chamber of Trade Commerce

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Katherine Sarah Weatherhead
Declares that:

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

The Petitioner is injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for the following reasons,

Your petitioner Katherine Sarah Weatherhead is freehold owner of Lower Little London Farm, Little London, Wendover, Aylesbury, Bucks HP22 6QQ. Your petitioner is a resident of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). She will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

I have lived at Little London for 19 years. I am a Director and the Group Secretary of “The Weatherhead Group which comprises 3 individual companies, drilling, drainage, and tankering the company is also based at this property. This company serves in particular the local area as there is no mains drainage, as such are providing an important social and health community benefit.

Lower Little London Farm is situated less than 1km of the proposed HS2 route. The property is shown on HS2 Ltd Maps.

Your Petitioner is concerned, that the value and her home and business has and will be negatively affected.

The property is situated in the Chilterns AoNB on the west side of the Misbourne Valley, directly opposite Hartley Farm which lies on the Eastern slope. It has unobstructed views of the hillside where the proposed railway HS2 would run on two viaducts and an embankment. Also views of the proposed substation, and balancing ponds.

Little London is a tiny rural settlement, no pubs, no shops, no street lighting, no mains drainage, and little noise.
Current and future problems caused by the proposal for an HS2 line through the AONB.

People living in the AONB have bought their properties at premium prices. They did so because they value peace, beauty and tranquility. I have invested large sums of money and a huge amount of time and effort and emotion to sympathetically renovate the property in adherence to the strict planning regulations that pertain to the AoNB. During the renovations we have reversed the house outlook to look across the valley to have wide ranging views of this unique protected landscape. This will now give us uninterrupted views of an enormous embankment with a high speed train running on top with the associated gantries.

I see it as a privilege and a responsibility to preserve the protected landscape. As part of the Community of Little London and adjoining Dunsmore, I, have endeavoured to preserve the environment for future generations. I was a founder member of the Dunsmore Society, which was constituted to protect the local environment before we had heard of the proposed HS2.

The prospect of the monstrous concrete monstrosity, visual and light intrusion, that is HS2 destroying the visual beauty and the noise and impact of the high speed trains destroying the tranquility fills me with horror and great sadness. HS2 Ltd and the government have failed to protect this legally protected area for a vanity project. I cannot afford to relocate because I am not covered by the Compensation Scheme. The scheme is totally inadequate and individuals like myself are left to bear the cost.

Problems caused by the Construction Phase include:-

Property devaluation and difficulty in selling the property.
Construction noise impacting on tranquility.
Destruction of unique landscape, the line including two 500 meter viaducts and a joining high embankment, balancing ponds, feeder station, spoil dumps otherwise known as sustainable placement areas!
Visual intrusion ZTV.
Decrease in air quality caused by construction dust. I have 2 family members who suffer from Asthma and the dust production from construction will have a deleterious effect on them. They are advised to sleep with the windows open and both construction and operational phases will make this impossible.
Reduced access to health facilities and emergency services, this is problematic as mentioned above with asthmatic family members.
Increased journey times in transporting my daughter to school.

Impaired access to amenities. As a family we cycle a great deal and use Smalldene Lane as a route into Wendover as the A413 is not really a safe road for a cycling group. This road is scheduled to be closed under HS2’s plans (Small Dene Lane).

My mother resides in Wendover and she is 81 years old and is not in good health which involves me in regular visits to see her sometime on a rapid response basis. The increased traffic loading on the A413 will create increased journey times for this.

Our relaxation time will be ruined by up to 36 trains per hour running along the embankment with the concomitant noise, electrical sparking and light pollution, this will be totally alien in this protected landscape.

I have several dogs which I enjoy walking on a daily basis, this will be an enjoyable experience alongside a giant construction site. Also when the residential construction site is in existence I would feel unsafe walking around the local woods, this will represent a huge change that I will need to make to my lifestyle which I think is unreasonable and brought about by HS2’s plans.

My 3 daughters have long dreamed of being married in St Mary’s Church Wendover followed by receptions held at home in our garden. Under the current proposals this will have to remain a dream as both properties will be plagued by noise and disruption.

Your honourable house may deem the above as self indulgent but it represents to me the very essence of what family life should be, as such I consider the level of chaos and disruption caused by the current HS2 plan to be totally abhorrent.

Problems caused during operation of HS2 will effect your Petitioner: -

Reduction in Property value.

Desecrated environment visually and auditory. Loss of tranquility, light pollution,

HS2 Ltd should have adopted the maxim of, Avoidance followed by Mitigation and if not possible then Compensation. In the view of your Petitioner they have done none of these in their current plans.

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

the disruption to sleep caused by obtrusive noise generated by passing trains in late evenings and early mornings; the visual impact of the proposed Small Dean Viaduct and associated embankments with noise barriers reducing the appeal of this part of the AONB; and associated impact on property values and local businesses for current and future generations.
Mitigation

1. A fully bored tunnel through the whole of the AONB. Whilst the Southern section of the AoNB has received tunnelling by way of mitigation this protection has been denied to the Northern section.

All excavated, spoil and waste material should be removed from the AoNB.

2. 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.

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

4. Compensation Scheme is not, but should be fair.

The impact on Dunsmore has not been acknowledged, or properly assessed in ES. There has been a failure to comprehend the topographical nature of the Misbourne valley.

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

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.

2. 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.

Signed

Katherine Sarah Weatherhead

Date 13.4.16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF The Weatherhead Group Ltd  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

The Petitioners are residents of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). They will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.  

The Petitioner is injuredly affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

Your petitioner A Weatherhead Ltd. is a family run Buckinghamshire business based at Lower Little London Farm, Little London, Wendover, Aylesbury, Bucks HP22 6QQ. The business was started 24 years ago and has been based at Little London for 18 years. The Weatherhead Group comprises 3 individual companies, drilling, drainage, and tankering. This company serves in particular the local area as there is no mains drainage, as such are providing an important social and health community benefit.  

Lower Little London Farm is situated less than 1km of the proposed HS2 route. The property is shown on HS2 Ltd Maps.  

Your Petitioner is concerned, that the viability of the business operation, and the value of the business and the residential/commercial property has and will be negatively affected.  

The property is situated in the Chilterns AoNB on the west side of the Misbourne Valley, directly opposite Hartley Farm which lies on the Eastern slope. It has unob-
structed views of the hillside where the proposed railway HS2 would run on two viaducts and an embankment. Also views of the proposed substation and balancing ponds.

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

Your Petitioner avers that the Group will be seriously and adversely affected during both the construction phase and then during operation. Your Petitioner has been involved with the HS2 proposal over the last 4 years through “The Dunsmore Society”, who have had bilateral meetings with HS2 Ltd and attended CF10 meetings.

Problems caused by the Construction Phase which will injuriously impact on your Petitioner: -

HS2 Ltd Environmental Statement was incorrect in terms of HGV use at the junction of Dunsmore Lane and the A413, It stated 1 HGV movement per day. Your Petitioners Company dispatches a minimum of 18 of such vehicles per day and their return movement. This is only one example of their inaccuracies and omissions. There will be 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.

The proposed closure of Smalldene Lane will mean that all vehicles will have to use the Dunsmore Lane junction with the A413, 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.

Due to the closure of Smalldene Lane, Weatherhead employees, (the business provides work for 15 families) will be forced, when coming to work from Wendover or Aylesbury, to use the A413. They will have to stop and make a right turn in the middle of the A413. Crossing continuous and heavy traffic with limited visibility putting the employees and others at risk.

People will be deterred from working for the Weatherhead group if as a consequence of construction traffic and hold ups their travel time to and from work is dramatically increased.

Because of congestion there will be a decrease in productive working hours and as a consequence the busi-
ness will be forced to increase customer charges because of this increased travel time due to HS2 Construction. Redundancies could be possible. HS2 Ltd have not properly assessed the financial impact on local businesses and as such have not properly assessed the true cost of HS2.

The congestion will have a severe effect on the response time of Emergency Services to Little London and could have major consequences in terms of events such as fire. There is a risk of increased insurance premiums.

Daily deliveries of tanker parts, sewage treatment plant deliveries, etc will be impacted because of congestion. There is therefore a significant risk that we will be charged more for deliveries or that companies will refuse to supply.

There is a real and perceived security risk to expensive plant and fuel during construction. Consequentially the Company will incur costs related to security.

Your Petitioner provides emergency 24 hour call out for sewage, water, and flooding emergencies. This service will be seriously impacted by the traffic congestion putting it in jeopardy.

Your Petitioner avers that the operation of HS2 following the completion of the proposed scheduled works would have the following permanent effects:

Problems caused by Construction and Operation phases of proposed HS2 injuriously impacting on your Petitioner.

1. Noise from construction and operation will destroy the tranquility of the Company Yard. There is nothing in the way to act as a noise barrier. 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. The Chiltern line running in the valley below the Petitioner’s property is in a cutting, and the A413 is beyond. The noise is significantly reduced by the topography housing and hedging. This will not be the case with HS2 in the local area which is on 2 high viaducts and a huge embankment. Our employees in
particular our mechanics highly value working in a tranquil rural location. Their working environment would be degraded both during construction and operation. During operation the noise will be every 90 seconds and will vary according to the trains position either on a viaduct 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 effect of a maximum 36 x 400 meter trains per hour will totally destroy the tranquility of the area. As mentioned above the area enjoys relatively high levels of tranquility and it is a matter for regret, that, despite requests to HS2Ltd they chose not to undertake any sound surveys here.

Remedial Measures:-
A fully bored tunnel to the end of the AoNB would solve most of the problems not only for the Petitioner but also importantly the employees and the customers. It would remove the threat to the company and peoples employment.

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

The Petitioners concerns during the construction phase can be summarised as:
the adverse impact on the local road network causing delays in travelling to work and accessing emergency services; the reduction in customers and other visitors wanting to come to Wendover businesses causing local unemployment; the reduction in property values for owners seeking to realise investments in their homes; and the noise, dirt, and Public Right of Way disruption that will be generated by the works.

The Petitioners concerns during the operational phase can be summarised as:
the disruption to sleep caused by obtrusive noise generated by passing trains in late evenings and early mornings; the visual impact of the proposed Small Dean Viaduct and associated embankments with noise barriers
reducing the appeal of this part of the AONB; and associated impact on property values and local businesses for current and future generations.

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Signed

13. 4. 16
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF  

Christina Marilyn O’Toole and Michael John O’Toole.  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

The Petitioners are residents of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). They will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.  

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

3. Your petitioner’s concerns are as follows  

Your petitioners are the freehold owners of Daffodil Cottage, Dunsmore, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6QH, in which the Petitioners have lived since 1997. The Petitioners bought the property because of its scenic location in quiet surroundings. The Petitioners are members of The Dunsmore Village Hall Association and The Dunsmore Society who have engaged with HS2 Ltd. at Bilateral and Forum meetings and have been engaged in the consultations.  

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

Your Petitioners aver that they are already currently affected,
suffering blight, and will continue to be severely affected both in the construction of and operation of the proposed HS2 railway.

Current problems injuriously affecting your Petitioners

The Petitioners believe that their property is now blighted as it is in the HS2 corridor. (A description now used by Estate Agents). They bought their property in 1997 as a peaceful tranquil retreat for their retirement. Because of its location in the AoNB and in the then much sought after settlement of Dunsmore, they bought it at a premium price.

They foresee that in the near future they will need to downsize; this plan is now in jeopardy. Also affected is the value of their children’s inheritance.

Problems in the Construction and Operation phases injurious to the Petitioners.

Your Petitioners aver that they will be seriously and adversely affected during both the construction phase and then during operation. The impact of noise, vibration, and light pollution, including electric sparking on health, from the high frequency of trains is considered by the Petitioners to be totally injurious especially for them in retirement.

There will be 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 Smaldene Lane will mean that all vehicles will have to use the Dunsmore Lane junction with the A413. 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.

The closure of Smaldene Lane will force your Petitioners when returning from Berkhamsted and Wendover to use the A413 and to stop and make a right turn to get home, crossing continuous and heavy traffic with limited visibility putting your petitioners and others at risk, including Emergency Services to Dunsmore and will impact on the journey times to the Health Care facilities located in Wendover. This could be injurious to the Petitioners and their property. As both Peti-
tioners are asthmatic, easterly winds causing chalk dust from the construction will be a potential serious health hazard.

Your Petitioners currently enjoy little light pollution. The need for powerful lighting on the construction site and the construction camps will have a negative impact on 'dark skies'. Noise from construction and operation will destroy the tranquility of the property. Although approximately 1km from the proposed line, there is nothing in the way to act as a noise barrier. HS2 Ltd noise assessment has not taken into account the topography of the valley or the tranquility levels. HS2 Ltd has 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. HS2 in the local vicinity of Dunsmore is on 2 high viaducts and a huge embankment.

The Chilterns AONB would be permanently and irrevocably scarred by the construction of two viaducts and an embankment with heights ranging from 10 to 18 metres and the associated catenary above. The line would be visible from numerous viewpoints around Dunsmore. 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.

The effect of a maximum of 36 x 400 metre trains per hour will totally destroy the tranquility of Dunsmore and its environs. As mentioned above, Dunsmore enjoys relatively high levels of tranquility and it is a matter for regret, that, despite requests to HS2 Ltd they chose not to undertake any sound surveys here; this, despite us having a private study done to establish a baseline level of noise. 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 Petitioners.

The noise from these trains will cause an intolerable strain upon your Petitioners' lives and sleep. During operation the noise will be every 90 seconds and will vary according to the trains' position either on a viaduct 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.
Remedies

In the light of all the issues above your Petitioners assert that the only acceptable form of mitigation in this area would be a fully bored tunnel throughout the AoNB. HS2 Ltd. has acknowledged that this is technically feasible.

Failing the above, the 2 viaducts and embankment should be totally enclosed as per ARUP concept. Screening must be with mature trees.

There should be a legally binding Code of Construction Practice.

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

the adverse impact on the local road network causing delays in travelling to work and accessing emergency services; the reduction in customers and other visitors wanting to come to Wendover businesses causing local unemployment; the reduction in property values for owners seeking to realise investments in their homes; and the noise, dirt, and Public Right of Way disruption that will be generated by the works.

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

the disruption to sleep caused by obtrusive noise generated by passing trains in late evenings and early mornings; the visual impact of the proposed Small Dean Viaduct and associated embankments with noise barriers reducing the appeal of this part of the AONB; and associated impact on property values and local businesses for current and future generations.

Petitioners have additional concerns about the construction of the Green Tunnel, and the associated impact on the Coombe Hill aquifer that feeds the Grand Union Canal and Weston Turville Reservoir SSSI. The key concern relates to currently undefined requirement to add reservoirs, pipelines and a pumping station to mitigate the damage caused by extensive interception of the aquifer; and the associated extension of the construction
costs and timescale in the Wendover area which could be avoided by redesign.

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

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 SCRUPLES OF WENDOVER LTD

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioners is Scruples of Wendover Ltd, 16 High Street, Wendover, Bucks HP22 6EA who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners business is 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 Scruples of Wendover Ltd, 16 High Street, Wendover, Bucks HP22 6EA. Your petitioner has been running her business in Wendover High Street since 1985 and now currently employs 21 members of staff. Your Petitioner's property will not be demolished as a result of the Bill but it is located on the High Street close to the line and within the construction footprint. Scruples customers and therefore the business will be detrimentally effected by the building of HS2 as Wendover will be disrupted and delays inevitable with heavy plant and increased traffic. Your petitioner therefore submits that the noise and dust in the construction phase will affect the High Street and the vibration and air pollution caused by the close proximity of an extremely large construction site will discourage not only my customers but also tourists to Wendover in general. People come into Scruples salon for relaxation and pampering, it will not be possible to offer this environment during the construction of HS2. Any detrimental effect on the business will result in the need to make cuts including redundancies. No compensation is available for businesses who will be affected by HS2.

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a business owner in Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals
regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.

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

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

This will inevitably lead to severe disruption and loss of business, as Wendover will lose its charming nature for the duration. Loyal customers will find it difficult to travel into Wendover and therefore could choose to take their business elsewhere. Those travelling from the west of the proposed railway may well be affected by major diversions. Many of our local customers may also seek out a saloons in a more relaxing environment that takes them away from the town.

The longer the disruption lasts, the harder it will be to persuade them to return. This impact will result in reduced profits for your petitioner, lowering the value of the businesses and make it more difficult to sell. HS2 will have a detrimental effect on your petitioner because the proposed construction phase is so long.

Your petitioner believes that they will be directly and specially affected by the proposed construction of HS2 as the general feeling of wellbeing in Wendover will be lost. I would ask their Lordships on the select committee where they would choose to go for Hair & Beauty treatment or a relaxing massage – a town in the middle of one of the largest transport construction sites in Europe or in a peaceful market town within the Chilterns AONB.

Your Petitioner contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Your petitioner and her customers need to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services
and rail, as well as to gain access to the vital link road the A 413 for London and all other areas.

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

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

3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, huge savings would be made by avoiding the need for: 2 viaducts, 4km of cuttings, 1.7km of embankments, 1 cut-and-cover tunnel, 6 compounds (net), 8 bridges, 7 pylon moves, 8 demolitions (homes/farms) detriment to 5 community assets, protection of 1,432 homes from harmful noise and over 4,000 people from property blight.

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

**Hierarchy of Mitigation**

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

b. That 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.
c. 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
d. 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
e. 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
f. 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
g. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

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

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

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

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

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.

Signature of YVONNE BONE Director of Scuples of Wendover Ltd

16th April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF THE LIONEL ABEL-SMITH TRUST

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner is a charitable trust established in 1977 by the late Lionel Abel-Smith, Lord of the Manor of Wendover, through the gift of 16 properties in Pound Street and High Street Wendover, in close proximity to the proposed HS2 route. The properties date from 15th and 17th centuries and are Grade II listed.

Your petitioner’s concerns

3. Your Petitioner’s properties lie within the area shown in the Environmental Statement which will be impacted by the construction and operation of HS2. Your Petitioner is the Lionel Abel-Smith Trust (Charity No.274879), a voluntary organisation with full charitable status founded in 1977. Its aim is to provide benefit for residents and organisations in genuine need within the Parish of Wendover and the Moor Park estate. The Trust is dependent on the rental income from properties in Pound Street and High Street, Wendover which the Bill may directly and specifically affect. These 16 properties were gifted by the late Lionel Abel-Smith, Lord of the Manor of Wendover, to form the Trust.

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

5. Your Petitioner is concerned that the installation and operation of HS2 will reduce demand for living in Wendover, particularly within the proximity of the route. A negative effect on the Trust’s income due to reduction in both property and “fair” rental value caused by construction and operation of HS2 will significantly reduce the value of the Trust’s fund and the beneficial capacity of the charity, consequently having an adverse effect on the whole community. The income provided by the properties and subsequently awarded in grant aid affects the functioning of numerous clubs and societies within the village in addition to the well-being of many individuals. Therefore your Petitioner requests an indemnity to remedy any damage, claims, demands, proceedings, costs, damages, expenses and disruption arising from the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development.

6. The historic, listed properties along Pound Street, Wendover are not compulsorily acquired, but there are concerns among other matters: structural damage to the property from construction vehicles and works, settlement impacts from noise and dust, impacts on visual amenity, interference with access, interference with supplies of services and for injurious affection caused by the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development.

7. Your Petitioner is also concerned that these properties are Listed therefore installation of noise insulation may be prohibited or would be very expensive. Your Petitioner requests that the issue of Listed Buildings Consent and the requisite installation is undertaken and funded by the nominated undertaker with consultation and the agreement of your Petitioner.

8. Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development at Wendover and on the wider area will impact significantly upon the quiet enjoyment of the properties and the entire neighbourhood by way of noise, disturbance, visual intrusion and considerable traffic increases. Your Petitioner believes that a fully bored tunnel through the AONB would be the solution to these issues and would not only protect the
asset value of your petitioner's properties but also the immeasurable heritage value of the entire AONB including the historic market town of Wendover.

9. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker is subject to binding mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of the works at the proposed Wendover Green Tunnel and other works associated with the proposed high speed railway. These binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to restrictions on noise, dust, vibration, construction hours, vehicle movements, operating hours, design of structures. Monitoring of compliance with these restrictions would be required and your Petitioner suggests this is carried out by the Local Environmental Health Department, funded by the Contractor.

10. Your Petitioner is concerned that there is potential for disruption of utilities and services to the properties which could cause considerable problems to our tenants. Your petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to binding mitigation measures in respect to disruption of services and have in place a contingency plan in anticipation of such potential disruption. The binding proposals should include implementing alternative arrangements prior to any relocation of utilities, and should indemnify your petitioner from any loss or damage arising from such work.

11. Your Petitioner is aware that some of its properties are of thatched roof construction and certain tenants have impaired mobility. The need for quick access of emergency services in the event of fire or other emergency is therefore essential and your petitioner is most concerned that increased congestion on the roads due to construction traffic may so hinder the arrival of emergency vehicles as to cause both loss of life and loss of buildings, let alone contents. This is a matter of extreme gravity and your Petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker draws up a full Emergency Services Access plan prior to commencement of any work, that this plan is agreed by Wendover Parish Council and approved by the County Council. Your Petitioner also wishes to be given an indemnity from any damage, loss or injury caused by delay in Emergency Service arrival due to effects of the construction of HS2.

12. Your Petitioner wishes to fully endorse the Petitions submitted by Wendover HS2 and Wendover Parish Council, and other Petitions supporting a fully bored Chilterns tunnel. Your Petitioner humbly requests that sincere care be put into the consideration of all these Petitions, for the sake of future generations to come.

13. Your Petitioner considers that the viaducts, green tunnel and associated proposals affecting the Chilterns generally and Wendover in particular as currently proposed should be replaced with a fully bored tunnel beneath the Chilterns, emerging to the north of Wendover.

14. This would remove the need for major construction works in the centre of Wendover, the moving of pylons, the destruction of properties, and need for the proposed 6 metre high noise barriers in the AONB together with many other disadvantages and disruptions both temporary and permanent associated with the construction and operation of HS2.
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.

Marion Clayton  
Chairman, Lionel Abel-Smith Trust

Wendy Gray  
Trustee, Lionel Abel-Smith Trust

Robert Duggan  
Trustee, Lionel Abel-Smith Trust

15th April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2016-17

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill
THE PETITION OF A. E. MOGFORD MBE

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner is the freeholder of Bank Farm which is a farm in Buckinghamshire and which is listed in the Book of Reference that accompanies the Bill as plot no 170 in the parish of Wendover in the district of Aylesbury Vale. Your Petitioner is also a tenant farmer with many grazing agreements around Wendover.

3. It is proposed by the Bill to authorise the compulsory acquisition of certain interests in land or property of your Petitioner, to which he objects, and notice has been served on your Petitioner of the intention to seek such compulsory powers. The land is to be used for the main railway line and to dispose of spoil along with a new water course.

4. Your Petitioner and his rights, interests and property will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill and your Petitioner accordingly objects thereto for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

5. Your Petitioner's main objective is to persuade your Honourable House to lower the line into a fully bored tunnel as it passes through Wendover.

6. Your Petitioner considers it unacceptable that the Environmental Statement describes Bank Farm's sensitivity to change of being of "medium" sensitivity. This description is surprising because the proposal will lead to the farm's main production being cut to such a level as to be uneconomic, and will make around 50% of his farm staff redundant. Your Petitioner considers that Bank Farm's sensitivity should be reappraised.

7. In addition, noise and traffic congestion will make your Petitioner's life and his way of going about his business extremely difficult for a considerable number of years.
8. Your Petitioner is also concerned that there is no clear indication of how he will be able to access the remaining hectares of his land after 30 ha have been compulsorily purchased.

**Extent of land take**

9. Land in the ownership of your Petitioner is liable to compulsory acquisition under clauses 4 to 8 of the Bill. The limits of deviation and of land to be acquired and used are drawn very widely and your Petitioner is unsure why that is. Your Petitioner will seek to enter into an agreement with the promoter of the Bill that the extent of compulsory purchase should be limited.

10. Your Petitioner is particularly concerned by the possibility of land being acquired permanently for a temporary purpose and considers it inappropriate for the Bill to contain compulsory purchase powers in respect of his land when the Nominated Undertaker’s requirement is for a temporary use only, for instance land acquired for disposal of spoil. Where land could possibly return to agricultural use after construction your Petitioner earnestly seeks to retain ownership. To this effect the new watercourse should follow the boundary of the railway line and the spoil disposal site be restored for possible agricultural use.

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

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

12. 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. The new watercourse and spoil disposal area will greatly reduce availability of land for possible return to agricultural use.

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

**Accommodation works**

14. Your Petitioner's 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 Petitioner. 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 Petitioner. That would help to mitigate the impact of the scheme. For crossing points, such a specification might include the width, height, weight limit and final surface. Once agreed, the specification should be binding on the Nominated Undertaker.

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

**Planning consent for replacement buildings and associated dwellings**

16. The construction of the Authorised Works will necessitate the demolition of storage facilities. Your Petitioner is likely to want to replace the demolished buildings. In most cases this will require a full planning application. While the cost of dealing with planning can be factored into the compensation payable by the promoter, the uncertainty over whether an application will be approved and the time delays that can arise if a case goes to appeal can all be very difficult for a business to manage. The development of some agricultural buildings is already permitted development, subject to conditions including limits on size.

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

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

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

**Severance and hedgerows**

20. The severance of agricultural land by such a long linear scheme will result of some of your Petitioner’s 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.

21. Your Petitioner proposes to your honourable House that the 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.
Compensation generally

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

The benefits of a fully bored tunnel

23. Your Petitioner proposes that part of the scheduled works be replaced by a fully bored tunnel beneath the Chilterns emerging to the end of the AONB to the north of Wendover.

24. HS2 Ltd has said that such a tunnel would cost £330 million more than the present proposal. However, it has refused to divulge any detail of this figure, or even the tender documents on which it was based.

25. Moreover, it seems that HS2 Ltd has not taken into account the benefits which a fully bored tunnel would bring, such as the money saved by not having to compulsorily purchase properties and land, build ugly 6m high noise barriers, or move electricity pylons and not damaging the environment. These benefits are valued at over £500 million.

26. For the foregoing and connected reasons, your Petitioner respectfully submits that unless the Bill is amended by the inclusion of a fully bored tunnel beneath the Chilterns emerging to the north of Wendover then the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

27. In addition, your Petitioner considers that:

   a. the sound absorbent fences proposed for Wendover are unacceptable in the AONB and will be visually intrusive, with no assurance of their effectiveness

   b. The Chiltern Hills AONB will be severely damaged and permanently scarred by the obtrusive viaduct and embankment 13 metres above the ground level with gantries a further 5 metres high
c. Special construction measures should be put in place to prevent vibration damage to listed properties in Pound Street, Wendover, belonging to the Lionel Abel-Smith Trust. The majority of these properties date from the 17th century with two from the 15th century. Your Petitioner considers that the effect of damage to the properties would be detrimental to both your Petitioner and the local community, for whose benefit the Trust was established.

**General**

28. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights and interests of your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for his protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.
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.

A. E. Mogford MBE

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

The Petition of Rachel Garver, Joseph Garver and Gwynne Jenkins

Declares that:

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

1. The Petitioners are Rachel Garver and Joseph Carl Garver of 23 Chiltern Road, Wendover, and Gwynne Jenkins of 11 Orchard Close, Wendover. They live in Wendover, in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which will be adversely affected by both the construction and the operation of HS2. Your Petitioners object to the Bill for reasons, among others, hereinafter appearing.

2. The Petitioners lead walks in the area around Wendover for the Aylesbury and District Ramblers and the Hampstead Ramblers of London, using the network of footpaths and bridleways linking the Ridgeway National Trail, the South Bucks Way, the recently opened Outer Aylesbury Ring and other established walking routes. The proposed high-speed railway will destroy or blight these paths - heavily used also by riders and bikers - and thus degrade your petitioners' quality of life. HS2 will have a devastating impact on what are the main attractions of these walks - the unspoilt countryside, wildlife such as bats, wild orchids and the rare Chiltern gentian, and the opportunity to observe the agricultural cycle. HS2 will blight local sheepfolds and farms, and the Bucks Goat Centre will be razed.

3. The Petitioners are concerned that HS2 Ltd have consistently underestimated the noise impact of their proposals, both on footpaths and in quieter parts of Wendover.

4. The Petitioners’ journeys to work and elsewhere will be affected by construction activity, extra traffic and road diversions.

5. The Petitioners are concerned that the value of their houses will be affected and they will not qualify for any compensation under the Need to Sell scheme. No property owners should suffer loss because of the railway.

6. The Petitioners contend that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas. It will have severe adverse effects on the reputation and prosperity of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction. It will permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area.
7. The Petitioners are also seriously concerned about the disruptions to their households 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.

8. The Petitioners contend that the use of 6-metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and the AONB, radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Also that such sound barriers by the new railway will not be adequate, or HS2 would not be proposing to fund more unsightly barriers along the roads between the railway and the Church.

9. The Petitioners further contend that the compensation offered to the community is inadequate. For example, the Church has been offered funding which will pay for a new roof but not secondary glazing.

10. Your Petitioners request that HS2 should pass through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel, and that an independent assessment of cost in respect of full AONB tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis be undertaken before any construction works commence in this area. HS2 Ltd. should be required to make accurate baseline noise measurements all round Wendover and the AONB as a matter of urgency to inform this analysis.

11. Your Petitioners accordingly emphasise that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB as referred to in paragraph 10 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioners request that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented.

Hierarchy of Mitigation

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

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with improved mitigation and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries, and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres be 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 extending to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the embankments beside them. This would also help protect the Baccombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.

d. That provision be made for constructing bridges where there are established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to
retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve 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 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 following the start of construction and operation of the railway including biodiversity mitigations, compensation off-set. This process must be managed by an independent body, which monitors and publicly reports progress against the "no net biodiversity loss" objective. A detailed costing should also be established for monitoring and reporting and for the environmental protection being overseen, and ring-fence these environmental protections and a separate budget for these purposes.

i. That other recommendations in the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee Report dated 2 April 2014 are also followed including but not limited to revising the environmental statement to distinguish clearly between mitigation and compensation measures in respect of biodiversity, carry out outstanding environmental surveying as soon as possible, weighing metrics for biodiversity offsetting towards production of biodiversity gains and taking explicit account of communities' wellbeing, adjusting metrics to encompass the precautionary principle, treatment of ancient woodlands should be separate from the overall biodiversity net loss calculation, reexamining scope for off-site biodiversity compensation, research on alternative discount factors for the off-setting metric.

j. That the railway operator be responsible for maintaining the screening of the line and all noise barriers including those that they place alongside local roads for the lifetime of the railway.

k. That the plans for the current Hunts Green Spoil Dump be substantially reduced and minimised and arrangements made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioners point 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.
1. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques should be considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.

m. 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.

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

o. 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.

p. 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 planning, construction and operation of the proposed line.

q. 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 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.

r. That Need to Sell be replaced by Wish to Sell or a Property Bond scheme, and that compensation be extended to all property owners who would otherwise lose significant sums because of HS2. That owners should not have to bear a 15% loss.

s. 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.

t. That the Community Fund be increased significantly.

12. 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 unless otherwise agreed with the local highways authority, 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 occur on the main emergency routes. And that the Promoter be required to reimburse the local health service for all additional costs resulting from the construction of the railway.

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.
13. The prayer

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

AND the Petitioners remain, etc.
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS

SESSION 2015–16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF Rosamund Jane Ann Green

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner lives at Old Pear Tree Cottage, 24 High Street, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6EA. The 15th Century brick and timber building is at the top of the High Street. Your Petitioner will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

3. The route of the proposed line is approximately 350 metres away from your Petitioner's cottage. There is a wide open space from the line directly to your Petitioner’s house with nothing between the two, your Petitioner would, therefore, suffer the same effects as dwellings within the Safeguarding Zone as the noise would be funnelled downhill between the buildings directly to her home. Your Petitioner moved to Wendover and this property in 1999, her livelihood, as an antique dealer in her sister's antiques centre, even closer to the proposed line, is also affected. The effects of construction and the noise from the high speed train mean HS2 will have an extreme and continual detrimental effect on her life.

4. Your Petitioner believes the intended construction will be unnecessarily destructive for her local area which will suffer the consequences of the new high speed line more than any other, simply through proximity. The current proposals, which include massive 6 meter high concrete walls, with a total of 3 in some places, are dismissive of and ride roughshod over the local community who have been told they and the area are too small to matter.

5. The whole area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Icknield Way, Ridgeway and Chilterns in general will be blighted irrevocably when the line is completed, particularly with the added intrusion of concrete barriers on the approach to and through Wendover. The effect on wildlife will be immeasurable and the ancient woodland, by virtue of its name, can never be replaced. The barrier for wildlife, the constant noise from the intended 36 trains per hour will be heard not just as they pass, but throughout the open countryside; we will be left with a scarred landscape. Tourism will be badly affected as the many thousands of people who
come to walk, cycle, run and sightsee will go elsewhere. It will take many years to build confidence with tourists before they consider the area is again worth visiting, which may never be the case as the AONB will have been spoilt forever. This will have a devastating effect on Wendover’s local economy including your Petitioner’s business.

6. The damage to the aquifers will have a detrimental effect on the water supply to Hampden Pond, the local spot for fishing and home to Kingfishers and the Witchell Pond, home to Crested Newts.

7. The Chiltern Way Academy, a specialist secondary school for boys and girls with social, emotional, communication and interaction difficulties, will suffer serious disruption, notwithstanding the multi-million pound investment to improve facilities at the School which is being undertaken.

