To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Fredric von Oppenheim, Baroness Marie-Rose von Oppenheim and Kimberley Ltd.

Declares that:

1 The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Schedule 1: Scheduled Works 2/14 and 2/24-2/27 of the Bill.

2 Your petitioner

The petitioners are Fredric von Oppenheim and Baroness Marie-Rose von Oppenheim of Boswells Farm, Wendover, HP22 6PJ and Kimberley Ltd, c/o Trafalgar Court, St. Peter Port, Guernsey, GY1 2JA. Kimberley Ltd is the freehold owner of Boswells Farm, Baroness Marie-Rose von Oppenheim is the freehold owner of Hartley Farm and Fredric von Oppenheim is the tenant farmer of both Boswells Farm and Hartley Farm. Fredric von Oppenheim and Marie-Rose von Oppenheim live at Boswells Farm.

3 Your petitioner’s concerns

3.1 Your Petitioners’ property is within the limits of the land to be acquired and used as shown on the plans deposited by the Bill and parts of the property are therefore liable to be compulsorily acquired. 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.

3.2 Your Petitioners have sought to participate in previous stages of the HS2 process, having submitted consultation responses to the Environmental Statement that accompanied the Bill, attended a meeting with representatives of HS2 Limited on 4 February 2014 and presented a previous petition to the Commons Select Committee which considered the Bill.

3.3 The works to be carried out in the vicinity of Boswells Farm are shown on Sheet 2-31 of Volume 2.1 of the deposited plans which accompany the Bill and include Scheduled Works 2/14 and 2/24-2/27. These works include the acquisition of part of your Petitioners’ property for the construction of the Small Dean Viaduct Satellite Compound, the Small Dean Viaduct and the Rocky Lane Underbridge. The proposed works will also cut across your Petitioners’ drive which provides the principal access to their home, farmland and five cottages. The Bill will therefore have a serious effect on your Petitioners.

Effects on the AONB and Ridgeway Path

3.4 Objection is first and foremost taken to the works proposed to be undertaken in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (“AONB”) and close to the nationally important Ridgeway Path which runs through your Petitioners’ property. These works include the building of the railway line, the construction of tunnels, cutting, viaducts and access roads, the diversion of existing roads, the removal of woodland and the
demolition of listed buildings.

3.5 The Chilterns AONB includes a wide range of ancient woodland sites (some of which are over 400 years old), ancient monuments and diverse wildlife. The route as set out in the Bill passes through the widest part of the Chilterns including some of the most remote and unspoilt parts of the area. The proximity of the Chilterns to London means that they are among the most visited areas in the UK and are used for walking, cycling and horse riding. They are therefore a vital resource for the capital.

3.6 Although the Chilterns AONB is the only AONB through which the proposed route of HS2 passes, allowing such a significant piece of infrastructure to blight the landscape of the AONB without adequate mitigation would set a dangerous precedent for the protection of other AONBs across the country.

3.7 Your Petitioners support the petition made by Conserve the Chilterns and Countryside ("CCC") regarding the damage that will be caused to the AONB by the Bill. In particular, your Petitioners are concerned about the effect of the construction and operation of HS2 on the landscape, ecology, economy and cultural heritage of the Chilterns AONB as well as the noise, traffic and segregation of the local area which will arise.

Direct effects on your Petitioners' property

Landscape and visual impact

3.8 Boswells Farm is a rural estate of historical significance, the former home of Sir Thomas Barlow, Queen Victoria's physician and his wife the grand-daughter of Charles Darwin. The estate is centred around Boswells farm house, which is some 550 metres from the proposed line and 450 metres from the edge of the construction boundaries as designated by the Bill. The estate includes a substantial agricultural business and plays an important part in the socio-economic fabric of the Chilterns AONB and provides local employment for three employees who work on the farm. The main driveway to the estate is formed as an avenue of mature beech trees and is of local and national recognition. The Ridgeway Path, a right of way of national importance, runs through Boswells Farm along a route close to the line and the working boundaries. Users of the path will also be exposed to both the works and the finished line with little or no suitable mitigation measures to limit its impact.

3.9 The viaduct will cross the main entrance to the property opening up a view of the viaduct, which will be a significant visual intrusion into an otherwise rural landscape of the AONB. The western end of the driveway and thus the main access to the property, will be severely affected.

3.10 During the operational phase of HS2 the current proposals forming part of the Environmental Statement (but not guaranteed by the provisions of the Bill) show limited landscaping mitigation planting, presumably seeking to screen the view of the embankment and balancing pond that will be constructed. Your Petitioners submit that the proposed landscaping, which simply seems to consist of replacing the trees removed during construction, is completely inadequate for screening the proposed scheme. The proposed single line of hedgerows, which will provide an ecological corridor, will also obviously not be adequate to screen the trains passing as well as a 10 metre high embankment.

3.11 Your Petitioners argue that there is no detailed indication of what mitigation is to be provided (for example planting detail or cross-section), no certainty provided in the Bill that the mitigation will actually be provided and it appears to your Petitioners that such
mitigation will in any event be wholly inadequate. It will not satisfactorily compensate for the loss of amenity resulting from the removal of trees and the construction of the line on the embankment and Small Dean viaduct across the avenue leading to Boswells Farm.

**Agriculture, forestry and soils**

3.12 Your Petitioner Fredric von Oppenheim is the agricultural tenant of Boswells Farm and Hartley Farm which operates as a commercial farming business. This business will be significantly affected by the Bill, under which approximately 17 hectares (c. 42 acres) of agricultural land will be acquired. The whole of Hartley Farm land, which extends to 23.54 hectares (58.17 acres), will be unusable throughout the duration of the construction period and the limitations on access created by the proposals will mean that the retained land at Hartley Farm will have restricted access thereafter. The impact will be to remove 5% and 10% of the farmable area of the estate. Parts of the farm will be “land locked”. This will inevitably affect the farm’s viability and impact on staff numbers. The proximity of the Works will affect the ability to move around the holding freely during the period of the works.

**Noise and vibration**

3.13 The documents accompanying the Bill show that your Petitioners’ home at Boswells Farm will be subject to “major adverse” noise effects from the operation of HS2 of over 10dB. The plans accompanying the Bill show that there is a noise barrier proposed for the Rocky Lane Bridge but this stops approximately 220 metres north of the Bridge. There are then no further noise mitigation measures over a further 660 metres of the viaduct. Furthermore, no assurances have been given that the limited noise barriers proposed will be effectively maintained in perpetuity.

3.14 Your Petitioners are also concerned about the noise effects at Wellhead Farm, part of Boswells Farm. Your Petitioners are not aware of any mitigation proposed for noise effects at Wellhead Farm.

**Traffic and transport**

3.15 The existing tree-lined avenue leading into Boswells Farm will be directly underneath the Small Dean viaduct. The proposed works to the entrance onto the A413, presumably to avoid structural supports and possibly resolve visibility splay requirements, is not justified or defined in any detail and therefore the impacts are not adequately defined.

**Water resources and flood risk**

3.16 Your Petitioners are concerned to understand the implications for their land of the balancing pond which is proposed to the North of the Small Dean viaduct. The plans provide very little information and therefore your Petitioners have not been able to assess any effects that this may have on existing drainage at their property. Your Petitioners are also concerned that changes to the water table may affect the trees on their land.

**Construction**

3.17 Your Petitioners are very concerned about the location of the Small Dean Viaduct Launch Satellite Compound on their land and the Small Dean Main Compound on the land close to their Property. The draft Code of Construction Practice does not provide enough information to allow your Petitioners to assess the disruption which will occur as a result of these compounds, however it will no doubt be significant given the dust,
noise, light pollution and influx of plant, machinery and resident workers which will be inevitable.

Mitigation

3.18 Your Petitioners submit that the only acceptable form of mitigation to the issues outlined above is a CONTINUOUS TUNNEL under the Chilterns AONB.

3.19 Your Petitioners are concerned that HS2 Limited has not produced any detailed costings to justify its contention (made to the Commons Select Committee) that a CONTINUOUS TUNNEL is prohibitively more expensive than their current proposals.

3.20 In the absence of a CONTINUOUS TUNNEL your Petitioners conclude that the harmful effects of the works described in paragraph 3.4 to 3.17 above cannot adequately be mitigated. The following mitigation would be required as an absolute minimum:

(a) Your Petitioners believe that further bunding for the purposes of visual and noise mitigation should be constructed at the Promoter's cost on the land within their ownership, situated between the route of the line and Boswells farm house. This bunding could be further landscaped with appropriate planting to be compatible with the immediate surroundings and also to maintain the setting of Boswells farm house. The materials for such bunding could be re-directed from Hunts Green Farm in the Lee on which it is proposed to deposit significant quantities of material.

(b) The partial noise fencing proposed for the Small Dean Viaduct should be extended along the whole route to the Rocky Lane Underbridge. The existing noise models recognise the major adverse impact on Boswells farm house but have not properly allowed for the significance of the property nor the other dwellings on the estate – all of which are similarly affected.

(c) Provision must be made to prevent the construction of the Small Dean Viaduct necessitating the realignment of your Petitioners' farm access track. In particular, a temporary access road from an alternative location to Boswells Farm should be provided at least while construction of the viaduct is carried out.

3.21 Your Petitioners have had the benefit of a letter of assurance from HS2 Limited dated 24 November 2015 providing assurances in relation to a number of detailed issues of concern. The assurances do not fully address the issues referred to in this petition and, if a CONTINUOUS TUNNEL is not adopted, then the mitigation listed in paragraph 3.20 will be required notwithstanding the letter of assurance.

3.22 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, Schedule 1: Scheduled Works 2/14 and 2/24-2/27, so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.
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 remains, etc.

Simon Ricketts
King & Wood Mallesons, Agent for the petitioners
April 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF THE IVERS COMMUNITY GROUP

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Additional Provision 4 (October 2015)

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is The Ivers Community Group, which has regard for the quality of life for its residents.

The communities of The Ivers are located within the Colne Valley Park at the narrowest part of the Green-belt between Slough to the west and the London Borough of Hillingdon to the east. The Ivers Community Group represents a cross-section of 1700 individuals aged from 18 to 80 years, it crosses all cultural groups and genders and includes people from all walks of life that have decided to settle in the ‘Doomsday Book’-mentioned Ivers for the semi-rural tranquillity that the area afforded with the added bonus of close proximity to communications routes and workplaces as far afield as the Midlands, London, Heathrow, and all major conurbations in the Home Counties.

Of recent years the area has become a victim of it’s proximity to essential locations for distribution companies and hauliers and currently experiences in excess of 1000 HGV movements per day on roads built hundreds of years ago that remain as they were in stature due to the number of homes that closely adjoin the primary routes. Many of these homes are already suffering greatly due to HGV traffic with respect to cracks, erosion by vehicle pollution and noise. These roads have been widened as much as possible to accommodate the traffic levels but the knock-on effect has been the substantial narrowing of pavements to widths as low as 0.75m in some cases and where two HGVs are still unable to pass each other without one or both mounting said narrow pavements.

The proposed construction works are estimated to take 2 years to complete and will include 500 extra HGV movements each day, all of which will travel on the narrow local roads through the communities and create congestion, dust, noise, a danger to residents using narrow footpaths and even poorer air quality.

This will create severe impacts for those living on or close to the roads to be used as access routes for the construction sites, dramatically affecting their quality of life. The residents of the canal house boats and the caravan sites are those who live the closest of all to the depot and its associated works and will be those most affected both during construction and operation.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Although your petitioner has given evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee, there are matters which still cause your petitioner great concern.

Construction HGV haul route
Your petitioner asks that the detail of the west bound haul route be made available to the local community; in particular the impact of this and its construction on the residents of the canal houseboats and caravan sites, as the majority of the HGVs will now use this route. The route will cross Hollow Hill Lane, causing disruption to the traffic flow on this widely used north / south connecting route. The Promoter is asked to provide the detail of the impact of this on the traffic on the roads on alternative routes, particularly where these will already be carrying large numbers of HGVs.

Mitigation for Local Impact.

The route for 350 HGVs a day from the construction work will now be directed via the western end of the construction site to the road network on Station Road Langley in Slough. These will then turn north and within 130m enter the Parish of Iver travelling along Langley Park Road to the roundabout where they will join the 75 HGVs a day that will exit via the east of the constructions site and travel north via Iver village. The combined figure of 425 HGVs a day will then travel through the village of Iver Heath to reach the motorway network.

The impact of the HGVs on the residents of Iver will be severe and your petitioner therefore requests that in light of the potential impacts on the Parish and taking into account the other developments in the area, the Promoter should provide funding for potential improvements to the public realm in the Parish of Iver as it has done in Langley.

Access to the Community and Environment Fund.

Given that the Heathrow Express Depot is not on the HS2 route, it is not clear whether our local community can gain access to the Community and Environment Fund. The criteria for applications to such funds include that the community is ‘en route’. For the purposes of eligibility to apply for these funds and other assurances that have been given, your petitioner asks that the Promoter expressly details that the Heathrow Express depot and its associated tracks are entirely part of the HS2 project and included in any reference to the route.

Community Engagement

Your petitioner is disappointed that there has been no community engagement with our local communities at all to date. Thus it was not possible for the community to have any input into the development of any of the proposals, unlike the situation elsewhere along the route. We ask that this situation is rectified as soon as possible.

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that this Community 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.

Signed

Print  SARAH PUDDIFOOT
On behalf of The Ivers Community Group

Signed

Print

Councillor Paul Griffin

Agent

Date 17/04/16
PETITION against the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF June Green

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner is June Green of The Chestnuts Glebe farm, Turweston. The Bill would authorise the compulsory acquisition of over 20% of the land owned by your petitioner, to which I object. Furthermore, my house and the rest of the farm will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, and your petitioners accordingly object thereto for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development at Turweston and around Brackley will harm the peaceful enjoyment of my home and poses a risk to the commercial activities undertaken at Glebe Farm. The current plans for HS2 mean activities will be significantly disrupted due to years of severe congestion around Brackley.

4. Noise and dust will be generated by both preparatory works and construction works in addition to that noise generated by the use of both light and heavy goods vehicles for the movement of people, materials and spoil into and from construction sites. During the operational phase noise will arise largely from trains passing as close as 50 metres from the remainder of the farm.

Adequacy of the Environmental Statement

5. Your petitioners, along with many others, prepared and submitted detailed comments about the Environmental Statement, published when the Bill was deposited. These have been the subject of a report by the independent assessor appointed by your honourable House. Your petitioners have major concerns about both the adequacy and accuracy of the Environmental Statement.

6. In the case of Glebe Farm, the environmental statement gave its area as over 10 times larger at 526 ha against its actual size of 44 ha and loss and severance of land amounting to 13.9 ha during construction (30%) and 8.6 ha permanently (20%) as 'negligible'.

7. The Environmental Statement contains many inaccuracies that do not enable a proper assessment of the 'worst case scenario'. In turn this means that it is impossible to carry out a comprehensive assessment of the project. Your petitioners are extremely worried that baseline assumptions have yet to be substantiated.

8. Your petitioners suggest that further information is produced to support the Environmental Statement. This should limit the need for phrases such as 'where practicable' and where reasonably practicable' to ensure a greater commitment to
thorough mitigation, and address the missing link between an acknowledged growth in traffic and minimal impact on air quality.

9. It is vital that such deficiencies are addressed by the Bill's promoter, since the draft Environmental Minimum Requirements contain key obligations for the Nominated Undertaker, responsible for constructing and operating the railway, and a number of the obligations are specifically linked to the Environmental Statement and depend upon its accuracy.

Unnecessary land take

10. Your petitioner is very concerned by a significant amount of land that the Nominated Undertaker identified for compulsory purchase but was only required by them on a temporary basis for realignment of an electricity line and pylons. Assurances have now been received that the land will only be subject to temporary possession which should resolve the issue once included in the register of Undertakings and Assurances.

Difficulty of replacing compulsory purchased land and tax implications

11. Your Petitioner is concerned that it is likely to prove extremely difficult or impossible to purchase land to replace the 20% lost through compulsory purchase. This may then lead to further losses through CGT or IHT due to the compulsory purchase of the land that I would never have chosen to sell. Your Petitioner requests that this situation is addressed so that those affected by compulsory purchase are not put in any worse tax situation than they would otherwise have been.

Access to my home and for visitors to Glebe Farm

12. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker makes a binding commitment to effective travel planning for the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development including agreeing a travel plan with the relevant local authority for businesses in the area.

Disruption from construction and operation of HS2

13. Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and its associated development including but not limited to construction operations including moving almost 9 million tonnes of material, up to 1,430 HGV movements per day for at least 17 months, two construction compounds, storage compounds, overhead cranes, and then the noise and impact of the operation of the railway to my home and Glebe Farm as a whole.

14. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker is subject to binding mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of the works. These binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to restrictions on noise, dust, vibration, construction hours, vehicle movements, operating hours and design of structures to ensure that my home and Glebe Farm are not unduly affected after the construction of HS2 commences.

15. Your petitioner submits that the nominated undertaker has no incentive to minimize harmful environmental impacts arising from the construction and operation of the high-speed railway and submits that measures designed to ensure effective monitoring of
compliance with these restrictions and enforcement of these restrictions be introduced to the Bill. The nominated undertaker should also mitigate the impact of noise, dust, vibration and impacts on visual amenity through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.

Highways and Construction Traffic

16. Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction of the high speed railway and associated development at Glebe Farm, Turweston, Brackley and the wider area will severely impact upon the quiet enjoyment of your petitioner's home and the neighbourhood by way of noise, disturbance, visual intrusion and traffic increases. This will include up to 1,430 HGV movements per day and major works on three of the four routes into Brackley.

17. Your Petitioner is concerned about the use of unsuitable highways by large vehicles delivering equipment and supplies, and removal of spoil during the construction works as well as use of highways by other vehicles. The disruptive effect of these vehicle movements will be compounded by major road realignments which will impact the ability of your petitioner, my family and guests to access my home.

18. Your Petitioner requests that hours for the movement of construction traffic is prohibited between 07:30 to 09:00 and to 15.00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday, and there are limits on the number of vehicle movements, limits on the size of vehicles to ensure that disruption is minimized.

19. Your Petitioner further requests that binding mitigation measures should include traffic management plans to be agreed between the nominated undertaker, the relevant local authority and the relevant highway authority to be monitored and enforced by environmental health officers employed by the local authority.

Code of Construction Practice

20. Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaker's ongoing accountability is unspecified. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply and the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event that the contractors do not comply with the Code of Construction Practice. Assessment in the environmental statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be fully effective; however, the Code of Construction Practice has no legal status.

21. 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.

22. 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 verifiable and
challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

23. Your Petitioner submits that clear and easy to follow enforcement mechanisms for local communities and local authorities should be included in the Bill. This will provide a commitment to rectify or compensate for environmental impacts.

Noise impact

24. Your petitioner is concerned about the impact of noise on my home and Glebe Farm as trains from the high speed line pass the area. Noise from passing trains will directly impact on your petitioner’s property.

25. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that the minimum possible noise can be heard at The Chestnuts Glebe Farm and there are no other adverse effects.

26. 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.

27. The 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 include but not be limited to full noise barriers and noise insulation for buildings and re-housing. The trigger levels at which point noise mitigation becomes necessary should reflect prevailing World Health Organisation guidance.

28. Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State or arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the nominated undertaker. Your Petitioner requests that Clause 35 and schedule 25 are deleted from the Bill.

Air Quality

29. 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 on and near Glebe Farm.

30. Your Petitioner requests that before construction there should be an air quality baseline monitoring study benchmarked against the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 and a copy of this report should be provided to your petitioner. Your petitioner submits the nominated undertaker be required to ensure its activities do not breach the standards detailed in such regulations and if such standards are breached, your Petitioner
requests that the Nominated Undertaker be required to cease its activities until air quality standards are brought into line with such standards.

31. Your Petitioner requests that the local authority should be provided with funding to undertake responsibility, compliance and enforcement for the monitoring of air quality in accordance with these binding mitigation plans and that the results of monitoring are made publicly available.

32. In light of the above, the Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to our expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to our representation before the Select Committee.

33. 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.

34. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their rights, (including their human rights) interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

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.

June Green

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Glebe Farm Limited

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioners are Glebe Farm Limited of Glebe Farm, Turweston. The Bill would authorise the compulsory acquisition of over 20% of the land occupied by your petitioners, to which they object. Furthermore, the rest of the farm will be injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, and your petitioners accordingly object thereto for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3. Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development at Turweston and around Brackley poses a risk to the commercial activities undertaken at Glebe Farm. The current plans for HS2 mean activities will be significantly disrupted due to years of severe congestion around Brackley.

4. Noise and dust will be generated by both preparatory works and construction works in addition to that noise generated by the use of both light and heavy goods vehicles for the movement of people, materials and spoil into and from construction sites. During the operational phase noise will arise largely from trains passing as close as 50 metres from the remainder of the farm.

Adequacy of the Environmental Statement

5. Your petitioners, along with many others, prepared and submitted detailed comments about the Environmental Statement, published when the Bill was deposited. These have been the subject of a report by the independent assessor appointed by the House of Commons. Your petitioners have major concerns about both the adequacy and accuracy of the Environmental Statement.

6. In the case of Glebe Farm, the environmental statement gave its area as over 10 times larger at 526 ha against its actual size of 44 ha and loss and severance of land amounting to 13.9 ha during construction (30%) and 8.6 ha permanently (20%) as ‘negligible’.