8. The noise pollution will also have a detrimental effect on our Church, which too has recently undergone extensive renovation. Services, concerts, fetes and all the many other activities will face unedifying intrusion and an internment in the graveyard, will be less than solemn with HS2 rattling past every 3 minutes.

9. Your Petitioner respectfully requests a FULLY BORED TUNNEL for the length of the AONB and believes that this is the only solution to the many and several problems and heartaches which will be caused by the construction of the HS2 train line.

10. Your Petitioner also requests an independent inquiry into the costing of a fully bored tunnel and for an independent cost benefit analysis to be undertaken in relation to the AONB before any construction works commence.

11. The prayer

Your 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.

Rosamund Jane Ann Green

15th April 2016
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015–16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF Nicolette Diana Gregory

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner lives at Pear Tree Cottage, 9 Back Street, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6EB. The 16th Century brick and timber building is at the top of Back Street which runs parallel to the High Street. Your Petitioner will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

3. The route of the proposed line can be seen from your Petitioner’s bedroom window, approx. 400 metres away. There is a wide open space from the line directly to your Petitioner’s house with nothing between the two, your Petitioner would, therefore, suffer the same effects as dwellings within the Safeguarding Zone the noise would be funnelled downhill between the buildings directly to her home. Your Petitioner moved to Wendover and this property in 1987, 29 years ago, to start an antiques business which is still trading. The effects of firstly the construction and latterly the noise from the high speed train (your Petitioner’s business is closer to the proposed line than her home) mean HS2 will have an extreme and continual detrimental effect on her life.

4. Your Petitioner believes the intended construction will be unnecessarily destructive for her local area which will suffer the consequences of the new high speed line more than any other, just through proximity. The current proposals, which now include massive 6 meter high concrete walls, three deep in some places, are inconsiderate and dismissive of the local community who have been told they and the area are too small to matter.

5. The whole area is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The visual blight to an area walked almost daily by your Petitioner for nearly 30 years (the Icknield Way and Ridgeway among others) will be considerable when the line is completed, especially as we now have the added intrusion of concrete barriers on the approach to and through Wendover. It will affect wildlife and ancient woodland which can never be
replaced. After the line is finished we will be left with a scarred landscape, a barrier to wildlife and almost constant noise. The intended 36 trains per hour will be heard not just as they pass, but the length of the open countryside. Tourism will also be badly affected as the many thousands of people who come to walk, run, cycle and sightsee will go elsewhere. It will take many years to build up confidence with tourists that the area is again worth visiting, which may never be the case as the AONB will have been spoilt forever. This will have a devastating effect on Wendover’s local economy including your Petitioner’s business.

6. The damage to the aquifers will have a detrimental effect on the water supply to Hampden Pond, the local beauty spot for fishing and Kingfishers.

7. The noise pollution, even with the 6 metre concrete wall mitigation, will mean serious disruption for The Chiltern Way Academy, a specialist secondary school for boys and girls with social, emotional, communication and interaction difficulties. The Wendover Campus has just undergone a multi-million pound investment to improve facilities at the School.

8. The noise pollution will also have a detrimental effect on our Church, which has also recently undergone extensive renovation. Even with the proposed sound proofing the services and concerts, fetes etc., the tranquil spot we love will be spoilt. A burial in the graveyard will be less than solemn with HS2 rattling past every 3 minutes.

9. Your Petitioner respectfully requests a FULLY BORED TUNNEL for the length of the AONB and believes that this is the only solution to the many, many problems and heartaches which will be caused by the construction of the HS2 train line.

10. Your Petitioner also requests an independent inquiry into the costing of a fully bored tunnel and that an independent cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB before any construction works commence.

11. The prayer

Your 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.

Nicolette Diana Gregory

15th April 2016
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS

SESSION 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

PETITION OF

24 TRADERS, TRADING AS ANTIQUES AT .. WENDOVER

and THE BARN COURTYARD (NICOLETTE DIANA GREGORY)

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners are 24 traders, trading as Antiques At..Wendover and the Barn Courtyard at the Old Post Office, 25 High Street, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6DU, an Antiques Centre and associated businesses established in 1987 comprising 24+ different small individual business/traders within the complex. They will be specially and directly affected by the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

3. The Antiques Centre, a 16th Century Grade II Listed Tudor house, comprises Barns (now used as a Gallery, Artists Studio and small individual shops), a Tea Room and Tea Garden and a private Courtyard car park. The Antiques Centre is situated on the High Street, opposite the Manor Waste (a large open area used as Wendover’s Market Square). Your Petitioners are a vibrant and busy community and bring considerable trade and tourism to Wendover. The property is leased on a ‘Full Repairing Lease’. Being 16th Century the property is built without foundations and will suffer damage to the fabric of the building from the vibration caused by the construction traffic which will pass approx 4 metres from the building.

4. Although your Petitioner’s businesses are outside the Safeguarding Zone, approx. 350 metres from the proposed line, there is nothing between the train line and your Petitioners. Your Petitioners will suffer at least the same amount of discomfort and inconvenience as those within the Zone during the construction phase. Your Petitioners therefore submit that the noise and dust will be channeled directly down the hill into the High Street and the vibration and air pollution caused by the close proximity of the construction vehicles will discourage, not only customers from coming into our shops, but tourists
from coming to Wendover for the envisaged 10 years of construction. There is no mitigation or compensation for businesses under the Bill.

5. The countryside around Wendover is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and attracts many thousands of visitors each year. The construction phase of the proposed line, with its accompanying destruction of this unique area, will deter many tourists for years to come having a detrimental effect on our individual businesses.

6. Your Petitioners assert that the general feeling of wellbeing in Wendover, which is an extremely gregarious and vibrant community, will be lost. There will be many unoccupied retail premises in the High Street and property in the immediate area will not be saleable for some time after the construction phase is complete. It will take many years for confidence in the area to return.

7. The devastation of the AONB together with the 6 metre high concrete walls for sound mitigation on the roads into Wendover will totally destroy countryside which is supposed to be protected by Her Majesty's Government.

8. Your Petitioners respectfully request a fully bored tunnel under the AONB as this would remove the concerns of your Petitioners and alleviate the vast majority of grievances regarding the upheaval, discomfort and genuine fear felt by those living and working in Wendover.

9. Your Petitioners would also request an independent assessment of cost including full AONB tunneling and a full independent cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB before any construction works commence.
14. 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.

NICOLETTE DIANA GREGORY  13th April 2016

SARAH FINAN

SUSAN HALL

EDNA PARKINSON

MICHAEL CROW

SVETLANA CRICK

ROSAMUND GREEN

MARIA JOHNSTONE

RACHEL HOUSTON

ANGELA CHAMBERLAINE

NICHOLAS CLAYTON

SARA WOOD
10. *The prayer*

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

IAN O'REILLY

MAUREEN RATTRAY

PETER RATTRAY

CORRIS KEEN

RACHEL TOY

ALAN WARNER

WENDY LEWIS

DEBOROUGH BOWDEN

MELANIE BIRD
10. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

DAVID BAKER

MARIE LEIGH

AIDEN PHILPOTT

JEANETTE SAUSBURY

FRANCIS NOBLE

SUSAN KAVANAGH

PHILIP HAND

DUNCAN MAY

DEREK COLLES
The petitioners Mr and Mrs Howie are specially and directly adversely affected by:

1. A Bill [hereinafter called "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, supported by the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, etc...

3. Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill's objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway mentioned in paragraph 1 above. They include provision for the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, the compulsory acquisition of land and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. They include clauses which would disapply and modify various enactments relating to special categories of land including burial grounds, consecrated land, commons and open spaces, and other matters, including overhead lines, water, building regulations and party walls, street works and the use of lorries.

4. Clauses 37 to 42 of the Bill deal with the regulatory regime for the railway.
5. Clauses 43 to 65 of the Bill set out a number of miscellaneous and general provisions, including provision for the appointment of a nominated undertaker ["the Nominated Undertaker"] to exercise the powers under the Bill, transfer schemes, provisions relating to statutory undertakers and the Crown, provision about the compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration, reinstatement works and provision about further high speed railway works. Provision is also made about the application of Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.

6. The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill ["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.

7. Your petitioners are the tenants of Park Lodge Farm Harvil Road Harefield UB9 6JP which is located in the London Borough of Hillingdon. Park Lodge Farm includes Dews Farm and consists of 240 hectares of land. Park Lodge Farm is owned by the London Borough of Hillingdon and your petitioners have been Farm Business Tenants since 2004.

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

9. Whilst your petitioners acknowledge that the principle of the Bill is established at second reading, your petitioners' views on the subject are so strong, they must be recorded in this petition. That the petitioners are not adequately catered for within the Bill as a Farm Business Tenant and the position they find themselves with both The Proposer and The Landlord both being Government Bodies and their higher objectives rather than the Farm Estate and associated concerns, i.e. the landfill remediation, etc., against community political requirements and political aspirations.

10. Your petitioners allege 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 petitioners consider 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 that 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.

11. There are a number of matters which cause great concern to your petitioners, arising from the proposals in the Bill, which adversely impact on your petitioners' tenancy at Park Lodge Farm. The construction of National Grid Feeder Electricity Station and Sub-Station, Compound Facility and Colne Valley Viaduct Satellite Compound, etc.,

12. The Environmental Statement states that during the construction of the high speed railway line, 87.1 hectares, which equates to 36% of Park Lodge/Dews Farm, will be used for the siting of sustainable placements for excavated material.
13. The works which are to be undertaken on Park Lodge Farm will cause considerable sealance to the east of the farm and south of Harvil Road [Dews Farm]. As part of the 87.1 hectares required, HS2 Ltd are requiring a mix of contaminated land and 'virgin' grassland. The 'virgin' grassland used for some of the sustainable placement is central to Park Lodge Farm's current working pattern, generating most of the silage. This will have a very significant impact on Park Lodge Farm which may cause it to cease to operate.

14. A proportion of the 87.1 hectares on Park Lodge Farm has been determined contaminated land and a special site for controlled waters under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. This proportion equates to 16.5 hectares and without remediation, it is not suitable for purposes connected to food production, including cropping and grazing, and your petitioners do not utilise it as a dairy farm or indeed for any alternative use.

15. Your petitioners would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker to provide the following written assurances/undertakings in the event that high speed railway works are carried out which adversely affect Park Lodge Farm:

[a] That your petitioners are treated fairly and receive full and proper compensation for any losses, financial or otherwise, which they may suffer.

[b] That the proposal to use Park Lodge Farm as a site of sustainable placements for excavated material is re-evaluated and if no alternatives can be found, suitable mitigation measures are put into place.

[c] That a landfill site on Park Lodge Farm (New Years Green Land Fill Site), will be constructed of sustainable placement materials suitable to reconstruct this land of 80 hectares to mitigate the very significant adverse effects on this site on Water, Air and Soil to allow this area to comply with EU and UK Law over the next 1,000 years through reducing leachate with proper capping of this site subject to London Borough of Hillingdon and Environment Agency conditions.

[d] That the issue of making improvements to the contaminated land at Park Lodge Farm is fully addressed at the same time that the issue of moving the extracted material from Park Lodge Farm and adjacent land is considered. Haul roads through Park Lodge Farm to be constructed to alleviate the traffic movements on Harvil road and beyond to minimal levels.

[e] That your petitioners are fully consulted in relation to the rebuilding, landscaping and possible redistribution of the land at Park Lodge Farm once the construction works have been completed and furthermore, that they will be assisted in every way possible to bring the whole of Park Lodge Farm back to a usable condition.

[f] That in the event that Park Lodge Farm is unable to continue to operate as a direct consequence of the high speed railway works, that your petitioners are relocated, at the Promoter's and Nominated Undertaker's expense, to a suitable, alternative business farm tenancy in the London Borough of Hillingdon.

YOUR PETITIONERS therefore humbly pray your Honourable House that the Bill may not be allowed to pass into law as it now stands and that they may be heard by their Counsel, Agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against so much of the Bill as affects the property, rights and interests of your petitioners and in support of such other clauses and provisions as may be necessary or expedient for their protection, or that such other relief may be given to your Petitioners in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

3
The Petitioner Mr and Mrs Howie 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 Mr and Mrs Howie remains, etc.

John (Iain) Howie
Petitioner

16th April 2016

IN THE
HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015-16

HIGH SPEED RAIL [LONDON-WEST MIDLANDS]
PETITION OF IAIN HOWIE AND SUSAN HOWIE

Against the Bill - by Counsel, & c

Iain and Susan Howie
Park Lodge Farm
Harvil Road
Harefield
Middlesex
UB9 6JP

Telephone Number: 07808 161054
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill (additional provision ap4, 12 October 2015)  

THE PETITION OF Vivien Felicity Salisbury  

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner, Vivien Felicity Salisbury, and her husband, John Frederick Salisbury are resident at 34a Kings Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire HP16 0QY and are freehold owners of this property. Our home is within 300m of the proposed line and consequently your Petitioner has been adversely affected since the announcement of HS2. Despite the very real benefits that accrue from the extension of the fully bored tunnel within ap4, which improve greatly our own situation and those of many others to the east/south of the area beyond our village and assist in the preservation of the eastern section of the AONB, your Petitioner will continue to be adversely affected even after the railway is operational and in future years. The currently proposed tunnel portal is within 400m of our property and the new vent shaft is around 350m from our home. We will be specially and directly affected, 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 will be directly, specially and injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, in relation to which your Petitioner has already petitioned (“the Existing Petition”). This Petition against the Additional Provision is without prejudice to your Petitioner’s Existing Petition.  

Your Petitioner and her husband and their 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

3.1 As explained by the Existing Petition, your Petitioner and your Petitioner’s area will suffer a range of severe and adverse effects by reason of the Bill, in respect of which your Petitioner 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 T3i already assessed by the Promoter. This will address most, if not all of these adverse effects, the concerns of your Petitioner and will reduce the impact on the AONB. Failing which, the Petitioner request further mitigation.

3.2 In relation to the Additional Provision, the adverse effects with which your Petitioner is concerned and to which she objects are caused by and associated with the works relating to the Additional Provision AP4-009-001 empowered by Clauses 1 and Schedules 1 of the Bill and associated powers in the Bill (including the power of compulsory purchase); Schedule 1 Work No. 2/14 (Railway) and 2718C (Access Road) as detailed on Deposited Plans, AP4 PLN 2.1.1, Replacement Sheets No. 2-24 to 26.

3.3 Traffic congestion at the Link Road roundabout on the A413. Your petitioner is concerned that the new temporary Chilterns tunnel north portal access road exits at the Link Road roundabout on the A413. There is already significant traffic delay caused by the weight of traffic here at peak hours, which are significant for at least two hours in the morning and from three until after seven in the afternoon and evening. Increased traffic flows throughout the day with a high proportion of heavy goods vehicles will place considerable strain on the junction, with serious effects on the businesses in Great Missenden and all the villages and surrounds, on Chesham, on Wendover and on ourselves and all the people in their work/life balance, with hugely increased delays and commuting and essential travelling times. This will be worsened by the further pinch points northwards beyond Rocky Lane at Wendover Dean and at Wendover and the cutting off of the Old Risborough Road in to Wendover, which takes out the only viable alternative route from Wendover to Great Missenden and beyond. This will severely impact on our and our family’s personal and working/volunteering lives during construction and in to the future.

The fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB would relieve all these issues. Failing this, an extension of the tunnel to Leather Lane would provide the opportunity for the temporary construction road to exit further north than the Link road roundabout. In the absence of the extended tunnel, reroute the access road along the line of GM1/12 hence reducing traffic at the A413 Link road roundabout.

3.4 Permanent access road to Frith Hill (SHL). Work No 2/18c. Your Petitioner notes a permanent access road on to Frith Hill at a bend on a narrow section of the road. The turning from the B485 to the continuation of Frith Hill in to South Heath is extremely dangerous. The turn is sharp from either direction, the road narrow and the following right-angled bend is severe, blocking all vision of traffic beyond. Local residents know not to use this stretch of the road in adverse weather or when there are accumulations of leaf fall in the autumn. It is not a road to be used by large vehicles at any time.
Turning out from Frith Hill on to the B453 towards Great Missenden is equally hazardous to those turning out and to cars coming up or especially down this steep hill and curving B453. A slower and less easily manoeuvred vehicle coming out of this junction would be even more dangerous to all road users and increasing vehicles using the junction will severely add to the back up of traffic along both roads in both directions.

Use of the access road during construction should be prevented. Retain access route as noted above as permanent and reinstate GM1/12 alongside. Access to Frith Hill would no longer be required.

3.5 Traffic delays and operational and construction noise and other pollutants from the building of the vent shaft on the B485 and the building of the portal, cuttings and line northwards from south Heath will worsen the traffic concerns, causing a sense of entrapment for those of us living along Kings Lane, and the impacts of construction on health and well being in the area, as well as the visual impacts on the countryside.

The fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns would remove most of these concerns. It is recognised that vent shafts would be required but the accompanying difficulties would be minor in comparison with the wide reaching effects of not having the tunnel. At a minimum provide independently verified factually based evidence of noise reduction for the alternatives offered and undertake to implement the more effective alternative; bury power lines; and ensure all building designed to fit locality and planning constraints of the AONB, adequate landscaping to mask sight of vent shaft building and catenary masts.

3.6 Continued property blight Your petitioner and her family have suffered over six years of property blight in the area, diminishing their opportunity to move at an age when they could re-establish themselves in another locality and realise monies from their single capital asset, their house, for their pension. They face a further ten years or more of blight before the situation might improve. They are unlikely to receive any compensation for the financial and emotional hardships this has caused. The Need to Sell scheme is an improvement on the Exceptional Hardship Scheme but remains insufficient.

Extending the tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB would remove these issues. Failing this a compensation scheme administered by a body independent of HS that provides the full unblighted house value (based on 2007, with house price inflation) to all residents when they wish to sell, or the introduction of a property bond scheme as advocated by HS2AA.

3.7 Health and Wellbeing For over six years residents in South Heath, including the Petitioner and her family, have been severely affected by the announcement of HS2, with clear evidence of ill health, stress, anxiety and depression at high levels in the area. Key concerns have included noise of operation and its construction, respiratory and other health effects of dust and airborne pollutants, the effects of HS2 on outdoor leisure activities including the enjoyment of nature and wildlife and the disruption to both, emergency service response times and the inability of many residents to adjust to and plan their lives as a consequence of house blight.
3.8 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 and the possible precedent for other AONBs or national parks.

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

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

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to our household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden, Prestwood and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, work, 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.

3.9 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillian 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 Gillian 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.

3.3ii 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 AONR 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.
To The House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

PETITION OF THE HS2 EUSTON ACTION GROUP  

Declares that:  

1. The Petitioner’s members and their property, rights and interests in the area of Euston would be injuriously and directly affected by the whole Bill. The adverse impact of the current proposals in the Bill for Euston Station, which were introduced in September 2015 as Additional Provision 3 (“AP3”), is much greater than in the original Bill.  

Your Petitioner  

2. Your Petitioner, the HS2 Euston Action Group (“the Action Group”), is an unincorporated association which was established at a Public Meeting chaired by Frank Dobson MP on 11 February 2014. Frank Dobson is now the President of the Action Group. Sir Kier Starmer QC MP is a member of our Steering Group. The Objectives of the Action Group are to: (i) coordinate the lobbying and petitioning by community groups and individuals who live or work in the Euston area and who are specially and directly affected by HS2; (ii) empower all members of the diverse communities in the Euston area who are specially and directly affected by the HS2 scheme to lobby and petition against the Bill; and (iii) share information and ideas with all those specially and directly affected by HS2 whether in the Euston area, Camden or elsewhere up the line.  

3. Membership of the Action Group is open to any community group or individuals who are specially or directly affected by HS2 in the Euston Area. The area covered by the Action Group is the same as that covered by the HS2 Euston Community Forum (the “Community Forum”), namely “CFA1”. The membership of the Action Group currently consists of 26 community groups and 345 individuals. The Action Group has cross-party support, the four political parties represented on Camden Council being members, namely the Camden Labour, Conservative, Liberal Democrat and Green Parties. Many of our members will be lodging their own petitions.  

4. The following community groups are member of the Action Group: Ampthill Square TRA; Camden Cutting; Camden Civic Society; Camden Peoples Theatre, Camden Town DMC; Christ Church & St Mary Magdelene; Churchway TRA; Cumberland Market TRA; Delancey Street Residents Association; Drummond Street Mosque; Drummond Street Traders Association; Drummond Street TRA; New Horizon Youth Centre; Netley Primary Governing Body; Ossulston TRA; Oakshot Court TRA; Park Village and Environrs Residents Association; Park Village East Heritage Group; Regents Park TRA; Regents Park CAAVC; Royal Asiatic Society; St Pancras Church PPC; Silsoe House Residents Association; Somers Town Community Association; Third Age Project; West Euston Partnership and West Euston Time Bank.
5. Many of our members will be petitioning the Select Community focussing on their local concerns. This petition rather focuses on the Euston-wide issues. This petition is written from the perspective of those whose homes or businesses will be adversely affected by HS2. For most of our members, the significant concern is about the impact of the construction works, as opposed to the operation of the scheme when completed.

Introduction

6. Your Petitioner urges the Select Committee to hold a preliminary hearing at which directions can be given as to how petitions can be determined in a proportionate and fair manner. We discuss the proposed directions at paragraphs 86 – 91.

7. Your Petitioner supports the proposal made by Lord Berkeley at the Second Reading that the Select Committee should appoint a special adviser on technical and railway matters. Your Petitioner is concerned that the House of Commons Select Committee (“HCSC”) had undue deference to the expert evidence adduced by the Promoter. A special advisor would ensure greater equality of arms. This is a matter of particular concern to your Petitioner given the unsatisfactory nature of the current proposals for Euston station and the alternatives that should be investigated.

8. Your Petitioner contends that the Promoter’s current plans for the London terminus at Euston are not currently fit for purpose. The Promoter is no longer able to deliver a London terminus at Euston by 2026. The current proposal delivers half a station by 2033, the Promoter having abandoned plans for a new station which integrates the existing classic platforms. The Promoter has not addressed the immense practical problems of upgrading the remaining classic services into the new station at Euston after the HS2 side of the station has been completed. Neither does the current proposal provide an integrated transport system with links to HS1, Heathrow or Crossrail 2. Crossrail 2 must be integrated into plans for a comprehensive redevelopment of Euston Station. The relationship between the London termini at Euston and Old Oak Common (“OOC”) still requires further consideration.

9. The current plans for the London terminus at Euston are unacceptable for the following reasons:

   (i) The exceptionally high cost;

   (ii) The immense damage and disruption to Camden, its residents and passengers using Euston over the coming decades, not only as a result of the construction of HS2 but the redevelopments of the classic platforms and the construction of the Crossrail 2 station;

   (iii) The failure to deliver a new integrated station at Euston fit for the C21.

10. The Promoter’s approach at Euston has been to deliver HS2 platforms whilst seeking to minimise the impact on rail passengers using the classic services during the construction period. This has determined its approach in AP3 which extends the end of the construction
period from 2006 to 2033. This approach has overridden its stated approach to mitigation in the Supplementary Environmental Statement ("SES") which is stated to be based on the following hierarchy:

(i) Avoiding the adverse impact: A new station at Euston could, and should, be constructed within the footprint of the existing station.

(ii) Where this is not possible, reducing the adverse impact: The failure to devise and provide funding for an integrated station at Euston will extend the adverse impact of the construction works to 2033 and well beyond.

(iii) Abating the adverse impact: The Promoter has given no adequate consideration to moving spoil by rail rather than road. This is currently “work in progress”.

(iv) Restoring or reinstating a feature after the adverse effects have occurred: The Promoter has failed to engage with the local community on how it will replace the public open spaces and mature trees in the Euston area.

(v) When none of these options mitigate the adverse impact, to compensate for the loss or damage caused: The Promoter is offering no compensation for the unprecedented adverse impact of the construction works on those living adjacent to the construction site in Euston.

11. Your Petitioner’s members feel particularly aggrieved by two matters:

(i) The Promoter has adopted the approach that they do not need to engage with local residents on mitigation matters. It is rather a matter that they can agree with the London Borough of Camden ("Camden Council"). This is particularly relevant to the issue of noise insulation. In their report (at [256]), the House of Commons Select Committee ("HCSC") recognised that many of the issues brought before them, could be better addressed by detailed communications between the parties. In Camden, there has been no such engagement with community groups.

(ii) Many of the impacts of HS2 cannot be mitigated, largely because of the Promoter’s decision to put the interests of existing rail users over residents during the construction period. Despite this, the government has refused to consider proposals for fair compensation. The reality seems to be that whilst the costs of constructing the HS2 platforms at Euston has increased, no adequate funds have been made available for mitigation and compensation.

12. The HCSC (at [255]) concluded its section on the Camden petitions in these terms:

“The AP3 Euston scheme has advantages for existing rail users. The effects of its longer duration must be recognised and addressed. A coherent plan for Euston station is needed to meet the expectations of rail users, underground travellers, businesses, local residents and the country’s capital.”
13. The Promoter has yet to devise or secure funding for such a coherent plan. Your Petitioner therefore seeks an undertaking that the construction works will not commence on the proposed HS2 station at Euston until the Promoter has obtained the necessary powers and funding for the comprehensive development of a station at Euston that embraces HS2, the classic services and Crossrail 2.

The Need for an Integrated Transport System

14. Your Petitioners support a modern integrated transport system in which a rail network plays an increasingly significant role. That transport system must withstand the challenge of Climate Change. Your Petitioners question whether the emphasis on high speed travel, with its greater carbon footprint, is consistent with this objective. Further, Britain is a small island and the priority should rather be to link all the major cities.

15. The scheme now proposed by the Promoter in AP3 does not meet the objective of an integrated transport system:

(i) On 17 March 2014\(^1\), the Promoter abandoned his plans for a link between HS2 and HS1 along the North London line. In the view of Your Petitioners, this decision was inevitable. Sir David Higgins has described the link as “an imperfect compromise”\(^2\). You Petitioner always saw this proposal as a non-starter. It is one which had been rejected some 25 years earlier when HS1 was being planned. No alternative has been proposed\(^3\). A proper link is not only required to provide direct links from Birmingham to the Continent, but also to facilitate cross-London connections to East London and towards Kent. The SES contemplates that passengers wishing to connect from HS2 to HS1 should walk 800m through Somers Town!

(ii) On 12 January 2012, the Promoters deferred their plans for a link to Heathrow Airport until Phase 2\(^4\). On 10 March 2015, the Promoter ruled out any link between HS2 and Heathrow before 2033.

(iii) When Phase 2 of HS2 is brought into Euston, the Station will not be able to cope with the additional footfall without Crossrail 2 which will cost a further £33bn. In March 2015, a Safeguarding Directive was made\(^5\). The current plan is start construction in the early 2020s. A single Crossrail 2 station is to serve Euston, St Pancras and King's Cross with below surface connections to all three. The construction of such a station will cause immense additional damage to those living in Somers Town because it is not currently possible to integrate it into a redeveloped station at Euston because funding is not currently available for this. The entrance to the new station must therefore be sited to the east of Eversholt Street. The SES makes no reference to the impact of these works, even though they will be executed at the same time.

---

1 See [link](#)
2 A view shared by Tfl – see [16] and [19] of Petition: AP2:163
3 Tfl consider that such a link is essential, not only to provide a link with HS1 but also to facilitate
4 See [4.23] of “High Speed Rail: Investing in Britain’s Future – Decisions and Next Steps” (12.1.12)
5 See [Safeguarding Directive](#)
(iv) Euston is unable to cope with any increase in the number of taxis, buses and cars delivering customers to and from the new station. Emissions of NO2 in Euston Road are already three times the EU standard. No increase in pollution levels is acceptable. The Promoters assess that there will be “substantial” increases in NO2 during the construction period. The long term effects have not yet been assessed, but will inevitably impact upon the health and life expectancy of Euston residents.

Old Oak Common (“OOC”)

16. In April 2015, the Mayor of London established the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation. By 2026, Old Oak Common could be the best connected station in the UK with a state of the art rail station at OOC, providing interchange between HS2, Crossrail, Network Rail, London Overground (the former North London Line) and the underground services. This includes Transport for London’s proposal for two new London over-ground stations at OOC and Hythe Road allowing access to both the Clapham Junction to Stratford and Richmond to Stratford lines. Provision was made for this in AP2. This option serves two distinct catchment areas, maximising rail links across the proposed Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation site.

17. On 18 March 2015, Your Lordships’ Economic Affairs Committee in their report “The Economics of HS2” recommended that the government should estimate the overall reduction of cost to HS2 of terminating the line at OOC, including any necessary redesign of the station at OOC to make this possible, and calculate the effect on the cost benefit analysis. On 29 September, the Promoter responded in these terms: “HS2 Ltd have examined and consulted on a range options related to the scheme design, including terminating at OOC and have found that the reduction in benefits would outweigh the savings”. This is illustrative of the dismissive manner in which the Promoter responds to objective appraisal of the scheme.

18. The Promoter continues to assert that the only onward travel from OOC is via Crossrail. He is not willing to improve the connectivity with the underground, North London Line and the other mainline services. In July 2011, the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham published “A Vision for Park Royal International” in which Sir Terry Farrell, CBE, concluded that access could be gained to 90% of stations in London with just one change. It is a matter of regret that over the subsequent five years, the Promoter has not worked more closely with Network Rail and Transport for London to maximise the connectivity at OOC. Our concern is that it may now be too late to achieve the full potential of OOC. The same mistake should not be repeated at Euston.

---

6 Description by TfL in Consultation (2014)
7 In July 2011, the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham published “A Vision for Park Royal International” in which Sir Terry Farrell, CBE, states that access can be gained to 90% of stations in London with just one change.
8 See “The Transport Strategy” in the Old Oak and Park Royal “OAPF Consultation” (27.2.15).
9 See [31] of the Report.
10 See letter
11 See written answer to PQ11228,
12 See Link
19. Your petitioner has consistently argued that HS2 Ltd have underestimated the cost and practical difficulties of bringing HS2 into a densely populated, high value area such as Euston. We are now being offered just half a station, constructed at twice the original cost in twice the time.

20. The AP3 station that is proposed is unacceptable. Cllr Sarah Hayward, the Leader of Camden Council, has described it as a “lean-to bolted onto an inadequate station”. Euston Station must be redeveloped in a single unified package. The current proposal is equally unsatisfactory for (i) local residents and businesses, (ii) existing rail users and (iii) Camden Council as the local planning authority. The only solution is for OOC to be the temporary London terminus, whilst the Promoter devises acceptable plans for Euston which should now be deferred and included in Phase 2 of the scheme.

21. In September 2015, the government lodged Additional Provisions 3 (“AP3”), their current plans for Euston. The Promoter has suggested that AP3 is no more than a number of minor amendments to the Bill, the additional cost of which is a modest £97,890,000. The reality is quite different. The original Environmental Statement (ES) is now redundant and is replaced by a Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES) which extends to 4,294 pages of documentation.

22. The Promoter is now proposing to develop Euston in three phases:

- Stage A (to the west of the existing station) will involve the construction of the six platforms needed when Phase 1 of HS2 is completed. These will be constructed between 2017 and 2026. Works to the front of the station will provide London Underground enhancements.

- Stage B1 (within the existing station footprint) will provide the five further platforms needed by 2033 when Phase 2 is completed. Construction will take place between 2026 and 2033.

- Stage B2, the redevelopment of the existing station, is currently unfunded. We are told that Network Rail will be seeking funds “as part of future control periods”. No investigation has been carried out as to the feasibility of rebuilding and lowering the 11 remaining classic platforms once Stages A and B1 have been completed.

23. On 1 December 2015, Tim Mould QC (the Promoter’s Counsel) outlined the government’s current position to the HCSC:

(i) a new integrated station at Euston is “not deliverable within appropriate funding constraints”. This is the assessment of “the government, the Chancellor, the Prime Minister”. There is no timetable for the government to come forward with funding to complete the final phase.
(ii) No additional statutory powers will be required by Network Rail to redevelop the station. Neither the HS2 Ltd nor Network Rail has yet made any estimate of the cost of completing the station. The best assistance that the HS2 Ltd was able to provide to the Committee was that the cost depends “on your piece of string”. The Spending Review and Autumn Statement 2015 includes no commitment to fund this.

(iii) The SES which was published to accompany AP3, is premised on Stage B2 starting after 2033.

(iv) Crossrail 2 will require a separate Hybrid Bill. On 8 January 2016, the consultation period ended on Transport for London’s latest Consultation on Crossrail 2. This is premised on a scheme constructed to the east of Eversholt Street, as it cannot currently be integrated into the existing station. As a result, 150 homes, the Travelodge Hotel and a number of businesses are at now risk. This would not be necessary, were Crossrail 2 to be integrated into the existing station.

Half a Station

24. In March 2010, the last Labour government published the white paper: “High Speed Rail”. Sir Terry Farrell described how Euston “could become one of the greatest stations in the world. The proposals include not only new platforms but also a remodelled and expanded tube station and dedicated bus and taxi interchanges providing direct and seamless access to the station concourse”. It was recognised that the existing Euston Station would need to be redeveloped within the timescale of HS2.

25. AP3 will now result in half a station, there being no proposals (or funding) for Stage B2. On 9 November 2015, the Select Committee visited Euston. They were asked to visualise the Spine Building that in 2033 will become a barrier to movement between the classic and the high speed platforms. The Committee were also told about the blank façades, the poor quality public realm, level changes and the poor quality of the buildings and the environment.