7. The Environmental Statement contains many inaccuracies that do not enable a proper assessment of the ‘worst case scenario’. In turn this means that it is impossible to carry out a comprehensive assessment of the project. Your petitioners are extremely worried that baseline assumptions have yet to be substantiated.

8. Your petitioners suggest that further information is produced to support the Environmental Statement. This should limit the need for phrases such as ‘where practicable’ and where reasonably practicable’ to ensure a greater commitment to
thorough mitigation, and address the missing link between an acknowledged growth in traffic and minimal impact on air quality.

9. It is vital that such deficiencies are addressed by the Bill's promoter, since the draft Environmental Minimum Requirements contain key obligations for the Nominated Undertaker, responsible for constructing and operating the railway, and a number of the obligations are specifically linked to the Environmental Statement and depend upon its accuracy.

Unnecessary land take and Electricity pylons

10. Your petitioner is very concerned by a significant amount of land that the Nominated Undertaker identified for compulsory purchase but was only required by them on a temporary basis for realignment of an electricity line and pylons. Assurances have now been received that the land will only be subject to temporary possession which should resolve the issue once included in the register of Undertakings and Assurances.

Difficulty of replacing compulsory purchased land and tax implications

11. Your Petitioner is concerned that it is likely to prove extremely difficult or impossible to purchase land to replace the 20% lost through compulsory purchase. This may then lead to further losses through CGT or IHT due to the compulsory purchase of the land that we would never have chosen to sell. Your Petitioner requests that this situation is addressed so that those affected by compulsory purchase are not put in any worse tax situation than they would otherwise have been subject to.

Access for staff and visitors to our business

12. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker makes a binding commitment to effective travel planning for the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development including agreeing a travel plan with the relevant local authority for businesses in the area.

Disruption from construction and operation of HS2

13. Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and its associated development including but not limited to construction operations including moving almost 9 million tonnes of material, up to 1,430 HGV movements per day for at least 17 months, two construction compounds, storage compounds, overhead cranes, and then the noise and impact of the operation of the railway to Glebe Farm.

14. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker is subject to binding mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of the works. These binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to restrictions on noise, dust, vibration, construction hours, vehicle movements, operating hours and design of structures to ensure that Glebe Farm Limited can continue to function after the construction of HS2 commences.

15. Your petitioner submits that the nominated undertaker has no incentive to minimize harmful environmental impacts arising from the construction and operation of the high-speed railway and submits that measures designed to ensure effective monitoring of compliance with these restrictions and enforcement of these restrictions be introduced
to the Bill. The nominated undertake should also mitigate the impact of noise, dust, vibration and impacts on visual amenity through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.

Highways and Construction Traffic

16. Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction of the high speed railway and associated development at Glebe Farm, Turweston, Brackley and the wider area will severely impact upon the quiet enjoyment of your petitioner's premises and the neighbourhood by way of noise, disturbance, visual intrusion and traffic increases. This will include up to 1,430 HGV movements per day and major works on three of the four routes into Brackley.

17. Your Petitioner is concerned about the use of unsuitable highways by large vehicles delivering equipment and supplies, and removal of spoil during the construction works as well as use of highways by other vehicles. The disruptive effect of these vehicle movements will be compounded by major road realignments which will impact the ability of staff and visitors to get to the business premises.

18. Your Petitioner requests that hours for the movement of construction traffic is prohibited between 07:30 to 09:00 and to 15:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday, and there are limits on the number of vehicle movements, limits on the size of vehicles to ensure that disruption is minimized.

19. Your Petitioner further requests that binding mitigation measures should include traffic management plans to be agreed between the nominated undertaker, the relevant local authority and the relevant highway authority to be monitored and enforced by environmental health officers employed by the local authority.

Code of Construction Practice

20. Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaker's ongoing accountability is unspecified. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply and the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event that the contractors do not comply with the Code of Construction Practice. Assessment in the environmental statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be fully effective; however, the Code of Construction Practice has no legal status.

21. 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.

22. 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 verifiable and challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.
23. Your Petitioner submits that clear and easy to follow enforcement mechanisms for local communities and local authorities should be included in the Bill. This will provide a commitment to rectify or compensate for environmental impacts.

Land Drainage

24. Your Petitioner is concerned about the effects of the Nominated Undertakers works on the land drainage on the farm and the Nominated Undertaker will utilise appropriate specialists to advise on appropriate works to ensure land drainage is not adversely affected.

Noise impact

25. Your petitioner is concerned about the impact of noise on Glebe Farm as trains from the high speed line pass the area. Noise from passing trains will directly impact on your petitioner's property.

26. Your Petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that the minimum possible noise can be heard at Glebe Farm and there are no other adverse effects.

27. 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.

28. The 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 include but not be limited to full noise barriers and noise insulation for buildings and re-housing. The trigger levels at which point noise mitigation becomes necessary should reflect prevailing World Health Organisation guidance.

29. Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State or arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the nominated undertaker. Your Petitioner requests that Clause 35 and schedule 25 are deleted from the Bill.

Air Quality

30. 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 on Glebe Farm.
Your Petitioner requests that before construction there should be an air quality baseline monitoring study benchmarked against the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 and a copy of this report should be provided to Glebe Farm Ltd. Your petitioner submits the nominated undertaker be required to ensure its activities do not breach the standards detailed in such regulations and if such standards are breached, your Petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker be required to cease its activities until air quality standards are brought into line with such standards.

Your Petitioner requests that the local authority should be provided with funding to undertake responsibility, compliance and enforcement for the monitoring of air quality in accordance with these binding mitigation plans and that the results of monitoring are made publicly available.

In light of the above, the Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to our expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to our representation before the Select Committee.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless 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 in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their rights, (including their human rights) interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Andrew Green
June Green

17 April 2016
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015-16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF Christine Mary Chapman

DECLARRES that:-

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is Christine Mary Chapman, freeholder of property known as Melling Farm, Station Road, Quainton, Buckinghamshire HP22 4BT, which the Bill may "specially and directly affect".

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioner is concerned the Bill will directly and specifically affect your petitioner and her family, together with her livestock since the property lies within 1 mile of the proposed line and all of the road frontage of your petitioner’s property falls within the HS2 Safeguarding Zone and is subject to a compulsory purchase in order to facilitate the construction of the re-routed Station Road.

Your petitioner's property will also be impacted by noise from the construction and operation of HS2 together with the impact of construction traffic involved in the building of the new road which will, in turn, bring excessive noise and traffic closer to her animals than at present.

Your petitioner is concerned that there alternative proposals with regard to her property which have been put forward by her Parish Council which are not only cost saving but also reduce adverse visual impact on the countryside, such proposals have been put forward on several occasions to HS2 to no avail.

Your petitioner is concerned with regard to matters of noise and vibration caused by the construction and operation of HS2. Your petitioner is concerned as there appears to be no mechanism in the Bill to deliver a properly noise-mitigated railway.

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, specifically the proposed new road through her property and your petition feels the Bill will specifically and directly affect the health of her livestock, two of which suffer from Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Your petitioner
greatly fears the effects of dust and dirt which will be carried onto her property on the prevailing winds once construction commences.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Christine Mary Chapman

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners: Andrew Jones and Jennifer Jones

The petitioners are owner occupiers of
34 Hodgetts lane, Burton Green, Kenilworth CV8 1PJ and of a field of just over two acres in size that borders the line of the proposed railway and extends to Hodgett’s Lane in Burton Green. The field is immediately across the road from the house.

3 Your petitioner's concerns

This petition, and our previous petition in the House of Commons, has, of financial necessity, been prepared without the benefit of legal advice. We do not have the resources to afford such advice nor any subsequent representation in the petitioning process.

We are ordinary members of the public - almost pensioners - with no prior experience of presenting arguments in a forum of this type.

Reassurances of a fair hearing were offered by the bill committee in the House of Commons for petitioners in person. Such reassurances will no doubt be reiterated by the current bill committee in the House of Lords, with all good intentions. But this is wholly outside of an environment in which an ordinary member of the public should be reasonably be expected to feel familiar, confident, articulate and lucid.

With no other option, many members of the public have felt confident enough to make presentations despite the current parliamentary mechanism, not because of it. One can only speculate how many other affected individuals have not had the capacity to exercise the petitioning rights offered.

Representation by senior Counsel is being provided extensively and at significant public expense for the promoter and various public bodies and organisations. If such representation is apparently justifiable for those bodies, and is also beneficially chosen by wealthy individuals and companies, then it must be even more essential for ordinary affected private individuals for whom legal expenses are wholly unaffordable.

It is our experience of petitioning in the House of Commons that, despite our best efforts, our petition was not as well prepared and was not as well articulated and presented as it would have been if we had been able to afford advice and representation. As a consequence, our petition was less satisfactorily understood, less satisfactorily considered by the bill committee in the House of Commons and an appropriate solution was not adequately defined and made binding. The promoters have been allowed to leave unfulfilled the letter and spirit of such acknowledgements and concessions to us as were articulated by the committee in the House of Commons but that were not made binding upon the promoter.
As a direct consequence, we are clear that there is a direct inequality of legal arms.

At the earliest opportunity, and in the first instance in considering this petition, we ask the committee to mandate the funding of independent legal advice and representation for private individuals in the petitioning process, by the promoter.

We urge committee members to reflect on their own emotions, anxiety and experience of speaking in parliament for the first time - an experience that, for most members, will have been preceeded by substantial experience of public speaking.

It is wholly invidious that the promoter has not made available any resources for the proper provision of independent legal support for private individuals who are petitioning. We have committed no crime nor been negligent. We are the innocent parties in this matter and yet while we are detrimentally affected by this public scheme, no provision has been been made for our proper representation in the quasi-judicial process established to minimize or make good that detriment. It is an injustice.

Whatever their individual good intentions and despite the highest standards of probity, the members of the House of Lords HS2 Bill committee cannot give assurances of a fair hearing if they are not also able to give assurances of fair representation.

We request that this matter is considered at the earliest date possible. Otherwise, we request that consideration of the remainder of our petition be significantly deferred. This would enable us to take advantage of the legal advice and representation enabled by this mandate that we have requested.

Additionally, delay to the presentation of the remaining part of our petition is also requested because HS2 Limited has not provided information that was requested several months ago. We note tardiness of this type was highlighted by the Parliamentary Ombudsman. We need time to analyse that information once provided and to prepare it for submission as evidence.

Burton Green is without doubt one of the most affected rural communities in Phase One of the proposed HS2 route. We, as individuals, are probably affected more than most. We have lived here for many years and intended to do so for a great many more.

We have a small piece of land which is next to the route and a home opposite. Although separated by Hodgetts Lane we regard the two properties as one.

We bought the field which is only just over two acres in size in 2002 having attempted to buy it when we first bought our home in 1986. One of the prime reasons for wanting it was that it is opposite our residence and we could ensure that for the foreseeable future it would used for agricultural purposes.

The other reason was to keep two horses, something we could only do if we had our own land next to our home. For these reasons we paid many times more than the agricultural value of the land.

Presently we have two horses, a goat and poultry. There are just sufficient outbuildings which are used for stabling, poultry housing, hay and bedding storage for a year. The buildings form one side of a concrete yard where the horses can be confined if necessary.
In the original plans, approximately two thirds of the land was earmarked for compulsory purchase to provide mainly sound mitigation in the form of bunding and trees, meaning there would be insufficient land to keep two horses and we would also lose all of the buildings.

At our hearing in January 2015 the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee instructed HS2 Ltd to find some way to resolve our situation. HS2 Ltd representatives visited the site in March 2015 and eventually in November 2015 were sent a revised plan with less land take for HS2.

The remaining area of our land that is required by HS2 is required solely to locate bunding. It is not required for the construction of the line itself.

However, this proposal leaves an inadequate area in which to replace the present range of buildings and concrete yard, reposition the field shelter and have sufficient land to divide into 3 paddocks for pasture rotation.

A large part of the present proposed land take is higher ground where the horses are kept during the winter to rest the major part of the field and avoid it being churned up during the increasingly wet winters. This is essential to protect the horses from mud fever and other ailments related to wet, muddy conditions.

In short, the solution offered provides no solution at all.

A further short extension of the cut and cover tunnel through Burton Green, in the direction of Balsall Common (North) would avoid the need to take any of our land. As the route continues beyond our field from the currently proposed tunnel into a deep cutting, it would cost very little more extend the tunnel by adding further roof to the cutting. The cost of this is over compensated. As has been revealed through an FOI enquiry, by being able to place more of the spoil on top of the tunnel extension and in bigger bunding at more appropriate adjacent locations, the project would be able to avoid substantial haulage costs. That would more than compensate for the cost of the additional roof structure on the cutting.

Relocation and increase of the bunding in the immediate vicinity, is not only to our benefit but also to the additional benefit of:
1. further reduced haulage costs for HS2 and
2. better noise attenuation for the village as a whole and
3. better protection for existing mature woodland at this location that also provides screening for the proposed electricity feeder station infrastructure.

This would be achieved by constructing the bunding behind the existing strip of established mature woodland that lies to the north-western boundary of our land, placing it between the woodland and the proposed new electrical feeder station infrastructure.

**It is imperative that the bill is amended to incorporate such design changes.**

Your petitioner, Jennifer Jones, has lived in Burton Green for the majority of the years since 1959, firstly with her parents and for the last 30 years in her present home.

Her mother lived at No 400 Cromwell Lane, Burton Green, which is at the junction between Hodgetts Lane and Cromwell lane and is located some 70m from the line of the track. Her mother would have been able to sell the house to HS2 Ltd at a valuation that fully compensated for the blight caused by the HS2 proposal under the Rural Voluntary Purchase zone scheme.
Her mother died in 2015 and Mrs Jones is an executor of her estate. On her death, her house fell outwith the Rural Support Zone Voluntary Purchase Scheme and into the “Need to Sell Scheme”. The Need to Sell Scheme has a pre-requisite that the property is marketed, the vendor being obliged to accept if an offer is made that is 15% less than a realistic asking price. Any possible purchasers will know that they can make an offer well below the true value. This is totally unfair and unacceptable to any vendor. In this case, twenty-five per cent of the estate has been bequeathed to her grandchildren who are finding their feet in life and they will be detrimentally affected. In essence, Mrs Jones, her brother and the grandchildren are being required by the Department of Transport to forgo 15% of their inheritance to the benefit of the HS2 project. We note that this invidious “reasonable endeavours to sell” requirement has been dropped from the parallel Express Purchase scheme in respect of properties in the Safeguarding areas.

It is imperative that the bill is amended so that either the Rural Support Zone voluntary purchase scheme continues to apply in respect of the sale of property following the death of a resident, or, preferably, that the “reasonable endeavours to sell” requirement is removed entirely from the need to sell scheme.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner* remains, etc.

Mrs Jennifer Jones
17 April 2016

Mr Andrew Jones
17 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF  
Aled Gwyn Smith, 6 Park Village East  

Declares that:  

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

Your petitioner  

2. Your petitioner is Aled Smith of 6 Park Village East ("PVE"). 6 PVE is a five bedroom detached listed Nash house, with a substantial garden, immediately adjacent to the section of the existing railway line leading into Euston, and immediately adjacent to the proposed section of high speed line which is designated by the Promoter as "Community Forum Area (CFA) 1 – Euston – Station and Approach".
Your petitioner’s concerns

3. Your petitioner claims that due to the very significant impact on our section of PVE existing provisions for compensation and mitigation are wholly inadequate.

4. By this Petition, your petitioner seeks a special provision to be included in the "Express Purchase" Scheme, and/or schemes available to residents in rural areas who will suffer far less blight and disruption.

5. Your petitioner is currently hardly impacted by noise from the road, which only has very light traffic. The railway is currently hardly noticeable due to the depth of the cutting, which sits around 8m below street level. Sadly, the enormous scale of construction in our road, the road closures for very long periods of time, and the noise (the highest volume anticipated on the entire line) will change this for a very long time. Consequently, your petitioner seeks compensation for the disruption and clarity that we will have the best possible mitigating measures (rather than the current derisory offers by HS2).

6. Your petitioner is concerned with the safety of his family and due to these works as his house has a minimal foundation and due to the presence of a giant sequoia, is at risk of soil slippage.

7. Finally, your petitioner seeks relocation, when construction and disturbance is disruptive to normal family life, to a comparable property close enough to not impact our school runs to Queens College Prep School in Portland Place and Hereward House in Swiss Cottage.

The Promoter’s proposals affecting 6 Park Village East

8. The scope and duration of the works is so significant that for the sake of brevity in this process the following section will highlight a few of the most salient works and their impact.

9. We are a family with two young children, a teenager, two cats and a dog. The noise impacting PVE is the highest on the whole line and much of the construction and demolition work will be conducted at night. Construction equipment and HGV movements will impact our sleep.

10. HS2 has acknowledged that the residents of PVE will experience “multiple adverse effects”. For example, PVE will be closed to vehicles for long periods of time (HS2 has not been clear about the timescale). During these very long periods of road closure, we will have no access to our homes. The impact will extend to our services too: rubbish collection, deliveries and potentially emergency access.
11. Those falling within the "surface safeguarded area" are entitled to the Express Purchase ("EP") scheme. HS2's "Guide to HS2 property schemes" explains EP as follows:

If you are eligible, you can ask the government to buy your property at its un-blighted open market value – that is, the value on the open market as if there were no plans for HS2. You will also receive, as per the Compensation Code:
reasonable costs of moving – for example, stamp duty on a replacement property of similar value, reasonable surveyors’ and legal fees, and removal costs; and a home loss payment, equal to 10% of the property's open-market value (up to £49,100), subject to meeting the qualifying criteria.

12. Your petitioner would like you to consider that years of construction work will take place a few metres outside our windows and front door and despite that HS2 has conveniently drawn the line that avoids liability to PVE residents under the EP scheme as presently formulated.

13. It is incongruous that the "voluntary purchase scheme" is available to those within 120m of the line (which PVE certainly is) but only outside the M25 in the Rural Support Zone. HS2's Guide explains that:

Under the voluntary purchase scheme, the government will buy your property for 100% of the un-blighted open market value, as assessed by two independent valuers.

14. We are currently only entitled to the "Need to Sell" scheme. The Guide explains that:

This scheme is available to owner-occupiers who can demonstrate that they have a compelling reason to sell their property, but have been unable to do so – other than at a substantially reduced price – as a direct result of the announcement of the route of HS2.

15. PVE is a very special case and should be given consideration as such. It disconcerting that this remains unrecognised by HS2 since the lodging of our first petition, and it has chosen to leave our fate in the fair-minded hands of the Select Committee of your Honourable House.

16. Currently HS2, acknowledging to some extent the severity of the effects of its proposals, has offered an unconditional but limited assurance as follows:

The Supplementary Environmental Statement and Additional Provision Environmental Statement reports that vehicular access could be restricted for up to 12 months to individual properties along Park Village East as a result of works to construct the barrette wall. During the period that the barrette wall work does prevent direct vehicular access to the front of Nos. 6 – 24 Park Village East (outlined in blue on the attached map), the Nominated Undertaker will treat occupiers of the properties as being eligible for temporary rehousing, by reason of the combined extent and duration of restricted vehicular access, ...
Relief sought from the Select Committee

17. For the reasons we set out above, we respectfully request the Select Committee to require the promoter to make a special provision for us to be entitled, at our individual option and at a time of our own choosing, to the benefit of the Express Purchase Scheme.

18. Your Petitioner therefore respectfully requests that the government should either include us in the surface safeguarded area, or provide a binding commitment for our property to be deemed eligible for the Express Purchase Scheme and/or the other voluntary schemes currently available only to properties in the safeguarded or Rural Support Zone areas.

19. If we can't access the Express Purchase Scheme then we would like to see the need to sell scheme cover necessary but unavoidable costs such as legal fees and stamp duty which householders forced to move through no fault or desire of their own should not – as a matter of natural justice – have to bear.

20. Your petitioner would also like to see an independent review of the “Need to Sell” scheme to ensure it is being operated fairly, and an elimination of the “compelling reason” clause, to the disadvantage of PVE residents.

21. If the worst case ensues and we can't access reasonable compensation and we are ‘locked’ into their homes for the coming decades then your petitioner would like to see certainty over like for like rehousing with costs covered.
The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Aled Smith
6 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CHRISTOPHER BENNETT LANGTON

Declares that:

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

Your petitioner

The petitioner is aged 66, retired and widowed whose property (426 Cromwell Lane, Burton Green) is situated 125 metres from the proposed line and therefore 5 metres outside of the Rural Support Zone and any meaningful or adequate compensation.

Your petitioner's concerns

The petitioner is specially and directly affected by the construction phase of HS2 which will extend over a total period of up to 7 years. The close proximity to the proposed cut and cover tunnel and associated works will result in noise, dust, air pollution, light pollution, vibration and visual intrusion.

As the 56 properties which do qualify for automatic compensation are vacated by owners the petitioner faces the prospect of living next to a 'ghetto' of unoccupied houses during the construction phase with an already apparent deterioration in maintenance standards.

As the petitioner will be in his 80's by the time the line is fully operational, he remains in the meantime unable to sell his property, downsize and enact retirement plans. Burton Green has minimal bus services and no shops or amenities. With the vagaries of the Need to Sell Scheme this results in effectively being a prisoner in one's own home until either needing to go into a nursing home or death.

The petitioner requests that the Voluntary Purchase Scheme be extended to include my property and 12 other similarly affected properties. All fall within a 'natural' cut off point beyond which there are no further houses for several hundred metres. Ten of the owners are of similar pensionable age. (For reference the full list of properties is 426, 428, 327, 329 Cromwell Lane all postcode CV8 1PG and Cornerways, 2 The Hollies, 1 The Hollies, Ashorne, Kelkenn, Lanthorn House, Coniston, 4 Seatons Field, and Stonegate Red Lane, all postcode CV81PF

The petitioner asserts that Burton Green is arguably the most affected community outside of London, and this section to the south of the line particularly so, and therefore qualifies for exceptional treatment.

The petitioner asserts that the only other alternative to mitigate the above affects is the
provision of a deep bored tunnel – Option F within HS2 documents. In addition it would preserve the community of Burton Green, obviate the need for a replacement Village Hall. It would preserve the Green Belt and ancient woodland, protect the safety and viability of the local Primary School. It would avoid traffic disruption to commuters and protect the ongoing amenity of the Greenway.

The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

CHRISTOPHER BENNETT LANGTON

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 BELSIZE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specifically and directly adversely affected by “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. 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, 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 open spaces, and other matters, including street works and the use of lorries.

3. The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill are specified in clauses 1 and 2 of and Schedules 1 and 2 to the Bill. 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. Schedule 4 makes provision for highway access, granting general powers to the nominated undertaker in relation to the form and lay out of means of access, and changes to existing means of access, at any place within the Bill limits.
4. The Petitioner is the Belsize Residents Association ("the Association") which is an association of residents in the electoral wards of Belsize, Frognal and Fitzjohns, Hampstead Town, Gospel Oak, Haverstock, Camden Town with Primrose Hill ("Belsize") within the London Borough of Camden. The purposes of the Association are inter alia to advise and support members of the Association collectively in the promotion and protection of their concerns in the area; to advise and support Belsize residents collectively in the promotion and protection of their interests; and to act to maintain, defend and improve public services within Belsize. The interests of members and residents are taken to include: public services and amenities; planning, development and conservation; public transport, traffic and parking. By its Constitution, the Association will not align itself with any political party. The Association has existed since the 1970s.

5. Membership of the Association is open to all residents of Belsize who accept the Constitution of the Association and pay an annual subscription at a rate determined from time to time by the Annual General Meeting. The Association has estimated that, as at 10 May 2014, there are 534 paying households.

6. The Association has estimated that, as at 10 May 2014, there are 73 member households in Eton Avenue, Adamson Road, Crossfield Road, Fellows Road, Merton Rise, Winchester Road, Strathray Gardens, Haverstock Hill, Steeles Road, Steeles Mews, Adelaide Road and King Henry’s Road which are roads within Belsize in which, or adjacent or proximate to which, the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees, noise and open spaces will be permitted by the Bill ("the Roads"). Other members of the Association live in roads that are adjacent or proximate to the Roads, and do or may generally use the amenities of the Roads.

Your petitioner’s concerns

7. Your Petitioners have serious concerns about the ecological effects of the proposed Adelaide Road ventilation shaft. The proposed shaft would be adjacent to the Adelaide Road Nature Reserve, which is a valued source of wildlife in a densely urban area. Your Petitioners object
to the loss of 2/3 hectare of woodland that is the habitat of bats, breeding and wintering birds and invertebrates in Belsize.

8. Your Petitioners propose, if the Adelaide Road Nature Reserve is to be affected, that like for like open space should be created in Belsize consistent with environmental objectives, and that the Secretary of State should be empowered in the Bill to enforce such objectives. Your Petitioners are concerned that commitments made in December 2015 regarding like for like replacement of any lost open space do not give sufficient assurance that any replacement open space is not so distant from Belsize to make it unusable by residents.

9. Your Petitioners understand the need to suspend various enactments for the purposes of such a major scheme, but are seriously concerned about the loss of trees in Belsize which are a much-valued amenity in a densely urban area and would otherwise be protected by legislation. Your Petitioners humbly request that funding is secured for ecological improvements, including replacement of trees, in Belsize.

10. Your Petitioners are seriously concerned that the construction of the Adelaide Road shaft will cause major disruption to residents, businesses and visitors to Belsize in terms of noise, access and other effects of prolonged construction works. There are a number of businesses in England’s Lane that would be severely affected. Your Petitioners fear that the disruption to local businesses will harm the local economy.

11. Your petitioners are concerned that the commitments made by HS2 Ltd in December 2015 to Camden Council, Transport for London and the Greater London Authority to use rail to remove spoil and deliver construction materials have not been detailed. The original plans indicated a main construction compound is estimated to generate typically more than one hundred daily two-way vehicle movements, so that your Petitioners fear a level of traffic inconsistent with a residential area in terms of pollution, noise and congestion. We welcome the commitments made by HS2 Ltd and these will substantially reduce the harm that the original plans would have imposed on Belsize. However, to date, we have not seen sufficient assurance that these commitments would be honoured and been able to scrutinise the impacts.
12. Your Petitioners humbly request that the highway authority be permitted to object to the opening by the nominated undertaker of an access on to, or the alteration of, a highway used by vehicular traffic on the ground that the nominated undertaker has failed to satisfy the highway authority that such an opening is reasonably necessary for construction works and/or has failed to consider all reasonable alternative options including alternative, non-vehicular modes of transport.

13. Your Petitioners and their interests and property are 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 reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

14. 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.

15. 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 Petitioners and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

NAME: PRABHA TV AZE
CHAIRMAN AND AUTHORISED OFFICER
BELSIZE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

18 April 2016
IN PARLIAMENT
THE HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015–16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Against – on Merits – Praying to be heard by Counsel, &c.

THE HUMBLE PETITION of HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

YOUR PETITIONER DECLARES that:

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced and is now pending in your noble 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 Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes."

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

YOUR PETITIONER

3. Your Petitioner is the local authority for the county of Hertfordshire (hereinafter called “the County”) as established under the Local Government Act 1972 (“the Act”). The Act conferred significant powers and duties upon Your Petitioner, and subsequent enactments have further increased the scope of these powers and duties. Overall, your Petitioner is responsible for the provision of public services in the County and amongst other functions, your Petitioner is the highway and traffic authority for most roads within the County.

4. Works authorised under the Bill would be carried out within the County and your Petitioner and the County's inhabitants are injuriously affected by the provisions of the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for the reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
5. Your Petitioner is supportive, in principle, of the proposal to construct a new high speed railway between London and the West Midlands ("HS2 Phase 1"). The petition against the original Bill for HS2 was withdrawn following assurances from HS2 in relation to slip roads onto the M25 and footpath diversions. Those assurances have dealt with a number of your Petitioner's concerns and include:

(a) dedicated slip roads onto the M25 to be provided to alleviate traffic on the locality;
(b) diversion of the Bridleway Rickmansworth 004 along Shire Lane; and
(c) works on Tilehouse Lane.

6. However, the Bill contains significant changes since the original assurance was sought. In particular, the significant alterations include:

(a) the extension to the Chiltern Tunnel by 2.6km;
(b) an increase in material excavated;
(c) an increase in vehicle movements;
(d) an extension in time for construction;
(e) the loss of sustainable placement area 2;
(f) the use of slip roads by all construction compounds; and
(g) the utilisation of natural resources.

7. Your Petitioner sets out below more detail on certain of the above issues, but in many cases, those assurances make provision for further information from HS2 and confirmation that mitigations will be implemented to deal with your Petitioner's concerns.

Extension to the Chiltern tunnel and increase in material excavated

8. The Bill provides for the HS2 route to pass beneath part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ("AONB"). A 13.5km tunnel would commence south of the M25 and emerge at Mantle's Wood in the Central Chilterns.

9. In response to the petitions regarding the Chilterns AONB, the High Speed Rail Bill Select Committee recommended that the Chiltern tunnel be extended by 2.6km from Mantle's Wood to the location of the South Heath tunnel north portal in the original scheme. Your Petitioner has a number of concerns about the extension of the
Chiltern Tunnel. The extension of the tunnel will result in an increase in material excavated, an increase in vehicle movements and an increase in construction time.

10. The extension to the Chiltern Tunnel will result in larger volumes of material being excavated from the southern portal, where the amount of spoil arising from its construction would increase by 19%. The Environmental Statement produced to accompany the Bill lacks clarity regarding the amount of additional material that will be extracted as a result of this extension and its method of disposal. Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to provide information regarding the exact volume of spoil arising from the construction, to the nearest 100 tonnes, and assurance that spoil entering the County will only be spoil arising from the extension to the Tunnel and not from other works for HS2 Phase 1.

11. Supplementary Environmental Statement 3 produced to accompany the Bill suggests the total quantity of surplus excavated material that will require disposal during construction will be approximately 12,573,420 tonnes. Failure to deliver details regarding the amount of excavated material and where the excavated material will be disposed of will extend disruption to the local area and detrimentally impact on the local people. With the loss of the sustainable placement area 2, there is a greater issue regarding where the extra material excavated is to be relocated. Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to provide a precise figure of additional material to be deposited in the County to fully assess its potential impact.

12. Your Petitioner raises these issues given the importance that it places not only on the environment, with the increased significant adverse landscape and visual effects, but also the health effects of removing this additional material through the tunnel’s south portal.

13. To deliver this commitment, your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to provide further information, confirming the amount of materials to be excavated and deposited, detailing the manner it will be excavated and providing information on what landscape mitigation will be undertaken both during and post construction. Your Petitioner requests detailed plans showing the proposed profiles and sections, before and after profiles, isopachayte drawings, and a detailed landscape impact assessment. Further, Your Petitioner seeks an assurance that only trees grown in the United Kingdom and native to the United Kingdom will be used for any tree planting.
Extension of time for construction – fauna and land management impacts

14. According to the Transport Assessment accompanying the Bill, updated on 30 October 2015, due to the extension to the Chiltern Tunnel, the duration of the movement of excavated material will be increased from approximately one year to approximately four years. Further, the construction activity, including but not limited to heavy plant machinery and construction compounds, will be in place for longer. This causes greater significant adverse landscape and visual impacts.

15. With the extension of time for construction, a greater length of time will be required before surrounding lands are restored, which in turn results in a greater impact upon returning populations of fauna. For example, the population of Corn Buntings found on the land, which is a species highlighted on the RSPB’s list as critically rare and classified as Red List species under the Birds of Conservation Review, will be displaced as a result of HS2.

16. Your Petitioner asks that the Promoter be required to provide further information on and a plan for the long-term land management objectives, aftercare provisions and what ecological gains can be brought forward as a result of the scheme. Your Petitioner submits that this is required to set out fully how the affected areas of the County will be restored after the construction phase. Such a plan should include a mechanism for on-going management and aftercare of the new final restored landform. Your Petitioner submits that by providing this information and plan, the Promoter would better minimise the impacts on the County and its inhabitants.

Rights of Way

17. As a result of the extension time for construction, the temporary measures put in place on Right Of Way 50 will remain in place for an extended period of time. Your Petitioner therefore seeks an assurance that the design and width of the temporary alternatives are maintained at a minimum of 3m width for footpaths and 5m wide for bridleways to mitigate the adverse impact upon amenity. Further, your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to update the Environmental Statement to reflect these changes proposed in the Bill.

Increased vehicle movements – road safety and air quality

18. Your Petitioner has concerns in relation to the volume of vehicle movements that will occur in a concentrated area on the M25 slip road and that the County may not be able to cope with the significant increase in construction road traffic activity. Your Petitioner considers that the increased vehicle movements predicted will adversely affect road safety and increase levels of nitrogen dioxide.
The construction of the proposed scheme will result in additional vehicles. If this is not properly managed, this could potentially adversely affect the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. Your Petitioner petitions for the Environmental Statement or the Health Impact Assessment document to be updated to reflect the increase in vehicle movements that will occur on the M25 slip road. Your Petitioner requests the Promoter to submit air quality monitoring data at least on a quarterly basis and agree with the local authority and Hertfordshire as public health authority where the monitoring points will be. Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to produce specific detailed local traffic management plans for Maple Cross, access routes to the Chiltern Tunnel and all the construction compounds associated with the Chiltern Tunnel. This should include detail on penalties for non-adherence, records of monitoring and enforcements carried out. This information should commence at the pre-application stage and is to be made available to the local authority upon request. Further, the Promoter should commit to provide monies for additional mitigation that may be required during the duration of the construction of the authorised works.

The increase in vehicle movements will result in additional nitrogen dioxide, which is caused largely by diesel engines. The Environmental Statement does not reflect the increased vehicle movements that will occur on the M25 slip roads and therefore does not account for the potential increase in nitrogen dioxide. Your Petitioner seeks assurance that this will be updated to reflect the changes. Further, Your Petitioner petitions for monitoring of nitrogen dioxide levels during construction and for mitigation to be put in place if the thresholds were exceeded. Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to provide fine particulate monitoring as soon as possible to enable a preconstruction baseline to be developed.

Natural resources

Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to provide additional information regarding what natural resources will be utilised in the construction of HS2. This is considered to be a significant secondary effect of the development. Your Petitioner asks that the Promoter be required to provide information regarding the types of aggregate, the volumes expected to be used and where this will be expected to be sought from. This is important for the purposes of reviewing and maintaining a bank of mineral supply in order to mitigate potential impact on the mineral resources of the County.
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 the Bill.

AND YOUR PETITIONER REMAINS, &C.

PINSENT MASONS LLP
Parliamentary Agents for Hertfordshire County Council

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Anastasia Kershaw and Christophe Crespin

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

2. Your petitioners
Your Petitioners are parents of two children, and owners of village property Little Kings House, Ballinger Common, Great Missenden HP16 9U, and the above Bill will specially and directly affect the petitioners' everyday lives, commuting for work and wellbeing of their children, both during construction and after completion. Your Petitioners live in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioners' concerns

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

In this respect, between Frith Hill at 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 are seriously concerned about the disruptions to their household, family health and children’s lives, which will result from the construction of the line. In particular the creation of large amounts of airborne dust, the probable adverse affect on drinking water quality, both of which could lead to the potential for increased asthma and allergies in their children; plus the severe damage on their and their children’s wellbeing of the extra noise, congestion and other implications during what will be a long period of construction.

Your Petitioners contend that building HS2 on the surface in this section will seriously damage the tranquility and cohesion of the local community for many years during construction, due to noise, dust, traffic, and the damage to the environment. In addition, the AONB is visited over 50 million times a year by visitors from London and other areas. This unspoiled countryside - so accessible from London - is used for the recreational benefit of many generations, including the petitioners family and children. Damage to it will permanently and seriously reduce the happiness of thousands of people who live and visit the area.

Regarding wildlife, the petitioners are extremely concerned about adverse affects of work on species that precariously maintain themselves. In particular HS2 works on the section of the HS2 crossing Leather Lane will irrevocably damage the rare wildlife habitats in that part of the area. For example, Skylarks, linnets and yellowhammers, owls and bats live on the land off King’s Lane that is owned by Susan Cowdy’s nature reserve. There are few enough rare species anyway and the petitioners feel that their habitats should be treasured and all possible damage avoided by tunneling under this area.

Your petitioners need to use the narrow lanes and roads which criss-cross the area and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the larger roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for work, school, medical services and rail. 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.

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:

- Your petitioners would like HS2 related traffic to be limited near Great Missenden school. The school is due to significantly increase the number of children attending the school. The parking situation at dropoff and pickup is almost impossible even now before the school has increased in size. The extra children will add significantly to traffic and congestion in the area. Many people have no alternative than to use their car for the school run. The petitioners would like to know about provisions made to control the number of HS2 vehicles near the school on the A413, the Link Road, Frith Hill and other surrounding roads, at such times, and would humbly ask to prevent extra HS2 related vehicular traffic in the area between 8.00 and 9.15am and 2.30 to 3.15 during term times.
- That possible further extensions of the tunnel from Frith Hill in South Heath be adopted, particularly as this also has acknowledged environmental benefits.
- That the tunnel be extended past Leather Lane so as not to damage the rare wildlife found there.
- 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.
- That provision is made for constructing bridges where there are established rights of way, including green bridges for wildlife.
- That all 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; in particular planting with native species and wildflowers to make the area more visually attractive and to encourage an increase in nature.

- That all along the line, the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature species trees, shrubbery and wildflowers, that will enhance the environment and benefit the local wildlife that may have been damaged by construction work.

- 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.

- 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.

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

- 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.

- 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.

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 and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

- To prevent excessive build-up of rush hour traffic to restrict HS2 related daily movements to the period between 09:30 and 2:30 throughout this section of the AONB, and particularly along the A 413, which will prevent excess traffic.
during school pickup and dropoff times during the term.

- **Lanes**: Prohibiting any widening or enlargement of the narrow minor lanes
- **Noise**: 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.
- **Spoil**: To provide means of removing most of the spoil from the AONB area, including by rail or by pipeline, to properly deal with the creation of spoil with minimal environmental dust and noise impact, and avoiding the creation of the spoil dump at Hunts Green. In dealing with spoil left over to make the spoil heap look of natural shape and be fully planted into a nature reserve with habitats provided for bats, owls and other species that may have been affected by construction. This work to be approved by an external undertaker approved by the Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust, or other qualified group.
- **Roads**: That contractors in the AONB should 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. In particular to plant natural tree and flower species to fit in with the environment and enhance the ecology of the area.
- **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.
- **Support finance**: To ensure 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.
- **Crime**: Also, in case of contractors misbehaving or causing damage or crime themselves, or decreased water quality, the petitioners would like a telephone or online hotline set up allowing residents to raise any issues of concern arising during construction, and the police, local and highway authorities, and any other group should have transparent access to all reports to ensure these are addressed and remedied in a reasonable length of time.

### 4. The prayer

The petitioners humbly 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 remains, etc.

CHRISTOPHE CRESPIN   ANASTASIA KERSHAW

Sign

Print the name of the person signing below each signature [and add “Agent” if appropriate]

Date 15/04/2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Emma and Marc Davies, Residents of Number 3 Coombe Avenue, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6BX

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The Petitioners are Emma and Marc Davies (hereinafter referred to as “the Petitioners”), and are residents of Number 3 Coombe Avenue in the Parish of Wendover, HP22 6BX, being part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and will be specially and directly affected by the Bill for the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.

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

3. Your petitioners’ concerns

Your Petitioners will derive no benefit of any kind whatsoever from HS2, and accordingly will suffer twice, firstly as taxpayers having to fund it, and secondly by being subject to the disruption caused by construction and the permanent blight and nuisance caused by operation.

Your Petitioner’s property is within 300 metres of the HS2 scheme and is shown in the Zone of Theoretical Visibility in ES 3.5.1.7.2., and, inter alia, in maps LV-03-036, LV-04-036 and SV-05-019.

Objection is taken to both the construction and operation of certain of the scheduled works proposed to be undertaken in Wendover, consisting mainly of the Small Dean viaduct, a high embankment with associated 6 metre high noise barriers between the northern end of the Small Dean viaduct and the southern portal of the Wendover green tunnel, the Wendover green tunnel, and the northern portal of the Wendover green tunnel. They include ancillary works such as satellite compounds, auto-transformer stations and portal buildings. Although the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee deemed fit to extend the Wendover Green Tunnel a short distance, the latest HS2 Ltd. proposal involves the construction of 6 metre high noise barriers from the southern green tunnel portal to the viaduct at Small Dean and a significant increase in the height of 2 of the electricity pylons. HS2 Ltd. admit themselves that there is nowhere in the UK with such monstrous sound barriers.

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, and preferably through the whole of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) ending at the AONB boundary to the
north of Wendover. We earnestly request that your Lordships require The Promoter to commission a fully independent review of the costs of 2 alternatives: The Promoter's existing scheme and a fully bored tunnel to the end of the AONB.

Problems caused by the construction process of the scheduled works

Your Petitioner avers that during construction of the scheduled works there would be the following effects:

Disruption of traffic and substantial delays along all local roads, caused by around 300 HGVs per day, especially the A413, the B4009 and the A41. This will cause significant disruption, stress and delay to your Petitioner's daily commute to work and will adversely affect access to emergency services.

A serious strain on local community services such as the Wendover Health Centre, to which your Petitioner is a regular visitor, and the police, caused by an influx of construction workers, which would adversely affect your Petitioner.

Dust caused by chalk and soil from construction and excavation, leading to the spoiling of your Petitioner's enjoyment of their garden. On storage, chalk dries out creating dust, the effect of which will be made worse by the prevailing south-west wind, which blows directly onto Number 3 Coombe Avenue.

Substantial damage to this part of the Chilterns AONB with its exceptional natural beauty and legally protected landscape which is frequently enjoyed by your Petitioner when out walking/cycling/driving, for example by the visual intrusion of the construction works. Further to this, the disruption to your Petitioner's regular enjoyment of local public footpaths and bridleways, including the famous Chiltern Way and Aylesbury Ring, and others such as the South Bucks Way, Icknield Way, Ridgeway Trail and Chiltern Link.

Substantial damage to the local cultural heritage, including the listed St Mary's Church, which your Petitioner uses for cultural purposes. In particular, the noise from the Small Dean embankment will render it unusable for concerts and lectures.

Disruption to power supplies caused by the need to move the electricity pylons near the line, which are in the immediate vicinity of Number 3 Coombe Avenue.