Twice the Cost

26. In March 2010, the cost of the new station was estimated at £1bn. By March 2012, the cost of a new level deck station had increased to £1.2bn. By April 2013, the estimated cost of the level deck option had risen to £2bn and HS2 Ltd devised Option 8 (the scheme in the Bill) at a reduced cost of £1.6bn.

27. In March 2014, David Higgins, newly recruited with his proven track record at Network Rail, announced that Option 8 was “not ambitious enough” and proposed a brand-new station fit for the C21. On 9 October 2014, HS2 Ltd (Alison Munro) reported that his level

---

13 “High Speed Rail” DfT (March 2010)
14 “HS2 Cost and Risk Model Report” (March 2012)
15 See Hansard (11.7.13)
16 See HS2 Plus (17.3.14)
deck scheme was “not fundable”\textsuperscript{17}. The estimated cost of the downsized AP3 station at Euston is now £2.25bn\textsuperscript{18}. This figure does not include the costs of land acquisition, mitigation or compensation.

**Twice the Time**

28. The Bill was premised on a new HS2 station being completed as part of Phase 1 by 2026. Whilst this was not explicitly stated in the Bill, this timetable was specified in both the ES (November 2013)\textsuperscript{19} and the Explanatory Note (28 May 2015)\textsuperscript{20}. A new station is now to be completed in three phases: Stage A (by 2026); Stage B1 (by 2033) and Stage B2 (which may commence before or after 2033, no funding yet having been identified).

29. The new timetable seems to have been devised to meet the requirements on HS2 Ltd to deliver six High Speed compatible platforms by 2026 and a further five by 2033. There has been no regard for the impact on residents. This will have a particular impact on two neighbourhoods, namely the Ampthill Square Estate and the Drummond Street area which will be surrounded by a construction site for the next 18 years. However the wider communities will also be affected by the construction traffic and the traffic gridlock for an additional 7 years.

**Stage B2**

30. The SES does not address the practical difficulties of completing Stage B2 as a level deck station after the High Speed platforms have been constructed. Your Petitioner suggests that the practical problems would be immense:

(i) This dysfunctional approach to the new station will cause unacceptable misery to local residents for a period closer to 25, rather than 18 years.

(ii) The development of the 11 remaining classic tracks in isolation will cause immense disruption to the rail users. The sad reality, as the upgrading at London Bridge has shown, is that such construction works have a much greater impact on the operation of a station than the planners predict. A level deck option would require the lowering of the existing classic lines and the removal of large quantities of spoil. It is doubtful whether this work could be executed without closing Euston station to classic train passengers.

(iii) The Euston area would be blighted for a generation. Camden Council would not be able to achieve the benefits of its EAP. To achieve the full benefits, including social housing and jobs for local people, there must be an integrated strategy for the redevelopment of Euston station within a realistic time frame.

\textsuperscript{17} See minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of the Euston OAPF Strategic Board
\textsuperscript{18} See written answer to PQ 11002
\textsuperscript{19} [2.3.6] of the CFA1 (Nov 2013)
\textsuperscript{20} See [10] of the Explanatory Note
Alternative Options

31. Your Petitioner believes that HS2 could be brought into Euston within the footprint of the existing station and without the widespread destruction of homes and businesses that AP3 entails. Three such schemes are being proposed, none of which have been subject to a proper appraisal:

(i) The Euston Express Scheme which is being promoted by Lord Berkeley and Jonathan Roberts. The current scheme (September 2015)\(^{21}\) would use classic compatible trains which could be built to achieve speeds of up to 360 kph, if the cost of achieving such speeds could be justified. Classic compatible trains could be operated on the last four miles of the WCML into Euston. Additional platforms could be provided within the footprint of the existing station where the existing platforms are excessively wide. The scheme would be quicker to build, cheaper and better for passengers. It would be fully integrated with Crossrail 2.

(ii) The Double Deck Down scheme for a fully integrated station on two levels within the existing station width. This would provide 11 platforms at ground level for traditional trains and 11 platforms below ground for HS trains.

(iii) High Speed UK provides a more radical proposal. This is a national scheme intended to provide a fully integrated national network with a core spine of four tracks between London and South Yorkshire, closely following the M1 from London to Leicester. HSUK proposes a 2km long surface connection at Old Oak Common to link Crossrail 1 to the West Coast Main Line and thus to enable most London Midland commuter flows to be diverted to Crossrail; this diversion could approximately halve the peak flow of commuter trains into Euston. HSUK does not require Euston station to be expanded and a far shorter construction programme is envisaged. Direct connections over existing lines are provided to St Pancras (for HS1) and to Heathrow.

32. If HS2 is to be brought into Euston, the Select Committee should set the following essential requirements which HS2 Ltd must undertake to meet:

(i) It must design a unified station fit for the C21st Century that integrates High Speed, classic services, and Crossrail 2.

(ii) The new station must be constructed within an acceptable time period. 7 to 10 years may be acceptable; 17 years or more is not.

(iii) The plan must be consistent with Camden’s Euston Area Plan (“EAP”). The current proposal is not.

(iv) The scheme must include effective mitigation measures for those who live and work in the area. Where the adverse effects cannot be mitigated, compensation should be offered. A comprehensive Environmental Statement is required.

\(^{21}\) See link
33. Your Petitioner seeks the following undertakings from the Promoter:

(i) There should be a full comparative study of all the alternatives for Euston before any final decisions are taken and any deemed planning approvals are granted. This study should also address the interaction between OOC and Euston with a view to achieving the full potential of the terminus at OOC as an interchange.

(ii) Construction works will not commence on the proposed HS2 station at Euston until the Promoter has obtained the necessary powers and funding for the comprehensive development of the station at Euston. A prerequisite to this is a comprehensive environmental statement and an acceptable timetable for the completion of the project.

(iii) OOC will be the initial London terminus, whilst the Promoter devises acceptable plans for Euston.

The Impact of HS2 on Members of the Euston Action Group

34. Your Petitioner embraces a number of communities with their distinct identities:

(i) Camden Cutting - The area to the east and west of the existing line with Granby Terrace to the south and Parkway to the north. Mornington Terrace, Clarkson Row, Mornington Crescent and Park Village East directly abut the railway line as it comes out of Euston station until it goes underground at the Parkway Portal. The 15 metre cutting in the Euston throat will be dropped by a further 35 metres. The retaining wall in Park Village East will be demolished and rebuilt, depriving residents of vehicle access to their homes. Park Village East will be closed during this period. Night time work will affect all the properties in the area. AP3 is much worse for local residents. The reinstatement of Line X will result in more work being done outside core working hours. There is now to be an additional satellite compound in Park Village East (North). Properties will be rendered uninhabitable.

(ii) The Regents Park Estate - This is the largest estate in Camden. It was constructed in the post-war years and is a diverse community that is at ease with itself. 193 dwellings are to be demolished. Another 250 flats may be rendered uninhabitable, particularly at Augustus House, Cartmel, Coniston, Langdale and the Tarns. There is a high level of overcrowding; the construction works will make life intolerable. Open space and play areas are particularly important for these families. Two playgrounds are to be lost and a number of open spaces. Significant areas of open space and play areas are to be lost. Construction traffic is to drive through the heart of the estate. This would not be necessary were spoil to be moved by rail. The AP3 plan to raise Hampstead Road Bridge by 4.8m will destroy the environment of neighbouring tenants. Tenants will have no access to a bus stop on Hampstead Road (currently in front of Eskdale) during the constructions works and subsequently. There will be gridlock on Hampstead Road Bridge whilst is rebuilt between 2016 and 2023. The tenants' hall in Silverdale is to be demolished; HS2 Ltd does not propose to replace it. Tenants are particularly concerned
about the lack of access to social housing. Land on the Regents Park Estate which could be used for new social housing, is rather being used for replacement HS2 housing.

(iii) The Ampthill Square Estate – The Ampthill Square Estate lies to the north of Euston Station. Gillfoot tower block looks directly down onto the station. The plans used by HS2 Ltd in the Environmental Statement are 10 years out of date. Five years ago, the estate was modernised at a cost of some £20m. A secure area was developed which has successfully addressed the past problems of drug abuse and anti-social behaviour, a fact not reflected in the Environmental Statement. A range of utility works are to be executed within the estate between 2016 and 2022. A construction compound is proposed in the Estate car park which will involve the stopping up of Barnaby Street. APS will extend the time that the Estate will be affected from 2026 until 2033 and beyond. 85% of the dwellings in Ampthill Square are now affected, there being a 48% increase taking into account the number of dwellings affected and the length of time over which they will be affected. The increase in night time noise (58%) is even greater.

(iv) The Drummond Street area – the triangle surrounded by Hampstead Road, Eversholt Street and Euston Road. Drummond Street has a well preserved grid of historic regency terraces, containing a mix of residential and commercial uses within a tight-knit historic urban grain. It has a vibrant, distinctive character, and Drummond Street itself is recognised for its specialist ethnic shops and restaurants. To the north of the Drummond Street area, St James’s Gardens is a historic open space that contains the Grade II listed structures that relate to its history as a burial ground and the National Temperance Hospital which has local heritage value. Most of this area will be destroyed by AP3. It could be preserved were the new HS2 platforms to be constructed within the footprint of the existing station. The Maria Fidelis School will be forced to move. The communities that remain will now live in the midst of a construction site for a minimum of an additional 7 years (the timescale extended from 2026 to 2033 and beyond). Any benefits that might otherwise arise from the EAP will be deferred by a similar period. Local businesses will struggle to survive. Residents in Cobourg Street will live within 5m of the construction works. No assessment has been made as to whether their homes will remain fit for habitation. Some of the residents affected are old and infirm. No compensation is offered.

(v) The Somers Town area to the east of the existing station. The length of time that this area will be affected by construction works is now extended from 2026 to 2033 and beyond. This area will also be affected by construction of Crossrail 2 (2020 to 2030). 150 additional homes are at risk if the new Crossrail 2 station is not integrated with the new station. At some uncertain date, Phase B2 will be constructed (rebuilding the remaining classic lines). Utility diversion works will have an adverse effect on this area, particularly in Chalton Street which will impact upon the Chalton Street Market. The works in Evesholt Street will now take 58% longer. The following locations will have significant residual adverse effects from NO2 between 2016-2026: Evesholt St; Euston Rd; Polygon Rd; Phoenix Rd; Ossulston St; and Charlton St. The community play area on the Churchway Estate at the east end of Lancing Street is to be seized for use of a construction compound.
35. The impact of HS2 on these communities is unique, both with regard to the period of time over which the works will be executed, and the impact of the works on the local community. Many of these difficulties arise from the decision of the Promoters to bring HS2 into Euston, a densely populated area with high land values. The Action Group highlights the following factors:

(i) Euston is not a brown field site (unlike the former situation at King’s Cross or Stratford). It is a quiet, inclusive, residential area with some 2,986 people living within 60m of the construction works; a further 3,186 within 120m; and 11,414 within 300m (a total of some 17,586 people). It includes areas of high deprivation with a number of elderly, infirm and disabled people. However, it is a stable and inclusive community, at ease with itself.

(ii) 220 dwellings are to be demolished (now 5 higher because of the new development at Granby House). Whilst the 136 secure tenants are to be rehoused in the area, the lessees (many of whom are Right to Buy applicants) are being forced to move out of the area. Crossrail 2 now threatens the loss of a further 150 homes in Somers Town (to the east of the station). This is only necessary because Crossrail 2 cannot currently be integrated into the redevelopment of the east side of the classic station. This is a total of 370 homes affecting some 1,600 people.

(iii) In the SES, the Promoter assessed 1,025 dwellings as experiencing noise higher than the noise insulation trigger. Measures are already in place to assess some 850 additional homes for sound insulation measures. This is a total of 1,875 homes affecting some 7,000 people.

(iv) Construction works will be executed within 3m of the front doors of properties in Cobourg Street\textsuperscript{22} where a Berlin wall is to be constructed; within 10m to 15m of properties in Park Village East\textsuperscript{23}; and within 20m of blocks on the Regents Park and Ampthill Square Estates. Petitioners will suggest that the trigger level is too high and that more properties will be rendered uninhabitable. A single loud noise at night is sufficient to disturb sleep.

(v) Extensive works will be executed outside normal working hours, HS2 Ltd having taken an informed decision that disruption to minimise the impact on existing rail passengers, at the expense of local residents and businesses. Works will be executed at night, over weekends and during holiday periods – just the periods when everyone is entitled to quiet enjoyment of their homes. Construction noise is inherently disturbing to sleep patterns and to health. Whilst Network Rail is obliged to pay compensation to the train operating companies for any disruption to their services, there is no such requirement for HS2 Ltd to compensate local residents and businesses. The Promoter is therefore going for the cheapest option, regardless of the basic principle that the “polluter should pay”.

\textsuperscript{22} Not mentioned in the SES
\textsuperscript{23}[12.4.86] and [12.4.89] of CFA1 (2015)
Many occupants will feel compelled to leave the area. We believe that the promoters have significantly underestimated the cost of compensating those who are unable to sell their homes. Since March 2010, property values in Camden have increased 59%\textsuperscript{24}. Property values are high, ranging from £435k for a one bedroom council flat on the Regents Park Estate; to £845k for a private two bedroom in Mornington Terrace; and £7.95m for a 5 bedroom Grade II* Nash house in Park Village East\textsuperscript{25}. Even a parking space can cost as much as £75k. Some property owners in Darwin Court and Park Village East have been unable to sell their homes and have had to resort to the discretionary Need to Sell scheme. Elsewhere, there is little evidence of blight given the excited state of the property market in London. Blight will take hold as the likely consequences of the construction works become apparent. This will then continue until 2033 and beyond, when the construction works are finally completed.

The amount of spoil that must be removed has increased from 2.8m to 3.5m tons (a 22% increase)\textsuperscript{26}. This is equivalent to the waste generated by 26 miles of tunnelling for Crossrail. The SES was premised upon the Promoter removing all spoil and transporting all construction materials by road. Much of this will be transported through quiet residential areas.

Whilst the two main compounds remain under AP3, the compound at the Podium has increased in size by 37% (an increase from 11,800 sqm to 16,200 sqm). The size of the National Temperance compound, which will entail the removal of 30 mature trees from St James' Gardens, is now 4,400 sqm (an increase of 45%).

The number of satellite compounds within the Euston area has increased from 12 to 17. Access to two of these compounds is through the heart of the Regents Park Estate. Three of the additional satellite compounds are at Park Village East (north), Cobourg Street and Melton Street.

The Euston Square Garden is now to be used as a construction site for 18 years. They are protected by the London Squares Preservation Act 1931, an enactment to protect London squares. This Act was specifically passed in the light of the developments which were occurring in the area on public open spaces, namely two of a quartet of squares at Endsleigh Gardens which disappeared beneath Friends House and the gardens of Mornington Crescent upon which the Art Deco Carreras Building was built.

The number of locations in the Euston area where there will be significant residual adverse effects from NO\textsubscript{2} between 2016-2026 has increased from four (Eversholt St; Ampthill Sq; Euston Rd; Hampstead Rd) to 23 (Euston Rd; Albany St, Augustus St; Hampstead Rd; Robert St; Varndell St; Park Village West; Stanhope St; North Gower St; Park Square East; Eversholt St, Polygon Rd; Phoenix Rd; Ossulston St;

\textsuperscript{24} In February 2016, the average price of a property (including flats) in Camden was £858k. Data taken from the Land Registry house price indices.

\textsuperscript{25} Information taken from zoopla

\textsuperscript{26} p.53 CFA1 (2013); p.105 CFA (2015).
Charlton St; Mornington Crescent; Harrington Sq; Barnby St; Parkway; Delancey St; Bayham Street; Arlington Rd). Again, this is simply unacceptable. The following locations will now also face significant adverse effects from NO2 between 2026 and 2033: Eversholt St; Ampthill Sq; Euston Rd; and Hampstead Rd.

36. There are two main reasons why AP3 not only extends the length of the blight but also the intensity of the impact between 2016 and 2026:

(i) HS2 Ltd has chosen to reschedule the works in order to reduce the impact on existing WCML passengers. This includes the reinstatement of Line X. They have done this at the expense of local residents.

(ii) HS2 Ltd has identified the need for a larger service and logistics basement in the station for which vehicular access is required. The proposed plan will involve raising Hampstead Road Bridge by 4.8m, blighting the landscape of those who live in the area. Residents on the north part of the Regents Park Estate will be denied access to the bus stop outside Eskdale. This will also impact upon the streetscape, creating a massive barrier between the Regents Park Estate and Somers Town communities.

37. The Promoter has stated that “by concentrating construction on certain locations at a time, disruption to the area as a whole at any one time will be reduced and easier to mitigate. Construction of the original hybrid Bill proposal would have meant a far more intense period of disruption for the community”29. It is impossible to reconcile this rhetoric with the reality of the AP3 scheme now described in the SES.

The Euston Area Plan (“EAP”)

38. The Promoter has described the plans outlined in AP3 as being “essential for the local community”30. The new scheme is intended to be “compatible with” and to “facilitate” the delivery of the wider vision of the EAP. No one in the local area sees the AP3 station as compatible with the EAP. The No.1 Objective of the EAP is “Prioritising local people’s needs: To ensure that new development meets local needs by ensuring homes, jobs, businesses, schools, community facilities and open space lost or affected by HS2, should it go ahead, are re-provided in the Euston area”31. HS2 rather see the redevelopment of the Euston area as a cash cow to subsidise the construction costs of the new station.

39. Your Petitioner highlights the following features:

(i) The area has been blighted since plans for HS2 were announced in 2010, particularly along Hampstead Road (the derelict garage site and the National Temperance Hospital). These sites would have been developed by now pursuant to
“Euston: A Framework for Change – Supplementary Planning Document” which was approved by Camden Council in 2009. Any benefits to local people will be deferred from 2026 to 2033 and beyond as a result of the phasing of the new AP3 station.

(ii) The Regents Park Estate is the largest estate in Camden. It is an essential source of affordable housing for the key workers essential to the running of any capital city. 220 dwellings are to be demolished, over 95% of which are low cost homes. The promoter is only intending to replace 136 of these, namely those occupied by “secure” tenants and which are to be provided on existing open spaces within the Regents Park Estate. The Promoter accepts that this loss of homes will be a major adverse effect on the local community, but makes no proposal to mitigate this.

(iii) A number of publicly owned sites have been acquired by the Promoter, namely land owned by Camden Council on the Regents Park Estate, the Drummond Street area and the Ampthill Square Estate, the National Temperance Hospital, and the Maria Fidelis School. Most of this is only required during the construction works.

(iv) The Promoter is also acquiring St James Gardens which we understand is owned by the St Pancras Church PPC. This is to be used as a construction site.

(v) The EAP makes provision for a new High Speed Station at Euston constructed within the footprint of the existing station. That is our desired option.

(vi) The EAP makes provision for the provision of replacement open space above the existing lines in the Camden Cutting to the north of Mornington Street Bridge. AP3 makes no provision for this. If it is not viable to provide open space in this area, full reparation must be made for any lost public open space to the south of the site.

40. The Action Group seeks the following undertakings from the Promoter:

(i) All public land which has been acquired by the promoter and which is only required during the construction period, will be returned into public use after the works have been completed (at the cost, adjusted for inflation, of acquisition). There must be full reinstatement to Camden Council of any land which is currently used for social housing.

(ii) Full reinstatement will be made for St James Gardens which should be returned to St Pancras PPC. These gardens are on the site of the C18 and C19 St James Burial Ground and former St James’ Chapel and contain Grade II listed monuments and over 50,000 bodies. St James’ Garden should be reinstated like-for-like within the remaining portion of St James’ Gardens that remains after the construction works.

---

33 The number of dwellings to be demolished has increased by 5 at Granby House. The Promoter declined to acquire this site before it was developed (estimated value: £1.7m in 2013). The acquisition costs have now increased to c. £6m.
35 See p.17 of the Euston Area Plan
have been completed with additional land made available to make reparation for any land that is lost.

(iii) There will be full reinstatement of any lost open spaces. These must all be public open spaces and not private land controlled by a developer.

**Clause 47**

41. Your Petitioner does not consider that this power is required. It should be removed from the Bill. We believe that the power is both unnecessary and undesirable. Local people fear abuse of power by any public authority. Local authorities already have sufficient powers and this power has not been considered necessary in previous similar Acts.

**The Promoter's Failure to engage with Community Groups**

42. The Action Group is a successor to the Community Forum which had been established by HS2 Ltd on 8 November 2012. The Objectives of the Forum were to (i) inform the local community about HS2 Ltd’s proposals and consultations; (ii) highlight local priorities for the route design; (iii) provide information from HS2 Ltd or DfT in a timely and transparent manner to enable members to make an informed response to the issues raised; (iv) provide for public participation in all aspects of the project which impact upon Euston; (v) identify and discuss local preferences for avoiding, managing or mitigating the impacts of the project during construction and operation; and (vi) identify local community benefits and activities which could be linked to the project. On 16 December 2013, the Community Forum had its last meeting. The community members on the Forum found the consultation process to be extremely frustrating. They were unable to identify any effective outcomes.

43. Our experience was not unique. At least one CFA passed a vote of no confidence in the consultation process. On 6 November 2013, the Chairs of a number of CFAs wrote to HS2’s chief Executive complaining of HS2’s failure to formulate any adequate mitigation measures.

44. The Community Forum responded to the following consultations: “Property and Compensation” and “Safeguarding” (31.1.13); “Draft Environmental Statement” (11.7.13); “Design Refinement” (11.7.13); “Property Compensation” (4.12.13); and Environmental Statement (27.2.14). Your Petitioner responded to the “Property Consultation 2014” (30.9.14) and the Supplementary Environmental Statement (6.11.15). Your Petitioner has seen no evidence that the Promoter has had any adequate regard to the responses made by the Community Forum, the Action Group or the other local community groups.

45. On 17 September 2013, HS2 Ltd issued a press release stating that they were abandoning CFAs to be replaced by a different type of engagement “more suited to the needs of petitioners”. On 18 May 2015, HS2 Ltd finally established the Euston Community Representation Group. We were promised a new style of engagement. In reality, this has been a one way process, HS2 Ltd informing the local community what they intended to do, rather than giving any weight to concerns that we have raised. We had asked that there be key performance indicators to assess the outcomes which we were able to secure through
engagement. These never materialised as HS2 Ltd were more concerned with outputs, namely the number of meetings and walkabouts.

46. This Group last met on 15 September 2015. A meeting has now been set for 27 April, after the deadline for the submission of petitions.

47. Over the last four years, the Community Forum and the Action Group have asked HS2 to fund a community resource, so that engagement can be structured to meet the needs of the local community and independent advice is available to those adversely affected by HS2. Camden Council have supported these demands, but the Council have stated that they are unable to fund this resource.

48. Your Petitioner submitted evidence to the Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee. We endorse the conclusion that HS2’s communication and engagement with residents has fallen far below the standards of a public authority that should be committed to upholding the highest standards of public administration. The Aarhus Convention on “Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters” emphasises the importance of the twin “pillars” of (i) access to relevant environmental information and (ii) public participation in decision making. The Action Group has seen no evidence that HS2 is committed to these principles.

49. Your Petitioner has the following asks:

(i) HS2 Ltd should establish an engagement programme that is real and effective, rather than theoretical and illusory. This must recognise the principles behind the Aarhus Convention.

(ii) To achieve this, HS2 Ltd must establish clear Terms of Reference setting out the objectives of the engagement programme and Key Performance Indicators which focus on “outcomes” (what the community has secured through the engagement programme) rather than “outputs” (the number of meetings that the community are required to attend).

(iii) There should be an independent chair.

(iv) HS2 Ltd should fund a community support and advice service which is accountable to and has the confidence of local people.

Mitigation – Air Quality (AQ)

50. The impact on Air Quality (AQ) of the construction of HS2 is the subject of the widest community concern, as shown by the large numbers of Petitions to the HC Select Committee asking for AQ mitigation measures. Your Petitioner’s primary concern is for the health effects on residents arising from the construction of the HS2 station at Euston, impacting for at least 17 years.
51. Local AQ is of exceptional importance to more than 6,000 Euston residents living within 120 metres of HS2. They already live with some of the very worst pollution in the UK. Euston is exceptional and warrants being treated as such. The local streets are extremely polluted and, for Nitrogen Dioxide, in long-term breach of EU law with no prospect of compliance for years to come – even without the additional pollution arising from the construction of HS2.

52. In the last 18 months, the science into the health consequences of air pollution has advanced greatly, particularly with regard Nitrogen Dioxide. The findings have become steadily more alarming. Pollution is now linked to asthma, cancer, impaired lung development, cardio-vascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and diabetes.

53. In July 2015, King’s College concluded that Nitrogen Dioxide was responsible for 22,500 premature deaths per year in the UK. London is the largest and worst example, with circa 9,500 deaths annually associated with pollution.\(^{36}\)

54. The primary villain is diesel engines. Even the cleanest diesel engines (Euro 6) emit Nitrogen Oxides and black carbon Particulates. Whilst these are small, unfortunately it is the smallest particulates that can penetrate the blood stream with long-term health consequences. HS2’s construction will entail extensive use of diesel engines, be they HGVs, white vans, non-road mobile machinery (NRMM) or diesel engine freight trains removing spoil.

55. Because of sharpened interest, provoked by the VW diesel “defeat software” expose in September 2015 and the Mayoral election to be held on 5th May, public awareness and concerns about AQ has risen enormously in the last nine months. The London Standard (13 April, 2016) reported that a majority of Londoners “would like a ban on diesel vehicles in central London”.

56. The most detrimental to health factors to Euston’s community are:

(i) black carbon emissions from HGVs, diesel-engined white vans under 3.5 tonnes and NRMMs (non-road mobile machinery).

(ii) particulates from massive demolition and construction.

(iii) the loss of literally dozens of mature pollution-eating trees in St James’s Gardens, those along Hampstead Road and in Euston Square.

57. Whilst the proposed Euro 6 standard for all HS2’s HGVs is welcomed, these diesel engines do emit Nitrogen Oxides and Particulates - albeit very small. But it is the smallest black carbon particulates that damage health by entering the blood stream. The standards

\(^{36}\) See (http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/jul/15/nearly-9500-people-die-each-year-in-london-because-of-air-pollution-study).
proposed by HS2 Ltd for most of the medium-term NRMM machinery is, in the main, alarmingly only to a Euro 3B standard.

**AQ - The political background**

58. Air Quality should be viewed in the context of the HCSC Report (at [232]): “We want monitoring of air quality to feed into an assessment of whether rehousing should occur in cases where air quality deteriorates. This should keep in mind an aspiration of improving the baseline air quality in Camden. The current position is clearly unsatisfactory."

59. There is a regrettable disconnect between HS2 Ltd and the residents of Camden; this because HS2 Ltd has deliberately negotiated only with Camden Council while paying lip-service to public engagement. The AQ “assurances” which have been agreed with Camden Council are vague and fall short of the specific air quality mitigation measures sought in dozens of Camden Petitions to the HCSC. Along with the study on rail transport, the detailed proposals on AQ monitoring and baseline have been delayed by HS2 until late May, resulting in residents “flying blind”.

60. Camden Council has had government funding hugely reduced in the last few years and its future funding stream is decreasing. The Council is now inadequately resourced to provide the necessary expertise and vigilance in either negotiating or enforcing AQ measures.

**AQ - Flawed HS2 methodology, based on the Defra “toolkit”**

61. At present there is only one “Automatic” AQ station near to Euston’s Safeguarded Zone and that is the one on the Euston Road opposite the fire station. HS2’s data is modelled and extrapolated from remote AQ monitoring stations. The Defra toolkit applied in the SES is known to be flawed and is discredited.

62. The methodology in the SES is fatally flawed. Plausibly, it depends on Defra and its “toolkit”. Defra itself has for the past five years been highly suspect on the issue of London’s AQ pollution. Instead of seeking and funding remedies it focussed on seeking waivers and delays in the date of AQ Directive compliance, particularly on Nitrogen Dioxide. Its forecasts have been consistently over-optimistic and it has concealed serious health incidents. Deplorably on AQ, Defra the ministry responsible, has been a consistently under-performing ignored backwater. In 2015 the Supreme Court ruled against its AQ plan and a second mediocre plan was published in the Autumn, proposing delayed compliance on Nitrogen Dioxide until 2025 for London. That report is the subject to a second referral to the Supreme Court.

63. The central issue is that AQ is very local. AP3’s SES Appendix AQ-001-001 admits at [2.17]: “...modelling is less robust than monitoring data and may not fully take into account local characteristics that influence pollution levels”.

64. Canyons, for example such as Putney High Street (eg Eversholt St, Delancey St, etc), trap pollution. HS2’s modelling is based on roadside monitors miles away to establish falsely high modelled baselines which would be the trigger for interventions. Only REAL monitoring will
do. The choice of monitoring station locations and the proposed AQ measuring methodology are at present secrets only to HS2 Ltd. The Community should have the opportunity, along with Camden Council, to specify the monitoring locations. Many Camden side streets are currently destined to be ignored by HS2 Ltd, despite the likelihood of additional HGVs and displaced traffic flows arising from HS2 works creating raised pollution and damaging health.

65. King’s College, the UK’s recognised experts who operate the London-wide real-time monitoring information network LAQN, state that ideally there is a need for a full 12-month AQ baseline measurement, to establish seasonal variations.

AQ - Mitigation Asks

66. Your Petitioner has the following mitigation “asks”

(i) The biggest single measure to help mitigate air quality (AQ) is for the maximum spoil and construction material to be transported by rail. A target of at least 80% by rail should be set.

(ii) The appointment of an independent adjudicator to be tasked with overseeing air quality, investigation of breaches and empowered where appropriate to stop demolition/construction and ensure that suitable remedies are implemented.

(iii) Establishment of accurate AQ baseline and continuous data from multiple new “automatic” monitoring stations, at locations to be jointly agreed by Community groups, Camden Council and HS2 Ltd. Euston needs a number of “reference stations” to provide real-time accurate local AQ data, publicly accessible to the residents online.

(iv) The Promoter to fund a dedicated Camden Council AQ Enforcement Officer for Euston.

(v) Diesel-engined trucks and vans under 3.5 tonnes should be required to meet Euro 6 standards and not granted exception status.

(vi) Camden’s resident groups and schools/businesses to be accorded a formal interface with HS2 Ltd, in addition to Camden Council, over the location of 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.

(vii) No HS2 HGVs on Regent’s Park Outer Circle road.

Compensation

67. The HCSC (at [237]) recognised that Camden is “exceptional and needs special treatment”. It is a matter of regret that the government has not recognised this. Whilst the Promoter has recognised the need to introduce a number of measures to supplement the
National Compensation Scheme in rural areas, these do not extend to Euston. Since the Bill was introduced in the Commons on 25 November 2013, the impact on those with homes or businesses has become progressively worse. As the cost of the new station has increased, it is apparent that there has been less money available for either mitigation in Euston or to compensate where the adverse effect cannot be mitigated.

68. In their interim report, the HCSC identified a primary aim of compensation as being to give “residents the confidence to stay, ensuring continuity and coherence within their communities.”37 We endorse this principle. Your Petitioner accepts that once the construction works have been completed, there will be no significant long term impact on property prices for most properties in the Euston area.

69. However, what is unprecedented is the duration and impact of the construction works. A child now aged 10, will be 28 by the time that the construction works are completed; a pensioner now aged 70, will be 88. Over this extensive period, the personal circumstances of all homeowners will change. They need to be reassured that they will be able to sell their properties without incurring substantial prejudice because of the construction works.

70. There are some properties on which the Promoter accepts that the operation of the scheme will have a major adverse effect on the amenities of residents which will be permanent and significant. Properties at Coniston, Langdale and Augustus House are identified38. No compensation is proposed.

71. The Promoter has recognised the developing European jurisprudence in the area of property rights a view endorsed by Sir Keir Starmer, QC, MP, who has advised the Action Group that the compensation package currently on offer is not compatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

72. The Promoter has recognised the need to introduce a number of measures to supplement the National Compensation Scheme. However, only the “Need to Sell” scheme extends to urban areas. Whilst the “Express Purchase” scheme also applies to urban areas, the safeguarding area has been drawn more restrictively within urban areas. In rural areas, it extends to properties up to 60m from the midpoint of the new line. In Euston, some 2,986 people live within 60m of the construction works. Only those who own the 220 dwellings which are to be demolished are eligible to claim. Residents who live within 5m (Cobourg St); 10m (Park Village East); and 20m (Langdale, Augustus House, Coniston and Cartmel) of the construction works are being offered no compensation.

73. The other schemes, namely “Voluntary Purchase”, “Cash Offer” and “Homeowner” are restricted to rural areas. The Promoter has suggested a number of reasons for the disparate treatment of urban properties:

(i) The Euston area will benefit economically from the new railway39. No evidence is adduced to support this proposition. The Euston area is already a high value area,
close to Central London and with excellent transport links. The reality is that most residents in the area will not see the completion of the scheme. The area will continue to be blighted until the scheme is completed.

(ii) Those living in the area are used to noise from the railway: Euston is a quiet residential area. It is not the noise from the railway that is the problem; it is rather the construction works.

(iii) Those living in urban areas are used to construction works: These works are of unprecedented length and intensity.

74. The following principles should underpin any compensation package:

(i) The compensation that falls to be assessed and paid as a result of the HS2 scheme must be fair and proportionate and arrived at by a process which gives proper weight to the interests of all those affected by the scheme. The Promoter has confirmed that he has not revisited the compensation to be offered to residents and businesses in the light of the greater impact of AP3.  

(ii) Compensation should not only be grounded in property rights. It must reflect the wider human rights which are undoubtedly affected the HS2 scheme. Long established communities will be destroyed, family and private life will be severely disrupted and every conceivable type of pollution will affect the environment for many years.