Noise from machines digging the green tunnel, moving spoil, constructing embankments and viaducts and traffic connected with that, leading to the inability of your Petitioner to concentrate during the day, enjoy the peaceful surroundings, and inability to sleep at night. The noise projections given out by HS2 Ltd. have been of average noise, rather than maximum noise, which has the greatest and most harmful effect. Further, the Department for Transport has incorrectly used targets for upgraded existing lines rather than the proper target for new projects.

Lighting over the construction area causing light pollution, which will disturb your Petitioner due to the proximity of Number 3 Coombe Avenue to the construction area. Number 3 Coombe Avenue currently has no light pollution at night.

The effect on the value of your Petitioner's property, which is of real concern due to the property being your Petitioner's biggest asset and investment. The property value will be
Problems caused by the completed works and the operation of HS2

Your Petitioner avers that the completed proposed scheduled works would have the following permanent effects:

The operational noise of the completed railway, with trains passing every 90 seconds, is an unknown factor but due to the prevailing winds and the proximity of Number 3 Coombe Avenue to both of the green tunnel portals, noise is a very real and worrying possibility and would cause an intolerable strain upon the life and affect the sleep of your Petitioner.

Number 3 Coombe Avenue is in an area which at present is peaceful.

The views of the Chiltern Hills in the AONB, which your Petitioner enjoys on a frequent basis when out walking/cycling/driving, would be permanently scarred by the nearby Small Dean viaduct, embankment with associated 6 metre high noise barriers, and green tunnel portals, in addition to the sight of 400 metre long trains passing every 90 seconds. It would be overbearing and dominant in the landscape and would abolish one of the main reasons your Petitioner has chosen to live in this area. The latest proposal utilising 6 metre high sound barriers would have a highly obtrusive and overwhelming effect on Wendover and coupled with the suggested double bank of 4 metre barriers would create an almost unbelievable and entirely inappropriate visual blight on the AONB.

The effect on the value of your Petitioner’s property, which is of real concern due to the property being your Petitioner’s biggest asset and investment. Your Petitioner notes that another property in the street was removed from the market unsold. This blight will continue on a permanent basis once the line is in operation.

Local facilities that are of value to your Petitioner, for example St Mary’s Church and the nearby wild meadow, would be substantially damaged. At present, Wendover is a thriving community with a good range of shops and many established businesses. The close proximity of HS2 with its attendant sight and sound will result in fewer tourists and will ultimately have a negative impact on local shops and businesses, many of whom may be forced to close with associated loss of employment, which in turn affects the social cohesion of the community.

Direct evidence of this can be seen during the construction of the Wendover bypass in 1997/8 which caused serious financial damage to many businesses. The loss of these facilities will lead to Wendover becoming a less desirable place to live for your Petitioner.

With no proper hydrological survey having been carried out by HS2 Ltd., your Petitioner is concerned that the operation of HS2 will have a serious effect on the springs and the Coombe Hill aquifer that feed the Grand Union Canal and Weston Turville Reservoir SSSI, with potential risk to the quality of the drinking water. The key concern relates to the 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 benefits of a fully-bored tunnel

Your Petitioner would like the proposed cut and cover green tunnel at Wendover replaced by
a longer bored tunnel from 500 metres further north to join the currently proposed bored tunnel at South Heath. This would protect the AONB and avoid most of the disadvantages set out above. HS2 Ltd. has confirmed that from an engineering and construction point of view this is possible. Should such a tunnel not be regarded as acceptable, the minimum mitigation required is a tunnel past Wendover as far south as Durham Farm.

So far HS2 Ltd. has refused to seriously consider a fully bored (or indeed mined) tunnel. HS2 Ltd. has said that such a tunnel would cost considerably more than the present proposal. However, it has refused to divulge any detail of its cost estimate, or even the tender documents on which it was based, and there is considerable justifiable speculation that the figure is considerably exaggerated. We are asking that fully independent costings be commissioned for the current proposed route and a fully bored tunnel option commissioned by HS2.

Moreover, HS2 Ltd. has not taken into account the value of the many benefits, both market and non-market, which a fully-bored tunnel would bring, such as the money saved by not having to compulsorily purchase properties and land, or compensate for blight, or move electricity pylons; by reducing the adverse health impacts on the community; by having a lesser impact on local businesses and tourism; and by not damaging the AONB, which is a legally protected landscape of national importance. These benefits are valued at over £500 million, which significantly outweighs the cost to construct the fully-bored tunnel.

For the foregoing and connected reasons, your Petitioner respectfully submits that the case for a fully-bored tunnel from South Heath to the end of the AONB to the north of Wendover is overwhelming, and unless the Bill is amended by the inclusion of such a tunnel, then the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

**Mitigation for construction of a fully-bored tunnel**

If a fully-bored tunnel is included in the Bill, your Petitioner proposes that at least the following mitigation be adopted for its construction:

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.

That the number of construction vehicles using local roads is limited, and at all times be such as not to inconvenience other road users.

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.

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.

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.

That noise levels be monitored on a frequent and regular basis by an independent organisation, with the result of such monitoring being immediately made public.
That artificial lighting at construction areas is limited to working hours.

That a full hydrological survey be carried out and given proper consideration. In particular, whether a redesign by lowering the scheme into a fully bored tunnel would avoid additional construction costs and timescale in the Wendover area, as a result of new reservoirs, pipelines and a pumping station that will be required to mitigate the damage caused by extensive interception of the aquifer.

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 levels to go to arbitration if agreement cannot be reached.

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.

That funding be made available to the local police force for increased staffing likely to be required due to the advent of a substantial construction workforce.

That full compensation for loss in property value caused by construction of the scheduled works and subsequent operation of the line be available to your Petitioner in light of the very close proximity of Number 3 Coombe Avenue to the line.

That the opportunity is taken during the construction works to replace overhead electricity pylons with underground ones, which would have a positive impact on the Petitioner due to current visibility of these pylons from Number 3 Coombe Avenue.

That the Code of Construction Practice, and regulations and agreements dealing with all the above matters 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

However, if the proposal for a fully-bored tunnel is rejected, your Petitioner proposes the following mitigation:

That the existing proposed Wendover green tunnel be extended to the south to meet the northern end of the Small Dean viaduct, and to the north to take the portal further from the edge of the town.

That the Small Dean viaduct and embankment be of high quality infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible to minimise the damage to nearby countryside and St Mary’s Church.

That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow quickly to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time so that your Petitioner can attempt continued enjoyment of the surrounding area.

That the mitigation proposed under 'Mitigation for construction of a fully-bored tunnel' be
adopted.

Mitigation for the operation of the line

If the line does go ahead, the following mitigation is proposed for the operation of the train:

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 minimise the potential audible impact on your Petitioner.

That there be a legally enforceable noise limit covering your Petitioner’s street and surrounding area with substantial penalties for breach.

That full compensation for loss in property value caused by construction of the scheduled works and subsequent operation of the line be available to your Petitioner in light of the very close proximity of Number 3 Coombe Avenue to the line.

That the maximum amount of planting be used, at the earliest opportunity and with the use of mature trees able to grow quickly to at least forty feet high, in order to conceal the line from view at the earliest possible time so that your Petitioner can attempt continued enjoyment of the surrounding area.

That, based on the example of HS1, a Community Fund of at least £25 million be established for the benefit of Wendover, which would not benefit from HS2 in any way whatsoever.

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 operation 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 petitioner remains, etc.

SIGNED:


DATE:
To The House Of Lords Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF: SAVE ST.GILES GROUP

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner:

The petitioner is Save St.Giles. An action group set up to help protect the character of the historic village of Chalfont St Giles. Founded by four residents of Chalfont St Giles. Mr R McDonnell, Mr K Jones, Mrs M McDonnell and Mrs C Jones they have spent a combined 62 years living in Chalfont St Giles village. This petition also has the support of ChalfontSt Giles Parish Council.

Save St.Giles have a website that has had over 10,000 visits in the last three months, their Facebook page has recently been viewed by over 22,000 and they have a petition to protect the meadows directly above the proposed tunnels with over 1,000 signatures in the first few weeks. They are committed to helping to protect the characters of our historic village and its community and the Green Belt land that HS2 will tunnel under which is of National importance being recognised as an Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty with a rare and precious chalk stream running through it.

The possibility of the chalk stream river drying up is significant and would directly effect the character of our village. The possible collapse of ground is a potential danger for our whole community and an increase in flooding and polluting of the aquifer will threaten the survival of the village, traders and vital services.
3. Your Petitioners Concerns:

The village and community of Chalfont St Giles have serious concern that HS2 ltd are tunnelling in the wrong place at a depth that is too shallow to protect the Chalk stream river, aquifer, village and community as detailed below.

In May 2011 HS2 ltd assured the community of Chalfont St Giles (during their road show) that the twin bore tunnels would bypass the centre of the village and be buried at a depth of 100 m. Months later, these promises were broken. Without informing the community, HS2 was diverted to run directly through the heart of the village at a minimum depth of only 19 m or shallower passing within meters of a Grade 1 listed church, running directly under a rare natural chalk stream, at perhaps the most sensitive location of the river possible.

Save St.Giles have consulted with experts who have local knowledge, not only of the complex chalk beds under the River Misbourne but of the geological make up of the ground on which our village sits. The qualifications and experience of these consultants is impressive (see below). They have serious and well founded concerns that HS2 are proposing to bore through ground at a depth that will result in problems ranging from the chalk stream permanently drying up, pollution of the Aquifer that supplies drinking water to London and the risk of ground collapse/ flooding. This new evidence is detailed below,

Executive Summary HS2 Tunnel through Chalfont St Giles

The HS2 tunnel current route, as proposed, transects the Misbourne Valley at Chalfont St Giles. The twin bore tunnel will pass from the northern side of Misbourne under the valley to the southern side of the valley. The valley is underlain by Chalk, in particular the Seaford Chalk. At the shallowest point the twin tunnels will be only 19m or shallower (estimated) below the surface or two tunnel diameters beneath the surface (HS2 engineer, Commons Select committee hearing, July 14th 2015). The subsurface in the Misbourne valley consists of glacial gravel and clay overlying fractured chalk before at depth more competent chalk.
The tunnels carrying the twin bore HS2 at Chalfont St Giles penetrates the upper most part of the Seaford Chalk. This is the most fractured of the entire chalk formation. Chalk contains abundant micro-porosity (up to 45% of volume) and is frequently highly fractured. It is a highly effective reservoir in the south of England for public water (Affinity water) and in the North Sea for oil (Ekofisk or Valhall oil fields). When the chalk is drained the micro-porosity may close and subsidence occur above it, as evidenced in the North Sea with periodic jacking up of the Ekofisk oil platforms. In the Misbourne Valley the upper part of the chalk is, in addition, highly fractured and consists of a rubble zone 16.2m deep, as evidenced by several boreholes at (Chalfont St. Giles pumping station), due to peri-glacial processes and flow of the Proto-Thames across the region approx half a million years ago during Anglian glacial period.

The drilling of the tunnel at this shallow depth poses the following risks:

- **Pollution of the regional aquifer that London sources its water from.** As evidenced by the £77M indemnity offered to Affinity Water, HS2 ltd has recognised a risk to the pollution of the regional aquifer by the drilling of the tunnel at such a shallow depth.

- **Long term damage to the aquifer that London and the northwest Home Counties source their water from.** Cycle time for the chalk aquifer is many thousands of years and therefore any pollution may be present for a very long period.

- **Sourcing of water from outside Chiltern district.** With a polluted aquifer water will need to be sourced from elsewhere in the south-east or further afield (e.g. Rutland Water).

- **Potential tunnel collapse and ground failure as drilling of the tunnel is within the rubble zone** as evidenced by local boreholes. Limited geophysical and geological data documenting fracture orientation and depth of fractures have been recorded from boreholes.

- **As seen elsewhere in the UK collapse of the subsurface should be expected when, not if, the tunnel transects through fractured shallow chalk.**
• **Collapse from fractures related to damage halo from tunnel.**

Numerical modelling of the damage halo around a borehole shows that the ground affected is not only just above the tunnel but surrounding the tunnel. Only by modelling the effect of the tunnel drilling through fractured chalk can this damage halo and its impact on Chalfont St Giles be understood. HS2 Ltd have recognised the potential for ground settlement during or soon after construction. There prediction of this occurring over only 260 metres of the river could be very conservative and also will be a continuous issue after construction not just limited to during and soon after construction.

• Without adequate data from boreholes, however, the numerical model is flawed. Has HS2 Ltd gathered this data? The halo could extend many 100’s of metres to km’s away from the tunnel, affecting local buildings, old and new, and local infrastructure such as pipelines and roads.

• **Drying up of Misbourne river.** The Misbourne is a chalk stream, which are highly limited in number and often referred to as England’s rain forests, due to their special status. In addition the Chilterns are an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, valued for its chalk streams. The streams are ephemeral. It is highly likely that the drilling of the tunnel at a depth of 19m or shallower through a highly fractured aquifer will lead to the river ceasing to run, with the resulting loss of wildlife and associated habitats. *The Chalfont St Giles section is the most sensitive section of the entire Misbourne river valley. HS2 intersects at exactly the worst place in the entire valley.*

**HS2 Ltd themselves have** agreed that it is impossible to be absolutely sure that the major tunnelling operation planned immediately under this complex and fragile environment will have no effect. Although their response appears they would only take action retrospectively which will be too late.

As shown by the indemnity agreement agreed between HS2 Ltd and Affinity Water, if the aquifer is polluted, then HS2 Ltd have already recognised that there is a risk of pollution. In addition, as highlighted above, there is a significant risk to the local infrastructure, community and indeed area of Outstanding Natural
Beauty caused by the shallow depth of the HS2 twin bore tunnel. These risks have to be acknowledged on the current routing of HS2 beneath Chalfont St Giles, either mitigated by shifting the tunnel or alternatively the tunnel depth deepened to alleviate or mitigate the potential risks. If the tunnel operation is executed as planned all that can be said is that a huge number of consequences will occur and all will look back at a missed opportunity.

HS2 ltd can offer no assurances that they will not damage the make up of the sensitive chalk stream but instead say they will simply ‘make good’ if the chalk stream is damaged. This, in our opinion is simply not acceptable when there is good evidence to suggest they could easily avoid running the risk of damage by setting the tunnel considerably deeper or preferably by diverting it away from the village all together.

HS2 ltd have stated that they will monitor the river for signs of damage but the nature of a chalk stream river is that it often flows in erratic cycles. It is expected to flood and it is expected to dry up. If drilling takes place in a flood season any damage will go unnoticed for months or perhaps years. If drilling in a dry season, damage will not be registered for months or years by which time HS2 ltd will undoubtedly claim the damage was not caused by them.

If their proposal is to make good, this could involve significant and extensive excavation. Why have HS2 ltd not considered crossing the Misbourne in a more remote location where repair will not adversely effect our community. The twin bore tunnels currently run under the bridge serving traffic to our community and is the main artery of access to housing, shops, doctors surgery, schools etc.

HS2 ltd have also chosen the exact point to tunnel under the Misbourne River where is is susceptible to serious and regular flooding. Most recently in 2014 tons of water sat in fields directly above the proposed tunnels and flooding was still present after three months of persistent pumping from commercial pumps. Flooding in Chalfont St Giles in 2014 was caused by exceptionally high groundwater levels within the chalk aquifer. Local critical infrastructure eg Affinity water pumping station and the BT exchange were affected. Chalfont St Giles is built on the sides of a flood plain. The rising of the aquifer is therefore periodic and the HS2 will go straight through this aquifer. Risk of damage to the aquifer is crystal clear (see Bucks CC Flood Assessment Report).

Link - https://www.bucksccl.gov.uk/media/2983689/Chalfont-St-Giles.pdf
The community of Chalfont St Giles is concerned that HS2 Ltd have not taken into account the additional stress placed on the make up of the ground during flooding which typically occurs every few years. The community is also concerned that the significant area taken up by the twin bore tunnel will actually increase the regularity and severity of flooding to the village which sits directly above the tunnels.

We request that HS2 Ltd explain why they decided to target the centre of our historic village with tunnels at a depth of 19m or shallower having assured the community that they would bypass the heart of the village at a depth of 100m. We request to see all the possible routes that they consider before drilling directly under the centre of our village.

We request that HS2 Ltd reverse their decision to tunnel under the centre of the historic village or at the very least to significantly increase the depth of the tunnel to avoid the very sensitive make up of the chalk stream.

We insist that the bed of the River Misbourne be reinforced for a significant stretch beyond the boundaries of the tunnels as a precautionary measure no matter where the proposed tunnel pass under it.

Finally we believe that HS2 Ltd will save approximately £200-300m by driving the twin bore tunnels through the heart of our village at a minimum depth of 19m or lower instead of adopting the original route that was presented to our village (in the HS2 road show May 2011) which bypassed the heart of our community at a depth of 100m. We fear that HS2 are less concerned with the Aquifer, which runs throughout the whole of this area and more interested in cutting financial corners to drive down the cost of the project.

Has reduction of cost been put ahead of damage to the aquifer that helps make up London’s drinking water? Are the risks of ground collapse being overlooked? Are HS2 Ltd ignoring the value of the fragile chalk environment that forms the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that is the Chilterns and our heritage?

Save St. Giles feel strongly that the current rail project does not link Northern cities to create a genuine Northern Powerhouse, does not connect to airports, does not solve overcrowding and that there are far more viable, less destructive and economically favourable proposals that have not been fully explored.
The above was prepared for Save St.Giles Group by:

**Ian Cloke**

Ian Cloke has over 27 years experience as a geologist with a background in structural geology modelling faults and fractures. Drilling activities included designing exploration and production wells through chalk and other fractured reservoirs. BSc (Dunelm), MSc & PhD (London), Fellow of the Geological Society of London. Lead worldwide exploration for Tullow Oil with activities in 17 countries. Exploration activities can be within sensitive areas such as national parks, affected communities and off shore.

Ian has also been the editor of Special publications for the Geological Society on South East Asia and East Africa and published papers in the Journal of Geological Society London, American Association of Petroleum Geologists and Journal of Asian Earth Sciences as well as been a key note speaker at international scientific conferences throughout Africa, Europe, America and South-East Asia.

**Haydon Bailey**

Haydon Bailey has a PhD in Chalk micropalaeontology, is a Chartered Geologist and has worked as a consultant stratigrapher in the oil and gas industry for forty years. He still specialises in Upper Cretaceous Chalk stratigraphy, although work has led to projects throughout much of the geological time scale around Europe, Africa and the Middle East. He’s been Chairman and Industrial Liaison Officer of The Micropalaeontology Society and is currently President of the Geologists’ Association.

Since 2012 Haydon has been Honorary Lecturer on the M.Sc. course in Applied & Petroleum Micropalaeontology at the University of Birmingham. He also holds the position of Geological & Environmental Adviser to the Chiltern Society (since 2008), when his initial role for the Society was to prepare a report on the underlying geology of the Misbourne valley. He is a co-author of the Chalk chapter in “Hertfordshire, Geology & Landscape” published in 2010.
Bob Older

Bob Older is a Chartered engineer BSc (hons) in civil engineering, Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers with 45 years experience in civil engineering construction and project management, ground engineering, water, drainage and irrigation experience, and specifically in relation to the sensitive chalk streams in the Chilterns. His is Chairman of the Misbourne River Action Group who are considered responsible for nurturing the River Misbourne back to health after many years of lack of care and maintenance. He has been monitoring the River Misbourne since 2008 and has access to detailed records relating to flow and condition of the river from 1992.

4. The Prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Signed ...........................................

Cindy Jones, Agent, 18th April 2016

Duly authorised agent of Save St Giles Group, Chalfont St Giles. Having been unanimously voted to Petition against The High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill by members of Save St Giles, 26th March 2016.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF I.M. Properties Developments Ltd.  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the works proposed to be authorised by the Bill ("the Authorised Works") which are specified in 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 schedule 2 to the Bill.  

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner is one of the UK’s largest privately owned property companies. They have entered into an agreement with the freeholders / occupiers of Curborough House Farm and Curborough Hall Farm, Curborough, Lichfield in the county of Staffordshire to promote land located close to the City of Lichfield (known as land to the north east of Watery Lane, Curborough) for residential development. A separate Petition on behalf the freeholders / occupiers of Curborough House Farm has also been submitted in respect of the land / part thereof in which your Petitioner has an interest by virtue of the aforementioned agreement.  

3. Your petitioner's concerns  

3.1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the bill”) has been introduced and is now pending in your honourable House entitled "A bill to make provision for a railway between Euston in London and a junction with the West Coast Main Line at Handsacre in Staffordshire, with a spur from 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".  

3.2. The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill (“the Authorised Works”) are specified in 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 Schedule 2 of the Bill.  

3.3. Your Petitioners do not object to the principle to construct a High Speed railway line between London and the West Midlands.  

3.4. The Petitioner objects to the proposed works which were included in the Additional Provisions and they varied these which were previously
identified for this location. Objection is taken to the works now proposed to be undertaken to the north east of Lichfield City and to the south west of Fradley and in particular, proposed works in the vicinity of Netherstowe Lane and Wood End Lane. Subject to your Petitioner being satisfied that suitable access will be maintained into the land, your Petitioner anticipates this objection is capable of being overcome. This is considered further in paragraph 3.27 and the Petitioner has sought to engage with HS2 and others regarding the alternative.

3.5. The proposed works mainly consist of the provision of the HS2 Mainline and the HS2 Handsacre Link, associated embankments, cuttings and various other landscape and ancillary works including alterations to existing highways.

3.6. The works as previously proposed identified track infrastructure located on an elevated viaduct structure following a different alignment positioned further to the north east which had less potential for direct impact on the existing local highways network and on the land which the Petitioner is promoting for residential development Petitioners land.

3.7. Your Petitioners and their interests are injuriously affected by those works proposed by the Bill, and to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing. The Petitioner has advised an alternative highways solution for Netherstowe Lane and Wood End Lane to those being presented in the Bill.

Background Context

3.8. Your Petitioner has, and continues to actively and vigorously promote the development of land to the north east of Watery Lane, Curborough for residential development. This has included extensive engagement through; the local plan making process; challenges to the local plan through the High Court and Court of Appeal; the development management process; and direct discussions with HS2 Ltd.

The Development Management Process

3.9. A planning application for the development of up to 750 dwellings with associated infrastructure in relation to the land which the Petitioner is promoting for residential development was submitted to Lichfield District Council on 16 January 2014. The application was made in outline form with all matters reserved for future consideration save for means of access. The application was accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment, which inter alia, considered the impacts of HS2.

3.10. The access strategy proposed for the development is to create a new distributor road through the Petitioners land providing a link connecting Watery Lane to the south and Netherstowe Lane / Wood End Lane to
3.11. The planning application was refused by Lichfield District Council on 20 May 2014. A planning appeal against this decision was subsequently lodged by your Petitioner and has been considered by way of a Public Inquiry. The appeal decision has been recovered by the Secretary of State. It has been confirmed by the Planning Inspectorate that the appeal decision of the Secretary of State is to be issued on or before 6th June 2016.

3.12. Your Petitioners and Leading Counsel are firmly of the opinion that there are clear and substantive planning grounds to support the appeal being allowed and that this view has been strengthened by recent Court of Appeal and other decisions of relevance to the issues being considered as part of the appeal.

3.13. In respect of HS2, should planning permission be granted a planning condition has been offered by your Petitioner to the effect that highways improvements to Netherstowe Lane and Wood End Lane will be made in accordance with submitted drawings as prepared by your Petitioner's appointed highways consultants or, will be in the form of an alternate scheme which may be required as a result of HS2. The condition was drafted to take account of comments made by HS2 Ltd to the planning application and has been agreed by Lichfield District Council and Staffordshire County Council (Highways) through the planning appeal process.

The Local Plan Making Process

3.14. Your Petitioner, through their professional advisors (Deloitte LLP, CBRE Ltd and Shoosmiths) has been intensively involved in the promotion of land to the north east of Watery Lane, Curborough since 2011. This has included the preparation of various Hearing Statements and subsequently taking part in Examination Hearings held into the Lichfield Local Plan Strategy and its Proposed Modifications. Through this process, your Petitioner has promoted the land for a new village option of between 2,000 and 4,000 dwellings and more latterly for the development of 750 dwellings which may ultimately form a first phase of the wider new village.

3.15. The Lichfield Local Plan Strategy was adopted in February 2015 and excluded the allocation of the Petitioners land on the basis that it was considered that other preferable sites were available to meet the area's objectively assessed housing need. The Inspector's Report into the Local Plan examination did however identify your Petitioners land and proposals as being sustainable and likely to be deliverable. Accordingly it is highly likely that the land will be brought forward in due course.

3.16. It is highly likely that the Local Plan Strategy will need to be the subject of an early review or early partial review to update its housing policies.
This is because there is a ‘trigger’ in the Local Plan Strategy to undertake a review of the Plan should Lichfield District be required to accommodate a proportion of Birmingham’s housing needs which cannot be met from within Birmingham’s own administrative area. The level of this unmet growth has been confirmed by Birmingham City Council (in proposed amendments to its draft Birmingham Development Plan) as being 37,900 dwellings, alongside the expectation that this unmet growth is to be accommodated in neighbouring authorities (one of which is Lichfield District) so as to address the unmet housing need. The Inspector’s final report into the examination of the Birmingham Development Plan has been issued to Birmingham City Council and formal adoption of the Plan is expected shortly.

3.17. Work to define the distribution of Birmingham’s unmet housing need to different neighbouring authority areas is being led by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) of which Lichfield District is part. The progression of a joint Strategic Housing Needs Study (“SHNS”), which is the review ‘trigger’ included in the Local Plan Strategy, is now completed.

3.18. It is anticipated that the GBSLEP Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth will provide the numerical apportionments of Birmingham’s unmet housing needs to surrounding Districts such as Lichfield. This will further inform the reviews of Local Plans and it is expected to be published for consultation later this year. The exact numerical allocation which will be directed to Lichfield is unknown at present but it is clear that further housing provision will almost certainly need to be provided in Lichfield and the precise number will become clearer over the next few months.

3.19. There are very strong grounds to conclude that some of Birmingham’s housing needs will be directed to the Lichfield District Council area and that this figure will be in the order of several thousand. Even if the Petitioner’s appeal proposals are not allowed, it is considered that the Petitioner’s Land will be of key importance in meeting housing needs in the future, including those of Birmingham.

3.20. The Birmingham housing issue is an important consideration in respect of your Petitioners land because it is the only area of currently unallocated land being promoted for residential development in Lichfield District which: lies adjacent to Lichfield City (which is the District’s highest order settlement with main line rail links to Birmingham and where the majority of future growth is currently focussed), is recognised to be sustainable and deliverable; and also lies wholly outside of the Green Belt. This position is supported by the conclusions of the SHNS which, inter alia, conclude that land to the north east of Lichfield (which includes the Petitioner’s Land and other land between the Lichfield urban area and HS2) represents one of the extremely few opportunities for strategic housing development within
the Birmingham Market Housing Area which (a) are situated outside of the Green Belt; (b) are available, deliverable and sustainable; and (c) are located on the edge of a main settlement accessible to a mainline rail station with convenient links to Birmingham, thereby fitting with both the Public Transport Corridor and Dispersed Growth spatial options preferred by the SHNS.

Discussions with HS2 Ltd

3.21. Your Petitioner has been involved in detailed discussions and meetings with senior members of the Property Acquisitions Team of HS2 Ltd which have taken place over a period of many months.

3.22. Throughout this process a number of potential options have been suggested by HS2 Ltd Officers, some of which would retain the currently proposed alignment as proposed in the Additional Provisions Bill whilst also maintaining an appropriate highways connection within the proposed HS2 safeguarded area between your Petitioners land and the A38 to the north. Of the options currently put forward by 1-152 Ltd, your Petitioner’s preferred option is ‘Wood End Lane AP02 Option E’.

Conclusions

3.23. Your Petitioners and Leading Queens Counsel are firmly of the opinion that there are clear and substantive planning grounds to support the current planning appeal for 750 dwellings on the land being allowed. The Secretary of State’s decision on the planning appeal is expected on or before 6th June 2016 so the outcome of the appeal is expected in a matter of weeks.

3.24. Even if the current appeal proposals fail, there is a very strong argument that the land will be required in the future to meet housing needs, notably to accommodate some of Birmingham’s unmet housing growth required to be directed to Lichfield District. Your Petitioners land is accepted as being sustainable and suitable and it is the only area of land being promoted in Lichfield District which is both adjacent to Lichfield City and outside of the Green Belt.

3.25. For these reasons it is important to ensure that the land remains available for current and future residential development and that an appropriate access strategy can continue to be provided to maintain the deliverability of development.

3.26. Your Petitioners therefore humbly request that the alignment as proposed previously, including the provision of viaduct and other associated works, is reinstated or, that an alternate acceptable solution is found which maintains suitable access onto the land.

3.27. With regards to the final point in the previous paragraph, your Petitioner’s highways consultants (BWB Consulting Ltd) has devised alternate highways solutions for Netherstowe Lane and Wood End
Lane to those being proposed in the Bill at present. More particularly, with the addition of a pumping station, deliverable alternate highways proposals have been identified which will:

3.27.1. Enable the proposed alignment of HS2 to remain unaltered;

3.27.2. Offer a solution which provides a construction cost saving compared to the cost of the highways works for Netherstowe Lane and Wood End Lane identified in the Bill;

3.27.3. Provide for overall environmental benefits, including a lesser impact on the Trent and Mersey Canal and the avoidance of increased traffic on sensitive highways routes in the area;

3.27.4. Ensure more convenient access for existing businesses and land uses in the area; and

3.27.5. Not fetter the development potential of the Petitioner's land.

3.28. In order to maintain the identified access strategy for the development of your Petitioners land and to deliver environmental and other benefits for the area, it is humbly requested that explicit provision is made in the Bill for the creation or retention of a satisfactory highways link connecting Netherstowe Lane and (any realigned) Wood End Lane (along the lines of that identified by your Petitioner) to ensure a continuous route from your Petitioners land to the A38.

3.29. 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,
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Tim Willis  
Shoosmiths  
2 Colmore Square  
38 Queensway  
Birmingham West Midlands  
B4 6BJ  
Tel: +44 (0) 121 625 4095  
Agent for the Petitioner

DATE 18 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Denham Waterski Club

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

2.1 The petitioner is Denham Waterski Club. Your Petitioner is the leasehold owner and occupier of land in the Colne Valley. Parts of the site are within the safeguarded area, including Denham Waterski Club’s clubhouse. The whole site is within the Colne Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) part of the site contains ancient woodland (Battlesford Woods). The club is a member only club and has operated from the site since 1997. The site comprises the clubhouse and waterski lake, Korda Lake, long pond and part Broadwater Lake.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Summary of key issues

3.1 The Petitioner is concerned that the Denham Waterski Club will be adversely affected by land-take by HS2, by the impact on the sporting experience as a result of deterioration in air quality, the loss of trees which currently provide shelter from wind and traffic noise to those using the water and the loss of the aesthetic value and tranquillity of the site, which is a major attraction for participating customers and spectators. It is identified in the HS2 Environmental Statement (paragraph 11.4.8) that there will be a significant noise effect on the clubhouse for a period of 15 months. Customers and staff access the site from the North Orbital Road which is major ‘A’ road due to be used by construction traffic. There are concerns as to journey times, congestion and road closures detracting from customer experience and the reliability of staff and customers arriving on time for bookings.

3.2 In addition to the matters raised below, the Petitioner reserves the right to raise the below matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to our expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to our representation before the Select Committee.

Loss of Habitat

3.3 Your Petitioner requests that the SSSI and ancient woodland be protected from these effects by ensuring that the line passes throughout the surrounding area in a bored tunnel. Ancient woodland is not a habitat that can be recreated and therefore the habitat created as a result of translocation will never be as valuable as the one lost. This would substantially mitigate
the adverse effects objected to in this petition, and the need for the less effective remedies proposed below.

3.4 If it is necessary to translocate habitat, your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should provide detailed translocation management plans in advance of any translocation of wildlife and ancient woodland and these plans should be agreed with the Woodland Trust.

3.5 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should provide detailed translocation management plans in advance of any translocation of wildlife and ancient woodland and these plans should be agreed with the Woodland Trust.

3.6 Your Petitioner is concerned about the responsibility and accountability for the management of all mitigation and compensatory habitat creation and the monitoring of habitats and species.

3.7 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to a binding management and mitigation strategy, and compensatory habitat creation.

3.8 Your Petitioner is concerned that the environmental statement contains very few details about the habitats that are to be provided and the steps that will be taken to create broadly similar habitats.

3.9 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be required to construct a new area of habitats to compensate for habitats being lost to the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development.

Land Take

3.10 Your Petitioner seeks an assurance that the Secretary of State will acquire no greater amount of land than is reasonably required for the construction and operation of the works authorised by the Bill. Your Petitioner requests that the Bill and the deposited plans be amended to exclude land that is not required, or that the Secretary of State be required to enter into legally binding agreements with your Petitioner that land that is not required will not be compulsorily acquired.

3.11 In addition, your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended so that any land which is only required temporarily for construction purposes should be categorised as such and not subject to permanent powers of acquisition. In addition, your Petitioner respectfully requests that clause 47 be removed from the Bill. If land at the site is to be acquired, then your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended or the promoter required to give sufficient notice to both the owner and occupiers before taking the land. The proposals in the Bill for the giving of notice are inadequate. The proposals for compensation in the Bill are also inadequate and should be amended.

3.12 Environmental Statement Maps from the SES3 and AP4 ES refer to map number CT-05-021 and AP4-007-002 noting additional land is required. Your petitioner requires more details plans of the specification and route of the proposed track drainage discharge. Your petitioner suggests a close pipe forms part of the drainage specification and that the drainage ditch is located on the outside of the existing trackway to avoid the need for crossing points to be constructed across the trackway. Your petitioner requests justification
from HS2 of the proposed drainage system. Your petitioner suggests the drainage proposed utilises the existing natural water sources and suggests the water flows to the existing pond which in turn drains into the river.

Mitigation Works

3.13 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker makes a binding commitment to effective travel planning for the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development including agreeing a travel plan with the relevant local authority for businesses in the area.

3.14 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker is subject to binding mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of the works. 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 to ensure the Denham Waterski Club can continue to function during the construction of HS2 and thereafter when HS2 operates.

Compliance and monitoring

3.15 Your Petitioner submits that the nominated undertaker has no incentive to minimize harmful environmental impacts arising from the construction and operation of the high-speed railway and submits that measures designed to ensure effective monitoring of compliance with these restrictions and enforcement of these restrictions be introduced to the Bill. The nominated undertaker should also mitigate the impact of noise, dust, vibration and impacts on visual amenity through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.

Noise

3.16 Your petitioner is concerned about the impact of noise on the site as trains from the high speed line pass the area. Noise from passing trains will directly impact on the experience of customers using the waterski club, in particular the clubhouse, which is used in part for coaching and educational training and for social functions.

3.17 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that no noise can be felt from within the club's site and there are no other adverse effects.

3.18 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.

3.19 The 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 include but not be limited to full noise barriers and noise insulation for buildings and re-housing. The trigger levels at which point noise mitigation becomes necessary should reflect prevailing World Health Organisation guidance.

Pollution

3.20 Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State or arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the nominated undertaker. Your Petitioner requests that Clause 35 and Schedule 25 are deleted from the Bill.

Highways and Traffic

3.21 Your Petitioner is concerned about the use of unsuitable highways by large vehicles delivering equipment and supplies, and removal of spoil during the construction works as well as use of highways by other vehicles. The disruptive effect of these vehicle movements will be compounded by road closures which will impact the ability of staff and visitors to get to the business premises, asset out above.

3.22 Your Petitioner requests that hours for the movement of construction traffic is prohibited between 07:30 to 09:00 and to 15:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday, and in particular at weekends, when the Denham Waterski Club is at its busiest and there are limits on the number of vehicle movements, limits on the size of vehicles to ensure that disruption is minimized.

3.23 Your Petitioner further requests that binding mitigation measures should include traffic management plans to be agreed between the nominated undertaker, the relevant local authority and the relevant highway authority to be monitored and enforced by environmental health officers employed by the local authority.

Accountability

3.24 Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaking's ongoing accountability is unspecified. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply and the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event that the contractors do not comply with the Code of Construction Practice. Assessment in the environmental statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be fully effective, however, the Code of Construction Practice has no legal status.

3.25 Your Petitioner submits that the Code of Construction Practice should be incorporated into the Bill. Parliament and not the nominated undertaking 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.

3.26 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 verifiable and challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

3.27 Your Petitioner submits that clear and easy to follow enforcement mechanisms for local communities and local authorities should be included in the Bill. This will provide a commitment to rectify or compensate for environmental impacts.

Air Quality

3.28 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 on customers carrying a sporting activity and on wildlife.

3.29 Your Petitioner requests that before construction there should be an air quality baseline monitoring study benchmarked against the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 and a copy of this report should be provided to the Petitioner. Your petitioner submits the nominated undertaker be required to ensure its activities do not breach the standards detailed in such regulations and if such standards are breached, your Petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker be required to cease its activities until air quality standards are brought into line with such standards.

3.30 Your Petitioner requests that the local authority should be provided with funding to undertake responsibility, compliance and enforcement for the monitoring, of air quality in accordance with these binding mitigation plans and that the results of monitoring are made publicly available.
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.

Edward Henry Stephen Briggs

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Ivydrive Development Company Ltd.  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

2.1. The petitioner is Ivydrive Development Company Ltd. Your Petitioner is the freeholder of the land occupied by the Denham Waterski Club, the Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust and the British Carp Study Group, located within the Colne Valley. Parts of the site are within the safeguarded area, including Denham Waterski Club’s clubhouse. The whole site is within the Colne Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) part of the site contains ancient woodland (Battlesford Woods). The Property comprises the clubhouse and waterski lake, Korda Lake, long pond and part Broadwater Lake.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

Summary of key issues  

3.1. The petitioner is concerned that the Denham Waterski Club will be adversely affected by land-take by HS2, by the impact on the sporting experience as a result of deterioration in air quality, the loss of trees which currently provide shelter from wind and traffic noise to those using the water and the loss of the aesthetic value and tranquillity of the site, which is a major attraction for participating customers and spectators. It is identified in the HS2 Environmental Statement (paragraph 11.4.8) that there will be a significant noise effect on the clubhouse for a period of 15 months. Customers and staff access the site from the North Orbital Road which is major ‘A’ road due to be used by construction traffic. There are concerns as to journey times, congestion and road closures detracting from customer experience and the reliability of staff and customers arriving on time for bookings.  

3.2. In addition to the matters raised below, the Petitioner reserves the right to raise the below matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to our expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to our representation before the Select Committee.  

Loss of Habitat  

3.3. Your Petitioner requests that the SSSI and ancient woodland be protected from these effects by ensuring that the line passes throughout the surrounding area in a bored tunnel.
Ancient woodland is not a habitat that can be recreated and therefore the habitat created as a result of translocation will never be as valuable as the one lost. This would substantially mitigate the adverse effects objected to in this petition, and the need for the less effective remedies proposed below.

3.4. If it is necessary to translocate habitat, your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should provide detailed translocation management plans in advance of any translocation of wildlife and ancient woodland and these plans should be agreed with the Woodland Trust.

3.5. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should provide detailed translocation management plans in advance of any translocation of wildlife and ancient woodland and these plans should be agreed with the Woodland Trust.

3.6. Your Petitioner is concerned about the responsibility and accountability for the management of all mitigation and compensatory habitat creation and the monitoring of habitats and species.

3.7. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to a binding management and mitigation strategy, and compensatory habitat creation.

3.8. Your Petitioner is concerned that the environmental statement contains very few details about the habitats that are to be provided and the steps that will be taken to create broadly similar habitats.

3.9. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be required to construct a new area of habitats to compensate for habitats being lost to the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development.

Land Take

3.10. Your Petitioner seeks an assurance that the Secretary of State will acquire no greater amount of land than is reasonably required for the construction and operation of the works authorised by the Bill. Your Petitioner requests that the Bill and the deposited plans be amended to exclude land that is not required, or that the Secretary of State be required to enter into legally binding agreements with your Petitioner that land that is not required will not be compulsorily acquired.

3.11. In addition, your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended so that any land which is only required temporarily for construction purposes should be categorised as such and not subject to permanent powers of acquisition. In addition, your Petitioner respectfully requests that clause 47 be removed from the Bill.

3.12. If land at the site is to be acquired, then your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended or the promoter required to give sufficient notice to both the owner and occupiers before taking the land. The proposals in the Bill for the giving of notice are inadequate. The proposals for compensation in the Bill are also inadequate and should be amended.
3.13. Environmental Statement Maps from the SES3 and AP4 ES refer to map number CT-05-020 and SES3-007001 noting “reconfiguration of land required”. It is unclear from the plans, as to the details supporting this reconfiguration. Your petitioner is concerned this is an area of steep topography and both plans CT-05-020 and CT-06-020 do not provide sufficient detail. Your petitioner requests engagement from HS2 and agreement to as far as reasonably practical to accommodate his designs and limit the landscape and alterations to this area.

3.14. The same plan (CT-05-020) details two areas of temporary material stockpile. Your petitioner requests justification from HS2 as to the siting, volume, heights and timescales associated with the proposed western stockpile. Your petitioner is concerned the location of this stockpile will affect his future plans on his Property, and requests HS2 remove or re-site this to an area of lower economic value to reduce the impact upon his Property.

3.15. Environmental Statement Maps from the SES3 and AP4 ES refer to map number CT-05-021 and AP4-007-002 noting additional land is required. Your petitioner requires more details plans of the specification and route of the proposed track drainage discharge. Your petitioner suggests a close pipe forms part of the drainage specification and that the drainage ditch is located on the outside of the existing trackway to avoid the need for crossing points to be constructed across the trackway. Your petitioner requests justification from HS2 of the proposed drainage system. Your petitioner suggests the drainage proposed utilises the existing natural water sources and suggests the water flows to the existing pond which in turn drains into the river.

Mitigation Works

3.16. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker makes a binding commitment to effective travel planning for the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development including agreeing a travel plan with the relevant local authority for businesses in the area.

3.17. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker is subject to binding mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of the works. 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 to ensure the Denham Waterski Club can continue to function during the construction of HS2 and thereafter when HS2 operates.