(iii) there should be equity between those living in rural and urban areas. Any disparate treatment must be objectively justified.

75. These principles are consistent with those outlined by the Secretary of State in his 2013 consultation, namely: (i) Fairness; (ii) Value for Money; (iii) Community Cohesion; (iv) Feasibility, Efficiency and Comprehensibility; (vi) Functioning of the Housing Market; (vi) The Best Balance between these Criteria.

76. One of the stated reasons for the “Alternative Cash Offer” is to encourage people to remain in their communities so that communities can ‘thrive’. This logic applies to urban as much as rural communities. In the Euston area, we have a number of distinctive and vibrant communities. It is very much an area at ease with itself. Those communities now face a unique threat.

Our Compensation “Asks”

77. We asks for an Independent and impartial HS2 Compensation Commission:

(l) to draw up a fair compensation scheme;

40 See written answer to PQ11141
41 See “Property Compensation” Consultation (2013)
(ii) to administer and determine applications for compensation.

78. This would permit the scope of the scheme to be decided on the basis of area of direct/indirect impact of the construction works, rather than arbitrary distances from the line. This is more relevant in urban areas where construction sites will be very close to homes and businesses. The impact may not necessarily depend on the distance of the property from the works, as some properties will be shielded by other properties.

79. The desired objective of Your Petitioner is to bind our diverse and vibrant community together through some 10-25 years of unique disruption. We do not want residents to be forced to move away from the area which would fracture the social cohesion of our vibrant and diverse communities. To date, the Promoters of the Bill have been deaf to our pleas for a compensation scheme that will achieve this. There is evidence that our community is starting to fragment. Some of our members have felt compelled to sell their homes before the construction works commence and both their lives and homes become blighted. Right to Buy tenants whose homes are to be demolished have felt compelled to move out of the area because the compensation offered under the express purchase scheme is inadequate to enable them to secure alternative accommodation in the area. The number of those choosing to leave the area will accelerate when the construction works commence.

80. All forms of compensation available to residents should be made available to businesses, irrespective of their rateable value. This should involve compensation for commercial tenants for loss of trade and for commercial landlords for loss of rent if they can demonstrate that this has occurred as a result of the HS2 scheme. HS2 poses additional costs to businesses, for example in delays caused by reduced accessibility, managing amenity impacts such as poorer working/trading conditions and costs attached to the uncertainty created by the scheme. Businesses are forced to buy in additional resources and professional expertise to manage these factors and the risk posed at their own expense. It is unfair that these hidden costs of the scheme are borne by individual businesses and the compensation offer to businesses should be adapted to reflect this. Businesses should also be compensated for loss of custom, where this is directly linked to the construction works. Many businesses in Drummond Street will be forced to close if a proper package of compensation is not put in place. This street could lose its unique character.

81. The Secretary of State acknowledge that the nuisance caused by the works is going to be such as to require HS2 Ltd to offer some 1,875 homes affecting some 7,000 residents a range of mitigation measures, including acoustic insulation and temporary rehousing. Many residents will not find additional glazing to be an acceptable solution whether because it is not practical (Georgian and Victorian listed properties with internal shutters) or because they are unwilling to live in hermetically sealed environments. Residents want to exercise control over their lives and will not accept offers of temporary accommodation in a hotel in some remote part of London. This has been a demand of many of the Euston petitioners. They wish to make their own informed choices as to how they would wish to mitigate the impact of HS2 on their lives.

82. In any event, the Promoter should be required to relax four of the five conditions that must be satisfied for the “Need to Sell” scheme:
(i) No prior knowledge – applicants must have bought their property before 11 March 2010

This rule must be relaxed given the uncertainty and the Petitioner’s changing plans for Euston. This rule will have a much greater impact on urban, rather than rural areas, given the greater turnover of properties. Many people have bought properties in the area since 11 March 2010. Currently, HS2 only seems to have blighted the top range of the local property market. Blight will take hold when construction works commence. This will continue until 2033 and beyond, when the construction works are finally completed. This rule will merely “bake the blight”. When construction works start, purchasers will not only be deterred by impact of the works. They will also know that their ability to sell will be handicapped by their exclusion from this scheme.

Anyone who bought property between March 2010 and September 2015 would have reasonably understood that construction works would end in 2026. The blight will now extend to 2033 and beyond.

(ii) Effort to sell – applicants must have marketed their property without success for at least three months, with no offers within 15% of a realistic (unblighted) asking price

The average price of a property in the area is £1m. A homeowner of the average home will be expected to incur a loss of £150k, before they can benefit from the scheme. A homeowner may need to sell their home to fund their retirement. It is not reasonable to expect them to incur such a substantial loss.

Those entering the property market in Euston may have committed themselves to mortgages of up to 90% to fund their purchases. This rule could leave such home owners with a negative equity.

(iii) Compelling reason to sell – a compelling reason to sell the property now, or that the applicant would be placed under an unreasonable burden if unable to sell their property in the next 3 years.

We agree with the Select Committee ([116] of their First Special Report) that this rule is too restrictive and should extend to anyone with a justifiable reason to move, including those motivated by their “age and stage” in life.

(iv) Property type – owner-occupier or ‘reluctant landlord’ - needing to rent the property as a result of HS2

The rateable value limit of £34,800 for businesses should be removed. The HCSC (at [283]-[284]) noted that the rateable value cap was not appropriate in the case of London businesses; too many would exceed the cap. This has a particular impact on Drummond Street where many of the double fronted business units have rateable...
values of some £60,000. The Government responded that it would prefer to maintain the cap’s “tried and tested” approach, applying a discretion in the case of hardship cases. However, it conceded that 33% would exceed the cap in the case of Drummond Street. That is too high. It would not be unfair if, illustratively, all the businesses in Drummond Street had the same scope for obtaining compensation. The Committee noted that the figure of £34,000 was set some time ago and would be reviewed in 2017. The Committee wanted a re-evaluation such that the proportion of London businesses falling within the cap is broadly the same as elsewhere. It asked the Department of Transport to liaise with other Departments to carry through a review as soon as possible, before the most potentially damaging aspects of construction work begin to affect businesses in London. Your Petitioner endorses this approach.

This scheme should extend to all property owners, including those who rent out their properties. For a number of local residents, this is their pension pot. Rents are likely to slump as a consequence of the construction works. Many landlords have purchased properties to fund their retirement and with the assistance of a mortgage. The slump in rents could result in the rental income being insufficient to service the mortgage. Property blight could preclude the landlord from selling.

(v) Location — no fixed outer boundary, but of HS2 must be established.

We have no recommendations to make in respect of this fifth condition.

83. Insofar as the compensation schemes are to be modelled on those for rural area, the Promoter should be required to give the following undertakings:

(i) The “Express Purchase” scheme should be extended to the Euston area in respect of all properties in locations where there are “predicted unmitigated significant adverse residual in-combination effects”. Such a decision would not necessarily be a costly one, given the long-term value of the assets that the government might acquire.

(ii) The “Voluntary Purchase” and “Homeowner Payment” and “Cash Offer” schemes should be extended to the Euston area. Your Petitioners can see no rational justification for excluding those who live in urban areas from these schemes.

(iii) The “Cash Offer” payment should be extended to the Euston area. It should not be capped at 10% (£100k) is inappropriate given the current (and increasing) level of property values in the Euston area. The average value of a property in the Euston area is now some £1m.

(iv) If the “Homeowner Payment” and the “Cash Offer” schemes should be extended to the Euston area, we can see no rational justification for restricting it to home owners. Many social tenants see their properties as homes for life and have family, friends and community support networks in the area. Some assured shorthold tenants, the only private tenancy currently granted in the area, have occupied their homes for many years.
(v) The compensation under the Land Compensation Act 1973 offered to Right to Buy lessees whose homes are to be demolished has proved insufficient to enable them to secure suitable alternative accommodation in the area and within their existing communities. It is a matter of regret that those who followed Mrs Thatcher's advice to buy their homes have been forced to move away from the communities in which they have lived for most of their lives. It is now too late to lure them back.

(vi) Compensation for Businesses in the Euston area, particularly in Drummond Street: The priority should be on mitigating the impact of the construction works on businesses. To the extent that this is not possible, fair and proportionate compensation will compensate them for any loss.

(vii) **Personal Mitigation Budgets:** The Promoters acknowledge that the nuisance caused by the works is going to be such as to require HS2 Ltd to offer residents a range of mitigation measures, including secondary/tertiary glazing or temporary rehousing. Many residents will not find additional glazing to be an acceptable solution whether because it is not practical (Georgian and Victorian listed properties with internal shutters) or because they are unwilling to live in hermetically sealed environments. Residents want to exercise control over their lives and will not accept offers of temporary accommodation in a hotel in some remote part of London. Many of Your Petitioners will be urging that the promoters make available personal budgets which will enable residents to make their own informed choices as to how they would wish to mitigate the impact of HS2 on their lives.

(viii) Any scheme should extend to all home owners who suffer loss as a result of the construction of HS2. This will include those who have let out their properties as part of their pension pots or have bought properties to fund their future pensions. They should be compensated for any loss in rental income caused as a consequence of HS2.

(ix) The Promoters will establish procedures for determining claims for compensation which comply with Article 6 of European Convention. Applications for compensation must be determined and payments made promptly. Strict time limits must be imposed. Applications shall be determined by an independent and impartial body. A panel including a member of HS2 Ltd is not acceptable. Such an independent and impartial decision-making body already exists, namely the First-Tier Tribunal (Property Chamber).

**Community & Environment and Business & Local Economy Funds**

84. The Promoter is proposing a Community & Environment Fund and Business and Local Economy Fund which will have a combined budget of £30m for the period to 2026. Your Petitioners ask that there be specific funds earmarked for Camden throughout the period of the construction work, namely from 2017 to 2033 with separate funds for businesses and community groups of, say, £500k per annum for each fund.
85. The HCSC (at [350]) recommended that the funding envelope of both funds should be substantially increased. It suspected that the Government is aware that the amounts are too low. The Committee wanted to see specific allocations to certain communities to avoid bidding wars. In its response (at [99] – [101], the government has agreed to increase the funding to £40m. It is proposing indicative allocations and proposes to publish them before the end of the Lords’ Select Committee hearings.

86. The Select Committee (at [237]) recognised that Camden is “exceptional and needs special treatment”. It is a matter of regret that the government has not recognised this.

The Enforcement of Undertakings and Assurances

87. Your Petitioner supports the case for the creation of an Independent Adjudicator. The Adjudicator should have responsibility to deal with all matters arising from the construction of HS2, including ensuring that the nominated undertaker complies with any undertaking and assurances. The current suggestion that local residents and businesses should have to escalate their concerns through their local authority is not going to be workable. Neither is it satisfactory that recourse should then be through the Secretary of State and thereafter to Parliament.

The Request for a Directions Hearing

88. The HCSC sat over 159 days to hear more than 1,500 petitions. We suggest that much of the time of the Committee would have been saved had effective case management been exercised encouraging the parties to identify the issues in dispute and to enter into meaningful negotiations to resolve those issues without the need to resort to the Committee. The Promoter failed to engage with the Camden community petitioners, apparently taking the view that they could negotiate with Camden Council on their behalf. They failed to recognise that whilst Camden Council and local petitioners had much in common, each had their own agenda.

89. Your Petitioner therefore asks for the following directions to be made:

(i) There should be full disclosure made by the Promoter of the research, if any, on the alternative options for the London terminus.

(ii) The Promoter Response Documents (PRDs) should to set out specific offers to the petitioners rather than vague responses to issues raised by petitioners.

(ii) There should be a clear structure and timetable for negotiations, with the potential for the Select Committee or an independent body to require that offers of assurances are made to petitioners within a given timescale;

(iii) HS2 should take a more collaborative, and less commercial, approach to negotiations, with a greater commitment to sharing information and working

42 The proposal made by Lord Turnbull at the Second Reading
towards common objectives and outcomes, rather than a narrow focus on engineering considerations;

(iv) The Promoter should ensure that senior officials or those with decision making authority are involved earlier in negotiations, so that decisions are not delayed unnecessarily.

90. In the House of Commons, the Camden petitions were heard last because of the Promoter’s failure to formulate viable plans for Euston station. Your Petitioner’s members felt that they were seriously prejudiced by the late stage at which their petitions were heard. Having been informed of the assurances that the Promoter had given to the Camden Council, the HCSC were perceived to have little interest in any additional “asks” from community groups. Some felt that they had almost given up as they came to the end of their ordeal, on one occasion sitting from 09.30 to 21.50.

91. Your Petitioners would also ask the Select Committee to visit Camden. The House of Commons has recognised that devising a coherent plan for Euston station is the most difficult part of the scheme. To date, the promoter has failed to do so.

The Prayer

92. Your 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:

Robert Latham on behalf of the HS2 Euston Community Action Group

18 April 2016
To The House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF (1) MOHAMMED SALIQUE, (2) SULTANUR RAHMAN CHOUDHURY; (3) MOHAMMED ARMAN AHMED; (4) AHAD CHOWDHURY; (5) SYED ABDUL GANI; (6) REDOAN PASHA; (7) S.A.KHAN; (8) PASQUALE BRIZZI; (9) SHEMSI SHAQIRI; (10) ARSATCUMAR BAGUATY; (11) GULAM HUSSAIN MANGER; (12) BAK KHADKA; (13) WALI UDDIN; (14) SHAIKH MUSTUFA KAMAL; (15) RAKESH GUPTA and (16) DON ANTONIO; (17) SARA FASIR; (18) A GOFUR; and (19) NUHEL CHOUDHURY ("THE DRUMMOND STREET TRADERS").

Declares that:

1. Your Petitioners and their property, rights and interests in the area of Euston would be injuriously and directly affected by the whole Bill.

Your Petitioners

2. Your Petitioners are individuals who trade in the Drummond Street area, London NW1 which runs west from the side of Euston Station. Most of the properties in Drummond Street were constructed between 1825 and 1840. Drummond Street used to be much longer extending through to Doric Way to the east of Eversholt Street. This part was lost when Euston Station was rebuilt in 1961. Over the last 50 years, Drummond Street has developed as a unique area in Camden with a number of curry houses, shops and businesses. It has a strong British Bangladeshi identity. We employ local people. We live in the local area. Unlike Brick Lane in Tower Hamlets, we are local businesses and are not part of chains. Many of our customers started to come to us as students; they now return when they travel to Euston Station as commuters.

3. Your Petitioners were not the first Asian food outlets in the street. Ambala, now a chain of shops selling Indian sweets, opened in 1965 catering to immigrants from India and Bangladesh (then East Pakistan) who had started moving into the Victorian terraces in the area. Our arrival galvanised a district blighted by the steam trains thundering in and out of Euston Station. When the main line out of Euston Station was electrified in the mid 1960s, Drummond Street became the heart of the community. As diesel engines replaced steam, the area began to prosper. In the 1970s, we campaigned with local residents against a large property company, Stock Conversion, which wanted to build offices in the area. Tolmer's Square was lost, not to developers, but to Camden Council who developed the site for council housing. Determined action saved the area for a mixed community, with a thriving street culture of small shops and cheap restaurants.

4. Many of Your Petitioners were brought up in the area. In the 1980s, they had to confront racism and police brutality. Your Petitioners are now part of a vibrant and diverse...
community at ease with itself. They have a mosque in Starcross Street and Islamic Centre in North Gower Street. In Drummond Street, people are judged by their contribution to the local community.

5. Your Petitioners are:

(i) Your First Petitioner, Mohammed Salique, runs Diwana Bhel Poori House at 121-123 Drummond Street. It is owned by Diwana Restaurant Ltd, of which Your Petitioner is a director. The premises are leased from a private landlord. Your Petitioner also has an interest in Chutneys at 124 Drummond Street. When Diwana opened in 1970, it was one of the first vegetarian restaurants in London. It serves students, office workers and passengers from all parts of the country. Your Petitioner has lived in the locality since 1978. In 1982, whilst at school, he earned pocket money helping at Diwana. The senior members of his community worked at Ambala and the local restaurants; some worked at the Euston Station Bath. In the early years, Your Petitioner was confronted by the evil of racial violence. After years of hard work with the council, the police and community leaders, relationships started to settle down in the 1990s. In 1986, Your Petitioner started to work for Diwana. In 2005, his turning point came when he was able to acquire the businesses with three of his colleagues. After years of struggle, the British Bangladeshi community is now thriving in Drummond Street. Your Petitioner is concerned that HS2 will destroy not only his business, but also the cohesive community in Drummond Street. It is an area, close to his heart.

(ii) Your Second Petitioner, Sultanur Rahman Choudhury runs Ravi Shankar at 133-135 Drummond Street. It opened in 1980. Your Petitioner has been involved in the business since 2009. Over £100,000 has been invested in the business. The premises are rented from a private landlord. Customers come from local hotels, public houses, and from Euston Station. Your Petitioner has lived in the area since 1997. Other family members live in the area. It employs 10 people. Any reduction in business will inevitably lead to redundancies.

(iii) Your Third Petitioner, Mohammed Arman Ahmed runs Drummond Villa at 180 Drummond Street and has been the co-owner of Drummond Street Villa Ltd since 1998. He has invested his savings in the business. He has a private landlord. The restaurant offers traditional Indian curry and tandoori chicken. Many of his customers come from Euston Station. Your Petitioner employs between 12 and 15 people.

(iv) Your Fourth Petitioner, Ahad Chowdhury runs Sizzling Bombay at 132 Drummond Street. Your Petitioner has lived in Drummond Street for over 30 years. At the age of 4, he learnt to ride a bike in St James Gardens. The gardens have always been a refuge from the hectic life of Central London. Your Petitioner grew up in the 1980s and faced the challenges of racism and police brutality. The Drummond Street community has overcome these problems and now live together as an extended family. Sizzling Bombay opened in 1994. Your Petitioner was lucky enough to take
over the business in 2003, and had not looked back until HS2 was proposed. The business employs 8 people.

(v) Your Fifth Petitioner, Syed Abdul Gani, runs Chutneys at 124 Drummond Street. He is a director of Chutneys Restaurant Ltd. Chutneys opened in 1987 and was one of the first restaurants in Drummond Street to offer an Indian vegetarian buffet alongside traditional Indian street food. Your Petitioner has worked in the restaurant since it opened. Most of the customers come from Euston Station or the underground stations at Euston Square and Warren Street. Tourists make return visits to the restaurant. Some customers rely on local parking. A recent example is a customer who celebrated her 90th birthday at Chutneys.

(vi) Your Sixth Petitioner, Redoan Pasha, runs the Taste of India at 126-130 Drummond Street. Your Petitioner has lived in North Gower Street for 20 years with his wife and five children. He has recently acquired Taste of India which is a second generation business and has invested £15,000 - £20,000. He has also been involved in Ravi Shankar since 1994.

(vii) Your Seventh Petitioner, S.A.Khan, runs Massala Hut at 161-163 Drummond Street. He was born and has always lived in the area. Your Petitioner is a co-owner of A.R.Massala Ltd. Your Petitioner started the business in October 2007. He has invested his savings in the business and borrowed money from family and friends. The business employs between 10-15 people.

(viii) Your Eighth Petitioner, Pasquale Brizzi, runs Brizzis at 131 Drummond Street. This is a coffee shop and Italian restaurant. This year, Your Petitioner celebrates the 30th anniversary of his business. He is concerned about his future.

(ix) Your Ninth Petitioner, Shemsi Shaqiri opened Cafe Nora at 120 Drummond Street on 14 January 2012. Your Petitioner has invested a lot of money in the business. He fears to invest more because of the uncertainties about the future of Drummond Street.

(x) Your Tenth Petitioner, Arsatcumar Baguaty, has a family business, Plentiful Foods Ltd which trades as The Indian Spice Shop at 115-119 Drummond Street. It specialises in Indian spices and groceries and has been a well established feature of Drummond Street for the last 50 years. Originally it was Patak’s Spice Shop and it has been owned by his family for over 25 years. Today, it continues to serve the same customers and their families, as well as many new families. Currently, the shop employs 5 full time staff and serves not only as a specialist spice shop, but also as a local supermarket for residents and commuters from Euston station. The shop has also been recognised for its specialism in Indian spices and groceries with appearances on BBC news, The Apprentice and Nigel Slater’s cookery programme. The Spice Shop is the main income for Your Petitioner’s family – his immediate family, and the families of his brother and brother-in-law. It is an integral and vital part of our lives. Your Petitioner is concerned that HS2 will mean the end of his
business as his customers will not be able to access the shop. Drummond Street will become a dead-end street.

(xi) Your Eleventh Petitioner, Gulam Hussain Mangera runs Savera Bakery and Sweets at 129 Drummond Street. His family came over to the UK in the mid 1970s. After a series of jobs, in 1976 his father obtained employment at Ambala in Drummond Street. In 1984 his family set up their own business and chose Drummond Street because of its central location and ease of access for their customers in both Fast and West London. “Savera Bakery” means “Morning Bakery”. They now run two businesses from the site, Simply Chicken on the ground floor and Savera Bakery in the basement. Their particular concerns are congestion, pollution, noise, restricted access and parking.

(xii) Your Twelfth Petitioner, Bak Khadka runs the Bio Organix Health Store at 141-153 Drummond Street. He is Nepalese. This is a health food store which he has run for the last 4-5 years. He has a private landlord. It is a family business, mainly run by family members. The family has invested their life in their business. It is their only source of income. The business relies on the footfall from Euston Station.

(xiii) Your Thirteenth Petitioner, Wali Uddin, runs 1-Optix at 96 Drummond Street, an eye care centre.

(xiv) Your Fourteenth Petitioner, Shaikh Mustufa Kamal, runs Amin Food Store at 134 Drummond Street. This is a family business established in 2009. Your Petitioner and his siblings have invested their savings in the business.

(xv) Your Fifteenth Petitioner, Rakesh Gupta, runs Gupta Confectioners at 100 Drummond Street. They are manufacturers and retailers of Indian sweets and savouries. They are also involved in event catering and street food markets. The business was established in 1979 and has been in Drummond Street since 1981 at the same premises. They are tenants of Camden Council. Your Petitioner’s parents established the business and Your Petitioner took it over some 12 years ago. They have employed many local young people over the years, some of whom are still in contact and have gone on to successful careers in various fields. Their customers are mainly those who live or work in the area but include many from various cities around the UK who drop by before catching the train at Euston to their final destinations. HS2 spells potential catastrophe for Drummond Street. The business would be hugely affected and Your Petitioner would need to consider redundancies. The confidence of small businesses is so uncertain that the commencement of HS2 could cause irreparable damage from which the business could not recover. Your Petitioner is locked into his property having spent many thousands over the years in improving and maintaining the premises. With HS2, Your Petitioner is not in a position where he could sell up and move as any goodwill which the business has accumulated over many, many years has evaporated. It seems to your Petitioner that no compensation is currently available. None of the readers are millionaires. They are rather hard working people seeking to achieve a better life for their families.
Your Sixteenth Petitioner, Don Antonio, runs African Gallery Kitchen at 102 Drummond Street. He has lived in the area for over 50 years. His restaurant has been a “treasure” in Drummond Street for over 25 years offering West African food with a wealth of African masks on the walls. A customer describes how she wandered onto Drummond Street in search of Asian food, “but strangely ended up at African Kitchen”. It is renowned for being “quirky, unique and superb”.

Your Seventeenth Petitioner, Sara Fasir, runs Crescent Dry Cleaners, 138 Drummond Street. Sara started her business some two years ago investing her life’s savings in it. She rents the premises from Camden Council. She employs two members of staff. Her business serves local residents, workers and tourists. The blight that will now be brought by HS2’s AP£ station will last for so long, that Sara cannot see how her business can survive.

Your Eighteenth Petitioner, A Gofur runs Shah Tandoori at 159 Drummond Street. He lives locally in Tonbridge Street.

Your Nineteenth Petitioner, Nuhel Choudhury runs the Green Light Pharmacy at 62-64 Hampstead Road. He lives locally at Swallowfield, Munster Square. The traffic gridlock that AP3 will bring to Hampstead Road will have a damaging effect upon his business.

Camden Council’s Euston Area Plan describes the Drummond Street area in these terms: “Drummond Street has a well preserved grid of historic regency terraces, containing a mix of residential and commercial uses within a tight-knit historic urban grain. It has a vibrant, distinctive character, and Drummond Street itself is recognised for its specialist ethnic shops and restaurants. To the north of the Drummond Street area, St James’s Gardens is a historic open space that contains the Grade II listed structures that relate to its history as a burial ground and the National Temperance Hospital which has local heritage value” (at p.19). All this will be lost under the Promoter’s current plans. This is unacceptable.

The Impact of HS2 on Drummond Street

The businesses of Your Petitioners are going to be devastated by HS2. The area to the east of Cobourg Street is to be demolished. For a period of 11 years (stated to be 2016 to 2026), a “Berlin Wall” is be erected down the centre of Cobourg Street whilst the new station is constructed. This will cut off our businesses from a large number of our customers from Euston Station.

AP3 will now extend the construction period for Stage B1 until 2026-2033. During this period, we will be cut off from our customers from the mainline station. We will then face further disruption whilst the eastern section of the station is developed. The phasing of the works will delay the redevelopment of the areas where homes and businesses are to be demolished. Much of the over site development will only be able to start when Stage B2 (the redevelopment of the eastern part of the existing station) is completed. The Supplementary Environmental Statement (“SES”) is premised on Stage B2 starting after 2033.
9. We also face the disruption that will be caused by the construction of Crossrail 2 (2020s-2030s). On 8 January 2016, the consultation period ended on Transport for London’s latest Consultation on Crossrail 2. This is premised on a scheme constructed to the east of Eversholt Street, as it cannot currently be integrated into the existing station. As a result, 150 homes, the Travelodge Hotel and a number of businesses are at risk. This would not be necessary, were Crossrail 2 to be integrated into the existing station.

10. The SES does not address the practical difficulties of completing Stage B2 as a level deck station after the High Speed platforms have been constructed. Your Petitioner suggests that the practical problems would be immense:

(i) This dysfunctional approach to the new station will cause unacceptable misery to local businesses and residents for a period closer to 25, rather than 18 years. Even a construction period of 18 years is unacceptable. It should be no longer than 10 years.

(ii) The development of the 11 remaining classic tracks in isolation will cause immense disruption to the rail users. A level deck option would require the lowering of the existing classic lines and the removal of large quantities of spoil. It is doubtful whether this work could be executed without closing Euston station to classic train passengers.

(iii) The Euston area would be blighted for a generation. Camden LBC would not be able to achieve the benefits of the Euston Area Plan. To achieve the full benefits, including the promise of 2,200 new homes and 16,000 new jobs, there must be an integrated strategy for the redevelopment of Euston station within a realistic time frame.

The Proposed Station at Euston

11. HS2 Ltd has consistently underestimated the cost and practical difficulties of bringing HS2 into a densely populated, high value area such as Euston. The AP3 station that is proposed is unacceptable.

12. Your Petitioners believe that HS2 could be brought into Euston within the footprint of the existing station and without the widespread destruction of homes and businesses that AP3 entails. Three such schemes are being proposed, none of which have been subject to a proper appraisal:

(i) The Euston Express Scheme which is being promoted by Lord Berkeley and Jonathan Roberts. The current scheme (September 2015)\(^2\) would use classic compatible trains which could be built to achieve speeds of up to 360 kph, if the cost of achieving such speeds could be justified. Classic compatible trains could be operated on the last four miles of the WCML into Euston. Additional platforms could be provided within the footprint of the existing station where the existing platforms are excessively wide. The scheme would be quicker to build, cheaper and better for passengers. It would be fully integrated with Crossrail 2.

\(^2\) See link
(ii) The Double Deck Down scheme for a fully integrated station on two levels within the existing station width. This would provide 11 platforms at ground level for traditional trains and 11 platforms below ground for HS trains.

(iii) High Speed UK provides a more radical proposal. This is a national scheme intended to provide a fully integrated national network with a core spine of four tracks between London and South Yorkshire, closely following the M1 from London to Leicester. HSUK proposes a 2km long surface connection at Old Oak Common to link Crossrail 1 to the West Coast Main Line and thus to enable most London Midland commuter flows to be diverted to Crossrail; this diversion could approximately halve the peak flow of commuter trains into Euston. HSUK does not require Euston station to be expanded and a far shorter construction programme is envisaged. Direct connections over existing lines are provided to St Pancras (for HS1) and to Heathrow.

13. If HS2 is to be brought into Euston, the Select Committee should set the following essential requirements which HS2 Ltd must undertake to meet:

(i) It must design a unified station that serves both the High Speed and classic services and is fit for the 21st Century.

(ii) The new station must be fully integrated with Crossrail 2, a project which will also have a major impact on the Drummond Street area.

(iii) The new station must be constructed within an acceptable time period. A construction period of 7-10 years may be acceptable; 17 years or more is not. This timetable would be devastating for businesses in Drummond Street. We would be blighted for a generation.

(iv) The plan must be consistent with Camden’s Euston Area Plan; the proposal for AP3 is not. The EAP’s vision of Drummond Street is rather of “protecting existing businesses and enhancing the area’s unique specialist role as a centre for ethnic shops and restaurants, along with its built character and heritage (Key Principles at xi).” The overall strategy in the EAP is to ensure that growth and change can protect and enhance existing local centres such as Drummond Street (p.32).

(v) The taxi drop-off point should be incorporated within footprint of the new station. The scheme must include effective mitigation measures for those who live and work in the area. HS2 Ltd’s stated approach to mitigation has a “hierarchy, whereby priority has been given to avoiding or preventing effects; and then (if this was not possible), to reducing or abating them; and then, if necessary, to offsetting them through repair (restoration or reinstatement) or compensation” ([9.1.1] of Vol 1, ES (Nov 2013)). The current proposal does not comply with these principles.

14. We ask that no construction works will commence on the proposed HS2 station at Euston until the Promoter has obtained the necessary powers and funding for the comprehensive development of the station at Euston. A prerequisite to this is a
comprehensive environmental statement and an acceptable timetable for the completion of
the project. We are entitled to know the full impact on our lives of the full package of works.
Any mitigation measures and compensation should reflect the full extent to which our lives
and homes will be blighted.

The Impact of the “AP3” Station at Euston on Your Petitioners

15. HS2 Ltd asserts that any impacts on our businesses arising from the construction at
Euston are “reduced or eliminated” ([13.4.35] CFA1). This is not correct.

16. We understand that there are to be major utility works in Drummond Street. Utility
trenches are stated to be >3m wide and >3m deep (p.82 CFA1). We have been given no
indication as to when these works are to start or finish. However, we note that the SES
asserts that utility works in Cobourg Street are to start in April 2016 and continue until
March 2020 (p.107 CFA1). This starting date seems most unlikely.

17. A number of our customers come from Euston station or are tourists staying at hotels:

(i) The Bree Louise Public House and the Ibis, Thistle and Cottage hotels are to be
demolished in 2017. AP3 will now delay any redevelopment of the area. None of
these demolitions would be necessary were the new station to be constructed within
the footprint of the existing station.

(ii) From 2026-2033, we will be cut off from the mainline station whilst Stage A is
constructed. This is the period during which the Berlin Wall is going to be constructed
along Cobourg Street. We welcome the indication that HS2 will ensure that rail
passengers will be able to gain direct access from the station to Drummond Street
during this period ([13.4.1] CFA1). We raise this further in our “asks”.

(iii) We will now face further disruption from 2026 to 2033 whilst Stage B1 is
constructed. During this period, passengers using the mainline station will have no
direct access to Drummond Street. The increased walking distances will be over
100m ([15.5.29]). This is not acceptable.

(iv) We then face the further disruption of Stage 2 and the construction of Crossrail.
This is not addressed in the SES. We find this unacceptable.

18. Drummond Street, Starcross Street, Euston Street and North Gower Street are now all to
be used for construction traffic. Previously, it was just Drummond Street. We welcome the
indication that Drummond Street is currently identified as a construction route that will only
be used for a small number of construction activities ([15.4.39]). We seek clarification of this
and an undertaking to this effect.

19. Hampstead Road is likely to be gridlocked as a result of the reconstruction of Hampstead
Road Bridge (between 2016 and 2023) and the construction traffic (up to 300-450 HGVs per
day).
20. There will also be a reduction in the number parking spaces in the Drummond Street area both during the construction period and permanently ([15.4.60]).

21. The number of construction compounds at the front of the station has been increased from 2 to 6. The public will be denied of their enjoyment of Euston Square Gardens from 2016 to 2033 (and beyond). All these factors will have an impact on those who decide to frequent the area. In short, we will now be operating in the middle of a building site for a period which has now been extended from 2026 until 2033 and beyond. There will also be an increase in pollution levels.

Mitigation Measures during the Construction Phase

22. It is not realistic for Your Petitioners to relocate their businesses. Drummond Street has acquired its unique character over some 50 years. Every restaurant and shop is the outcome of individual endeavour. British Bangladeshi traders have excelled in this nation of shopkeepers. All the businesses complement each other. Many of our customers come to Drummond Street because of the reputation that we have acquired for our Curry Houses which provide a range of high quality, but modestly priced, meals. Someone who eats in a restaurant may also buy their groceries and Indian sweets in neighbouring shops. Your Petitioners face a stark choice: either somehow to survive years of immense disruption (now extended from 10 years to more than 17), or to close our businesses, eradicating the Drummond Street so many people know and love from the face of Camden.