Compliance and monitoring

3.18. Your Petitioner submits that the nominated undertaker has no incentive to minimize harmful environmental impacts arising from the construction and operation of the high-speed railway and submits that measures designed to ensure effective monitoring of compliance with these restrictions and enforcement of these restrictions be introduced to the Bill. The nominated undertaker should also mitigate the impact of noise, dust, vibration and impacts on visual amenity through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.
Noise

3.19. Your petitioner is concerned about the impact of noise on the site as trains from the high speed line pass the area. Noise from passing trains will directly impact on the experience of customers using the waterski club, in particular the clubhouse, which is used in part for coaching and educational training and for social functions.

3.20. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that no noise can be felt from within the club's site and there are no other adverse effects.

3.21. 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.

3.22. The 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 include but not be limited to full noise barriers and noise insulation for buildings and re-housing. The trigger levels at which point noise mitigation becomes necessary should reflect prevailing World Health Organisation guidance.

Pollution

3.23. Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State or arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the nominated undertaker. Your Petitioner requests that Clause 35 and schedule 25 are deleted from the Bill.

Highways and Traffic

3.24. Your Petitioner is concerned about the use of unsuitable highways by large vehicles delivering equipment and supplies, and removal of spoil during the construction works as well as use of highways by other vehicles. The disruptive effect of these vehicle movements will be compounded by road closures which will impact the ability of staff and visitors to get to the business premises, asset out above.

3.25. Your Petitioner requests that hours for the movement of construction traffic is prohibited between 07:30 to 09:00 and to 15.00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday, and in particular at weekends, when the Denham Waterski Club is at its busiest and there are limits on the
number of vehicle movements, limits on the size of vehicles to ensure that disruption is minimized.

3.26. Your Petitioner further requests that binding mitigation measures should include traffic management plans to be agreed between the nominated undertaker, the relevant local authority and the relevant highway authority to be monitored and enforced by environmental health officers employed by the local authority.

Accountability

3.27. Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaker’s ongoing accountability to is unspecified. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply and the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event that the contractors do not comply with the Code of Construction Practice. Assessment in the environmental statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be fully effective, however, the Code of Construction Practice has no legal status.

3.28. 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.

3.29. 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 verifiable and challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

3.30. Your Petitioner submits that clear and easy to follow enforcement mechanisms for local communities and local authorities should be included in the Bill. This will provide a commitment to rectify or compensate for environmental impacts.

Air Quality

3.31. 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 on customers carrying a sporting activity and on wildlife.

3.32. Your Petitioner requests that before construction there should be an air quality baseline monitoring study benchmarked against the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 and a copy of this report should be provided to the Petitioner. Your petitioner submits the nominated undertaker be required to ensure its activities do not breach the standards detailed in such regulations and if such standards are breached, your Petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker be required to cease its activities until air quality standards are brought into line with such standards.
3.33. Your Petitioner requests that the local authority should be provided with funding to undertake responsibility, compliance and enforcement for the monitoring of air quality in accordance with these binding mitigation plans and that the results of monitoring are made publicly available.

Fishing Habitat

3.34. Korda Lake, part Broadwater lake and long pond are all occupied by The British Carp Study Group. The BCSG is a national single species organisation for experienced and successful carp anglers. It's main purpose is social, encouraging the free exchange of information between members who, by the nature of the standard required for membership, are some of the most experienced carp anglers in the country. It is a group member of the Angling Trust.

3.35. As part of the services we provide to our members we manage three angling sites in various parts of the country. The Korda Lake/Long Pond/Broadwater/River Colne complex is our flagship site. Korda Lake especially is considered to be one of the premier carp and tench lakes in the country. The complex has been extremely successfully managed, stocked and maintained by us for in the region of 20 years and it has produced specimen carp to over fifty pounds in weight and specimen tench to 14lbs. Membership is much sought after.

3.36. They have continual access to the lakes and river on foot and by vehicle. Anglers travel from all over the UK and stay on site for periods ranging from of 24 hours up to a week. A major part of the attraction of this site is that angling takes place within the peaceful natural environment of the Mid Colne Valley SSSI.

3.37. There are bailiffs who visit the site on a daily basis and are on call 24 hours a day if there are problems at the site. Site Security and security of fishing stocks are extremely important to use. The replacement value of the carp alone in Korda Lake alone is in the region of £100,000 if they were commercially available and theft is quite common at other venues.

3.38. Your petitioner is concerned about safety and security of the fishing stocks during construction if your petitioner and the British Carp Study Group do not have full access and maintain a presence on site. Your petitioner requests that HS2 engage with him and the current occupier being the British Carp Study Group to allow pedestrian and vehicular access to ensure the ongoing security of the site is maintained.

3.39. Your petitioner understands that that the British Carp Study Group’s membership year runs from May to May. Your petitioner supports their ongoing occupancy and requests HS2’s prompt engagement to enable your petitioner and the British Carp Study Group to plan for the forthcoming membership year and ensure ongoing access for members, maintenance and security.

3.40. Your petitioner considers the British Carp Study Group’s occupancy as vital to the sustainability of the site. The occupancy provides a social function supported by their national membership. It provides valuable economic income, which further allows for the ongoing maintenance of the site. Their occupancy provides an environmental benefit as their constant presence on site ensures the lakes and surrounding ecosystem are
maintained to the high standard to support the fish stocks. Your petitioner considers their occupancy continues to enhance the ecological and freehold value of the site. Your petitioner requests active engagement with the British Carp Study Group to ensure to support their occupancy and custodianship of the property.
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.

Edward Henry Stephen Briggs

18th April 2016
IN PARLIAMENT

THE HOUSE OF LORDS

SESSION 2015–16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Against – on Merits – Praying to be heard by Counsel, &c.

THE HUMBLE PETITION of HEATHROW AIRPORT LIMITED AND THE HEATHROW EXPRESS OPERATING COMPANY LIMITED

YOUR PETITIONERS DECLARE that:

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced into and is now pending in your noble 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 Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes.”

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

YOUR PETITIONERS

3. Your first-named Petitioner, Heathrow Airport Limited (“HAL”), is the operator of Heathrow Airport (“Heathrow”), the UK’s only hub airport. Heathrow accommodates 82 airlines serving 180 destinations (in 85 countries). In 2015 over 75 million passengers passed through the airport. Some 45.5 million of these passengers begin or end their journey in the UK and therefore require effective and reliable surface transport connections to get to or from the airport. As a major transport interchange and the busiest bus and coach hub in the UK, Heathrow is served by the Heathrow Express (“HEX”) and Heathrow Connect (“Connect”) rail services and the Piccadilly Line tube, providing services to and from Central London, and over 500,000 bus and coach services a year. HAL has invested over £1 billion in rail infrastructure at Heathrow including track, stations, rolling stock and depot infrastructure which forms part of the airport’s overall Regulated Asset Base (RAB).
4. Your second-named Petitioner, Heathrow Express Operating Company Limited ("HEOC"), is a wholly owned subsidiary of HAL. HEOC is a major employer in its own right and employs over 450 skilled members of staff. It operates the premium HEx rail service and the Connect stopping service between Heathrow and Paddington. Together, HEx and Connect contribute over £100 million to servicing the cost of the RAB.

5. Since it began operating in 1998, HEx has offered a fast, dedicated, direct, premium service for airport passengers. HEx is the fastest route between Central London and Heathrow with a journey time of 15 minutes every 15 minutes throughout the day. It is a vital and highly valued component of the public transport offering to access the airport, serving 5.5 million passengers a year (16,000 passengers a day) and accounting for some 25% of Heathrow’s public transport mode share. HEx has carried over 60 million people since its launch. HEx is designed specifically for the needs of airport passengers with level access, wider doors and generous luggage racks. On-board services include free Wi-Fi, at-seat power sockets and comfortable seating, delivering high levels of passenger satisfaction. In the most recent 2013 National Rail Passenger Survey, HEx scored highest of any rail service in the country for passenger satisfaction (96%) and was voted the highest performing train service overall.

6. Connect is a half hourly stopping rail service running between Heathrow and Paddington station calling at Ealing Broadway, West Ealing, Hanwell, Southall, Hayes & Harlington and Heathrow Terminals 1, 2 and 3 ("T123") only. Connect complements the premium HEx service, and is particularly important to Heathrow staff, as well as passengers travelling to Heathrow from these areas. Connect is operated by HEOC under a joint venture arrangement with First Great Western ("FGW") as it is a requirement of FGW's service franchise agreement to provide a stopping service to Hayes and Harlington.

7. HEx and Connect are of strategic importance to HAL and to the airlines using Heathrow. HEx in particular is in the control of HAL and independent of third party involvement, guaranteeing a fast dedicated premium rail link for Heathrow’s passengers. Fast, frequent and reliable travel between Heathrow and Central London is critical to passengers, airlines and to Heathrow in maintaining its attractiveness and reputation as a premier international travel hub. With HS2 in place, HEx will continue to provide the only express link between Heathrow and Central London and will become the only fast, non-stop service between Heathrow and the high-speed network. HEx is a critical part of the surface access proposition, particularly for business passengers. HEx / Connect, together with the Piccadilly Line and buses provide an important part of the free inter-terminal transport provision between Terminals 1, 2 & 3, Terminal 4 and Terminal 5.
8. HEx and Connect are operated partly on rail infrastructure (stations, tunnels and track) within HAL's ownership and partly along the Great Western Main Line ("GWML"). HEx is operated under a Track Access Agreement entered into in 1993 between HAL and the then British Railways Board ("the Access Agreement").

9. Outside of HAL's demise, HEOC holds an operator's licence under section 8 of the Railways Act 1993 and is permitted to run a non-stop service to Paddington under the Access Agreement.

10. The western section of the Crossrail route runs from Paddington in west London to Heathrow and Reading. From the intended opening date of May 2018, Crossrail will provide services between Heathrow and Paddington, subsuming the Connect services and doubling service frequency to quarter-hourly. In 2019, full Crossrail services will begin serving Heathrow with 4 trains per hour providing a stopping service through Central London to East London. In combination with HEx there will then be 8 trains per hour connecting Heathrow to London.

11. Your Petitioners do not petition against the Bill your noble House in respect of its effects on Connect services after May 2018, but there will nevertheless be a significant adverse impact on the provision of Connect services between the implementation of the powers in the Bill, should it be passed in its current form, and the date on which Crossrail becomes operational.

12. HEx services operate in a substantively separate market segment to the proposed Crossrail services and accordingly the bringing into operation of Crossrail is of no relevance to the HEx services or to the adverse effect of the Bill, should it be passed in its present form, on those services.

YOUR PETITIONER'S CONCERNS

13. Your Petitioners are supportive, in principle, of the proposal to construct a new high speed railway between London and the West Midlands ("HS2 Phase 1").

14. Your Petitioners previously raised concerns as to the proposed acquisition under the Bill of your Petitioners' depot for their HEx and Connect operations and the proposals for a replacement depot, which your Petitioners were concerned were not adequate. Your Petitioners have been in detailed discussions with the Secretary of State for Transport ("the Secretary of State") who has worked hard to understand and meet your Petitioners' concerns. Your Petitioners have entered into an agreement ("the Relocation Agreement") with the Secretary of State whereby the Secretary of State has committed, subject to certain conditions, to provide a replacement depot in a different place. That replacement depot is now authorised by the Bill. Your
Petitioners are pleased at this outcome and so no aspects of the provision of the replacement depot are raised in this petition.

15. In addition, your Petitioners previously raised concerns in relation to the disruption to be caused to Heathrow, HEx and Connect services during the construction of the Scheduled Works contained in the Bill and that there was not sufficient mitigation or compensation provided for those impacts.

16. Again, your Petitioners have been in detailed discussion with the Secretary of State for Transport in relation to these concerns and all parties have made good progress. A further agreement in draft ("the draft Compensation Agreement") was developed between your Petitioners and the Secretary of State and on 22 January 2016, in relation to the draft Compensation Agreement the Secretary of State gave to your Petitioners an undertaking in the following terms:

"In consideration of HAL and HEOC not appearing before the Select Committee of the House of Commons further to their petition ..., the Secretary of State undertakes that:

1. the draft Compensation Agreement attached ("the Agreement") will be referred to the Department for Transport’s Legislative Decision Board in respect of the Bill at the next available opportunity (currently anticipated to be 29 January 2016);

2. should the Legislative Decision Board approve the Agreement, the Secretary of State will execute the Agreement within 5 working days of such approval;

3. in any event, the Secretary of State will use all reasonable endeavours to enter into an agreement substantially in the form of the Agreement within 4 weeks of the date of the Undertaking, subject to HAL and HEOC doing likewise; and

4. the Secretary of State will not take the fact that HAL or HEOC did not appear before the Select Committee as a point of prejudice against either of them should either of them deem it appropriate to deposit a petition against the Bill in the House of Lords."

17. Representatives of your Petitioners and the Secretary of State continued to negotiate minor points on the draft Compensation Agreement over the period immediately following receipt of the undertaking until your Petitioners definitively agreed the Secretary of State’s most recent changes on 21 March 2016. Your Petitioners were informed that the draft Compensation Agreement would be put forward for approval by
the Secretary of State. Unfortunately, no such approval has been indicated as at the
date of this petition and the draft Compensation Agreement has therefore not been
executed.

18. As at the date of this petition, your Petitioners have been informed that the Secretary
of State's representatives have secured an appointment with the Secretary of State on
Tuesday 19 April to seek his endorsement of the draft Compensation Agreement,
which your Petitioners hope will be forthcoming.

19. It is therefore with regret that your Petitioners are obliged to petition your noble House
in the meantime, in order that your Petitioners can bring these issues before a Select
Committee of your noble House pending, or following, (as the case may be) the
Secretary of State's determination on the draft Compensation Agreement.

20. Your Petitioners therefore petition against the Bill in order that, if need be, the Select
Committee can consider the issues raised in this petition and give a direction or
recommendation to the Promoter if the Select Committee considers it appropriate.

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

AND YOUR PETITIONERS REMAIN, &C.

PINSENT MASON LLP
Parliamentary Agents for Heathrow Airport Limited and the Heathrow Express Operating
Company Limited

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Searchaid Limited

Declares that:

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

2. The Petitioner is Searchaid Limited which is a small business providing services to solicitors and others to assist in the completion of property transactions. The business is located at 5 Hinton Road, Brackley NN13 7EQ and staff members have to frequently travel around the Brackley area.

3. Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development at Brackley poses a risk to the commercial and employment activities undertaken by Searchaid Limited. The current plans for HS2 mean activities will be significantly disrupted due to years of severe congestion around Brackley, longer journey times for staff and customers, noise from construction and operation of HS2 and reduced air quality. This petition is made on behalf of Searchaid Limited.

Access for staff and visitors to our business

4. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker makes a binding commitment to effective travel planning for the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development including agreeing a travel plan with the relevant local authority for businesses in the area.

Disruption from construction and operation of HS2

5. Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and its associated development including but not limited to construction operations including moving almost 9 million tonnes of material, up to 1,430 HGV movements per day for at least 17 months, two construction compounds, storage compounds, overhead cranes, and then the noise and impact of the operation of the railway at Brackley.

6. Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker is subject to binding mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of the works. These binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to restrictions on noise, dust, vibration, construction hours, vehicle movements, operating hours and design of structures to ensure the Searchaid Limited can continue to function after the construction of HS2 commences.

7. Your petitioner submits that the nominated undertaker has no incentive to minimize harmful environmental impacts arising from the construction and operation of the high speed railway and submits that measures designed to ensure effective monitoring of compliance with these restrictions and enforcement of these restrictions be introduced to the Bill. The nominated undertaker should also mitigate the impact of noise, dust, vibration and impacts.
on visual amenity through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.

Highways and Construction Traffic

8. Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction of the high speed railway and associated development at Brackley and on the wider area will severely impact upon the quiet enjoyment of your petitioner's premises and the neighbourhood by way of noise, disturbance, visual intrusion and traffic increases. This will include up to 1,430 HGV movements per day and major works on three of the four routes into Brackley.

9. Your Petitioner is concerned about the use of unsuitable highways by large vehicles delivering equipment and supplies, and removal of spoil during the construction works as well as use of highways by other vehicles. The disruptive effect of these vehicle movements will be compounded by major road realignments which will impact the ability of staff and visitors to get to the business premises.

10. Your Petitioner requests that hours for the movement of construction traffic is prohibited between 07:30 to 09:00 and to 15:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday, and there are limits on the number of vehicle movements, limits on the size of vehicles to ensure that disruption is minimized.

11. Your Petitioner further requests that binding mitigation measures should include traffic management plans to be agreed between the nominated undertaker, the relevant local authority and the relevant highway authority to be monitored and enforced by environmental health officers employed by the local authority.

Code of Construction Practice

12. Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaker's ongoing accountability is unspecified. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply and the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event that the contractors do not comply with the Code of Construction Practice. Assessment in the environmental statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be fully effective; however, the Code of Construction Practice has no legal status.

13. 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.

14. 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 verifiable and challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

15. Your Petitioner submits that clear and easy to follow enforcement mechanisms for local communities and local authorities should be included in the Bill. This will provide a commitment to rectify or compensate for environmental impacts.
Air Quality

16. 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 staff and visitors at Searchaid Limited.

17. Your Petitioner requests that before construction there should be an air quality baseline monitoring study benchmarked against the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 and a copy of this report should be provided to Searchaid Limited. Your petitioner submits the nominated undertaker be required to ensure its activities do not breach the standards detailed in such regulations and if such standards are breached, your Petitioner requests that the Nominated Undertaker be required to cease its activities until air quality standards are brought into line with such standards.

18. Your Petitioner requests that the local authority should be provided with funding to undertake responsibility, compliance and enforcement for the monitoring of air quality in accordance with these binding mitigation plans and that the results of monitoring are made publicly available.

19. In light of the above, the Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to our expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to our representation before the Select Committee.

20. 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.

21. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their rights, (including their human rights) interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

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.

Karen Green

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF JESTICO + WHILES + ASSOCIATES LTD - ARCHITECTS + INTERIOR DESIGNERS

 Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill and in particular Clauses 1, 4 and 18.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is a Limited Company, a nominee company, incorporated in England as a practice of Architects + Interior Designers with over 100 employees, contributing up to £100m to the local economy as annual turnover.

The petitioner has a Leasehold interest in a 5,000ft² building (B1 use class) at 1 Cobourg Street, London, NW1 2HP which it has occupied since 1998 (18 years) with a further 8 years remaining on the lease and a long term ambition to continue occupying the premises as a vital component of its ongoing business. The property is located 50m to the west of Euston station and is located within the High Speed Two Phase One Safeguarding Area and as such the Bill will specially and directly affect the continued and successful operation of the international architectural business that has operated in the area around Euston for over 30 years.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

The petitioner occupies a building within the High Speed Two Phase One Safeguarding Area for carrying out its international architectural business activities, providing offices and support facilities for its 100 employees. The compulsory purchase of the property at 1 Cobourg Street will mean that the business is specially and directly affected by the Bill which could lead to the extinguishment of the business.

Jestico + Whiles Architects converted this mid nineteenth century former warehouse building that used to serve as the incoming stables and goods depot for Euston station into its architectural studio space in 1997. This unique locally listed historic building provides a showcase for the practice’s work to visiting clients and fellow consultants as well as providing valuable social and amenity space for employees including an open south facing yard and a separate bicycle storage yard for employees. The property is extremely well located for the Company’s clients, co-consultants and employees in close proximity to Euston station and the West End at an affordable rent. The building also enjoys a treasured outlook over the adjacent St James Park, which is very hard to find in Central London.

The Company also occupies adjacent premises within 100m of the property at 231 North Gower Street NW1 2NR, which sits outside of the High Speed Two Phase One Safeguarding Area. The two buildings (one inside and one outside the Safeguarding Area) are linked by a sub-surface fibre optic cable installed by the company at its own expense in the public highway to ensure high speed network connections across the business, and this cable passes partially through the Safeguarding Area. This means that both properties may be specially and directly adversely affected by the Bill as this connection would be severed.
The harm caused to the Company relates to the potential loss of business premises at 1 Cobourg Street and the disconnection of premises at 231 North Gower Street. In seeking alternative premises the Company would be forced to forfeit close proximity to major transport links, views over a park and a characterful historic building as the practice’s showcase premises, which are extremely unlikely to be available in the locality at an affordable rent.

The passage of the HS2 Bill and the designation of our business premises within the Safeguarding Area has resulted in many years of uncertainty surrounding our ability to continue occupying the premises. As the Bill appears to be approaching its Royal Charter the prospect of a relocation seems increasingly likely, but the company is financially committed to a 10 year lease and therefore unable to act in the best interests of the Company. The lack of information and total lack of engagement from HS2, despite approaches from the company, has blighted the company’s ability to plan for the future and the uncertainty surrounding proper compensation has impeded and is continuing to impede the Company’s business performance.

The petitioner therefore objects to the inclusion of 1 Cobourg Street within the Safeguarding Area due to the impact that this will have on the Company’s ability to continue operating from this unique former stables building overlooking St James Park, and the indirect impact this will have on the connected business premises at 231 North Gower Street.

The Bill should be amended to ensure that businesses specially and directly affected by the Bill are properly compensated, to require as much information as possible to be provided to help Businesses plan for their future and to require agents of HS2 to actively engage with local businesses to minimise disruption and any negative impact on their continued and successful operation. The Bill should be amended to ensure that once compulsory purchase proceedings are commenced against the petitioner’s Freeholder that sufficient time and compensation is allowed to enable a planned and equivalent relocation by the Leaseholder, which property agents’ advice could take between 6 and 18 months in the current market. The current proposed timetable for HS2 is completely impractical to enable relocation once compulsory purchase has commenced.

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she, or someone representing the Company in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to 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,

Signed on behalf of Jestico + Whiles + Associates Ltd.

Suzanne K Gilmour, Director
Appointed as Agent by the Board of Directors
Jestico + Whiles + Associates Ltd (registered company 2891337)

18 April 2016
IN PARLIAMENT
THE HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015–16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Against – on Merits – Praying to be heard by Counsel, &c.

THE HUMBLE PETITION of WARDINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

YOUR PETITIONER DECLARES that:

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced and is now pending in your noble 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 Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes.”

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

YOUR PETITIONER

3. Your Petitioner is the Council of the Parish of Wardington in Oxfordshire. The Parish, which comprises 497 inhabitants, is particularly affected by the proposed use of the A361 by HS2 construction traffic.

YOUR PETITIONER’S CONCERNS

A361: vehicle movements

4. The A361 runs through Wardington village, incorporating a number of sharp turns where homes and local amenities front the road. The A361 is a key route carrying traffic between the M1 in the north and the M40 in the south at Junction 11, passing through a number of villages
including Chipping Warden (the site of a construction compound). That part of Wardington through which the A361 runs is within a conservation area.

5. Your Petitioner has significant concerns as to safety, noise and vibration, air quality, impact on businesses and local roads, and damage to the infrastructure of the A361 from heavy use of the A361 by HGVs and other vehicles.

6. Your Petitioner is particularly concerned as to the safety implications of such a heavy volume of traffic. It will be impossible for pedestrians to cross the A361 through Wardington safely. Some residents need to cross the road to reach the main part of the village. There is a bus stop which can only be accessed by crossing the road. The footpath is so narrow that pedestrians will be in danger from HGVs. The road cannot be widened at a number of pinch points. There are a number of bends, and forward visibility is poor in a number of places.

7. Your Petitioner believes that these safety concerns could only be addressed (and then not adequately) by the introduction of traffic lights (which would cause unacceptable congestion).

8. On the 3-mile stretch of the A361 between J11 of the M40 and Wardington there were 85 casualties in the 5-year period 2011-15. Your Petitioner is concerned that casualty numbers will rise if there is a significant increase in the numbers of HGVs and vehicles on the A361.

9. HS2 Limited has given an assurance to your Petitioner that it will “seek to reduce as far as reasonably practicable the number of HGVs using the A361 through Wardington to a number below 500 each way per day”. This is, in your Petitioner’s view, inadequate. It is not even an absolute commitment. It is your Petitioner’s view - endorsed by the Select Committee in the House of Commons - that Wardington could not cope with 500 HGVs each way per day. Indeed, it is your Petitioner’s view that the village would be unable to cope with even very substantially reduced numbers. The A361 as it passes through Wardington is, your Petitioner contends, currently unsuitable for HGV use.

10. HS2’s proposed limit of 1,000 HGVs per day is in addition to:

   (a) 204 HS2 LGVs;

   (b) 377 non-HS2 HGVs (2014 figure); and

   (c) 7,342 other vehicles (2015 figure; 12 hour period).
11. This amounts to one vehicle every 2.18 seconds.

12. Despite encouragement from the House of Commons Select Committee, your Petitioner has had no confirmation that there will be substantial reductions in the number of HGVs below 1,000 per day. The latest information supplied by HS2 indicates that there will be 1,120 HS2 vehicles on the A361 south of Chipping Warden. There is a footnote stating that HGV numbers will be limited to 500 each way.

13. It is also a matter of concern that the reduction in the proposed numbers of HGVs from 2,240 per day to 1,000 per day will be effected by increasing the period of peak construction traffic. This will not materially reduce the adverse impact on Wardington. Your Petitioner is concerned that HS2 intends there to be vehicle movements on Saturdays between 8am and 1pm.

14. Your Petitioner accordingly asks that the Bill be amended so as to (i) require the Promoter to make fewer (preferably much fewer) than 500 traffic movements through Wardington each way per day; and (ii) to prohibit HS2 traffic movements on the A361 south of Chipping Warden outside of week days between 8 am and 6 pm.

*Impact assessment and monitoring*

15. Your Petitioner is also concerned that there will be significant adverse impacts from increased noise, vibration, and pollution, and that the environmental impact of an additional 1,000 HGVs and 204 LGVs on Wardington and that these have not been properly assessed. Your Petitioner asks that the Promoter be required to carry out an appropriate assessment of the environmental (including noise, vibration, air quality, traffic and transport impacts) and safety effects of HS2 on the Wardington community.

16. Your Petitioner asks that the Promoter be required to take all reasonable steps to remedy and/or mitigate any adverse impact identified in its full-scale assessment prior to the commencement of HS2 construction works. It further asks that the Promoter be required to put in place intelligent monitoring systems before and during the period of construction to ensure that the maximum permitted number of HGVs is not exceeded, and that noise, vibration and pollution restrictions are not infringed.

*Extension of haul road to Turweston*

17. Due to pressure from your Petitioner, HS2 Limited has committed to construct a temporary haul road from Chipping Warden roadhead to Greatworth during the carrying out of bulk earthwork facilities to relieve traffic on the A361. Your Petitioner believes that the haul road should be extended to Turweston so as to relieve pressure on the A361. Extending the haul road, rather
than moving spoil on public roads over a distance of approximately 24 kilometres, would yield beneficial cost savings to the Promoter.

18. HS2 Limited has only committed to undertake a review of the technical and economic case for the extension. Your Petitioner asks that the Bill be amended so as to require the Promoter to extend the haul road to Turweston.

Bypass

19. Your Petitioner is concerned that no measure for managing HS2 construction traffic on the A361 will be sufficient to address its concerns. HS2 Limited have proposed a number of mitigation measures, such as widening the A361, and the provision of a double solid central line to make it clear that overtaking is not possible. However, the road cannot be widened at its narrowest point (6 metres), and there is no possibility of overtaking in any event due to the narrow width of the road.

20. Your Petitioner has proposed that a bypass be constructed around the village of Wardington. This would go a long way to address concerns as to safety, noise, pollution, damage to road surface, vibration, congestion, property devaluation, access and egress, and emergency services. It would significantly reduce journey times for all vehicular users of the A361, including HS2 construction traffic. It would reduce the adverse impact on local B roads. It would also be of long-term benefit to the parishioners of Wardington and to the general public as users of the A361. At present, HGVs regularly mount the kerbs leaving tracks on the grass verges. Where two or more HGVs pass each other, they have to reduce their speed to a halt.

21. The House of Commons Select Committee made reference to such a bypass in their Report when encouraging the Promoter to take a creative approach to the reduction of the traffic burden on Wardington.

22. There is a suitable route for a bypass, to the east of the village of Wardington. This would be about 1000-1200 metres in length, crossing agricultural land. Discussions are on-going between the owners of the affected land and your Petitioner. The majority of the affected landowners have indicated a willingness in principle, subject to adequate safeguards and appropriate compensation, to give consent.
23. The residents of the Parish are overwhelmingly in favour of a bypass.

24. The Promoter has not given full and proper consideration to the feasibility and advantages of constructing a bypass, or even a temporary haul road, around Wardington.

25. Your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended so as to provide for the construction of a bypass to the east of Wardington.

Movement of excavated material from Priors Hardwick

26. Your Petitioner is concerned that HS2 has failed to justify its need for excavated material at Lower Boddington and therefore asks that the Promoter be required to carry out a review of the extent of the need for excavated material at Lower Boddington.

27. In the event that the Promoter makes out a case for excavated material at Lower Boddington, your Petitioner is concerned that the Promoter has not given sufficient consideration to supplying Lower Boddington’s need for spoil from Wormleighton and Stoneton and other areas to the north of Wardington, including the area known as "the Boddington Loop" rather than taking it on the A361 through Wardington.

28. Your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended to lower the track bed so that it passes under, and not over, the Oxford Canal. This would generate substantial excavated material which could be used to meet Lower Boddington’s needs. The material would only have to be transported about 2 kilometres to Lower Boddington, thereby obviating the need to transport spoil on the A361 through Wardington.

Adjudicator

29. Your Petitioner is concerned that there will be no forum, to which it would have ready access, to adjudicate on any issues arising out of non-compliance with assurances or failure to implement appropriate mitigation measures. In particular, there will be no designated body to perform the function of securing the minimisation of adverse impacts on communities and the natural environment situated in locations, such as Wardington, affected by HS2 construction.

30. Your Petitioner submits that the Bill should be amended to establish a body corporate to be known as the Office of the HS2 Adjudicator whose main objective would be to protect the natural environment and communities impacted by the construction and operation of Phase 1 of High Speed 2, and to make provision for additional mitigation measures.
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 the Bill.

AND YOUR PETITIONER REMAINS, &c.

PINSENT MASONS LLP
Parliamentary Agents for Wardington Parish Council

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

CHRISTY ROGERS and MICHAEL CURRY

Declares that:

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

Your petitioners

2. Your petitioners live with their three young children at 36 Park Village East NW1, which is the southern-most of the Grade II* listed Nash villas in that street. Your petitioners are Michael, age 42, a company director, and Christy, age 40, a barrister. The children are Daniel (age 7), Cecily (age 5) and Peter (age 3). Your petitioners purchased the long Crown Estate lease of their home at the end of 2009.

3. Your petitioners are members of the Park Village East Heritage Group (PVEHG) and they support and refer to the petition of PVEHG.

4. Your petitioners' home is within 5 horizontal metres of the proposed HS2 line. Park Village East is probably the worst affected by HS2 construction of any residential street on the entire route, apart from those streets in which people's homes will be demolished.

5. The construction of HS2 will result in a massive loss of quality of home and family life for your petitioners and their children, over a period of at least a decade and perhaps much longer. Your petitioners set out below the principal losses they face.

Access

6. Early in the planned construction sequence, HS2 will demolish both the road bridges which are situated either side of your petitioners' home and connect it with the rest of Camden – Mornington Street Bridge, and Granby Terrace Bridge. These bridges will not be reinstated for at least 10 years. At about the same time, the northern section of Park Village East will be closed to traffic for at least 5 years.

7. Your petitioners' home will be completely isolated in terms of vehicle access, except to/from the south via Robert Street. This will be the same route used by HS2 construction traffic to and from a massive construction compound to be located on Park Village East opposite your petitioners' home. HS2 estimates that there will be approximately 200 lorry journeys per day to/from this compound. If your petitioners wish to travel north by car (to their children's school, for example), they must follow
the construction traffic south, and then either turn left on Robert Street and negotiate Hampstead Road bridge, which will be reduced to one lane per carriageway due to HS2 works; or they may turn right to join the construction traffic on Albany Street, which will at the same time be undergoing massive utility works in order to install a new 42" ring main under that road (diverted from Park Village East due to HS2).

8. Your petitioners' children currently attend three different schools in the local area. Daniel's school is a 40 minute walk, or currently an easy 10 minute drive. HS2's plans would make the journey by car completely unfeasible.

9. Any journey to or from your petitioners' home, for visitors, for delivery drivers, for house and garden maintenance vehicles, for emergency vehicles - will be absolutely punishing. Gridlocked traffic on circuitous routes will bring frustration and resentment to your petitioners' daily lives for many years.

10. The construction of HS2 may involve the loss of access for long periods to your petitioners' driveway. Certainly, the on-street parking for visitors will be lost, together with a huge amount of residents' on-street parking. HS2 has not, in the several years now of planning, produced any suggestion for where people will park once the construction compound is established and the houses to the north have lost all on-street and off-street parking. Members of the Select Committee of the House of Commons challenged counsel for HS2 on this point, and there was no answer. There is, quite obviously, nowhere available, and unless HS2 is directed to make special provision, residents and their visitors will be left with nowhere to park.

Noise

11. SES2 para 14.3.19 and Table 19 (reproduced in PVEHG petition at para 22) sets out that your petitioners and their children can expect daytime noise levels of 80dB (typical) and 90dB (highest) for a period of 18 months. For a period of 12 months they can expect night-time combined vibration and noise of 65dB (typical) and 75dB (highest). For a further period of 18 months they can expect day-time noise levels of 75DdB (typical) and 85dB (highest).

12. These are very long periods to endure very high noise levels. HS2's materials provide no estimate for how much of the time noise levels would be at or near highest levels. Since most of the work must be done outside 'core working hours' (in order to preserve the rail service on the existing lines), your petitioners can expect the most daytime noise to occur at the weekends, when it will presumably be unrelenting.

13. Of course, your petitioners must accept HS2's estimates, and they do not have the capability to test them. However, HS2 freely admits that the construction plan is at present 'conceptual'. It is fair to assume that noise levels will not be any lower than HS2 claims. The stated noise levels are the highest for any property on the proposed line.

14. SES2 para 14.3.13 states that your petitioners' home is "forecast to experience noise levels higher than the noise insulation trigger levels as defined in the draft CoCP". However, secondary glazing will not be offered for rooms other than
bedrooms and sitting rooms. This is obviously inadequate, bearing in mind the level of predicted noise and the long periods for which your petitioners will be exposed to that noise. It is clearly extremely unpleasant to have high levels of noise in hallways, landings and bathrooms, and to be obliged to keep all doors closed at all times. It is completely unreasonable to impose on your petitioners the burden of that noise and inconvenience for long periods. Your petitioners believe that HS2 will spend more money defending your petitioners' challenge to this policy than it would cost to extend the policy to all windows.

15. In any event, your petitioners question the effectiveness of secondary glazing as against the noise of an immense civil engineering project being undertaken just a few metres from the windows, together with vibration, dust, bright lights at night, constant movement of trucks and other plant. It cannot possibly be right to say that an extra pane of glass is going to make those conditions tolerable for a period of years.

16. The construction of HS2 will render your petitioners' garden – which is very large and currently very tranquil - unusable for long periods. Noise levels will be particularly high at the weekends, when most of the demolition work will be done, outside 'core working hours'. The amenity of the garden would effectively be lost for at least the 3-6 year period of peak construction and would be greatly affected for the rest of the construction period.

17. There are very wide gaps between your petitioners' detached house and the neighbouring buildings: At least 20m to the north and 15m to the south. At the rear of the garden is a tall bank and on top of the bank a very high brick wall. The MoD buildings rise directly behind the wall. These tall brick structures bounce street noise straight back into the garden. Not only will these factors make the garden unusable, but the noise reverberating around the rear garden will also enter the house at the rear. The noise mitigation offered by HS2 does not include rear or side windows. Your petitioners' house has a conservatory at the rear, which is central to the main open plan living area. In the summer months it will get extremely hot unless the doors are open to the garden – in which case it will be extremely noisy. For these reasons your petitioners require noise insulation together with appropriate ventilation measures to the rear of their house and not just the front.

Construction plant to be situated on Park Village East

18. The construction of 'barettes' within the carriageway of Park Village East will entail standing a piling rig on the carriageway, which will need to be at least 40m high. There will be a huge amount of concurrent and associated works taking place on the carriageway. Subsequently, plant will be placed on the carriageway for railway construction. SES2 confirms at 4.10.4 that there will be a need "for construction plant to be placed on Park Village East for the reinstatement of Line X".

19. Your petitioners' house is unusual in having no space in front of it between the wall of the house and the pavement. Large plant can be expected to take up the whole road. This puts the plant a slim pavement's width from your petitioners' windows.
**Settlement**

20. HS2 intends to demolish the 30m high wall which retains the roadway of Park Village East, undercut the carriageway, and construct a cantilever supported by ground anchors extending right under your petitioners’ house.

21. HS2 intends to monitor for settlement, of course. However, any settlement damage is your petitioners’ risk, subject to reimbursement by HS2. This means that if there is settlement damage, your petitioners’ insurer must pay for the repairs, and then argue with HS2 about liability and quantum.

22. Your petitioners’ home is a Grade II* listed building, parts of which were built in the 1820s. It is also part of the Crown Estate, and any works to the building must be done under Crown Estate supervision. These factors would make any settlement extremely expensive to repair. Settlement is currently a low risk, because the house was fully underpinned as part of recent renovation works. HS2’s works will move the house to high risk of settlement, coupled with very high cost of repair. Your petitioners’ insurance premiums will increase massively and remain high for decades.

**Lack of mobility and Life Options**

23. The fact is that now and for at least the next 10-20 years, your petitioners’ home is not saleable on the open market except at a fraction of its unblighted value.

24. The only compensation scheme currently potentially available to your petitioners is Need to Sell. However, this is a scheme which is extremely limited in its conception. The applicant must show that there is a change of circumstances which causes the applicant to need to move house AND that the applicant cannot afford to keep the blighted house anyway (because this is what is meant by ‘an unreasonable burden’). Essentially, if the applicant has other assets, the applicant is expected to sell those and leave their blighted house empty, or let at a fraction of unblighted value. With this in mind, the applicant must provide to the Panel a complete picture of their financial circumstances. Applications are decided by HS2 and there is no appeal.

25. The House of Commons Select Committee listened carefully, over almost a whole day, to the concerns and requests of petitioners in Park Village East, but ultimately provided nothing of any substance for your petitioners in their Report of 22nd February 2016, other than some stern words to HS2 about the application of the Need to Sell scheme. The Committee wanted “more recognition of areas that will suffer especially egregious effects from construction” (para 282). At para 292, the Committee stated: “We kept a watch list of petition cases where we felt that there should probably be a successful outcome if an application under Need to Sell were made”. Despite this, when Mrs Carn of no.4 Park Village East applied recently to the Need to Sell scheme, the Panel decided that her husband’s job offer in the United States did not provide a compelling reason, and that she had not shown that keeping the house would be an unreasonable (financial) burden.
26. The fact is that the Need to Sell scheme was not conceived to provide a means of escape from the "egregious effects of construction," and HS2 has not and will not apply it in the way envisaged by the House of Commons Select Committee.

27. Further, "Need to Sell" is not suitable as an escape route from the intolerable effects of HS2 construction because it imposes a huge financial burden on the applicant. In the Need to Sell scheme the applicant must pay all costs of moving, of adapting a new house to their taste and purpose, and most importantly of stamp duty on an equivalent property. It is quite wrong that if the Government drives a person out of their house by inflicting an unbearable nuisance, the Government should then extract (nearly) 12% of the purchase price of a replacement.

28. There is no logical reason why compensation schemes which have been thought necessary and fair for people living outside the M25 should not equally be necessary and fair for those in London. By depriving your petitioners of fair compensation, the Government is hiding the true cost of HS2, and is making your petitioners and their children pay for it through massive loss of their quality of life.

29. Unless the government provides for your petitioners a more flexible and generous compensation scheme, your petitioners must consider themselves bound to stay in their house, through career changes, children growing up, perhaps a desire to downsize or raise funds, and most other normal changes of circumstances which often prompt people to move house - and of course must endure more than a decade at the epicentre of a massive civil engineering project.

The Relief Sought by Your Petitioners

Redesign

30. Your petitioners believe that there are alternative schemes for the construction of the Euston end of HS2 which would be less damaging to your petitioners and to the whole of Camden/Euston, and which would achieve the objectives of HS2.

31. Your petitioners believe that if the damage to Camden which will be caused by the construction of HS2 were to be factored into a cost/benefit analysis for the whole project, the project would not be viable.

32. Unless directed to do so, HS2 has no motivation to improve the design which has been settled upon, or to redesign with different priorities (which might include maintaining a tolerable condition of road transport within Camden).

33. Your Petitioners humbly ask that HS2 be ordered to reconsider the design of the Euston Approach, giving greater recognition to the local environment in the balance of considerations.

Alternative Accommodation

34. The serious adverse effects of loud noise, night-time noise, weekend noise,
vibration, dust, pollution, severe access restrictions, isolation, bright lights at night, heavy construction traffic, and possible settlement, are cheerfully acknowledged in SES2 to operate 'in combination' in relation to your petitioners and their children over a period of many years (eg para 8.4.40). The effects of the construction of HS2 will effectively deprive your petitioners and their children of the enjoyment of their home for a period which cannot realistically be regarded as 'temporary'.

35. HS2 declines, unless ordered to do so by the Select Committee of this Honourable House, even to consider whether your petitioners' home can realistically be regarded as habitable during the peak years of construction. Your petitioners wholly reject the approach of HS2 in its Information Paper E23, which is to consider noise in isolation and to apply a very technical set of thresholds for noise levels, which must endure for more than a specified number of hours for more than a specified number of days in a given period, triggering the need to re-house local residents for a brief period. Such an approach is in its very design highly disadvantageous to residents, who will have great difficulty in enforcing the criteria, and for whom the best possible outcome is the appalling disruption to family life of re-housing in a hotel. Further, the approach ignores factors other than noise which are highly relevant to habitability.

36. Your petitioners humbly ask that there be an independent assessment of the harm which is likely to be caused to their home and its occupants, pursuant to which an advance rehousing plan can be made which is fair and certain. Your petitioners humbly ask that, according to such a plan, any rehousing of their family should meet the following conditions:

   (i) It should be a once-off event, for the duration of the period of peak construction in the Cutting (which is likely to coincide with the period of closure of Park Village East)
   (ii) Alternative accommodation should be of equivalent standard to the home your Petitioners will have to vacate. A common-sense approach to arranging this would be to award your petitioners the unblighted rental value of your petitioners' home for the period. This would be in line with the situation where an insured property is made uninhabitable for a period such as where underpinning is carried out.
   (iii) HS2 should bear the reasonable removal costs of all chattels, and other removal expenses at both ends of the period.
   (iv) HS2 should provide insurance and security for the vacated house.
   (v) HS2 should bear the Council tax for the vacated period.
   (vi) HS2 should maintain the garden for the vacated period.