23. Your Petitioners fear the massive extent of the disruption that they will face during the construction period. HS2 Ltd have signally failed to assess the cumulative impact of the construction works on our community: the noise, dust, vibration, ventilation, air pollution, loss of safe access routes, loss of amenity and daylight, the construction traffic, the bridge closures, and the congestion. A significant factor is the quantity of works which will be executed outside core working hours, premised on the principle that the disruption to existing rail passengers will be kept to a minimum regardless of both (i) the impact on our local community; and (ii) the period of time over which works will be executed. The Environmental Statement was premised on this being from 2016 to 2026. We now face 18 years of more severe disruption.

"Asks" in respect of which Assurances have been provided

24. Shortly before we presented our petition to the House of Commons Select Committee on 14 December 2015, the Promoter offered us a number of assurances. These were revised after our appearances and are set out in a letter, dated 21 December. Your Petitioners are grateful for these assurances, but they fall far short of what is needed.

25. We hope that the Promoter will give effect to these assurances. Should the Promoter failed to do so, we reserve the right to revisit them before your Committee. These assurances cover the following:

   (i) Assurance 1: Engagement – business engagement personnel are to be appointed.
(ii) Assurance 2: Business Support – regular meetings are to be held.

(iii) Assurance 3: A Business Support Strategy is to be developed.

(iv) Assurance 4: Business Support (Relocation) – assistance is to be provided.

(v) Assurance 5: Access – temporary traffic measures are to be agreed.

(vi) Assurance 6: Construction Timetable – a detailed timetable is to be provided.

(vii) Assurance 7: Connectivity between Drummond Street and Euston Station – access is to be maintained where reasonably practicable.

(viii) Assurance 8: Deliveries to Drummond Street Businesses – an engagement plan is to be developed.

(ix) Assurance 9: Road Cleanliness – all reasonable practicable measures are to be put in place.

(x) Assurance 10: Signposting from Euston Station – notices to be displayed confirming that Drummond Street remains open and directing customers.

(xi) Assurance 11: Loss of Parking Bays – opportunities for reprovision are to be investigated. We will be monitoring what progress is being made.

(xii) Assurance 12: Shahjalal Jame Masjid and Islamic Cultural Centre – an engagement strategy is to be developed for faith and inter-faith group.

26. The Select Committee (at [241]) recommended that there should be a footfall survey in relation to Drummond Street and neighbouring restaurants and shops to establish usage patterns. That will help address how to retain business. The Promoter should consider ways to make the route from Euston to Drummond Street attractive and friendly. The Promoter has accepted this recommendation and is in discussion with us as to how this can be implemented.

“Asks” in respect of which no assurances have been provided

27. These assurances fall far short of what is needed. The Promoter has been unable to accede to the following “asks” which we will pursue before the Select Committee:

(i) Traders will be compensated for any loss to their trade. One element is rent reductions. Many of Your Petitioners lease their premises from private landlords which tie them in to upwards only rent reviews.

(ii) There will be no increase in pollution levels whether as a result of the construction works or after the new station is opened. NO2 levels are already three times the EU maximum. This is unacceptable.
(iii) HS2 Ltd should work with the Mayor of London to extend the Ultra Low Emission Zone to the whole of the area of Euston and neighbouring streets which will be used by HS2 construction traffic. HS2 Ltd should be required to fund this, if required.

(iv) There will be a package of property modifications and shop front improvements which will protect businesses from the risk of subsidence and include triple glazing and sound proofing. Businesses are currently excluded from the sound insulation measures that are being offered for residential premises.

(v) All properties will be surveyed before and at regular intervals during the construction works. HS2 Ltd will make good any damage caused by construction works. During the blitz, a large bomb fell on the corner of Drummond Street and Cobourg Street, with enough force to damage the Northern Line beneath it. A number of properties in the street have had to be pinned. The properties are therefore vulnerable to vibrations and heavy traffic.

(vi) Finance will be provided for shop front improvements to protect them from the adverse effects of the construction works.

(vii) Specified limits will be imposed to reduce the nuisance whether with regard to noise, pollution, dust, traffic control, hours of work, and the time within which work will be completed. If these conditions are broken, compensation will be paid to local businesses and residents without delay.

(viii) Spoil and construction materials should be transported by rail and not road.

Business Support Fund

28. The Promoter is proposing a Community & Environment Fund and Business and Local Economy Fund which will have a combined budget of £30m for the period to 2026. Your Petitioners ask that there be specific funds earmarked for Camden throughout the period of the construction work, namely from 2017 to 2033 with separate funds for businesses and community groups of, say, £500k per annum for each fund.

29. The Select Committee (at [350]) recommended that the funding envelope of both funds should be substantially increased. It suspected that the Government is aware that the amounts are too low. The Committee wanted to see specific allocations to certain communities to avoid bidding wars. In its response (at [99] – [101], the government has agreed to increase the funding to £40m. It is proposing indicative allocations and proposes to publish them before the end of the Lords’ Select Committee hearings.

30. The Select Committee (at [237]) recognised that Camden is “exceptional and needs special treatment”. It is a matter of regret that the government has not recognised this.
31. The Select Committee (at [283]-[284]) noted that the £34,800 rateable value cap for ‘Need to Sell’ business applications was not appropriate in the case of London businesses; too many would exceed the cap. This has a particular impact on Drummond Street where many of the double fronted business units have rateable values of some £60,000. The Government responded that it would prefer to maintain the cap’s “tried and tested” approach, applying a discretion in the case of hardship cases. However, it conceded that 33% would exceed the cap in the case of Drummond Street. That is too high. It would not be unfair if, illustratively, all the businesses in Drummond Street had the same scope for obtaining compensation. The Committee noted that the figure of £34,000 was set some time ago and would be reviewed in 2017. The Committee wanted a re-evaluation such that the proportion of London businesses falling within the cap is broadly the same as elsewhere. It asked the Department of Transport to liaise with other Departments to carry through a review as soon as possible, before the most potentially damaging aspects of construction work begin to affect businesses in London. Your Petitioner endorses this approach.

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

Signed:

Mohammed Salique, the First Petitioner
AND the Petitioners remain, etc
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To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF MARTYN KENNETH DOLBEAR

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Martyn Kenneth Dolbear, resident at 8 Chiltern Road, Wendover HP22 6DE, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in Wendover adjacent to that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioner as a resident of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.

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

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your Petitioner contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

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

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

Hierarchy of Mitigation

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

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

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.

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

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

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

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

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

i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds should not be artificially lined.
j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse impacts are found.
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line.
n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.
o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.
p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.

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

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

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.

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

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

THE PETITION OF The Chesham Society

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

The petitioner is The Chesham Society, representing the people of Chesham. Chesham is the largest town in the Chilterns District with a population of 21,000. The society is a registered charity, founded in 1957, with around 200 members. Its objectives include protection of its “area of benefit”, which includes the parish of Chartridge to the northwest of the town.

3. The town is surrounded on all sides by the Chilterns Hills. Its economy is sustained by shoppers from the surrounding villages, and by visitors to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“the AONB”). Chesham is the terminus for Metropolitan line services from London, and its station is within easy walking distance of the AONB. It is an accredited “Walkers are Welcome” town, to maximise the benefits of its fortunate situation. The historic buildings of Chesham’s ‘Old Town’ are only 3.5 miles from the Chilterns Tunnel portal at South Heath, presently proposed by the Amended Bill.

4. Chesham was represented at all Community Forum meetings in Community Form Areas 9 and 10. Chesham Town Council, along with The Chesham Society, has met the Bill Promoter, HS2 Ltd, to discuss your Petitioner’s concerns regarding the impact of the railway. The information provided by the Promoter, including in the Environmental Statement (“the ES”) and amendments (“SES3”) have not provided reassurance, and your Petitioner explains certain of its concerns regarding the ES below.

Your Petitioner’s concerns and objections to the Bill and your Petitioner’s requests for mitigation

5. Your Petitioner’s community will suffer a range of adverse impacts, beginning in earnest with the many years spent constructing the railway and continuing with its operation.
6. Particular objection is taken to the works to be undertaken within the AONB to the west of Chesham, and in particular to works 2.1 and 2.12 to 2.27 (listed in Schedule 1 of the Bill) in the parishes of Amersham, Little Missenden, Great Missenden, Chartridge and The Lee and to the clauses of the Bill which would authorise these works. The works complained of are between 3 and 10 miles from the town, in open countryside between Chesham and the A413 - the principal road connecting the Chilterns with Aylesbury Vale and the M25/M40 junction near Gerrards Cross.

7. Most of the adverse impacts on Chesham and its population result from congestion on the A413 and associated construction routes, due to the works listed above. Additional information released in November 2015 (AP4/SES3) shows that traffic caused by HS2 construction will exceed the capacity of the road networks in several locations. While your petitioner has always maintained that this would be the case, the figures previously released by HS2 Ltd have not supported our view. Your petitioner maintains that the inaccuracy of the information previously provided by the promoter has compromised the discussion of the scheme which has taken place hitherto, and have concealed the fact that the scheme could not be delivered by reliance on the existing road network. Various aspects should now be reconsidered, most particularly further extensions to the Chilterns tunnel (the 'long tunnel' options).

8. The adverse impacts affecting your Petitioner's community that will flow from the Amended Bill as presently drafted are explained in greater detail below. First, this Petition explains the mitigation sought.

Mitigation sought

9. Your Petitioner humbly requests that your honourable House alters the Bill and/or requires the Promoter to give undertakings to mitigate the worst impacts of the railway and associated works as follows (listed in descending order of effectiveness):

1. An extension of the currently proposed fully bored Chilterns Tunnel throughout the AONB to a point outside it, such as the T3i scheme first proposed during the July (2015) sessions, or developments of this scheme-the Full Tunnel.

2. Should the committee decline to alter the Bill to require a tunnel throughout the AONB, then an extension of the currently proposed fully bored Chilterns Tunnel by an additional 1.5 km to Leather Lane, as was originally proposed by the Residents Environmental Protection Association ("REPA") and referred to as "the REPA Option".

3. Should the committee decline to alter the Bill to require either the Full Tunnel or the REPA option, then we request a range of measures to reduce the adverse effects of the construction and operation of the railway as it passes through the AONB. Your Petitioner doubts that these measures would provide anything approaching an effective solution, even given an unlimited budget. They are referred to as "the Fallback Option".
10. The Full Tunnel. While we are aware that after the July (2015) sessions, the House of Commons committee were “strongly of the view that the case for a long tunnel has not been made”, they arrived at this view before the promoter issued the AP4 data, revealing the extent of traffic congestion which might be expected. Further development of the long tunnel proposal has reduced the cost considerably (by boring from the southern end only), and so reduced the disruption in the Wendover-Stoke Mandeville area. We ask this committee to reconsider the Chilterns Tunnel in the light of these developments.

11. The REPA Option. While your petitioner welcomes the extension of the Chilterns Tunnel to South Heath, and the associated benefits to communities and landscape, we nevertheless regret that the opportunity to extend the tunnel as far as Leather Lane was not taken, particularly given the associated overheads of issuing Environmental Statements and conducting a further round of petitioning, and the problems in accessing the new tunnel portal from the A413.

12. The Fallback Option. This groups together various proposals to improve mitigation in the face of the current HS2 proposals. Attempts to retrofit mitigation measures to a flawed design cannot result in an acceptable solution; for example, the construction of bunds and noise barriers may reduce noise pollution but increase visual impact. Reduction in the line height may reduce visual impact (from the line itself) but would increase the impact of the spoil dump/landfill proposed at Hunts Green. Some features, such as the Wendover Dean viaduct, defy any attempt to mitigate the adverse effects. Despite these difficulties, the utter inadequacy of the current proposals leaves considerable scope for improvement, while still falling far short of what might be achieved by additional tunnelling.

Inadequacy of environmental assessments

13. In our previous petition, we judged the Environmental Statement (ES) published in November 2013 to be quite inadequate, characterised by major omissions, inconsistent numerical data and a systematic underestimation of adverse effects. As a consequence the effects noted below have been underestimated, and the mitigation proposed is largely ineffectual.

Impacts from the construction phase

14. Your Petitioner identifies three aspects to the problems caused by construction traffic:

1. The direct impact of construction traffic, causing congestion on construction routes, and physical damage to unsuitable or inadequate roads.

2. Indirect effects caused by non-construction traffic seeking to avoid congestion on the construction traffic routes by using other less suitable roads. The routes chosen by displaced traffic cannot be directly controlled by the Promoter or the Nominated Undertaker.

3. Cumulative effects of the previous items on the communities near the route, which include reduced access to the emergency services, increased journey times, reduced access to local recreational facilities, reductions in community activities and decline in local businesses.
- all of which will lead to very substantial increases in journey times for our members who commute between Chesham and neighbouring towns - Aylesbury, High Wycombe, Beaconsfield and Amersham in particular.

15. Your Petitioner notes that only item 1 above was addressed in the ES, and even then in an inadequate fashion. This has not been rectified by SES3/AP4 and so we repeat our mitigation requests -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse effects</th>
<th>Proposed mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased congestion on the A413 during peak hours; Disruption to School bus services and public transport; Restricted access to Chiltern Railways Stations (Wendover, Great Missenden, Amersham)</td>
<td>Restricting HGV movements to the period 09:30 - 15:30 throughout the AONB, and prohibiting HGV Movements along school routes for 30 minutes before and after the start and end of the school day (during term time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating a 'Park and Ride' scheme to transport construction workers along the trace, from car parks outside the AONB, and enforcing this by not providing parking for contractors on or near the construction compounds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table summarises the more objectionable effects which will arise from the construction process, and the mitigation your Petitioner humbly asks your honourable House to require, either by amendment to the Bill or by insisting that the Promoter give suitable undertakings.

**Construction Traffic**

16. The latest traffic assessments (AP4/SES3) indicate substantial problems with road capacity throughout the AONB -

- The narrower sections of the A413 are all loaded above 95% ¹
- The Great Missenden roundabouts (A413-A4127-B485) are loaded above capacity - e.g. 121% for the A413 Southbound pm
- There are capacity problems at the A413-A355, A355-A40 junctions, and also on the construction route through High Wycombe to Handy Cross.

17. Despite the problems revealed by the latest round of traffic assessments, many major junctions remain un-assessed -

- The A355-A413 junction at the foot of Gore Hill
- Any junctions between the construction routes and the M40

¹ As calculated according to the DfT "Design Manual for Roads and Bridges TA46/97; see the Chesham Society ES response - http://www.hs2amersham.org.uk/Resources/ES/Chesham/CheshamSoc_ES_2.3.pdf
18. Even with the deficiencies noted, the AP4 traffic assessments now confirm your petitioner’s previous contention that the AONB road system would be overloaded by the additional traffic generated by HS2 construction. This should have been an important consideration when considering the extension of the Chilterns tunnel.

19. Your petitioner is concerned that the promoter is relying on Transport for Bucks (TfB) to implement measures to mitigate the problems described above. As negotiations are still ongoing, your petitioner is unable to comment on the outcome, and it is doubtful that your committee can make an informed assessment of the scheme until the proposed mitigation measures have been published. In the interim, we request these assurances -

- That the promoters scheme should not increase journey times (between Amersham and Wendover) by more than 5 minutes during peak hours (7am-9am, 4pm-7pm) and more than 10 minutes at other times.
- That the measures agreed between TfB and the promoter be subject to public consultation either by your committee, or by a similar body with equal powers.

**Hunts Green Spoil**

20. The removal of spoil from the “Temporary” dump at Hunts Green presents a particular difficulty. The first proposal was to remove this via Rocky Lane, then north on the A413 to Nash Lee, requiring 300 to 450 HGV movements a day, peaking in year 5 of the project. Since the 2021 traffic prediction shows overloading factors at the Rocky Lane-A413 junction of x10 and x7 (am, pm), this was undeliverable. Under AP4, some 50% of the spoil will be routed back down the trace and onto the A413 via the haul road to the Missenden roundabout.

21. Under both schemes a very substantial HGV traffic flow across the A413 is required, which we estimate to be beyond the existing junction capacities. Measures to achieve the projected flow will inevitably lead to severe delays on the A413 north of Great Missenden.

22. We ask that your committee direct the promoter to produce a report, with traffic and junction predictions, showing the effects of the proposed scheme as they relate to removing spoil from Hunts Green, and if these do not comply with the requirements of 19 above, to devise an alternative method of dealing with the spoil.

23. We reiterate our opposition to a permanent dump at Hunts Green, which conflicts with the waste management principles adopted by the promoter, and the policies of Bucks CC.

**Emergency Services**

24. Your Petitioner remains concerned that the emergency services will be unable to provide timely support to the area’s families and property due to road congestion during the construction period. These concerns have been heightened by the additional information revealed in SES3/AP4.
Social, Business and Educational Impacts

25. Your petitioner remains concerned about other adverse impacts -
- Access to Chesham facilities from neighbouring towns and villages
- Provision of school transport, to schools in Chesham, and for Chesham pupils to schools in other communities
- Reliability of bus services in the AONB, with particular reference to the Whielden Street vent shaft works

Operational impacts

26. Your Petitioner has identified the following impacts which relate to the operation of the proposed railway -
1. Noise impacts, at different classes of receptor.
2. Visual impacts, of the different proposed structures.
3. Landscaping impacts caused by the destruction (and addition) of landscape features.
4. Ecological impacts.

27. The cumulative effect of these impacts will be to degrade the local environment to the extent that it will no longer offer recreational opportunities to local residents, or attract visitors. Your Petitioners will suffer both from loss of amenity, and loss of economic opportunities associated with tourism.

Ecological impacts

28. Your Petitioner’s community and visitors make extensive use of the recreational facilities afforded by the AONB, and strongly object to the adverse effects on the ecology of the AONB, in particular on the bat and owl populations, which are particularly at risk from collisions with trains. The line will form a barrier to the movement of wildlife, dividing populations and reducing their viability. This will deter visitors with an interest in our natural environment, The best mitigation for these impacts is the Green Route as requested above, although as a fallback the provision of wider ‘green bridges’ for footpaths may slightly reduce the impact on larger mammals.

Adequacy of the information available to your Petitioner

29. Your Petitioner is also concerned that the Bill, the Deposited Plans and Sections and the ES are all vast documents, with inadequate cross referencing and no central index, making it almost impossible to locate every relevant item in the minimal time allowed for preparing a response. In addition to the failure of the ES to adequately assess the impacts of the proposed railway and associated works neither it nor the Bill allow the reader to understand what is proposed in sufficient detail. Your Petitioner is also concerned that HS2 Ltd continue to announce changes to the proposed works, but have not made public which parts of their documentation have been superseded during this process.
Conclusions

30. Your Petitioner fully supports the petitions requesting a fully bored tunnel that extends throughout the AONB. Only that will address most, if not all, of the numerous adverse impacts that your Petitioner’s community and the AONB will otherwise suffer and your Petitioner requests your honourable House alter the Bill, and cause the Proposer to give undertakings, accordingly. As a partial fallback your Petitioner supports the full REPA Option as originally requested, and as an entirely inferior final fallback, your Petitioner requests the numerous subsidiary mitigation measures outlined above.

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

For and on behalf of Chesham Society

Dr J E CONBOY (Agent )

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Michael Richard Allen, Michèle Anne Allen and Teresa Jane Allen
Declares that:

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

2. The Petitioners are, Mr and Mrs Allen, who have lived at Meadowview, Grange Close, Twyford, Buckingham since they purchased the property freehold in July 1983 and the Petitioner, Miss T Allen, who was born there in 1984. The property is detached, was originally built in 1976 of brick under tile construction and is located in a Close of 6 similar homes. The Close is bordered by the Grade 1 listed Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary (parts of which date from the 12th century) to the north and the village Recreation Ground to the east. There is immediate access to open, flat farmland where there are several footpaths and bridleways, regularly used by your Petitioners.

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

The property is a family home of approximately 3,900 sq ft of accommodation and it consists of 6 bedrooms, 3 bathrooms, 3 reception rooms and a kitchen with utility room, with unobstructed views of the open, flat farmland to the north and east.

Your Petitioners, Mr & Mrs Allen, purchased the property specifically to bring up their family (having two children at the time of purchase and the third being born at the property) in a village environment which was both safe and tranquil, having previously lived in a property in Twyford but situated on a through road. Twyford village benefits from a school, a village shop and a village pub. It is a sociable village, with a strong community borne out by the fact that very few properties have come up for sale over the years.

Your Petitioners, Mr and Mrs Allen and Miss Allen will be 70, 66 and 32 (respectively) towards the end of 2016. Their plans for the future have always been, at a suitable time, to sell the property to allow them to free up capital to fund a comfortable retirement for Mr and Mrs Allen in a smaller, more manageable home and assist Miss Allen to purchase her own property.

As it passes the property, the proposed new high-speed railway line will be on a nominally 3-metre high embankment with an acoustic sound barrier and an earth bund finishing approximately 5 metres above the rail line level.
Your Petitioners' property will not be demolished as a result of the Bill but it is located within 300 metres of the line.

Your Petitioners' home is referred to in HS2 documents as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

vii) Your Petitioners also note countless other references to the village of Twyford throughout various HS2 documents which refer to the adverse impact of not only the operation of the scheme, but the period of construction with its associated noise, transport disruption, dust and light pollution, which is expected to last for 10 years from 2017.
3. Your Petitioners' concerns are that they and their property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Your Petitioners are petitioning against the Government’s Bill to design, build and operate a high-speed railway line for two reasons:-

* Increase in the level of sound
* Inadequate compensation

First Petition - Increase in the Level of Sound

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

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

Appendix SV002-013 Table 1, lists the results of this survey with the 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 this part of the village as the increase in noise from the Opening Year baseline to the predicted noise at baseline-plus-15-years 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-C02 is defined in Table 5 as:-

“Approximately 10 dwellings in the vicinity of Grange Close and Church Street closest to the route and their associated shared community open areas (local playing fields with clubhouse). Forecast increases in sound from the railway are likely to cause a moderate adverse effect on the acoustic character of the area around the closest approximately five properties.”

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

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

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

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

**Second petition – Inadequate Compensation**

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

Your Petitioners and owners of similar properties which are, crucially, a similar distance from the proposed high-speed line have been told by local estate agents that they will not be able to sell their properties at anything approaching un-blighted market price as they are so seriously blighted. This situation is unlikely to change until a few years after the line is opened and house prices start to recover to some degree. However, this is unlikely to be until 2029 at the earliest at which point your Petitioners will be 83, 79 and 45 years old.

As a direct result of the Proposed Scheme your Petitioners will be unlikely to exercise any form of choice should they wish to sell their property and exercise the right to move at any time during the construction and operation of the railway. Whilst they accept that the Government is proposing a new “Need to Sell” scheme, this appears to be appropriate to them only if they have an urgent need to sell and not as a lifestyle choice. Your Petitioners also note that the Rural Support Zone (RSZ) is a linear area, 120 metres either side of the railway line, and does not take into account sound mapping, produced by HS2, which shows the real adverse impact of the scheme on residents such as your Petitioners.

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

Your Petitioners object to the powers that are proposed to be provided by the Bill to the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker and respectfully submit that the Bill should be amended or undertakings should be required so that HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must review the construction strategy for the project and its related works by considering their cumulative impacts on the community of Twyford by reducing the proposed noise levels and proposing a fair and equitable compensation scheme. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

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

- Move the line further away from the village of Twyford to the north. There is sufficient open farm land to allow such a diversion of the proposed route.
• Construction of a ‘green tunnel’ as the railway passes the village of Twyford, as an alternative to the proposed bund (which appears to offer little mitigation as currently proposed)

• Bring forward the timetable for the planting of any trees (which should be indigenous) for screening (as included in the proposed scheme) so as to improve the chances of more effective noise and visual mitigation.

• Reduce the speed of the trains as they pass the village. Speed reduction will not only significantly reduce the noise but also allow greater route flexibility to avoid village blight.

• Increase the height of the bund to above the pantograph level. Although this will inevitably reduce the overall noise levels, your Petitioners note that the level of the bund is not stated in the Environment Statement but it is assumed to be the same level as the sound wall at 5 metres above track level.

• Lower the track level. If the track level is lowered, and assuming that the bund is maintained at its proposed height, it will reach nearer to the pantograph level and hence be more effective at reducing noise.

• Purchase your Petitioners’ property at the full un-blighted value should your Petitioners be unable to sell their property at full market value.

• Offer a Property Bond which covers any shortfall between achieved sale price and un-blighted market 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. Your Petitioners and other seriously affected property owners in Twyford, are unable to sell their properties for anything approaching their true value due to the blight caused by the contents of the Bill. The Government should offer a Property Bond to all seriously affected residents. The Property Bond should guarantee that when they choose to sell, the resident will be compensated for any loss of sale income against un-blighted value.

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

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 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.

Signed

Michael Richard Allen        Michèle Anne Allen        Teresa Jane Allen

15th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF DAVID ALAN VICK  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner is DAVID ALAN VICK (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Petitioner’), the owner occupier of Lapstone House, Blackgrove Road, Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire, HP18 0NJ (‘the Property’). The property is in close proximity to the proposed line, but in far closer proximity (250m) to the proposed elevated deviation of the A41, a new flood lit roundabout and bridge over the railway, that will have to support nearly 17,000 vehicles per day, in addition to the Bill, now also with increased construction traffic movements named in the additional provisions document October 2015.  

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location, but will be directly and specially affected during construction, and the operation of HS2 and the new highway.  

Your Petitioner will be directly, specially and injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, and the Additional Provision October 2015, both of which your Petitioner accordingly objects to, for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

3.1 Part of your Petitioner’s property (95) is within the limits of land to be acquired and used as shown on the plans deposited with the Bill, and this part of your Petitioner’s property (20% of the total) is therefore liable to compulsory acquisition under the Bill.  

HS2 have now stated that they no longer require this land, but HS2 have failed to provide any drawings or information about any changes to the alignment of Blackgrove Road realignment work no. 2/58.  

3.2 Your Petitioner’s property is adjacent to the work no. 2/58, and is in close proximity to the work nos. 2/49, 2/55, and 2/57 proposed under the Bill. Therefore your Petitioner’s residential property will be subject to intolerable noise, dust, visual impact, pollution, and vibrations during construction and operation; road and rail.  

3.3 The Environmental Statement accompanying the Bill is seriously flawed in that it hardly mentions our property and how it will be affected by noise, dust, visual impact, pollution, and vibrations during construction or during rail and road operation etc.  

3.4 Your Petitioner’s property is located on Blackgrove Road which is proposed to be used under the Bill as a route for construction traffic. Your Petitioner uses
Blackgrove Road several times daily when commuting to work, to drop children off at school, to access local services including shops, health services and the post office. Therefore closure of, or congestion on, this road will result in your Petitioner being isolated from shops and services. Use of this road by construction vehicles will increase delays, increase the dangers at the road in the junction with the A41, and increase the time taken and cost for your Petitioner to access facilities.

3.5 From your Petitioner’s property, your Petitioner enjoys views of complete 360 degree rural landscape with no more infrastructure than a single unclassified rural road. This environment will be devastated during the construction phase and will remain significantly adversely and intolerably affected once the railway and associated roads and infrastructure authorised by the Bill are operational.

3.6 Your Petitioner’s property lies within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility as shown in the maps that accompany the Environmental Statement. These maps do not take into account the impact of the relocated roads, heavy traffic, and operational flood lighting of the roundabout that will cause major adverse effects on this property.

3.7 Your Petitioner’s property is adversely and seriously affected by the diversion of the A41 road and its traffic from 1km away, to come across fields to approximately 250 meters of your Petitioner’s property. This involves raising the A41 up as a new major trunk road, across an in-filled rural valley, via earth built access ramps, up to the roof height of your Petitioner’s property, approximately 250 meters away, sending all the resultant traffic around a huge roundabout, fully lit with street lights in an otherwise completely dark and very quiet rural landscape, across a huge concrete bridge structure, taking the A41 and all its traffic over the HS2 rail line and 15m deep cutting. The new road bridge across the HS2 railway line, will direct every single eastbound vehicle, and its headlights, directly at your Petitioner’s property, at roof ridge height, throughout the evenings and night, every night. The prevailing wind is from the SW so it will bring the all the road noise directly to your Petitioner’s property from its elevated SW position. Every single eastbound vehicle on the A41 will now have to slow or stop to negotiate a 280 degree turn about an elevated roundabout. Every westbound vehicle will have to labour up to the elevated roundabout and cross concrete bridge before turning back towards Waddesdon on the original A41. Our day/night noise measurements in the ES also appear reversed.

3.8 The most recent surveys of vehicles on the A41 measured vehicle numbers in excess of 17,000 per day, of which 270+ were HGVs and 2230 were vans, that is without the additional vehicles that will result from the expansion of Berryfields housing, Fleet Marston housing, ARLA mega dairy milk tankers or the new 300k tonne pa capacity EfW incinerator plant at Calvert. The A41 is currently 1km away.

3.9 During Select committee, Sir Peter Bottomley, ex Transport Minister, expressed regret that the Promotor, HS2, and the Local Highways Authority, Bucks County Council, had shown very little foresight, as the A41 was already 5000 vehicles per day above the trigger point for it to be tuned into a dual carriageway, and that the proposed realignment of the A41 with bridge and roundabout very well prevented that from being undertaken in the future, whereas the locally proposed scheme, of an A41 road underpass of HS2, at Fleet Marston, would have allowed this future dualling.

3.10 The bill proposes to compulsory purchase the ‘front gardens, parking spaces and driveway’, full width, in front of your Petitioner’s property, so that Blackgrove Road
can be diverted tightly around the side of your Petitioner's property, whilst quickly ramping the new road up to meet the level of the new road bridge and roundabout 250m away. The bill proposes purchase all of the 15m deep frontage of your Petitioner's property to within about 3 meters of the front door, but not to purchase the actual house or the remainder of the gardens. Your Petitioner made a request for HS2 to reconsider this, and to purchase the entire site, due to the severe impacts your Petitioner's property will suffer from the scheme. HS2 have addressed none of our concerns, but have simply provided an undated, unsigned letter of assurance that they do not want any of your Petitioner's land, giving us no more detail than the cursory statement that the road realignment will comply with highways regulations.

3.11 Blackgrove Road near your Petitioner's property is currently a very straight, very fast, remote rural road, with no lighting, no pavements and open unspoilt countryside on all sides. Vehicles have to travel uphill past our property entrance from either direction. Despite this incline the typical vehicle speeds far exceed the 60mph posted speed limit. The result is that your Petitioner has to keep the grass and roadside vegetation cut to lawn lengths, so that there is a usable safety vision splay in both directions. To the south this is for 75+m, to the north this is 60+m. Beyond these points the vegetation must be kept down to 12’' tall extending out to 150+m in either direction from the entrance driveway of your Petitioner's property. Exiting your Petitioner's property driveway with the vegetation trimmed to these high standards is still a precarious daily exercise. The bill proposes to bend the southern part of Blackgrove Road around the side of your Petitioner’s property, starting from right in front of it, whilst also elevating the road up to the new A41 roundabout and road bridge that crosses the HS2 rail line cutting. The north bound traffic on Blackgrove Road will therefore be hidden from any one exiting your Petitioner’s property on foot, by bicycle or by car. The northbound traffic will be travelling downhill towards a concealed entrance on a very fast, remote rural road, with no lighting, and no pavements. The entrance to your Petitioner’s property will then be in the worst possible location, on the inside of the curve. To create a safe vision splay for this new curved road would involve removing most of the trees, hedgerows, shrubs and fencing from the front of our property along similar lines as indicated by the area for compulsory purchase in the bill. HS2 have now stated that there is no longer a requirement for a compulsory purchase of any of your Petitioner’s property, and that the road alignment will remain the same. No planning permission would ever be granted for a property entrance on the inside of a fast downhill curve. Refusal would be on the grounds that the required safety vision splays would not be achievable. The promoter has offered no credible solution.

3.12 As put by your petitioner’s MP, the Rt. Hon. John Bercow MP, in a letter of 22nd Jan 2014, to the promoter,...... “The simple fact of the matter is that, with the realignment of Blackgrove Road and the A41 as set out in the Environmental Statement, the impact on Mr Vick’s property will be severe and it is a matter of regret that this goes seemingly unrecognised in the ES. Furthermore, safeguarding areas have not been updated to reflect the road realignments and the consequent blight my constituent is experiencing. HS2 Ltd should urgently look at this matter with a view to extend the safeguarded area to include the entirety of Lapstone House, thus making my constituent eligible for compulsory purchase. Mr Vick has been advised by property agents that his home is unsellable, given the latest blow from High Speed 2, and it is simply unacceptable that he be excluded from compulsory purchase....... Rt. Hon. John Bercow MP"
Your Petitioner requests

3.13 Your Petitioner requests that the promoter be instructed to compulsory purchases the entire site of Lapstone House and grounds totalling approx. 0.5 acre.

Your Petitioner requests

3.14 For the benefit of the viability of this property, and safe access to and from the site, for whoever ultimately ends up owning the property, your Petitioner in addition to 3.13, also requests that HS2 keep Blackgrove Road on its current straight alignment for at least 200 meters past this property entrance, until Blackgrove Road is very much closer to the new A41, to then finally turn towards the roundabout.

HS2 can then continue their planting mitigation around the roundabout, closing off the very large gap in planting it has at present, which is currently directly in line with this property; replacing the current access ramp position and direction, with one that points towards no nearby dwellings.

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 Alan Vick
15th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CRAIG PAUL TRACEY MP FOR NORTH
WARWICKSHIRE AND BEDWORTH

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

2.1 Your Petitioner is Craig Paul Tracey MP, The Member of Parliament for North Warwickshire (hereinafter referred to as "the Petitioner"). Your petitioner’s main function is to represent the constituents of North Warwickshire and redress for their grievances.

2.2 Your Petitioner and their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing. Your petitioner is petitioning under Standing Order 96 as an inhabitant of the Warwickshire Council Local Authority area through working and running an office within said local authority area.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

3.1 Your petitioner is aware that another petition has been submitted by the Kingsbury & District Stop HS2 Action Group and another by Kingsbury Parish Council. The Petitioners are concerned with the lack of mitigation, lack of information on traffic flow and lack of consultation on the Bill, AP2 and AP4.

3.2 Your petitioner is aware that another petition has been submitted by the Middleton HS2 Action Group (MHAG) and another by Middleton Parish Council. I request that the committee listen very seriously to these groups who have made every effort to engage with HS2 Ltd. The Petitioners are concerned with flooding issues which could be exacerbated by the proposal as well as the design of the balancing pond, the diversion to footpath T17 and effect of the North Wood area amendments in the Bill without consultation with them.

3.3 Your petitioner is aware that another petition has been submitted by Lea Marston Parish Council, another by Water Orton HS2 Action Group and a further by Water Orton Parish Council. The Petitioner is requesting that the committee, again listen seriously to these groups for the same reasons as the former. In particular the removal of mitigation at the Hams Hall Business Park with no intention to replace, lack of further mitigation and the lack of consultation with the Promoter on the Bill, AP2 and AP4.
3.4 I request that the committee listen very seriously to the Petitions from Middleton, Kingsbury, Lea Marston and Water Orton as the Select Committee and Promoters objective of Special Case’ or ‘going the extra mile’ in community consultation has not been adhered to by HS2 in terms of the Bill, AP2 and AP4. These groups have had little or no consultation with HS2 on the Bill and subsequent AP’s and are concerned with the lack of information given within AP2 into increased traffic, noise and the removal of mitigation. They are also concerned that the mitigation to the railhead is insufficient. The Petitioner requests that the Select Committee defines the meaning of a “Special Case” when referring to the effect HS2 has on the constituency of North Warwickshire.

3.5 I also request that the committee look very carefully at the recommendations laid out by the Commons select committee interim report in terms of the consultation with your petitioner which states ‘We urge the Promoter to be assiduous in maintaining contact with the constituency MP, as with all Members with constituencies on the line.’ And the response by the petitioners

3.6 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed by other Petitioners the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

3.7 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, Craig Paul Tracey MP, 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.

Signed:

Print: Craig Paul Tracey MP

Date: 15th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16 and 2016-2017

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Ethel RAE Olive Sloan

Declares that:

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

Your petitioner

1.1 Your Petitioners is a retired resident of the historic village of Twyford, a small tranquil village of north Buckinghamshire population 450. It is an agricultural rural area which was part of the Bernwood Forest established in the C10th reaching its limits during the reign of Henry 2nd. It is an area which has in character changed very little.

1.2 Twyford is located 200m (the closest house) from the line and is adjacent to the proposed Steeple Claydon/Calvert Construction Depot and near the proposed East/West line. Between the proposed HS2 line and the village runs the defunct Central Railway line. The village will be impacted 24/7 both during construction and operation in part because of its proximity to the Infrastructure Depot (IMD) and on a section of the line where the train will be running at maximum speed and hence at its loudest, because the added pantograph noise volume is a result of speed. This added noise would not be a problem if speeds were reduced to those of HS1 and European HSR.

1.3 Your Petitioner is and has been an active member of the very vibrant community, a member of the Parish Council, Twyford Stop HS2, a director of Stop HS2 and AGAHST, member of Beds Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT), Director of the Twyford Village Community Shop and Twyford Youth Club, member of various clubs including TADS (Twyford Amateur Dramatic Society for 34 years), the Gardening Club (TWYGS), the wine club (Plonkers), Voice Fusion singing group, a supporter of Twyford Cricket Club, Twyford First School, St Mary’s Church, singing in the church choir, and the facility of nearby Great Moor Sailing Club all of which will be impacted to varying degrees by HS2. The overall impact on Your Petitioner’s life and the community at large will be serious. The Social calendar for various groups, including the school and the church, involve outdoor events, essential for the funding their future. These events help gel the community adding to its remarkably strong community spirit. Events held outdoors on land and properties that will be seriously blighted.
1.4 Your Petitioner's rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

1.5 Your Petitioner is really disturbed that a comparative Environmental Impact Assessment was not carried on all 3 major route options. This counter to the Department for the Environment recommendations. Alternative routes as with HS1 followed existing transport corridors where mitigation is largely already in place.

A CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

2.1 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 include road closures, lorry movements. The roads in the area are rural B and C roads and in their current state of disrepair are barely suitable for car traffic and, as such, unsuitable and not designed to carry further heavy loads. Twyford, being sited next to a main construction depot will be impacted to varying degrees for the whole 10 years.

2.2 Your Petitioner is extremely concerned that the Promoters have potentially allowed for 24 hour working, 7 days a week during construction. Being near a major construction depot at Steeple Claydon/Calvert the area will be impacted for 10 years. The construction period will give rise to dust with the resultant creation of, poor air quality. This will inevitably give rise to considerable health concerns especially as some villagers already have asthma and respiratory problems.

2.3 Apart from the effect on the village as a whole special concern is for users of the recreation field. There is no proposed mitigation during construction for the recreation field. Apart from the regular usage by the village in general, and the Cricket and football Clubs (including the junior cricket teams) the recreation field will be used by Twyford School and therefore includes children as young as 4 whose lungs are still forming and who are extremely vulnerable to air pollution.

2.4 Your Petitioner is concerned there have been no mitigation proposals have been put forward to protect the village from noise during construction. No information has been made available regarding noise levels during this period.

2.5 Noise is of considerable concern particularly in respect to sleep disturbance and hence health, learning.

2.6 Noise on the recreation field is of concern from a safety point of view. It is important referees and umpires can be heard, but essential coaches and teachers can be heard during PE lessons for health and safety reasons.

2.7 Your Petitioner is very disappointed no sound monitoring was carried out on the recreation field despite the fact it was requested at Community Forums and Roadshows.

3 Remedies for noise and dust particularly in relation to the recreation field during construction

3.1 Planting of trees along the old Central Railway is planned. If this is carried out before the commencement of any work and reasonable size trees used, they
would absorb a considerable amount of dust noise and would help mask the visual impact during construction. The timing of this planting is, therefore, critical. The defunct line lies between the village and the proposed HS2 line. The planting should be Native species to the area and should include English Oak and Black Poplars.

3.2 Ambient noise levels should be taken on Twyford recreation field prior to any commencement of work to ensure increase levels of noise can be properly assessed and addressed.

3.3 There should be quantifiable standards of noise and dust levels in the Code of Construction and it should be part of the Hybrid Bill and contractors responsible by law to Parliament. Currently there is no laid down legal recourse of action for breaks in the Code.

4. Traffic during construction and severance of Twyford

4.1 Emergency services response times in the rural area of Twyford are at, if not over, the recommended national response times. Your Petitioner is concerned about road closures, congestion and diversions particularly during construction if emergency response times are even longer.

4.2 Your Petitioner is extremely concerned about the road closures and congestion. There is a great deal of interdependence between the villages in the area of Twyford, and north Buckinghamshire. The proposed route and particularly road closures during construction sever the villages, isolate Twyford is at risk of isolation...
   - The majority of people work outside the village.
   - All the Secondary schools are outside the village.
   - Children from local villages attend Twyford school and it is dependent on them to ensure numbers are kept up and it doesn't suffer falling rolls and closure.
   - There are no medical facilities in Twyford, the majority of people travelling to Steeple Claydon surgery. Your Petitioners have raised this issue with The Promoter. Steeple Claydon surgery also cares for the occupants of the Twyford old people's home, Lime Tree Court.
   - The population of Twyford has a higher percentage of retired people than the national average. Inevitably the requirement to have access to their doctor will increase.
   - Your Petitioner has requested information regarding medical facilities during construction when the population will nearly double, but this problem does not appear to have been publically addressed.
   - Your Petitioner is concerned about severance between families and communities. All the villages have relatives in neighbouring villages. The care support network for example for elderly relatives and child care is essential particularly as services have had to be cut. Impact is greater in rural and less affluent areas like North Buckinghamshire..

5. Remedies during construction and the severance of Twyford

5.1 There is next to no accommodation for workers in the area of Twyford and workers will have to travel to and from the Construction Depot/IMD by road. Your Petitioner and Community Forum members have requested a halt on the East West line which will enable workers to travel to and from work by rail from...
local large conurbations where there is accommodation thus removing some congestion.

5.2 Your Petitioner suggests transport of heavy materials and plant be transported by East West Rail to the Construction Depot, taking it off the roads.

5.3 Your Petitioner suggests the excessive footprint of the safeguarded area is used for the movement of plant, materials and workers along the footprint from the depot keeping traffic off the narrow roads.

5.4 Ideally full medical services should be made available for workers on site at the Construction Depot and not put pressure on local overstretched services.

5.5 Should road closures make Twyford’s access to Steeple Claydon surgery impossible for any length of time Your Petitioner suggests provision should be made by The Promoter, at its cost, with the surgery to have an outreach service in Twyford for that period.

It is important to note that there are no adequate public transport services to the next nearest surgeries at either Bicester or Buckingham. Some of Your Petitioner’s fellow villagers suffer from long term illnesses and continuity of treatment by their medical practitioner contact is of utmost importance to them

6. Impact on utility infrastructure during construction

6.1 Your Petitioner is conscious that the village infrastructure and utilities are at their limit. Fresh and foul water systems are inadequate and regularly fail in the area giving rise to flooding. Your Petitioner fears any added pressure from the Depot will lead to further flooding within the village. During construction there will at times be more than twice the population of workers to Twyford’s current population putting an immense strain on already failing facilities.

7. Remedies for Impact on utility infrastructure during construction

7.1 The Construction Depot should be totally independent of local utilities, particularly fresh and foul water services.

7.2 Your Petitioner asks for reassurance that clear surface water drainage systems be maintained at all times. Currently they flow precariously through fields that are to be transverse by the HS2 bund and on into local rivers. The Local Authority have not been able to supply maps of these very fragile systems and, if no assurances are given the homes in the village are at risk of flood in heavy rain. This is irrespective of the fields themselves which do not flood to any depth.

8. Impact on the Church

8.1 Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction impact on the church will reduce the usage of the church. For example it has hosted Music in Quiet places, but it may never be suitable in the future. The village is not rich and the costs of running the Norman church Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Commonly called St Mary’s Church)are very high. Any reduction in usage would cut vital revenue to this Grade 1 listed historic building. It is praised as being of great value by both in Pevsner and Simon Jenkins in 1000 Best Churches. It has some of the oldest pews in the country

8.2 The impact of any vibration on ancient buildings has been denied. The Church and C14th St Mary’s House are at great risk having no foundations. The Church have requested HS2 Ltd do a full survey prior to the commencement of
construction.

9. Assurance for historic listed buildings

A full structural survey should be carried out and facility for remedial claims for any damage caused by the construction and operation of HS2 made available. This should be long term ie decades as the prolonged detrimental impact will not be immediately evident.

10. Greatmoor Sailing club and BBOWT

10.1 Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of the line, both visually and audibly, past Great Moor Sailing Lake. It is a tranquil area for recreational use with 300 family members and over 2000 users including many Twyfordians. It is an important education centre used for Duke of Edinburgh Awards and a recognised training centre by the Royal Yachting Association sailing lessons, scouts, cadets and the Royal Logistic Corps. It is also used for all other outdoor activities some of which include fishing, walking, camping, sub aqua and canoeing. It is the only facility of its kind for 24 miles.

10.2 Your Petitioner is concerned about noise levels and dust at Great Moor Lake. The noise will be magnified across water and the visual impact seriously intrusive, plus the visual impact on this beautiful place of tranquility must be treated with sensitivity providing the best in practice mitigation and approved by its trustees. The dust will be particulates from the landfill which pre-dates current landfill safety regulations. This concern is highlighted in view of the number of young that use the sailing facility.

10.2 Your Petitioner requests that a full environmental impact survey is carried out on the Great Moor property. The Board advise one has not been fully carried out and bearing in mind the proximity to nature reserves and landfill including under water links this is an important omission. It is set adjacent to the BBOWT Berks Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust Jubilee Lake Nature Reserve and benefits from the biodiversity of the nature reserve.

10.3 Your Petitioner is particularly upset and disturbed by the apparent dismissive treatment of wildlife, Nature Reserves and SSSIs. Much of the area in North Buckinghamshire has been relatively undisturbed for 1000 years, hence the ancient woodland areas and richness of biodiversity besides bats. This is particularly noticeable in the areas under the care of BBOWT (Berkshire Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust). Much of this biodiversity has spread to surrounding areas including Twyford and includes red listed species like butterflies, which remain un-mentioned. The impact especially during the disturbance of construction is of considerable concern to Your Petitioners.

10.4 Your Petitioner has raised the issue of lack of space for 2 railway lines East West and HS2, by Sheephouse Wood but the problem we are advised is still unresolved. As a BBOWT member, Your Petitioner is concerned decisions will be made at the expense of Sheephouse Wood and it's 'occupants'.

B OPERATIONAL IMPACT

11. Operational Noise Vibration and Light

11.1 Currently Twyford and the surrounding area are in a tranquil area as defined by CPRE and an area of night time darkness. People moved there for this peace, dark and tranquility. Your Petitioners are concerned that the noise and night
time light from the line and the IMD while in operation is excessive and the proposed mitigation inadequate. Their quality of life will be desimated.

11.2 Your Petitioner is concerned that the thresholds adopted in the Environmental Statement for noise limits are set well above those set by the World Health Organisation (WHO) giving rise to serious health problems. This is borne out by the Institute for Acoustics. Twyford will be particularly affected being part of the fastest section of the route the speed is the cause of the high noise level made worse by the fact that at the speeds through Twyford added noise will come from the pantograph. From the photo montages it appears the bund by Twyford will not be high enough to mask this noise.

11.3 Your Petitioner is concerned that noise levels will prohibit the outdoor social events. These are a vital element to the community spirit of the village.

11.4 Your Petitioner is seriously concerned about the safety of school children using the recreation field for PE where they cannot hear teachers

11.5 Your Petitioner is concerned that the thriving Cricket Club will be unable to maintain the support to continue.

11.6 The noise levels from HS2 will prevent Your Petitioner and fellow villagers using their gardens and opening their windows between the hours 5.00 am to 12.00 midnight (the hours of operation.) Your Petitioners consider this an infringement of their rights and liberties.

11.7 Your Petitioner is concerned the Environmental Statement does not give a maximum noise level. This is particularly relevant for public rights of way crossing the line.

11.8 Your Petitioner is concerned about the effect of the noise levels on Dairy cattle. There is evidence that excessive noise results in milk yields being reduced together with an increase in the number of calves aborted.

11.9 Your Petitioner has requested the Promoter for information on vibration, especially ground vibration, but we have been unable to get answers and responses. These requests have been made at Roadshows and Community Forums. This is of particular concern to the Grade 1 listed church in Twyford and the adjacent St Mary’s House.

12 Remedies to prevent noise, vibration and light pollution

12.1 Your petitioner feels the height of the line can be reduced. The height is excessive. At Community Forums Your Petitioners requested The Promoter speak to the local Drainage Board and farmers who have hands on knowledge of the water systems in the area. The Environment Agency does not have such up to date hands on information. Farmers have laid extensive drainage systems to take heavy rainfall.

12.2 If the line is lowered
   - The existing height of the bunding past Twyford would help to mitigate noise from the pantograph
   - Would help toward a cut and cover requested by Chetwode (further up the line)

12.3 If the speed of the trains is reduced to speeds comparable with other HSR in Europe there would be little or no noise from the pantograph reducing the
detrimental impact. If the speed is reduced the train would have more route flexibility to avoid some of the severe Environmental damage it is currently inflicting.

12.4 If the line is straightened and moved further away from Twyford to an alignment preferred by Arup the noise would be reduced.

C Compensation

13 Your Petitioner and all the villagers live outside the safeguarded zone of the HS2 line and therefore will not be entitled to voluntary purchase. They have lived in an area which is already severely blighted and have been unable to move freely, but have watched the market value of their properties drain away. The restrictions on the eligibility to apply for the Need to sell scheme do not change their circumstances and they feel their right of choice and their freedom to move has been removed unless they are able and prepared to take large fiscal losses. The latest proposals for compensation do not change their circumstances. These are circumstances over which they have had no control but have had forced on them by Government.

13.1 Your Petitioner does not feel she can take on the traumas she has witnessed by others when they have gone through the process of applying for the Need to Sell scheme. Her home has become a prison.

13.2 Your Petitioner has only ever asked for fairness in whichever Compensation scheme is to be adopted. The only fair proposal Your Petitioner has seen to date is the Property Bond scheme put forward by Action Alliance. This guarantees a payment bond to the value of the property at an unblighted price.

13.3 Although Your Petitioner appreciates Government want to keep the costs of HS2 down, they do feel it is at their expense. The reality is, to give fair compensation would not impact greatly on the budget, but it would create some good will and defuse some of the anger those inflicted by the HS2 proposal has created.

14 The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she, 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.

RAE SLOAN

17th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16 & Session 2016-17

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Twyford Parish Council in the County of Buckinghamshire

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is the Parish Council of Twyford in the County of Buckinghamshire through which the proposed High Speed rail line passes for a distance of some four kilometres

Your Petitioner wishes to state that, at an Open Parish Council meeting held on 11th April 2016, attended by Councillors and members of the public, an outline petition was discussed and, following amendments, was approved. The Chairman was authorised to sign the Petition.

Your Petitioner represents a parish of some 450 adults, with dependent children, the vast majority of whom reside in the village of Twyford and will be affected by the works proposed under the bill. The age profile of the village is, for the record, significantly older than for the population at large.

These works include land and properties subject to compulsory acquisition, land and properties suffering changes to access, highways that will be used as major construction routes, footpaths and bridleways that will be moved or suffer temporary or permanent closure, areas of green space that will be lost or impacted, land to be used for ancillary plant buildings and a maintenance loop, land to be used for construction sites, noise during construction and operation of both the line and the accompanying IMD, visual impacts during construction and operation, temporary closure of roads, re-routing of roads and changes to junctions, damage to local businesses and property blight. The provisions of the Bill will injuriously affect most of the area for which your Petitioner is the local parish council, and your Petitioner accordingly objects thereto for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

The parish is traversed by the proposed route of HS2 over a distance of some 4 kilometers, partly on an embankment with a viaduct over water courses. It is bordered to the east by the proposed Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD), to the south by the proposed revived East-West railway line and is within 5 kilometers of an energy from waste facility built by Buckinghamshire County Council. The currently proposed route now lies some 210 metres from the nearest dwelling in the village.
The village of Twyford is not financially rich but has a vibrant community spirit. There are few properties extending to more than half a hectare. Employment within the village is largely restricted to a significant dairy farm known as Poroway Farm and Shepherd's Furze Farm. Otherwise residents are self employed or travel to surrounding towns such as Aylesbury, Bicester, Buckingham or Milton Keynes on a daily basis. The village supports a Church of England First School that will take children from age three to eleven; a considerable proportion of pupils travelling to Twyford from the neighbouring communities of Calvert Green and Charmond. Education after age eleven largely involves travel to Buckingham or Waddesdon and is sustained by county provided transport.

Since the announcement of HS2 in March 2010 and the indication that Twyford would lie on the preferred route your Petitioner has arranged some ten public meetings to inform its electorate. Your Petitioner’s representatives have attended every Community Forum meeting for area 13, have been involved in at least five direct meetings with representatives of the Promoter and have arranged and sponsored a meeting with the then Secretary of State for Transport, the Rt Hon Philip Hammond MP, that included representatives from other affected parishes and was chaired by our constituency MP, the Rt Hon Speaker of the House of Commons, John Bercow MP. Residents of your Petitioner’s parish have also been vocal attendees at all Road Shows put on the by the Promoter in the Community Forum area.

In 2010 when announced the route of HS2 past Twyford was along the now defunct Great Central Railway track and at that time was no more than 50 metres from the nearest dwelling and a lesser distance from the only public green open space in the village, the Recreation Ground held in trust for the village by your Petitioner. Following a meeting between representatives of your Petitioner and the Promoter the line was moved by the Promoter to its current location although, at that time, it was not clear to your Petitioner what level of noise could be anticipated within the village. The only indication of noise levels at that time being those demonstrated in the sound booths at the Road Shows organised by the Promoter.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioner is concerned about the extensive impacts on the community of the Parish of Twyford and asks that the Promoter reassesses the options for sites and takes into account the requirements of the East West Route and the spur to Aylesbury and the HS2 route requirements to relocate the Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD) away from Twyford.

The IMD Issues are:

Lack of Specific Consultation – the IMD was presented as fait accompli despite the size and magnitude of this part of the project. Under normal planning requirements this project, if stand alone, would have attracted a major Planning Inquiry and also passes the size criteria for EIA and SEA reviews. In the event for this and for the project as a whole the Planning Inspectorate walked away from their statutory duties leaving the promoter as the final arbiter.

Location and Deficiency of early planning – Arup were commissioned to identify a location for the IMD at approximately the half way point between London and Birmingham. Six sites were identified in the area between Aylesbury and Steeple Claydon and these were scored on, what is accepted by Arup, a fairly crude scale. In the event part of the currently proposed site (2.3) scored best and was promoted. However, after a period it was established that the area defined by the current site (2.3 on the chart) was insufficiently large and this was combined with an adjoining site 2.1 (which scored the lowest on the Arup scoring method). Your petitioner
concludes that if the scope of the requirements for an IMD had been correctly assessed by Arup and the combined sites 2.1 and 2.3 had been assessed as one the score that would have been achieved for the combined site would not have been the highest and therefore an alternative site for the IMD would have been selected.

Rail head for transfer of freight – The Parish and community are informed that the current layout can be perceived as such which implies its possible use for the transfer and re-routing of freight cargoes.

Removal of opportunity for betterment with station – Addison Road junction – since 2010 the communities of Calvert Green, Charndon, Steeple Claydon have increased in population. Some 400 to 600 houses have been built or in advanced stages of planning, a reasonable proportion of which are, or will be, deemed affordable. Had HS2 not been proposed there would have been a compelling argument for the creation of a station on East West Rail, not at Queen Catherine Road as recently proposed, but at the junction of Addison Road and the East West route to provide opportunities for travel to work to the east, to the west and to the south as an alternative to the use of private vehicles. Providing this alternative would have clear social, economic and climate change benefits.

Your petition is concerned about the strains on local services the number of people on the IMD site both during construction and in operation will put strai

DESIRED OUTCOME

Your petitioner asks that HS2 are advised that the location be revisited in the light of combining sites 2.1 and 2.3. Evidence can be presented to the Select Committee to demonstrate the reasons.

Your petitioner asks that there is a written undertaking that the IMD will not be used as a freight transfer destination.

Your petitioner asks that a medical centre including qualified medical staff – doctors and nurses– is created on site so that use of Steeple Claydon surgery is not adversely impacted for residents of Twyford.

Your petitioner asks that HS2, as the newly announced managers of the combined HS2 and East West Route project, be instructed to meet with local communities and the Parish representative on a sitting panel to discuss how a station on East West Route can be developed at the crossing of East West Route and Addison Road.

Your petitioner is concerned that the petitioning processes in both the House of Commons and House of Lords are being truncated as the farms and the community learn of yet to be received significant impacts and issues. Your petitioner ask for a suspension of the Hybrid Bill process to enable due process by followed by communities, farms and people to enable the Aarhus Convention principles and the Supreme Court assurance to be achieved.

Your petitioner is concerned about the following Route Location Issues which have not been addressed properly.

Arup preferred route – The consultants, Arup, developed alternatives to the currently proposed route beyond the IMD towards Brackley. The most easterly of these (Route C) would deliver significant benefits to Twyford in terms of noise reduction and access to land. This route was rejected by the then Secretary of State as being too close to Preston Bissett and, therefore merely transferring the pain from one community to another. The issue of moving the route was a subject of the first Twyford Parish Council petition and was presented to the HoC SC in
October 2015. It is asserted that your petitioner and community did not receive a satisfactory hearing that day for two reasons – that the map provided by the Promoter was not the map that was produced by Arup with the result that QC to the Promoter wrongly dismissed our claim because “it was merely affected homes in Chetwode” and that the Division Bell sounded as this matter was in front of the committee and on their return the impetus was lost. It remains your petitioner’s contention that the effect of Arup Route C would not transfer the pain to Preston Bissett, that its true location would not in any way affect homes in Chetwode as it would actually move the line away from that community, but it is recognised that there could be some direct damage to one or two other properties.

Compromise – Your petitioner does, however, believe that there is real room for compromise in this matter which could involve the moving of the route a lesser distance from Twyford than to Route C. This is now more easily facilitated as your petitioner believes that certain dwellings in the area are now owned by the Promoter. In your petitioner’s presentation to the House of Commons your petitioner asked for the Select Committee to assist in obtaining a transparent assessment of the costs and benefits of Route C but progress towards this was lost by the Division.

Station – there is a suggestion by Rt Hon David Liddington MP that a station be developed in the Aylesbury Vale area. Your petitioner understands this would be to provide an interchange between HS2 to East West Rail and possibly be used by Javelin type trains as is the case with CTRL/HST. In order for this to be effective it would require a minimum of four tracks on the HS2 route both to the south and to the north. This would exacerbate the challenges already faced to locate the currently proposed number of lines into the section close to Sheephouse Wood and can be seen as a further argument in support of the rethink of the HS2 project which, as the company HSUK has suggested feasible alternatives could achieve improvement to the HS2 Phase 1 Route 3 alignment at a saving of up to £20bn, a significant reduction.

Four tracks – even if the development of a station is refused there remains a concern that, to achieve a greater revenue HS2’s route be used for freight transference which your petitioner believes would require the construction of a further two tracks at least to the north of East West Rail.

Alternative routes – It is very clear that the attempt to locate and construct the route past Sheephouse Wood without encroachment is a very difficult challenge. It is also clear that by ignoring the opportunities presented to include either Bicester, the fastest growing Garden town in the country, or Milton Keynes (the HSUK proposal), already established as a major conurbation, on a high speed route which would integrate with the current network represents a failure to deliver a cohesive transport policy but to spend a vast amount of money in the process with any benefits accruing very far into the future. There is another scheme, for example that from HSUK, which adopts a more inclusive strategy and appears to deliver that at a discount of some £20bn on HS2 Phases 1 and 2 and HS3.

DESIRED OUTCOME

Your petitioner asks for the desired outcome that the Select Committee directs HS2 to meet with Twyford representatives to examine the opportunities of locating the route away from the village of Twyford towards the Arup Preferred route C. Such movement has been achieved in some locations during the planning process and would not change the principles or the travel or construction times. The County Route construction is not the most critical time activities and it will not change the costs or timescales.

Also that a written undertaking is given to the Parish Council and Local/County Authorities that there will not be a station/interchange developed in the area bounded by the parishes of Twyford,
Steeple Claydon, Preston Bissett, Charndon and Calvert Green.

Also that a written undertaking to the effect that there will not be additional tracks alongside the currently proposed HS2 route. That an additional written undertaking be given that freight will not be serviced on the HS2 route whether or not additional tracks are constructed.

Your petitioner is concerned about Traffic issues including:

Access for emergency vehicles – already at limit of acceptable response times – there is therefore the need for vehicles and staff based at IMD site or in immediate area, if this is not feasible during early construction, in order to maintain response times as current during the construction period of disruption

Twyford Mill – In a recent Additional Provision the byway from Bicester Road to Twyford Mill was scheduled as an access route, this was subsequently removed – BUT Twyford Mill is now or will shortly be in possession of HS2 so your petitioner is concerned at change and implications on village. This concern is brought forward by the prospect of the Twyford Mill site being utilised for construction or storage purposes or more worryingly as a site for worker accommodation. Our concern is then that there will be significantly more commuter traffic on our roads and that, as is always the case with temporary work camps there will be increases in crime and resultant increases in household insurance premiums.

Access to the east – much of the traffic from Twyford travels to the east, be it for health, retail, education or work related activities. We remain concerned that the increase in HGV traffic on the road between Gawcott and Edgcott in connection with construction will either render the crossing of this road, a necessary evil, extremely hazardous or will significantly increase journey times, or both, for the period of construction. Your petitioner is concerned that the reconstruction of the Gawcott to Edgcott road to pass over the IMD site will drive traffic down completely unsuitable minor country roads including through our village. The issues of access will be exacerbated further should timetables slip and multiple road closures occur concurrently.

Monitoring Construction Traffic – The roads in this area are narrow, poorly surfaced and maintained and totally unsuited to increases in traffic. Your petitioner would like the confidence to believe that adequate monitoring procedures will ensure that all traffic connected with construction, be that HGV, delivery vehicles, light commercial vehicles and private cars and mini buses ferrying workers to and from sites are only using the designated routes and that adequate penalties are imposed on those who default.

DESIRED OUTCOME

Your petitioner asks the following,

That the promoter obtains written assurances from the emergency ambulance, fire and rescue and police services that current response times will not deteriorate because of actions by the promoter or its contractors in respect of traffic management and road closures. Further that should these undertakings not be forthcoming that the promoter pays for ambulance and fire and rescue vehicles and staff to be based at, or close to, the IMD for the period of disruption due to construction.

Also that the undertaking not to use the Mill Lane access from Bicester Road as an access route to the proposed line as previously given is not changed by the acquisition of Twyford Mill and its land by HS2.

Also that the site at Twyford Mill is not utilised by HS2, or its contractors, for any purpose related to the building of HS2 which would result in additional vehicle movements through the village along Bicester Road and Portway Road.
Also that every vehicle requiring access to any construction site is tagged and that the appropriate electronic monitoring systems are in place on all non designated routes to ensure compliance.

Your petitioner is concerned about Consultation Issues and the need to formally include Parish Council representatives on all local decision making bodies during the construction phase.

**DESIRED OUTCOME**
Your petitioner asks for the desired outcome that a written undertaking be given that Parish Councils along the whole of the route will be included as described for the whole period of construction.

Your petitioner is concerned about Compensation Issues.
Recent information re vibration and noise highlight the necessity for the time span for consideration of impact to be extended until the full schedule of 14+ trains per hour has been running for at least one year.

**DESIRED OUTCOME**
Your petitioner asks for the desired outcome that there is an undertaking that compensation in respect of noise and vibration effects will be assessed and paid one year after the completion and operation of Phase 1 when a relatively minor timetable of services will be run and again one year after the completion and operation of Phase 2 when the full programme of trains in both directions is running.

Your petitioner is the trustee and custodian of the local Recreation Ground which is close to and in open sight of the currently proposed line. This is the only public open space in the village and is utilised not only by the residents but also by a very successful cricket club, playing in division 1 of the Cherwell League as well as sustaining two other adult teams, five age related junior teams and a de facto junior academy for some 60 juniors. In the winter months the ground hosts Twyford United FC from the North Bucks League and the ground is to be used by pupils from the school. Other activities such as wedding receptions and a notable Music Festival also take place. Your petitioner is clearly concerned that all the hard work that has been put in over the past, at least, twenty years to produce an award winning playing surface will be put at naught should the ground be rendered unusable by dint of noise during the construction and operational periods and by dust and air pollution during the construction phase.

**DESIRED OUTCOME**
Your petitioner asks for the desired outcome – that should the ground become unusable permanently, or for a period exceeding one year, at whatever stage in the construction and operational periods that the promoter be required to source, finance and develop an alternative facility of similar or better condition within the village envelope. For example, on land available by virtue of the acquisition of Twyford Mill.

**HS2 and East West Project Management Issues** – We understand that the management of the two projects to create HS2 and to develop East West Rail is now in single hands, of HS2. We further understand that a report on our this will be managed has been produced but not
published. We presume that this report will provide the appropriate impact assessment of the joint project so that we may understand how this will now affect our communities. Based on past experience, however, your petitioner is concerned that the combined impact will be such that there should be the opportunity for this to be studied prior to any hearing before your Lordship’s Select Committee.

DESIRED OUTCOME

That HS2 be required to publish the report prior to the commencement of hearings before this Select Committee in such time that the implications for the local communities can be assessed. That in effect this development is treated as an Additional Provision with all that that would require i.e. the opportunity for further consultation and petitioning.

Your petitioner is concerned that the HS2 Phase 1 Route section had different MPs lobbying for the Chiltern tunnel extensions and a MP, the member for Richmond, and London Mayoral candidate lobbying for tunnelling beneath Hillingdon Northolt which if agreed creates tunnelled distances which if realigned will enable the Route to connect to Bicester rather than pass Aylesbury and Twyford providing rail services benefits to Birmingham and London for commuter to and from Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire. The alignment can avoid losses to the golf courses in Hillingdon and Aylesbury and reduce the impacts on the lakes near Hillingdon/Denham. Your petitioner and Twyford Parish are in the constituency of the Rt Honourable, The Speaker who has not been to lobby in the media, or in Parliament for your petitioner’s area, as other MPs have been able to and are doing.

DESIRED OUTCOME

Your petitioner asks that the House of Lords Select Committee invites the Government to assess and critically compare the two alignments to recognise the rail services benefits of a Station at Bicester for daily commuting and the avoidance of the loss of the amenities and recreational facilities in Hillingdon, Denham and Aylesbury.

Your petitioner is concerned that an issue excluded from the House of Commons Select Committee petitioning by Standing Order and relating to the principle of line of route alignments for Phase 2 are being reconsidered by HS2 to respond to community requests for such alignment adjustments. This is not the approach that was taken in HS2 Phase 1 and its Select Committee. Members of Parliament for the areas of Sheffield and Crewe have had greater opportunities to have route alignment and station location decisions reviewed than was available to the Parishes and communities from Ruislip to Amersham to Buckingham for Phase 1. The first Judicial Review with the local authorities and people near Aylesbury was informed by Mr Justice Ouseley that their petitioning would be permitted to request realignment considerations, but it was not by the Standing Order imposed on the Select Committee.

Your petitioner is concerned that, whilst during the Bill’s second reading in your Lordship’s house, Lord Stevenson of Balmacara argued that it was not the place of Parliament to abuse communities, the example of your petitioner’s attempts to have the Arup preferred Route C considered for the betterment of your petitioner’s parish suggests otherwise.

Your petitioner is concerned that at least two farmers near Twyford/Calvert/Quainton have been served with notices to take further land after the issue of the House of Commons Select Committee without these being within an Additional Provision process and after the third reading in the House of Commons and the second in the House of Lords. To have curtailed the
Parliamentary process for people to respond through House of Commons petitioning for changes and matters more significant than some which have been within previous Additional Provisions surely is not consistent diligent or due process. This iterative land take is of great concern to Twyford Parish as suggestions for a station emerge.

DESIRED OUTCOME

Your petitioner asks if the House of Commons petitioning can be restarted to enable those people receiving instruction for further land take to have the opportunity that others have had. This is an example of the abuse Lord Stevenson has referred to.

Your petitioner wishes to present evidence to demonstrate that HS2 could take an alternative route from London to the West Midlands that would:
1) avoid the major environmental damage faced by Twyford and many other rural communities.
2) provide the enhanced national intercity network that the nation needs, delivering direct benefits to a much greater proportion of the population than HS2 possibly can.
3) adhere to the principles of the HS2 Bill.
4) reveal huge failings in the processes adopted by HS2 Ltd.

Your petitioner is concerned that HS2 Ltd's route selection process is fundamentally flawed, and that there is no justification for the selected HS2 route through the Chilterns AONB, and through the unspoilt rural areas further north in which your petitioner lives. There has been no meaningful consideration of the M1 corridor which appears to offer an excellent route not only from London to Birmingham, but also to all other principal cities of the Midlands, the North and Scotland.

Your petitioner is concerned that the M1 corridor route was dismissed from consideration before detailed technical assessment of its true potential could be applied; moreover, your petitioner is concerned that the reasons offered to dismiss the M1 corridor are:
1) highly generic,
2) not based upon detailed analysis but rather unfounded assertion,
3) comprehensively discredited by the detailed designed work undertaken in support of the High Speed UK proposals, which are routed via the M1 corridor.

The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the Parish Council, in the person of the Chairman, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity 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.

15th Day of April, 2016
To the House of Lords Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF MR AND MRS M C RAFFETY

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioners are owner/occupiers of the property known as The Firs, Potter Row, Great Missenden HP16 9LT. The southern portion of the garden of The Firs is located within the voluntary purchase zone (VPZ ie 120 metres from the centre line of the track). The whole of the property falls within all three Homeowner Payment Zones (HPZ). The Firs is not only home to your Petitioners but it is also their place of work. This means that there will be no respite from the effects of the Scheme.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

Based on information published by HS2 Ltd and the Department for Transport the property is expected to experience substantial adverse impacts during both construction and operational phases. The ES identified a number of significant adverse effects in the location of the Property. These effects therefore represent ones that even the promoter itself considers 'likely' to arise although your petitioners thinks the effects could be even worse than predicted.

Construction phase - ES describes as "significant" and having a "major adverse impact on residential amenity". It will be noted that by reason of the proximity of the boundaries of the Property to both the railway construction area and the construction traffic route, ie the temporary haul road, it will experience the full force of construction effects. The temporary haul road is estimated to have 360 moxi truck movements per day – right next to the boundary of The Firs. The dust, pollution and especially the noise will be truly intolerable from which there will be no escape.
Remedy – a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at the very least a 1.5km extension of the bored tunnel to Leather Lane, The Lee, Great Missenden. (REPA)

Operational Phase - Once the railway is operational, the Property will be post construction effects. These are described in the ES as “significant” and having a "major adverse effect on residential amenity" (ES, 5.5.5). These in-combination effects are:

“significant visual effects” due to the close proximity of the scheme for example

- The new permanent access road just beyond the boundary
- The balancing pond just beyond the boundary
- The bunds
- The removal of all the trees beyond the boundary of The Firs
- The sound barriers sitting on top of the cutting
- The top of the gantries

Remedy – a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at the very least a 1.5km extension of the bored tunnel to Leather Lane, The Lee, Great Missenden. (REPA)

Noise Effects

The Petitioners currently enjoy the peace and tranquility one would expect to find in an AONB close to London. The Petitioners currently wake up to bird song rather than the noise of a high speed train. Once the train is operational the tranquility will disappear. It has been stated that the noise from these high speed trains will be greater than the World Health Organisation recommend. It is unjustifiable for a new railway, in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, to exceed these levels and submit residents to noise levels which will affect sleep patterns and their feeling of well being. The Petitioners will no longer enjoy the peaceful enjoyment of their own home, that is both the house and garden, which is a breach of human rights. The Petitioners will be subjected to injurious levels
of operational noise from HS2. The promoter uses words like 'reasonably practical' in its approach to noise reduction. We have concerns that the ballast track will be turned into slab track due to the concern of the Rayleigh Waves and this will increase noise levels further however the promoters words 'reasonably practical' may exclude them from reducing the further increase in noise levels and the area would therefore suffer even higher noise levels than currently predicted.

The noise as the train exits the South Heath portal will create a sound boom. How this is to be mitigated is uncertain. The Promoter appears to be reluctant to give a guarantee that there will be no tunnel boom and their lesser assurances – that boom will not occur – are not enforceable. We need binding assurances that the noise levels will not exceed the levels set by the World Health Organisation.

Remedy – a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at the very least a 1.5km extension of the bored tunnel to Leather Lane, The Lee, Great Missenden. (REPA)

Business

Your Petitioners run a business from the address. This business will be seriously and adversely affected as the highly specialised staff have already stated that they have no desire to work in the hostile conditions that the building of this Scheme will present to immediate vicinity of The Firs. These staff are valued for their specialist knowledge, gained over many years. It will be very difficult to find experienced staff let alone ones willing to work under such poor conditions. The business has to move or will close. The transporting of the business’s goods will be made extremely difficult. These are time and condition sensitive deliveries.

Remedy – a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at the very least a 1.5km extension of the bored tunnel to Leather Lane, The Lee, Great Missenden. (REPA)

Transport

Construction is due to last 8 years in the proximity of the Petitioners Property. The main road in Great Missenden (A413) will be used as the major construction route. This road already suffers from congestion at peak times so adding all the workers traffic, transportation of material for the construction of HS2. all the spoil and all the ancillary goods the A413 will be congested for the duration of the construction working hours 08.00 – 17.30 five days a week plus Saturday mornings.
Under current plans the temporary haul road exits the construction site at the roundabout on the A413 just opposite the Link Road in Great Missenden. This will cause huge tailbacks for traffic coming from Prestwood and Aylesbury as they head towards London. The petitioners also have concerns that this is unsafe as the temporary haul road, as it heads for the A413 is steep and opposite the children's playground, the tennis courts and the area where the school buses wait for their passengers.

Your Petitioner is concerned about how the emergency vehicles will cope with this congestion as the nearest A&E department is located at Stoke Mandeville which is accessed via the A413. The whole route between Great Missenden Stoke Mandeville Hospital will be one giant construction site.

**Remedy** – a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at the very least a 1.5km extension of the bored tunnel to Leather Lane, The Lee, Great Missenden. (REPA). Although problems will still exist beyond the AONB with access to Stoke Mandeville A&E and with emergency vehicles so your Petition requests additional funds for Air Ambulance services for the duration of the construction phase.

**Community**

Your Petitioners live in a tight knit community where neighbours know each other and are willing to lend support in times of need. This community is being 'picked off' as HS2 buy up property leaving some empty, with hideous chains around the gates, or let out properties to tenants on short term agreements. The community is breaking up. This leaves the more vulnerable and elderly to fend for themselves as their neighbours leave the area. The community of Potter Row will be swiped out as has happened in Hyde Lane, Hyde Heath. This is all very distressing.

**Remedy** – a fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at the very least a 1.5km extension of the bored tunnel to Leather Lane, The Lee, Great Missenden. (REPA)

**Property**

All properties along the length of Potter Row are BLIGHTED.

Some have been given NTS some are CPO. Some residents are too frail to face the rigours of the NTS and some simply feel unable to cope with a move due to their personal circumstances. The Community is crumbling and will ultimately be totally broken up.
The Government should maintain as far as practicable the stability and cohesion of communities along the route” 3.1.4 Property Compensation Consultation 2013.
The Government is failing to recognize the impact of this scheme on the community of Potter Row.

Your Petitioners have been rejected under the VPS but accepted under the NTS however your Petitioners do not believe the price HS2 have offered is the full, unblighted price. Your Petitioners took their experience to the HoC Select Committee. Your Petitioners have had a very poor experience of dealing with HS2 regarding the wide discrepancy in values submitted to them from 3 of the limited pool of 5 valuers. Your Petitioners believe these wide discrepancies are due to the lack of local valuers included in that pool. Your Petitioners understand that the Need to Sell Scheme is being reviewed but have an element of distrust borne out of previous experience. Your Petitioners have been unable to take their case to an independent arbitrator. HS2 have submitted an offer, have reviewed the offer and the valuations all internally and there is nowhere to seek independent advice that HS2 is willing to listen to. HS2 act as judge and jury. This is despite obvious errors having been made in those valuations. There must be a more democratic and fair process for disputes to be aired.

Remedy

An independent review panel for the Need to Sell Scheme and the Voluntary Purchase Scheme or (RSZ)

Any property which is experiencing blight should be considered for the scheme regardless of a compelling Need to Sell

The Scheme should be made more inviting for those who cannot cope with the intense questioning and scrutiny from the NTS team

Valuers with experience in the local area, PRE HS2, should be relied upon to give full, unblighted values.

A fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB or at the very least a 1.5km extension of the bored tunnel to Leather Lane, The Lee, Great Missenden. (REPA) could help to ease the blight in the immediate vicinity of Potter Row.

The use of ‘comparables’ adheres to unblighted properties or makes a % increase in the case of blighted properties. Properties already sitting next to existing railway lines should be excluded as comparables! The valuers should also recognize that the general desirability of an area has been diminished by the Scheme and adjustments should be made for properties further from the line ie not directly impacted. but seen as less desirable because of their location within the towns and villages with overarching affects.
Safety

Your Petitioners have grave concerns regarding the security of this Scheme. As the Scheme is proposed it appears no special consideration has been given to the current threat of terrorism. With a combination of very high speed and very high volumes of passengers this could present a serious threat.

The Rayleigh waves can cause a high speed trains to derail more easily than a train at lower, more conventional speeds.

Remedy: Independent security and safety exerts should review the Scheme.

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 by

Michael Raffety

Sarah Raffety

Dated 15th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON TO WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF THE CHILTERN COUNTRYSIDE GROUP

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is The Chiltern Countryside Group (CCG) (and hereinafter referred to as ‘the Petitioner’).

(a) The CCG was originally established in 2008 by volunteers living in the Chilterns with a concern and heart to protect and enhance the Chilterns and its nationally important Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Chilterns AONB has unique qualities which are especially valued for its location and accessibility as the nearest 'green lung' for London. There are over 50 million visits made annually to the Chilterns AONB for quiet recreational activities, for example, walking and cycling in the natural beauty of the Chiltern Hills (2007 Tourism South East).

(b) Your Petitioner has appointed a Steering Group of volunteers, all of whom are professionals from different walks of life, to undertake the daily functions of the Petitioner's activities. The CCG supporters are invited to participate in these at whatever level they (the individual supporter) consider to be appropriate.

(c) Your Petitioner has a specific mission statement of: 'Preserving the peace of the Chilterns'. Your Petitioner identifies that, whether this is through living, working or relaxation, it enjoys and benefits, collectively and individually, from the special character and healthy leisure pursuits and relaxation afforded to it presently by the Chilterns AONB. Therefore, your Petitioner is directly and specially affected by the proposals laid down in the HS2 Hybrid Bill. Your Petitioner actively seeks to preserve such benefits for the nation, now and for future generations and asserts, furthermore, that the proposals of the Bill would injuriously affect their ability to do so.

(d) Your Petitioner works closely with the Chiltern Conservation Board, the Chiltern Society and other organisations with a similar purpose. Your Petitioner is recognised by Members of Parliament, Councillors and the Local Authorities in the Chilterns as a relevant contributor to and consultee on issues relating to the protection of the Chilterns AONB.

(e) Your Petitioner has engaged with HS2 Ltd directly since 2010 on many issues and has participated in the Community Forums 8, 9 & 10 run by that organisation for the Chilterns communities.

Since its formation in 2008, your Petitioner has made substantial submissions and reports to the Parliamentary Inquiries and Consultations on issues relating to the Chilterns AONB and different
modes of transport, including high speed rail. All these can be accessed through your Petitioner's website: http://www.chilterncountrysidegroup.org

Your Petitioner remains disappointed that the constructive dialogue and potential improvements to the scheme to mitigate impacts which could have arisen from these opportunities have not been utilised to afford greater benefit to the impacted areas and communities or indeed, to designing a high speed rail route outside the AONB with optimum connectivity to other key national transport infrastructure.

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

(a) The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty:

Your Petitioner finds the provisions of the Bill are without any measurable or perceivable benefit to the Chilterns AONB and its communities. This is unlike the case for the Kent Downs where many stations in the vicinity of that AONB have direct access to HS1. The potential benefits in terms of tourism, business and to residents derived from such connectivity will not accrue to the Chilterns.

Your Petitioner believes its rights, present and future interests in, and benefits from, the Chilterns AONB would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in their present form.

(b) Your Petitioner is cognisant with the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (S85) (CROW Act) which establishes in law:

'S 85 General duty of public bodies etc.

(1) In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.

(2) The following are relevant authorities for the purposes of this section—

(a) any Minister of the Crown,
(b) any public body,
(c) any statutory undertaker,
(d) any person holding public office.'

(c) Your Petitioner is also cognisant with section 86 of the aforementioned Act which provides for the establishment of Conservation Boards. Indeed, the Chilterns AONB has a highly-regarded and very professional Conservation Board upon which this legislation in section 87 has conferred the following responsibilities:

'General purposes and powers.

(1) It is the duty of a conservation board, in the exercise of their functions, to have regard to—

(a) the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty, and

(b) the purpose of increasing the understanding and enjoyment by the public of the special qualities of the area of outstanding natural beauty'.

The Act continues that the most important of these two functions is (a) – the conservation and enhancement of the AONB's natural beauty.

The Conservation Board also in S87 has the obligation to 'seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the area of outstanding natural beauty'.

(d) Your Petitioner also believes that the ability of the Chilterns Conservation Board to undertake its responsibilities on behalf of your Petitioner and others with a vested interest in the AONB will be seriously compromised by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in their present form.

(e) Your Petitioner finds the provisions of the Bill contrary to the spirit and practice for the planning and implementation of a major national infrastructure, which by its very qualification 'is for the benefit of the nation' and which should therefore uphold those requirements especially enshrined in law to protect nationally significant heritage landscapes.

Your Petitioner therefore objects to the Bill for the above reasons and those, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

(f) The Environmental Statement:

Your Petitioner finds that the Environmental Statement (ES) and Additional Provisions (AP) which accompany the Bill are inadequate in their recognition of the individual and cumulative effects which the proposals will make temporarily and permanently upon the Chilterns AONB.

The ES concludes the overall impact on the Chilterns AONB to be only moderately adverse, an assessment with which your Petitioner, together with professional environmental bodies, including Natural England, does not concur. The Report of the ES Assessor identified (p12) that minimising the impact of the proposed route through the Chilterns AONB was the single greatest issue of concern for respondents to the HS2 ES, most of whom, we would suggest, are ordinary citizens.

Your Petitioner is concerned that there appears to be only a limited assessment of the cumulative effects of the proposed scheme upon the AONB. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that this be remedied forthwith.

Your Petitioner submitted responses to the ES Draft and Final Consultations (ref. CCG website) which drew the Proposer’s attention to certain omissions and curtailed considerations of impact on the AONB. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that should further or new information become available, that Petitioners be offered an additional opportunity to respond to these, through extension to existing petitioning time-frames, or a specific extra period in which to do so.

(g) The proposed scheme will have the following permanent effects upon the Chilterns AONB:

- 8 km of the route will be on surface, embankment, viaduct, shallow cuttings or in cut and cover tunnelling
- Ancient woodland at Jones Hill Wood will be destroyed. Ancient woodland at Jenkins Wood is likely to be affected by the proximate deep cutting
- Important and historic hedgerows will be destroyed.
- 120 m section of the Grims Ditch Scheduled Ancient Monument will be destroyed
- Of the land taken for construction, a large proportion is currently productive farmland and will be taken permanently
- Numerous mature trees (not in woodland) will be felled
- Kilometres of security fencing
- Noise barriers up to 6m high
- 4 vent shafts up to 4 m high, each covering 3,300 sq.m
- 6 auto transformer electricity stations/sub-stations, each covering approximately 1500 sq.m
- Hundreds of gantries carrying overhead wires
• 2 viaducts of 500 m each at (a) Wendover and (b) at Wendover Dean up to a maximum of 26 m high including gantries
• Cut and cover tunnelling described as 'green' more than 1 km long
• Unknown number of telecommunication masts
• 7 new over-bridges for roads, tracks and public rights of way
• Redesigned and re-aligned rural roads
• New service roads
• Lighting and light pollution from trains and flashing from pantographs
• Loss of ancient countryside
• Loss of ancient woodland
• Loss of breeding Barn Owl population
• Loss of, and disturbance to other wildlife and severe restrictions on habitat movements of mammals including deer
• Creation of numerous settling ponds and flood swales
• Embankments up to 16 m high (including bunds) with gantries of 8 m on top
• Visual and noise intrusion from up to 36 trains per hour travelling at up to 360 kph
• Loss of amenity for thousands of residents living within 2 kms of the route
• Loss of quality of national amenity for leisure pursuits throughout all seasons
• The Chilterns tunnel north portal is adjacent to several high value heritage assets

It is quite clear that the proposed scheme will significantly impact permanently upon the Chilterns AONB. It will not look or be the green, unspoilt landscape as it now is, with the same level of tranquility and far-reaching rural views which it currently possesses. The ancient landscape, woodlands, buildings and settlements of the AONB are irreplaceable. The setting, rural nature and extensive viewpoint sites of the AONB are integral to its value and character.

Your petitioner respectfully asserts that the only way to significantly reduce the adverse effects on the Chilterns AONB is by means of a fully bored tunnel through the AONB.

Deviation:

(h) Your Petitioner is concerned that provisions within the Bill (Schedule 1) would appear to allow construction or maintenance of any of the scheduled works to deviate vertically upwards by up to three metres, vertically downwards to any extent and laterally to any extent with the deviation limits shown in the deposited plans.

Your Petitioner is concerned that such deviations, if applied, have the potential to cause significant changes to the degree of impact and that this is not adequately addressed in the ES. Your Petitioner is concerned that the provisions of the ES only require reasonable endeavours to adopt measures to reduce adverse environmental effects – and these are also required not to add unreasonable cost or delay to the scheme's construction and operation.

Your Petitioner is concerned that these provisions do not afford sufficient protection to the AONB landscape and communities. The provisions would appear to rely upon the Promoter's definition of what is 'reasonable or unreasonable'. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that any deviation for scheduled works vertically upwards should be limited to no more than one metre and that appropriate limits should be laid down for unscheduled works.

Noise and Tranquility:
Your Petitioner finds the assessment of noise and vibration from the construction and operation of the proposals to be inadequate. Tranquility – both aural and visual - is a key resource of the AONB providing much of its character and benefits. There is no doubt that the construction and operation of the proposals will significantly impact upon that key asset.

Your Petitioner finds inadequate assessment of the noise impact upon that tranquility, both for location and at different times of day. For example, operation of the railway and its maintenance at night will inevitably cause greater noise intrusion upon silent landscapes and communities than during conventional daytime activities. There is likely to be significantly greater noise intrusion into quiet landscapes enjoyed by the public on rights of way, than alongside a national transport corridor.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that reassessment of significant noise impact be carried out and that this report be published to Parliament and publically.

Your Petitioner believes the scheme’s design should incorporate the most up to date practices to reduce noise impact. As this scheme is presented by the Promoter as a world class railway for the future, its design and operations should go beyond current World Health Organisation (WHO) recommendations to facilitate not just lower noise impact on communities and landscapes now, but for future generations. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that binding requirements are laid down which oblige the Promoter to design and operate the scheme so that day and night noise thresholds in both rural and urban areas are at least compliant with WHO noise guidelines.

Your petitioner is very concerned over the visual impact of the proposed 6m high noise barrier near Wendover.

Your Petitioner is concerned that recent scientific research carried out for the Promoter by Professor Woodward of Heriot Watt University, a leading expert in the field of geo-engineering, has revealed safety risks for trains travelling on the planned ballast track at the speeds required for HS2 to operate as proposed. This is of particular concern for the miles of track on embankment between London and Birmingham.

To improve safety and track integrity, the recommendation by experts is to reinforce the soil base of track with concrete slabs, which are recognised as causing greater noise during the train's operation.

Your Petitioner is already highly concerned about noise pollution from HS2 into the peaceful countryside and small communities of the AONB. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that the Promoter be required to carry out noise assessment tests for all track design requirements and amendments needed to satisfy safety standards with a particular focus on operations on embankments and at the operating speeds proposed.

Your Petitioner further requests that these tests should be published by the Promoter for the general public as soon as possible and certainly prior to the Hybrid Bill being given Royal Assent. Your Petitioner requests further undertakings from the Promoter that all mitigation to reduce noise required over and above that already publically assured or undertaken will be provided without compromising the quality of that mitigation, that such mitigation will be subject to discussion and agreement by the Promoter with the appropriate Local Authority and that the Promoter will cost such mitigation into the financial provisions for the scheme.

Your Petitioner also has grave concerns for the aural (and visual) intrusion of the two viaducts at (a)Wendover Dean and (b) Wendover, each 500m long and up to 26m high, including gantries.
Your Petitioner is particularly concerned for the impact of noise from these for the village of Dunsmore.

We find such large artificial constructions to be totally alien to the natural and organically evolved tranquil and green landscape of the Chilterns AONB. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that these viaducts be removed from the design scheme by replacing the overground route in the AONB with a fully bored tunnel.

Your Petitioner is concerned that noise levels during construction may exceed those parameters set out by the WHO. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that Local Authorities be given legal enforcement powers which compel such activities to cease should this occur.

(j) Spoil:

Your Petitioner is concerned at the proposals for disposal of spoil from and within the AONB. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that provisions be incorporated into the Bill which minimise the depositing of any excavated, waste material and spoil within the AONB; that where such material is generated within the AONB, it is removed as quickly as practically possible, and that the material is not used to create landscaped embankments alien to the landscape and character of the AONB.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that routes for spoil haulage lorries are agreed in consultation with Local Authorities to ensure they avoid sensitive residential areas and ancient lanes.

(k) Ancient Woodlands:

By the very definition of its nature, ancient woodlands are irreplaceable. They are of national importance and play a key element in the landscape of historically and nationally significant areas, such as the Chilterns AONB. Indeed this AONB is renowned nationally for its indigenous beech and the habitats which this species of tree sustains. Your Petitioner finds there is limited mitigation and compensation for the loss or degradation of these natural sites.

However, should the Promoter progress the scheme, your Petitioner respectfully requests that:

- planting should be of indigenous trees currently found in the AONB in such woodland sites, taking into account current knowledge of climate change, pests and disease and that such trees be allowed to reach their maximum height
- planting should be to a design which complements the natural and existing AONB landscape
- planting should be carried out as early as possible as the scheme progresses through the AONB
- monitoring at the expense of the Promoter should extend over a 60 year period during which replacement trees should be planted, should the original planting fail.

(l) Hydrology

Your Petitioner is concerned about fresh water supplies and the effect on the River Misbourne and possible pollution to these during the construction and operation of the proposed scheme.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that during the construction period, regular sampling should be taken of surface water from different points surrounding the construction site. Such samples should be independently tested by one of the UK's accredited water service laboratories and the results provided to the Environment Agency and the relevant Local Authority.
Your Petitioner respectfully requests that provisions to legally safeguard public water supplies, to at least present standards of quality and availability, be incorporated into the Bill.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that full ecological and historical environmental surveys on surface water bodies are carried out, prior to commencement of construction operations.

(m) Ecology:

Your Petitioner is concerned at the adverse effects on the fauna and flora of the Chilterns AONB during the construction and operation of the proposed scheme. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that mitigation provisions be made to reduce such effects so that ancient woodlands are not severed or destroyed, that wildlife migratory routes remain, or are established in as natural a manner as is possible and that due recognition and regard is given to species and habitats of significance to the AONB.

The House of Commons published an Environmental Audit Committee Report in April 2014 which recommended that monitoring of all aspects of environmental protection should take place over a 60 year period from the start of construction and operation of the scheme.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that the recommendations of this Report be adopted by the Promoter and that legislation is enacted to ensure compliance with these.

(n) Public Rights of Way:

The Chilterns AONB offers a rich variety of Public Rights of Way from nationally recognised and significant paths such as the ancient Ridgeway to local footpaths and bridleways. These are accessible by various means and afford tranquility, a feeling of remoteness and far-reaching views.

Your Petitioner is concerned that these amenities are not lost to the public and respectfully requests that the need for re-alignment is minimised and where absolutely necessary, this is made sensitively to the original natural landscape without any reduction in accessibility by use of extra green bridges. The Promoter should be made aware that many such routes, which may be used by construction vehicles during that process, are presently heavily used by walkers, cyclists and riders.

(o) Light Pollution:

Your Petitioner is concerned that light pollution during construction of the scheme and its subsequent operation when flashing from contact with overhead wires and train lights will adversely impact on communities and isolated residents, where currently there is little or no artificial light impact. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that artificial light intrusion be reduced to the minimum for safety and that this is monitored regularly.

(p) Heritage:

The character of the Chil terns AONB is defined not only through its landscape and natural features, but through its heritage assets and their settings. These include the many assets grouped at the Chilterns Tunnel north portal and Grim’s Ditch Scheduled Monument. Your Petitioner finds the proposals cause significant impact upon those features, which may also provide practical functions, as for example, St. Mary's Church, Wendover which offers religious and cultural facilities to the community.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that provisions are made within the Bill to protect heritage
sites and their settings from degradation or loss through the construction and operation of the scheme. These provisions should recognise that heritage sites may have several functions and that almost always, their settings are an integral feature of their importance and ability to fulfil those functions.

For example, mitigation offered to St. Mary's Church, Wendover appears to recognise its use as a concert venue, but fails to recognise the essential qualities of peace and quiet necessary both in, and importantly, outside the Church for its primary purpose as a place of religious sanctuary for daily worship and reflection and for the community in life's rites of passage.

(q) Loss to business and the economy in the Chilterns AONB:

Your Petitioner is concerned that the Proposer has not adequately taken into account the probable losses to businesses and therefore the local economy in the Chilterns which is likely to be caused by the construction and operation of the scheme.

Great Missenden is a small community in Buckinghamshire set in the heart of the Chilterns AONB. This settlement has a range of independent High Street shops heavily dependent upon, not just local shoppers, but on visitors from outside the area. Retailers there expect footfall and trade, including tourism, to be adversely affected by the construction of the scheme and believe that the reputation of the AONB will suffer substantially and may never recover to its present levels.

Specifically, HGVs using the haul road from the Chilterns Tunnel north portal to the A4128/A413 roundabout will cause traffic to back up towards Great Missenden High Street affecting access to the railway station, fire station, schools and other services and businesses. HGVs using the haul road are also a safety hazard to children accessing play equipment and schools. The haul road also has a visual impact on Great Missenden.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that the haul road be re-located.

Your Petitioner finds that no assessment has been made of the possible losses to businesses and to tourism generally in the AONB, which potentially could be significant. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that such an assessment be carried out and that a) the socio-economic effects of the loss of business and tourism be taken into full consideration and that b) the findings be incorporated into the published Benefit Cost Ratio for the scheme and thus given proper consideration by Parliament.

(r) Code of Construction Practice:

Your Petitioner finds the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) inadequate in its requirements and regulations of important aspects of that phase.

There appears to be no scheme to ensure compliance for lead contractors nor establishment of redress and action where there is failure of compliance with the CoCP. Your Petitioner understands that the CoCP does not have legal status, a situation which it believes should be addressed through the Bill.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that the CoCP becomes part of the Bill and that legislation should empower the relevant Local Authority, together with independent experts, to oversee and seek redress where there is failure to comply with the CoCP. Effects should be measured, such as air quality, to ensure that WHO guidelines are implemented where applicable and that contractors are accountable in fulfilling their obligations to the CoCP.
Your Petitioner respectfully requests that explicit haulage routes are adhered to where otherwise historic rural byways would be used and that traffic management plans be agreed through consultation with the relevant Local Authority.

(s) Remedies to reduce impact on the Chilterns AONB:

Your Petitioner believes there are two options which should have received greater consideration in the design of the proposed scheme:

(i) A different route alignment:

A high speed route which is completely outside any AONB or National Park, including that of the Chilterns and which affords optimum national and international connectivity for the UK's major transport corridors. Your Petitioner has frequently called for a new high speed rail route to be part of a properly planned national transport infrastructure for all transport modes. It does not find this to be true for the proposed scheme.

(ii) A fully bored tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB.

Your Petitioner finds that the Proposer has failed to properly take account of a full and proper consideration of the natural capital of the AONB and accordingly the benefits of tunnelling options as superior alternatives to overground rail lines for the Chilterns AONB. Your Petitioner questions whether Government has fulfilled their obligations under the CROW Act 2000 s85 if the Proposer does not conduct such evaluations, as such failure would appear to compromise the intention of that Act in protecting heritage quality landscapes.

Your Petitioner concurs completely with the recommendation of Natural England in its ES report (2.37) that: 'It would seem, therefore, that an extended bored tunnel could provide the most effective means of mitigating the landscape and visual effects on the AONB'.

Your Petitioner contends that the inheritance which the proposed scheme will give for Government will not, as the present provisions of the Bill stand, be as a world-class railway for the benefit of the nation but rather will afford the potential to establish a precedent that the statutory legislation in place to safeguard AONBs and National Parks can be over-ridden, ignored, or minimised at will.

If Government should proceed with the proposed scheme, then the only possible remedy which can afford a semblance of mitigation and demonstrate an attempt to fulfil the obligations of that legislation is a fully bored tunnel throughout the length of the Chilterns AONB.

Your Petitioner respectfully requests that proper consideration with due regard to costs and benefits, including those of a natural character, be given to the rail route being constructed in a fully bored tunnel which extends throughout the length of the Chilterns AONB to the NW of Wendover with the minimum number of surface constructions required for safety.

Your Petitioner believes that a fully bored tunnel would afford an optimum mitigation remedy to most of the concerns which it identifies in this Petition, and indeed, would expect there to be other benefits which it has either not considered in this document, or of which it is unaware.
Further matters:

Your Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above and any further matters relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition, which may arise in due course from discussions, preparation and publication of reports, revisions to proposals or any other matters relevant to our stated concerns, prior to your Petitioner's representation before the House of Lords' Select Committee.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless clauses of the Bill are removed or amended, then the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

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

4. 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........

NAME: Jennifer Walier

Agent for:

The Chiltern Countryside Group

Date 14-4-16
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CHRISTINE MAYLOR

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Christine Maylor, resident at 37 Moor Park, Wendover, HP22 6AX, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in Wendover adjacent to that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner's concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.

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

Your 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 crosses the A 413 almost every day to access the Coombe Hill area and Princes Risborough road and, for all the above reasons, it will be a nightmare. Your Petitioner contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Wendover is known for its beauty and charm, visited by thousands of walkers and tourists in the AONB, who will also have an unwanted birds eye view of the chaos and noise from the highest point in the Chilterns, Coombe Hill. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

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

Hierarchy of Mitigation

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

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

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve 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, includ-
ing boxing in if necessary.
g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportun­
ty 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 substan­
tially 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 substan­
tially 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 qual­
ity and the effect of the construction works, with actions undertak­
en, including cessation of construction in this area, if any adverse im­
pacts 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 as­
pects 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 regard­
ing 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 ass­
sements and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.
3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response given the traffic congestion that will on the main emergency routes.

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

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

[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] 3-4-16.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16
PETITION against the
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill
THE PETITION OF:
Mrs. Keri Brennan & Mr. Terrance Brennan
Mr. Dominic Staveacre & Ms. Caroline E. Selman
Mr. Ross Cluskey & Mrs. Kimberley Cluskey
Ms. Lynne Southworth
Ms. Amanda Fernando & Mr. Drupesh Patel
Mr. Joseph Kirby
Mr. Terrence Greenway & Mrs. Rita Greenway
Mr. David Wells & Jayne Wells
Mr. Robert Jones
Ms. Monica Mardarescu
Mr. Martin Fenner & Mrs. Michele Fenner
Mr. Steve Roberts & Ms. Sue Cowley
Mr. Luke Shirley and Mrs. Ellie Devenish
Mr. Hughie Ballentine & Mrs. Kathleen Ballentine
Mrs. Bridgette Ward
Mr. David Kennedy and Mrs. Frances Kennedy
Mrs. Pauline Powell
Mrs. Rita Look
Mr. Bob Steptoe and Mrs. Lilly Steptoe
Mr. Michael McNamara  
Mr. Maurice Leonard & Mrs. Christine Leonard  
Mrs. Edna Collins

Declares that:

1. The petitioners and their properties would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the whole Bill.

The petitioners

2. The petitioners are the owners of properties in Herlwyn Avenue, Lawn Close, Almond Close and Roundways, which are situated in Ruislip Manor in the London Borough of Hillingdon.

The petitioners' concerns

3. The Bill authorises the construction of a railway tunnel in Ruislip Manor, which will pass near to or directly under the petitioners' respective properties.

4. Clause 4 of the Bill gives the Secretary of State the power to acquire land required for the purpose of Phase One of HS2. Clause 8 of the Bill provides that the power under Clause 4 may be exercised in relation to the sub-soil or under-surface of the land only.

5. The petitioners are concerned about potential structural damage to their properties arising from both the construction of the tunnel and the subsequent operation of a high speed railway and also from ground settlement once the construction works have been completed.

6. The petitioners have been given written notification that their properties fall within the sub-surface safeguarding area and that the sub-soil or under-surface of their properties is to be acquired.

7. The petitioners received a letter from the Secretary of State in November 2012 in which he, inter alia, stated:

"In addition on 25 October we launched a Property and Compensation consultation document setting out a package of proposals designed to reassure the owners of properties above tunnels. The proposals include before and after surveys (paid for by HS2 Ltd) and Settlement Deeds giving a clear, legally binding confirmation that HS2 Ltd (or any future owner of the infrastructure) will be responsible for resolving any settlement or subsidence issues caused by
tunnelling. We are proposing to offer the same help and reassurance to the owners of the properties above or near sub-surface work."

8. The petitioners therefore had a legitimate expectation that, on the basis that their properties would be above a tunnel, that they would be entitled to before and after surveys, paid for by HS2 Ltd, and Settlement Deeds.

9. The Promoter has, since this date, had little or no specific engagement with the petitioners on these issues apart from issuing a C3 Ground Settlement Information Paper, which petitioners were not made aware of, and which has no legal standing and, far from clarifying the position, has further confused the petitioners, leaving them fearful of the effects of the construction works and the passing of the high speed trains on their properties. This uncertainty has also had an adverse impact on the respective values of the petitioners' properties and their ability to sell them should they wish to do so.

The petitioners' requests

10. The petitioners request your right Honourable House to require the Promoter to honour the written commitment which he gave to them, and irrespective of the final depth of the tunnel and the distance of the petitioners' properties from the central point of the tunnel, the petitioners should be entitled to before and after surveys of their properties and be invited to enter into legally binding Settlement Deeds.

11. The petitioners further request your right Honourable House to require the Promoter to provide them with a statement of the methods by which the impacts of the tunnelling is to be monitored before, during and after construction with time frames and locations.

The prayer

12. 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 some or all of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF LIONEL HENRY JUDD

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is resident at Little Coombe Bacombe Lane Wendover Buckinghamshire HP22 6EQ, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in Wendover within that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect

The Petitioner is one of the Trustees of Bacombe Lane a private road owned by and maintained by its residents

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioner as a resident of Wendover and its environs in the Chilterns AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover. Your Petitioner’s property is shown in the Zone of Theoretical Visibility in ES 3.5.1.7.2., and in maps LV-07-036, LV-08-036, LV-07-037 and LV-08-037.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two large and intrusive viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention. The AONB is an area recognized as being of National not just regional/local importance being visited by thousands of people from across the UK and abroad.
Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquility of the area and its beauty. It will severely affect adversely the communities in the area (socially, environmentally, economically) during and for a period after its construction. It will permanently and seriously reduce the ability of residents of the area and the numerous visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the ANOB.

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to him and his wife personally, living within approximately 220 metres of the construction site. These disruptions will arise from the construction of the line including dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. In particular as Bacombe Lane is to be diverted across the field to the North to join Ellesborough Road and the footpath to Wendover across the said field is to be stopped up during the period of construction, the Petitioner and his wife will have a longer journey by car or on foot into Wendover to shop and for other social and recreational purposes.

Your Petitioner contends that the proposed use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously mar the approach and the environment of Wendover, radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Generally your petitioner uses the narrow lanes (including Bacombe Lane as mentioned) and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, community, social and recreational activities, 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 as part of the charm of the ANOB and is worried about proposals to use narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

Your Petitioner requests that an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full AONB tunneling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.2  Your Petitioner accordingly emphasizes that, if the Bill were to be amended to include
the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover as
referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in
paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts
would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the
extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and
implemented

Hierarchy of Mitigation

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover by
boring or mining be adopted, particularly as this 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. If the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved
will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the
Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel
i. That in relation to the balancing ponds, alternative sustainable urban drainage system
techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority and that any ponds
should not be artificially lined.
j. That in relation to the River Misbourne, and water supply, full surveys and continuing
monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the
construction works, with actions undertaken, including cessation of construction in this
area, if any adverse impacts are found
k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
l. That it is specified that for the AONB, the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries designed to be as compatible and as unobtrusive as possible with the AONB environment and which designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and other local concerns for the Area.
m. That the local authorities for areas along the proposed line should be reimbursed and compensated for additional expenditure and losses incurred in relation to their involvement and responsibilities in all aspects of the construction and operation of the proposed line
n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as envisaged and described in, and with the powers and responsibilities as set out in, the amendments to the Bill regarding the same as proposed by Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons
o. That there should be established an independent HS2 Adjudicator with the duties, powers and functions as set out in the amendments regarding the same under the name of Cheryl Gillan and others relating thereto as proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons
p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations

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

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

k. That all of the Promoter's and contractors' vehicles including HGVs and LGVs be clearly marked and identified as involved with HS2 construction with individual numbering and signage for security purposes and to enable the Petitioner and his neighbours in Bacombe Lane be reassured as to the identity of new/strange vehicles in the lane, houses in the lane having been subject to burglaries when the Wendover Bypass was constructed. In the 40 years the Petitioner has lived in Bacombe Lane the only burglaries known to the Petitioner were doing the said construction period.

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.

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

LIONEL HEAVY

[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]
PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION of Valerie Ann Stevenson.

Declares that:
The petitioner (Valerie Ann Stevenson) is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced and is now pending in the House of Lords entitled “A Bill to make provision for a railway between Euston in London and a junction with the West Coast Main Line at Handsacre in Staffordshire, with a spur from Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes”

The Bill is presented by Secretary of State Mr Patrick McLoughlin, supported by the Prime Minister and others.

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.

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

Clauses 43 to 65 of the Bill set out a number of miscellaneous and general provisions, including provision for the appointment of a nominated undertaker ("the Nominated Undertaker") to exercise the powers under the Bill, transfer schemes, provisions relating to statutory undertakers and the Crown, provision about the compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration, reinstatement works and provision about further high speed railway works. Provision is also made about the application of Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.
Your petitioner is a retired art teacher and member of Bucks Art Society aged 73 and is a resident of 23A Little Hampden Close, Wendover HP22 6EH for 24 years, located approx 190 metres from the centre of the line.

Your Petitioner and their interests are injuriously affected by the Bill, during construction and afterwards, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

The Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State and the nominated undertaker to construct a railway line close to the Historic market town of Wendover and through the centre of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with resulting environmental disruption, noise and pollution and which will be visible from a distance of up to 3 kilometres from the line. This peaceful countryside, woodlands and the far reaching views from the rolling hills that surround the area have inspired paintings which hang in national and local galleries, Aylesbury County Museum and private collections. Many art studios, art colleges and artists are sited near the route as they have been attracted to this beautiful part of Buckinghamshire. I would miss the joy of painting outside near Dunsmore, Great Missenden, Wendover, Baccombe Hill and surrounding villages and so will the next generation of artists who so love this area.

Your petitioner objects to the powers that are proposed by the bill and respectfully requests that before construction strategies are finalised and work commences that a fully bored tunnel in accordance with the plan proposed by Bucks County Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council, Chiltern District Council and others is incorporated into the final plan for the construction of the line, and that the Bill should not be permitted to pass into law unless such provision is made.

Mitigation on the form of sound barriers has been proposed, rather than a bored tunnel. A 6 metre tall barrier will run some 650 metres from the bypass to the Small Dean viaduct and additional barriers 4 metres high are proposed on the western side of the London Road and the eastern side of the bypass. The petitioner objects to the proposals for sound barriers which will be monstrously intrusive in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, or someone representing your petitioner in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND your Petitioner will ever pray, &c.

Signed

V. A. STEVENSON

14/5/2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION DF Penelope Helen Miles

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is, Penelope Miles, resident at 91 Grenville Avenue, Wendover, Bucks HP22 6AL, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in Wendover adjacent to that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
Your Petitioner as a resident of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.

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

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your Petitioner contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

Your Petitioner requests that an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full AONB tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented

Hierarchy of Mitigation

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

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

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.

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

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

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the line, and particularly along the A413
b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08:00 and 09:00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.
c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response given the traffic congestion that will on the main emergency routes.
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a timely manner.
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Penelope Helen Miles

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF  

INSERT NAMES HERE

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners are residents of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). They will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

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

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

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

the adverse impact on the local road network causing delays in travelling to work and accessing emergency services; the reduction in customers and other visitors wanting to come to Wendover businesses causing local unemployment; the reduction in property values for owners seeking to realise investments in their homes; and the noise, dirt, and Public Right of Way disruption that will be generated by the works.

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Signed

Ronald Petersen (Agent)

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

[Insert names here]

Mr. Richard Harwood

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners are residents of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). They will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

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

3. Your petitioner's concerns

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

the adverse impact on the local road network causing delays in travelling to work and accessing emergency services; the reduction in customers and other visitors wanting to come to Wendover businesses causing local unemployment; the reduction in property values for owners seeking to realise investments in their homes; and the noise, dirt, and Public Right of Way disruption that will be generated by the works.

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

SIGNED

Ronald Pescott (Agent)

16 APRIL 2016

Richard Harwood.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

Christopher John Pallet

Decls that:

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

2. Your petitioner

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

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

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

The Petitioner has two overriding concerns both during construction and during operation as follows:-

The permanent loss of amenity to citizens of the whole country of the delightful Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty between Wendover and South Heath. The impact would be magnified by the erection of horrendous 6m (20ft) high noise barriers proposed by HS2 to mitigate noise. These barriers are higher than the eaves height of two storey houses. They are similar to the side walls of many industrial buildings. Their construction
would be tantamount to an industrial development slicing through the AONB.

The quality of life of residents close to the line between Wendover and South Heath would be severely affected. It is estimated there are 11,000 of these residents, the majority in Wendover. The impact would occur both during construction and when completed. It would be caused by construction work and traffic, followed by virtually constant trains running at unprecedented speeds. This would be coupled with the visual impact of the viaducts and noise barriers.

The Petitioner proposes a fully bored tunnel from 200m to the north of Bridleways in Wendover to the proposed tunnel at South Heath. This would save the AONB and the charming town of Wendover. Much of its cost should be offset by reduced compensation, road and pylon amendments, viaducts and hydrogeological works.

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 remain etc.

Signed

Christopher John Pallet

15th April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

Christopher John Pallet

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioner owns the freehold of two commercial properties in Wendover High Street being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). He will be specially and directly affected by the reduced value of these properties by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

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

3. Your petitioner's concerns

The Commercial properties owned by the petitioner are

a) 1 High Street on the south eastern side of the High Street and
b) 8 High Street on the north western side of the High Street.

1 High Street is a shop with self-contained flat over. The tenant trades as a gift shop.

8 High Street comprises two shops at ground level with offices above. These shops are let as a Barbers and an Estate Agent. The offices are partly let to individuals and your Petitioner uses part for his firm of Chartered Surveyors. Your Petitioner owned property a) for 30 years with others until he purchased his partners' interest four years ago.
Property b) has been owned by your Petitioner for forty years. As a prudent self-employed person your Petitioner made these purchasers to provide a pension income in due course. Your Petitioner is now 73 and is relying on the rents for much of his income. Properties a) and b) are both 550 metres from the portal of the proposed green tunnel at Baccombe Lane. Your Petitioner will be directly and specifically affected by the operation and during construction of the works due to the noise, visual effect, congestion and affect on tourism because these factors will serve to lower commercial rental value with the direct effect on your Petitioner’s income and consequently the capital values on his properties.

Your Petitioner is qualified to comment on valuation matters being a general practice Chartered Surveyor with direct experience in valuing commercial and residential properties in Wendover on a continual basis since 1967. From 1973 until 2013 your Petitioner owned a Firm of Chartered Surveyors and Estate Agents and still carries out commercial and professional work from the first floor offices at 8 High Street. Wendover has attracted a mix of traders and private dwelling purchasers many with wide experience of running things and as result there is a large range of societies and activities and your Petitioner has deep concerns that the operation of HS2 will result in a loss of the appeal of the town to this type of involved resident. The expected loss of occupiers in relatively high priced work will reduce the turnover of the shops and hence the rental and capital values of your Petitioner’s properties. It is an interesting fact that Wendover has traditionally commanded a premium over adjoining villages of approximately 10% in property prices. This is likely to be lost with the reduction of appeal of the village.

Many of the shops in Wendover including the gift shop in your Petitioner’s property 1 High Street benefit from tourism but also destination shopping from local towns with buyers attracted to the experience of a trip to an attractive historic town with some interesting shops. The majority of these people radiate outwards from close to London but the number will doubtless diminish if visitors are confronted with a massive viaduct and 6m high industrial scale noise barriers dominating the entrance to the village as currently planned. The noise level will further deter visitors. Fewer customers will result in less viability to traders and consequently lower rental values or worse the demise of traders and empty units all with direct effect on your Petitioner’s retirement income.

The House of Commons Select Committee indicated that loss of value to commercial property holders would be covered by compensation. Can your Petitioner emphasise that there is no provision as far as he can establish in the Lands Compensation Acts for compensation for injurious affection to commercial property. Therefore the scheme will have a direct and significant loss on the Petitioner’s livelihood.

Your Petitioner considers that a fully bored tunnel commencing 200m to the north of Bridleways in Wendover running to the proposed tunnel at South Heath would prevent the construction of the AONB and prevent the loss of rental and capital values to the commercial properties in Wendover.
5 The Prayer

The Petitioner therefore asked 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

Christopher John Pallet FRICS

15th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Michael Alan Payne and Jean Angela Payne

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners

Your Petitioners, Michael Alan Payne and Jean Angela Payne have owned and lived at Court Leys, South Street, Wendover, HP22 6EF for the past 30 years. Michael is aged 68 years and Jean 66 years, both of whom are retired.

The Bill would authorize the construction and operation of the railway through and near Wendover. According to the Environmental Statement Volume 2 Community Forum Area Report CFA10 for Dunsmore, Wendover and Halton, the proposed Wendover green tunnel construction (north & south) will start in 2017 and finish in 2020. In addition to the excavation period, worker compounds and the traffic associated with it will continue until 2025. These proposed workings at their nearest point are within 125 metres of your Petitioner's property.

Your Petitioner’s main objective is to persuade your Honourable Lords to lower the line into a fully-bored tunnel as it passes through Wendover.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

Mitigation for construction of a fully-bored tunnel

   If a fully-bored tunnel is included in the Bill, your Petitioners propose that at least the following mitigation be adopted for its construction:

4. That the operation of construction traffic on the A413 and the B4009 only be permitted during the agreed working hours, excluding rush hour (7-9am and 5-7pm) on weekdays.

5. That the number of construction vehicles using local roads is limited, and at all times be such as not to inconvenience other road users.
6. That the removed spoil should not be permitted to be dumped in the Chilterns AONB, and that all spoil should be removed by rail, not road.

7. That a traffic management plan be agreed before construction starts with the local county, district and parish councils, such plan to go to arbitration if agreement cannot be reached.

8. That the permitted working hours for all matters relating to construction be strictly limited to 8am to 6pm on weekdays, 8am to 1pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays, with an hour before and after for start-up and close down.

9. That acceptable noise levels be agreed before construction starts with the local county, district and parish councils, such noise levels to go to arbitration if agreement cannot be reached.

10. That noise levels be monitored on a frequent and regular basis by an independent organisation, with the result of such monitoring be immediately made public.

11. That artificial lighting at construction areas is limited to working hours.

12. That the maximum level of toxic traffic emissions from construction traffic be agreed before construction starts with the local county, district and parish councils, such emission level to go to arbitration if agreement cannot be reached.

13. That funding be made available to Wendover Health Centre and local hospitals for the provision of any necessary additional facilities to cope with increased health problems, such as sleep disturbance, respiratory illness and hypertension, and including those caused by traffic emissions and dust created by the construction of the scheduled works.

14. That funding is made available to the local police force for increased staffing likely to be required due to the advent of a substantial construction workforce.

15. That full compensation for damage to property or loss in property value caused by construction of the scheduled works be available to all those who suffer such loss.

16. That the maintenance loop at present proposed to be located to the north of Wendover be moved to an area where there are much larger permanent works scheduled.

17. That the Code of Construction Practice, and regulations and agreements dealing with all the above matters in paragraphs 4 to 14, 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.

Mitigation for construction of the present proposal

18. However, if the proposal for a fully-bored tunnel is rejected your Petitioners propose the following mitigation:-
19. That the existing proposed green tunnel be extended to the south and north of Wendover.

20. That the mitigation proposed in paragraphs 4 to 16 above be adopted.

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.

Michael Alan Payne

Jean Angela Payne

Date: 14th April 2016
The petitioners (‘Your Petitioners’) are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioners

The petitioners are Peter James Larkham and Jane Anne Larkham, resident at 7 Mill Mead, Wendover HP22 6BY in the Parish of Wendover, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion of the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioners are joint householders in Wendover, which is on the Northern edge of that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly adversely affect, and will itself be adversely and seriously affected during both construction and operational phases, by lorry movements, noise, congestion, dirt, dust, and eventually the frequent operation of very fast trains which by the laws of Physics will be noisy.

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

3. Your Petitioners’ concerns

3.1. Adverse and serious effect on your Petitioners

Your Petitioners as residents of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB are concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover, which dates from the 15th century or earlier, and its population of some 7000.

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in deep and wide cuttings or on high embankments (necessitated by having to adapt the undulating Chiltern Hills to the needs of potentially the fastest train in the world, which requires very straight and very level track) and on two large and intrusive viaducts, all of which will require huge excavation and movement of spoil. 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, for the enjoyment of your Petitioners', and later, generations.

Your Petitioners contend that building HS2 on the surface in this section will permanently destroy the tranquility of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, which they and over 50 million visitors per year from London and other areas, and have severe adverse effects on the reputation, social, environmental and economic cohesion of the communities in the area during and for a period after its construction.

Your Petitioners will suffer severe disruption and loss of amenity 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 5-10 years.

Your Petitioners contend that the use of a 6 metre high sound barrier between half and three-quarters of a mile in length at the Southern and more attractive entrance to the village will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and its Southern surroundings in the AONB and have a negative commercial effect. Your Petitioners will be affected by the widening or stopping (temporarily and permanently) of various footpaths, narrow lanes and roads for access and construction, some of which will not be restored to their original condition, thereby losing forever these characteristic features of the area. Since the huge amounts of spoil will not be removed by rail, your Petitioners will be adversely affected by the thousands of lorry movements on the roads, including the two-lane A413 which is most certainly not the “transport corridor” as described by the Lord Adonis.

3.2 Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

Your Petitioners request that, to further protect the Chilterns AONB, the bored tunnel presently proposed as far as South Heath is projected to beyond the North of Wendover, 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.

Your Petitioners are aware that the priority for building the line is now capacity rather than savings of time, so that the slower speed sustainable in a tunnel is no longer a consideration and therefore neither is the length of the tunnel on operational grounds.

Your Petitioners note that these proposals for an extended tunnel have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and accepted by DfT and HS2 Ltd as both feasible and environmentally preferable; that this proposal has been extensively discussed with local councils and action groups and within the local area forums; and that it is supported by them.
Your Petitioners contend that 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; and further contend that by saving the
cost of these redundant measures, including the “green tunnel” past Wendover, the long
soundproof barrier and two viaducts, the differential cost of extending the bored tunnel
would be much reduced.

Your Petitioners also note that some £700 million was spent on environmental grounds on
a bored tunnel to take the A3 road under the Devil’s Punchbowl AONB on the
Surrey/Hampshire border, and contend that the Chilterns AONB and the town of
Wendover should be protected in the same way and for the same reasons.

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

3.3 Hierarchy of Mitigation

Your Petitioners accordingly emphasise that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the
provision of a fully bored or mined tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover
as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out below
would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively
mitigated, your Petitioners request that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the
following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

a. That further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath to 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 (without prejudice to the “green tunnel”
already agreed for Wendover), 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, the linking embankment and the long intrusive and
inappropriate (in an AONB) 6-metre high soundproof wall to the South of
the village, and also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage
and solve potential hydrogeological problems
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there are established
rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not
only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve 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 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 point 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.

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 JAMES LARKHAM

JANE ANNE LARKHAM

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

PETITON against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

[INSERT NAMES HERE]

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners are residents of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). They will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

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

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

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

the adverse impact on the local road network causing delays in travelling to work and accessing emergency services; the reduction in customers and other visitors wanting to come to Wendover businesses causing local unemployment; the reduction in property values for owners seeking to realise investments in their homes; and the noise, dirt, and Public Right of Way disruption that will be generated by the works.

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Signed

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

INSERT NAMES HERE

MARY STERK

Declarations that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners are residents of Wendover Parish, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). They will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

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

3. Your petitioner's concerns

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

the adverse impact on the local road network causing delays in travelling to work and accessing emergency services; the reduction in customers and other visitors wanting to come to Wendover businesses causing local unemployment; the reduction in property values for owners seeking to realise investments in their homes; and the noise, dirt, and Public Right of Way disruption that will be generated by the works.

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

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

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

SIGNED

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London -- West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF [Ronald & Ursula Drackford]  

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

2. Your petitioner’s  

Your Petitioners, Ronald & Ursula Drackford, 3 Witchell, Wendover, Buckinghamshire HP22 6EG who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner’s lives in Wendover adjacent to that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.  

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  

Your Petitioner’s as residents of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.  

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

Your petitioner’s are 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’s contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A 413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner’s 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’s 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 Petitioner’s 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 Petitioner's accordingly emphasizes that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented.

Hierarchy of Mitigation

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

b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with improved mitigation and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 meters 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 Balcombe 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 Organization 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 minimized and that arrangements are made for the spoil to be removed from the area by rail or pipeline. Your Petitioner points out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for
this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M 25 end of the tunnel.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

a. Restricting HGV daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 15:30 throughout this section of the line, and particularly along the A413
b. Additionally prohibiting HGV movements to and along the A413 during busy traffic periods and along school routes between 08.00 and 09.00 and between 15:00 and 15:30 during school terms.
c. Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
d. Constructing new roads for the contractors and vehicles to access the trace directly from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane and prohibiting the use of all existing narrow minor roads in the AONB by construction traffic.
e. That the Promoter and the contractors should be required to construct the railway to ensure that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust and vibration is minimised to meet the highest standards applicable and controlled and that air quality is maintained
f. Constructing such facilities as may be necessary to remove spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to apply proper methods of dealing with spoil and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green.
g. That contractors in the AONB will be required to restore the land and temporary access roads after use to acceptable AONB landscaping and that local authorities be given the power to inspect such works and if necessary sanction contractors. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.
h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response given the traffic congestion that will on the main emergency routes.
i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a timely manner.
4 The prayer

The petitioner's 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's remains, etc.

/R. A. DRACIFORD  
URSULA F. DRACIFORD

[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]  31 Oct 2016
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF DUDLEY HUGH PAGE

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

2. Your petitioner
   Your Petitioner is Dudley Hugh Page of Old Fields 158 Aylesbury Road Wendover Bucks HP22 6AP who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in Wendover adjacent to that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

   3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB
   Your Petitioner as a resident of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.

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

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your Petitioner contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

Your Petitioner requests that an independent assessment of cost including in respect of full AONB tunnelling and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken in relation to the AONB area before any construction works commence in this area.
3.2. Your Petitioner accordingly emphasises that, if the Bill were to be amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB to the North of Wendover as referred to in paragraph 3.1 above, then, whilst the mitigation measures set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 below would, in large measure, be unnecessary and their impacts would be otherwise effectively mitigated, your Petitioner requests that, except to the extent met by any such provision, the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented:

Hierarchy of Mitigation

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

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

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best avail-
able 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.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a timely manner.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

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

DUDLEY HUGH PAGE

10TH APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

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

THE PETITION OF PATRICIA RILEY-PAGE  

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

2. Your petitioner  
Your Petitioner is Patricia Riley-Page of Old Fields 158 Aylesbury Road Wendover  
Bucks HP22 6AP who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in Wendover adjacent to that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect  

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

3. Your Petitioner's concerns  

3.1. Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB  
Your Petitioner as a resident of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB is concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.  

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

Your petitioner contends that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect.

Your petitioner 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 has to use the local main roads to fetch and carry her grandchildren to school play school and nursery and is concerned they may be distressed if she is unable to reach them in time because of heavy traffic jams. Your petitioner is also carer for her elderly husband who frequently has to attend local hospitals, GP surgery and such like fairly urgently.

Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioner further regards this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and is also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

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

Hierarchy of Mitigation

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

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

c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.

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

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

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of the highest quality design and the infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.
g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

p. That arrangements should be made for independent local Valuers to be appointed to advise the Promoter in relation to compensation assessments and Need to Sell Scheme and other property valuations.
3.3 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by giving the Code of Construction Practice legal effect with independent assessment of compliance and sanctions for breach of the Code. In addition your Petitioner requests that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response given the traffic congestion that will on the main emergency routes.

i. That appropriate arrangements be made and put in place, including for the Promoter of the Bill to provide or secure the provision of the necessary additional finance, to enable the local police forces to increase policing and to put in place other protective arrangements in order to reduce the risk of crime in the area during construction.
j. A hotline should be set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction and in particular for road users to report any damage to the roads, and the local and highway authorities should have access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a timely manner.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

PATRICIA RILEY-PAGE

10TH APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF JOHN and JOSEPHINE HINTON  

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

2. Your petitioners  
Your Petitioners are, John and Josephine Hinton, resident at 19, Pound Street, Wendover, Bucks. HP22 6EJ, 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  
Your Petitioners as residents of Wendover and its environs in the Chiltern AONB are concerned about the serious and injurious effect of the currently intended proposals regarding this part of the AONB and on the town of Wendover.  

In this respect, between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the Proposed Route is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, and on two large and intrusive viaducts and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section B5 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW
Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.

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

Your petitioners are also seriously concerned about the disruptions to their household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your Petitioners contend that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover and radically alter the character of the town and have a negative commercial effect. Your petitioners need to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. Your petitioners further regard this network of narrow lanes in the AONB as a characteristic feature of the area and are also concerned about proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access to the trace and to and from the A413 and elsewhere.

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

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

Hierarchy of Mitigation

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover by boring or mining be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.
b. That, if that is not accepted, then the line along this section of the track be housed within deeper cuttings, with improved mitigation and bunds, where appropriate, to seek to reduce noise and to conceal the line and the gantries and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is excluded for the AONB section of the line.
c. That the existing proposed green tunnel at Wendover be replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the south and north of Wendover to remove the need for 2 viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.
d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there is established rights of way, including making these Green Bridges, bearing in mind not only the need to retain trees and shrubs but also the need to preserve wild life access, particularly given that this is part of the AONB.
e. That the speed of the trains be reduced as per the recommendation of the House of Commons Environmental Audit Select Committee Report in order to help reduce the environmental impact and sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.
f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of the highest quality design and the infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible, with enclosures where possible and with the maximum use of noise barriers on both sides, including boxing in if necessary.
g. That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow to at least forty feet high,
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 point out that, if the full tunnel proposals are adopted, then the amount of spoil involved for this section of the line will be substantially reduced and it could also be removed, including by rail, at the Wendover exit of the tunnel, or, if bored one way, from the M25 end of the tunnel.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that your petitioner, 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.

John Hinton  Josephine Hinton

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Roger William Waller  
Declares that:  

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

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

Your Petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, stated in this petition.  

3. Background  

Your petitioner is a freehold owner of “The Outlook” and has lived in Dunsmore since 1983. Dunsmore is the highest settlement in The Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AoNB) located some 800ft above sea level. Dunsmore experiences high levels of tranquility and exceptionally low levels of light pollution. The settlement has no mains drainage, no mains gas supply and fortunately no street lighting. It is approached only by a steep single track road which runs from either the A413 to the East and the Rignall Road to the West. Dunsmore has a large number of ProW running through it and attracts walkers, horse riders and cyclists as it is located on The Chiltern Cycle Way. The Ridgeway long distance footpath runs just to the West of the settlement attracting many walkers. Many of the paths and tracks run along the ridge on which Dunsmore is situated, giving far reaching views across and along the Misbourne Valley through which it is proposed to run the HS2 line on two viaducts and an embankment.  

4. Your Petitioner will be seriously and adversely affected during both the construction phase and then during operation.
5. Problems caused by the Construction Phase:-

There will be serious disruption of traffic and substantial delays caused by the additional 300 HGV's envisaged by HS2Ltd using the A413, B4009 and the A41. The proposed closure of Smalldene Lane will mean that all vehicles will have to use the Dunsmore Lane junction with the A413, this junction was not given special analysis by HS2Ltd during the Environmental Statement despite comments that the traffic flows asserted by them are completely wrong.

The congestion will have a detrimental effect on the delivery of Emergency Services to Dunsmore and will impact on the journey times to the Health Care facilities located in Wendover. Assuming the shops in Wendover will survive the inevitable loss of trade the construction will bring, then even daily visits will become a more onerous task with the increase in journey time resultant on the congestion caused.

The location of Dunsmore on the ridge crest overlooking The Misbourne Valley means that the views to the East which are currently a protected landscape under Section 85 of the CROW Act 2000 will be lost for ever. Your Petitioner has for years walked the tracks and paths around Dunsmore, this recreation will become totally unenjoyable as the views will be of cranes and construction as shown in the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) maps in the Environmental Statement issued by HS2Ltd. The proven beneficial health effects of walking will be negated by the reluctance to walk alongside and overlooking such a gargantuan construction site.

The chalk dust from the construction will be of great nuisance when we have Easterly winds and it is inconceivable that the whole construction area can be kept damp to prevent the dust travelling large distances from the site.

Your Petitioner objects to the use of a so called "sustainable placement" in the AONB at Hunts Green Farm across the valley from Dunsmore. Such placement will have negative visual impacts and change the character of the area.

Your Petitioner objects to the use of balancing ponds in The Chiltern AONB as these once again will drastically alter the unique character of the area.
As mentioned above Dunsmore is an area relatively free from light pollution and the need for powerful lighting on the construction site and the construction camps will have a deleterious effect on the "dark skies" currently enjoyed in the settlement.

6. Problems caused during operation of HS2:-

Your Petitioner asserts that the operation of HS2, following the completion of the proposed scheduled works, would have the following permanent effects:

Your Petitioners view of The Chilterns AONB would be permanently scarred by the construction of two viaducts and an embankment with heights ranging from 10 to 18 metres and the associated catanery on top of that. The line would be visible from numerous viewpoints around Dunsmore and from your Petitioners own property. The cumulative effect would be overpowering and would destroy what is a protected landscape.

The effect of trains up to 400 metres long running at least every 2 minutes will totally destroy the tranquillity of Dunsmore and its environs. As mentioned above Dunsmore enjoys relatively high levels of tranquillity and it is a regret that despite requests to HS2Ltd they chose 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 noise from these trains will cause an intolerable strain upon your Petitioner's life and his sleep. Currently when working in the garden the noisiest feature is a blackbird singing at the end of the garden where your Petitioner spends a great deal of time. During operation the noise will be every 2 minutes and will vary according to the trains position either on a viaduct of 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 value of your Petitioner's house has already been adversely affected due to the plan to construct HS2, this will only increase during the construction when it will be unsaleable.
The maxim of, Avoidance followed by Mitigation and if not possible then Compensation should have been adopted by HS2. In the view of your Petitioner they have done none of these in their current plans.

Remedial Measures:-

HS2 Ltd have attended bi-lateral meetings with The Dunsmore Society and residents. Residents have also attended the CFA 10 meetings. At these meetings it was made clear to HS2 Ltd that the only mitigation to protect the AoNB in this area and for the residents of Dunsmore was to lower the line into a fully bored tunnel to run to a position North of Wendover. This HS2 Ltd have admitted in the Environmental Statement is technically possible but rejected on cost grounds, despite being very reluctant to discuss costings citing “Commercial Sensitivity”. This does not seem to make sense as until the Royal Assent is obtained, no contracts can be awarded unless huge penalty clauses are in place.

At the bi-lateral meetings Dunsmore residents made it clear that if the option of the fully bored tunnel were not to be enacted then in order to protect both the AoNB and the settlement of Dunsmore, a fully enclosed structure similar to the Arup concept enclosure was required on the 2 viaducts and on the embankment to ensure people would neither see nor hear the trains. This proposal is discussed and dismissed by HS2 Ltd in the Environmental Statement.

It would appear that whilst the Southern section of the AoNB has received tunnelling by way of mitigation this protection has been denied to the Northern section.

If this proposal is to proceed as a world class railway then the mitigation should be of a world class standard as well. If The Chiltern AoNB were to be tunnelled throughout, HS2 Ltd would have a whole range of routing options that is denied to them using the surface routing.

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 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 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.

Signed

Roger William Waller

16th April 2016