Noise Mitigation

37. Your petitioners humbly request that, for any period of the works during which your petitioners and their children remain in their home, an effective plan is put in place by which to mitigate the adverse noise effects of the construction. The mitigation
should include:

(i) Effective acoustic screening at the roadside of Park Village East, to mitigate noise effects in your petitioners' house and garden;
(ii) Temporary secondary glazing to be installed on all windows of your petitioners' house, the style of which to be reasonably sympathetic to the historic nature of the building;
(iii) Effective means of ventilation or air conditioning.

Access and Parking

38. Your petitioners humbly request that, for any period of the works during which your petitioners and their children remain in their home, an effective plan is put in place by which to mitigate the adverse effects of the construction on access to your petitioners' property and vehicular parking. The mitigation should include:

(i) Maintenance of vehicle access to your petitioners' driveway
(ii) The construction of a temporary car park for residents and visitors as part of the development of the existing carriage sheds into a construction compound.
(iii) The temporary alteration of residents parking zones, to allow PVE residents to use residents parking bays on the east side of the cutting. This would allow your petitioners to avoid some of the worst traffic to the south (and on Albany street and Hampstead Road) by parking where there is direct access to the north, and walking over the planned foot bridge to access PVE.

Insurance and Maintenance

39. Your Petitioners humbly ask that provision be made for

(i) The insurance by HS2 of your petitioners' property against damage from settlement, fire or misadventure during the period of the works, and against settlement for a period of 50 years after the completion of the works;
(ii) regular cleaning at HS2's expense of the windows and paintwork of your petitioners' house to remove dirt and dust caused by the works.
(iii) Restoration of the decorative order of your petitioners' house on completion of the construction works (or near completion, at the request of your petitioners), both externally and internally, the exterior to the requirements of the Crown Estate Quinquennial Redecoration, and the interior to the standard prior to the construction works.
40. Your petitioners humbly request that all compensation schemes available to affected residents of properties outside the M25 should be made available to your petitioners. In particular, the Express Purchase scheme, or a scheme providing similar terms, should be available to your petitioners, at their option and at any time of your petitioners’ choosing, between now and the completion of construction of HS2.
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.

Christy Rogers

Michael Curry

April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF THE CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND WARWICKSHIRE BRANCH:  

Declares that the Petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the works proposed to be authorised by the Bill specified in clauses 1 and 2 and in Schedules 1, 2 and 3 to the Bill.

1. The petitioners are the Warwickshire Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England ("CPRE Warwickshire"). CPRE Warwickshire was established in 1963, and was originally called the Council for the Preservation of Rural England. CPRE Warwickshire aims to protect and enhance the beauty, tranquillity and local distinctiveness of the countryside and to influence land use in town and country for people and nature. Its Memorandum and Articles of Association, as incorporated in 2001, give as its principal object to promote and encourage, for the benefit of the public, the improvement, protection and conservation of the English countryside and in particular that of the County of Warwickshire. The area of benefit includes the City of Birmingham (including Sutton Coldfield), the City of Coventry and the Borough of Solihull. The Borough of Solihull includes a significant part of the County of Warwickshire as it was before 1974. CPRE Warwickshire in April 2014 has some 900 members comprising individuals, Parish and Town Councils in Warwickshire, and affiliated local organisations.

2. The Petitioners are specially and directly affected by the Bill proposals because the proposed high-speed railway would directly and severely harm the countryside of Warwickshire and Solihull, which it is their principal role to protect and conserve. The published plan would cross the county for 35 miles from the southeast to the north, entering at Wormleighton and leaving at Middleton. Between Kenilworth and Coleshill, it would cross the ‘Meriden Gap’ from southeast to northwest, entering it at Burton Green and leaving it south of Coleshill. The Meriden Gap is the narrow, 6-mile-wide Green Belt separating Birmingham and Coventry.

3. CPRE has developed maps which show the tranquillity of the whole country using a process which is now well-established. The most tranquil areas are depicted in green and the least tranquil in red. The proposed line would pass through some of the county’s most tranquil landscape between the Northamptonshire boundary at Wormleighton and Offchurch in the Leam Valley east of Leamington.
4. The Government's HS2 plan is for a new, very high-speed, railway, on a new route. The engineering specification is exacting. To be capable of 400 km/h (250 mph) such a line must have very slight curves, and look almost straight to anyone walking in or enjoying the countryside. Such a specification makes an alignment that fits the Warwickshire landscape very difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. The alignment proposed would be unnatural, cutting through hills and rising and falling rather than curving around higher ground as do normal roads and railways. The electrification equipment would create a visual blot in many places. Along the route would be cabins, electrical feed stations, and access tracks to these from local roads, more than on current electrified lines.

5. The Petitioners submit that the effects of the route proposed for the high-speed line would be seriously damaging to the landscape character of the countryside through which is it proposed to be built. It would harm the tranquillity of the countryside in areas which are defined as tranquil now, indicated in paragraph 3 above.

6. Damage would be caused by the high level of noise produced by a high-speed train at the speeds proposed, because the potential frequency of 18 trains each way and their length (400 metres) could lead to intervals between trains no greater than 1 min 40 secs. The vibration from trains at the speeds proposed (up to 400 km/h or 250 mph) would be likely to be felt in their houses by those living close to the line. There is no established research on the levels and impacts of noise and vibration from trains operating at such a combination of high speed, frequency and length as is projected.

7. The route of parts of the proposed line would be such that construction traffic by road would have a serious adverse impact, and rail could not be used because there is generally no existing railway close by which could be used to carry materials in a way that would minimise impact during the construction period.

8. The need for electric power supply from the National Grid appears likely to require more overhead electric supply lines, because of the high demand for electric power from the projected number and speed of trains using the line. That would have a further harmful effect on the countryside.

9. The Petitioners consider that the form and design of the line would not reduce road traffic but because of its character would be likely to increase it. It would not contribute to the principles of sustainable transport. The line would not be integrated with the existing rail network but instead segregated from it, with separate railway stations except at London Euston. The station at Curzon Street, Birmingham would be separate from the main New Street station and require a walk of up to half-a-mile to change trains. The Birmingham Interchange station would be nearly 1 mile from the present Birmingham International station. It would not be a public transport interchange, but a parkway station with extensive car parking. The impact on the surrounding road system would be adverse in each case. The level of road-building required around Birmingham Interchange would be harmful to the character of the countryside east of the M42 motorway, and the openness of the Green Belt would be badly damaged.
10. The Petitioners note that the high-speed line would not serve the City of Coventry at all, but instead bypass it to the south. The City of Coventry lies in the centre of Warwickshire and has a population (2011) of 317,000. 500,000 people in all live within 10 miles of the city centre of Coventry. The city's station is currently served by fast trains running at 200 km/h (125 mph) between London and Birmingham (3 trains per hour). The high-speed line appears likely to result in a reduction in the frequency and speed of the Coventry to London service. As the high-speed line will at the same time offer services from the proposed Birmingham Interchange station, road traffic to that location would be generated from Coventry, increasing environmental impacts.

11. These objections can in the Petitioners view be met by the following changes to the Bill.

12. Firstly, the route of the high-speed line should be amended. Your Petitioners are convinced, and can show, that the purpose of the Bill would be better achieved by a different route between Euston in London and Handsacre in Staffordshire.

13. Secondly, if the published route is not altered, the location of the proposed Birmingham Interchange station should be changed, and the form of the proposed Birmingham Curzon Street station be altered.

14. Thirdly, if the published route is not altered, additional tunnelling and noise protection measures should be included at specific locations.

15. These changes sought to the Bill are set out in the following paragraphs.

Examining alternative alignments for the High-Speed Line

16. The Petitioners emphasise that Government policy on public participation on routes for transport infrastructure has not been followed for High Speed 2. Since July 1973, a clear policy has applied to the planning of new motorways and major roads. Under the policy 'Participation in Road Planning' issued then, and in force ever since, the public must be consulted about practicable alternative routes for road projects and their responses assessed before a preferred route is published, followed by formal statutory procedures.

17. This procedure was required for the planning of the high-speed railway between the Channel Tunnel and London (now High Speed 1). In 1988 practicable alternative routes were published and an extensive public participation process on alternatives was carried out. After several interim decisions a final route was arrived at. The Channel Tunnel Rail Link Bill was then introduced into Parliament by the then Secretary of State for Transport. This took place only after long discussions involving interested parties and affected local communities on the alignment. As a consequence the passage of that Bill to enactment in 1996 was relatively smooth from the viewpoints of those affected and local authorities.

18. The failure of the Secretary of State for Transport to require a similar process of public consultation on alternative routes for High Speed 2, and his issue instead of a single preferred route, has prevented effective examination of alternative routes
before the Bill was introduced into the House of Commons. The Petitioners submit that the House needs to examine practicable alternative routes submitted by Petitioners because, contrary to established policy as applied to the planning of High Speed 1, for High Speed 2 there was no consultation of the public and interested parties and local authorities on alternative routes at the non-statutory consultation stage.

**Route of the High-Speed line**

19. Your Petitioners submit that the route of the high speed line between Euston in London and the junction with the West Coast Main Line at Handsacre, near Lichfield should use existing transport corridors to minimise environmental damage and reduce cost, without separate out-of-town stations, and should serve key urban centres. The route shown in the Bill should be amended to one starting at Euston and finishing between Lichfield and Handsacre using the following alignment:

- incorporating a tunnel from Primrose Hill to West Hampstead
- the use of the formation of the Hendon Lines of the Midland Main Line from West Hampstead to Mill Hill in North London
- an alignment alongside the M1 motorway from Scratchwood (Mill Hill) to Crick in Northamptonshire
- then alongside the Northampton Loop of the West Coast Main Line from Crick to Rugby alongside the West Coast Main Line through Rugby
- alongside the Trent Valley section of the West Coast Main Line from Rugby to Coombe Fields east of Coventry
- alongside the M6 motorway on its south side from Coombe Fields to M6 junction 4 south of Coleshill
- and then the published Bill route from west of Coleshill to east of Lichfield with a variation to avoid the attractive landscape of Hints and a more direct alignment onto the West Coast Main Line between Lichfield and Handsacre than that proposed in the Bill.

20. This alignment would if desired include the spur from Water Orton to Curzon Street as shown in the Bill, but the Petitioners do not believe that a tunnel between Castle Bromwich and Washwood Heath in the Tame Valley is necessary. (Schedule 1, Work no 3/203 in Birmingham, page 98 of the Bill.) Part of the formation of the existing Birmingham - Derby line at ground level can be used, as was originally intended.

21. This alignment can incorporate a spur from Crick to Glen Parva and Leicester alongside the M1 motorway, terminating at Leicester (London Road) station, so enabling further benefits to be achieved for the East Midlands, earlier than is possible with the published alignment. With the published alignment, Phase 2 of the high-speed line has to be constructed to give any benefit to the East Midlands region.

22. This revised alignment for the high-speed line would better achieve the described purpose of the Bill for the following reasons among others:
• It would have significantly lower environmental impact than the published route.
• It would cost less to construct because (inter alia) the requirement for tunnelling would be greatly reduced.
• It would be less costly to operate because the energy consumption would be reduced by the much shorter distance that trains would be travelling in tunnels (or alternatively be no slower in end to end journey times because trains would not be slowed by the proportion of the line in tunnel).
• It would enable stations to be in urban centres instead of at out-of-centre locations.
• A lower maximum operating speed than the potential 400 km/h (250 mph) allowed for in the published route’s design would make it simpler to achieve a suitable alignment, because the curve radii minima can be lower and the line better fitted to local features and constraints.

23. A comparison between the alignment proposed by the Bill and this alternative shows that while the alignment proposed in the Bill is stated by its Promoter to require 338 houses to be acquired and demolished, this alternative alignment would need between 65 and 75 dwellings to be purchased. Most of those dwellings are adjacent to the existing motorways M1 and M6. The Petitioners submit that this is a significant advantage over the Bill Route.

24. A comparison of the effects on statutorily designated landscape, between the alignment proposed in the Bill and this alternative alignment, shows that the Bill Route directly affects the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in a serious way, whereas the alternative alignment would not affect the Chilterns AONB at all. The Petitioners submit that this gives their alternative alignment a major advantage over the Bill Route in terms of impact on designated landscape.

25. A comparison of the effects on the natural environment shows that the alignment proposed in the Bill would, according to The Wildlife Trusts, affect directly seven Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). This alternative alignment would affect one only SSSI, the River Blythe in Warwickshire, which would also be affected by the Bill alignment. The alignment proposed in the Bill would according to the Woodland Trust directly affect 27 Ancient Woodlands. This alternative alignment would affect directly 8 such woodlands, in most cases where the woodland is already severed by the M1 and M6. The Petitioners submit that these comparisons show that the alternative alignment is superior in terms of impact on the natural environment.

26. This revised alignment would also take significantly less time to construct and need not cause any delay to the anticipated opening date of the high-speed line of 2026. It has the further advantage that it can be constructed and brought into use in stages and need not be built all at once.

27. The Petitioners can provide drawings and costings for the alternative alignment at the appropriate time.

Location of Birmingham Interchange
28. If the High-Speed Line is constructed on the route shown in the Bill, the location of Birmingham Interchange should in the Petitioners' submission be at the existing Birmingham International station.

29. The alternative location at Birmingham International station proposed by the Petitioners would be by means of a loop off the high-speed line with connections from both south and north, and use the space allowed at the existing station for additional platforms when it was constructed in the mid-1970s. (Schedule 1, Work no 3/1 in Parishes of Great Packington, Little Packington and Coleshill, page 77 of the Bill.) This space is on the northeast side of the existing platforms. The alignment of the loop line would have a lower speed than the main high-speed line, but as all trains using it would be stopping at the new Interchange platforms the alignment does not need to be laid out for high speed. The loop line would cross under or over the M42 south of Junction 5 (M42/A45), pass under the A45, run through the new platforms, then through the Elmdon Trading Estate requiring some relocation of industrial buildings. It would pass along the western edge of Birmingham Business Park where there is a corridor of undeveloped land, and rejoin the high-speed line where it bridges the M6 west of M6 junction 4. This alternative location would have direct advantages over the location in the Bill. It would enable convenient interchange with other trains at Birmingham International, with buses, and with the existing people-mover to Birmingham Airport, and would require no new green-field land for car parking.

30. The alternative location at Birmingham International station would remove the very grave danger of urban development in the Meriden Gap which the published Birmingham Interchange would bring. The Green Belt east of the existing M42 is undamaged by major development at present; but the published Birmingham Interchange would bring development with it, as is demonstrated by the ‘UK Central’ development proposals for land in the Green Belt adjacent to the station site proposed in the Bill. These proposals (in 2016 marketed also as ‘Arden Cross’) are being publicly advanced by Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council, Birmingham City Council and the Greater Birmingham & Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership. They would damage the Meriden Gap so seriously that its future as a strategic planning gap separating Birmingham and Coventry would be in grave doubt.

Birmingham Curzon Street Station

31. The proposed station at Curzon Street as published in the Bill has only terminal platforms for high-speed trains. (Schedule 1, Work no 3/205 in City of Birmingham, page 98 of the Bill). It has no interchange with the majority of services in the Birmingham area which start from, terminate at or run through New Street station. New Street station despite upper-level rebuilding is too small a site to be enlarged or run efficiently in the long term. The Curzon Street station should be revised in design to include platforms for through services on the lines running out of New Street to the east and should be revised in the Bill to become the major through main-line station for Birmingham. Such a proposal for a larger and better station at Curzon Street than that proposed in the Bill has been published by Arup Associates under the name ‘Birmingham Grand Central’. Plans therefore exist which can be drawn on and developed further.
Other parts of the published alignment

32. If the alignment of the high-speed line through Warwickshire is to be constructed, the following amendments should be made to the Bill to meet essential needs to protect the countryside and remove or minimise noise at locations where this would bring benefits. These improvements are required over and beyond those recommended by the Commons Select Committee on the Bill.

33. The proposed four-track section that provides emergency loops and service facilities between Wormleighton and Ladbroke should be deleted from the proposal. (Schedule 1, Work no 2/133, in Parishes of Stoneton and Ladbroke, page 67 of the Bill.) This layout creates a widened railway in one of the most tranquil areas in Warwickshire.

34. A bored tunnel under Cubbington Wood of up to 1 km in length should be included to protect the valuable environment at that location. (Schedule 1, Work no 2/146, Parish of Cubbington, page 69 of the Bill.) Cubbington Wood is Ancient Woodland. Ancient woodland is as stated by the Woodland Trust ‘an irreplaceable national resource of great importance for its wildlife, soils, recreational uses, cultural value, history and the contribution it makes to our diverse landscapes'. It deserves full protection, which only a tunnel can provide if the route in the Bill is confirmed.

35. A bored tunnel of 1.5 km at Hints, to protect the very fine landscape and setting of the village which is an unusually attractive landscape between Sutton Coldfield and Tamworth. This would be within Staffordshire, not in Warwickshire, but Hints is a local landscape used and enjoyed by people resident in the Sutton Coldfield which is within CPRE Warwickshire’s area of benefit. (Schedule 1, Parish of Hints and other Parishes, Work no 3/48, page 88 of the Bill.)

Other issues

36. The Petitioners object to the proposed high-speed train maintenance depot at Washwood Heath in Birmingham. (Schedule 1, various Works in City of Birmingham, pages 97-99 in the Bill.) This is a potential location for major employment development in Birmingham and is the largest brownfield site available. The consequence of the Bill proposal is that the current Birmingham Development Plan is unable to allocate this land for employment development to meet the City’s needs, and is instead proposing major employment use on currently Green Belt land at Peddimore, 6 km further east and outside the built-up area in a much less sustainable location. The proposal to release Green Belt land for employment at Peddimore is a direct result of the Washwood Heath location being included in the Bill, and is very damaging to the Green Belt and thus to the interests of your Petitioners. The Washwood Heath location should be removed from the Bill, so that the land can be instead be allocated for the employment uses that the City Council wishes it to have; and so that the proposed Peddimore employment site in the Green Belt can be deleted from the Birmingham Development Plan.
37. An alternative location for the high-speed train maintenance depot can and should be sought. The Petitioners would submit that locations in the West Midlands can be found which do not require land needed for employment policies of any Local Plan. Hams Hall is one potential location.

Conclusion
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

........................................  18th April 2016

John Wharam, Company Secretary

........................................  18th April 2016

Mark Sullivan, Technical Secretary
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PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF THE CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specifically and directly adversely affected by the provisions of the Bill, particularly as set out below.

The petitioner

2. The Petitioner is the Campaign to Protect Rural England (commonly known as “CPRE”), which was established as a charity and company limited by guarantee in 2003, having been first established in 1926 as the Council for the Preservation of Rural England. The Petitioner's objectives are to protect the beauty, tranquillity and local distinctiveness of the countryside and to secure better development. The Petitioner operates as an umbrella for 43 county branches that cover all of England, seven of which are directly affected by the Authorised Works. The Petitioner has about 69,000 individual members, 200 local groups and around 2,000 parish and town council members, including a sizeable proportion of those along or in close vicinity of the Authorised Works.

3. The Petitioner has a long history of influencing infrastructure projects to make them more beautiful and function better with regard to surrounding land uses. In the 1930s the Petitioner worked alongside the Roads Beautification Association and in the 1950s secured a sympathetic portal design of the third Woodhead Tunnel in the newly created Peak District National Park.

4. Since 2010 the Petitioner has been invited to and participated in stakeholder events by the Department for Transport and High Speed Two Ltd (“HS2 Ltd”), including the HS2 Environmental Ministerial Round Table. The Secretary of State for Transport first announced proposals for an HS2 independent design panel when
he gave the Petitioner’s Annual lecture in 2012, where he described the Petitioner’s input as ‘challenging but constructive’. HS2 Ltd made use of the Petitioner’s tranquillity mapping in the Environmental Statement and has referred to the report ‘The Carbon Impacts of HS2’, which the Petitioner commissioned jointly with two other charities, on its website.

Overview

5. At this stage of the Bill, the Petitioner’s focus is on making sure that the detail of the Bill, associated documentation and undertakings maximise the design quality and wider benefits of the Authorised Works, so as to secure a legacy and prevent mistakes being made that future generations regret. The Petitioner has been guided by the lessons from major infrastructure such as High Speed 1 and its enabling legislation, the Channel Tunnel Rail Act.

6. The Bill is the first Hybrid Bill since the National Planning Policy Framework was adopted and the Petitioner is concerned that it conflicts with its principles unreasonably. With two more Hybrid Bills expected in this Parliament, the Petitioner is particularly concerned that this Bill risks setting a bad precedent. In many instances the Petitioner has secured supportive statements from ministers on issues, such as taking design and cycling seriously, but this has not yet fed through to policies and the officials on the ground.

7. Although the Petitioner appeared before the House of Commons Select Committee, because this was only in the last few days of the hearings, the Petitioner was unable to secure coverage of many of its issues in the final report, as it had already been largely written. The Petitioner respectfully requests that it is not heard at the end of the petitioning period in this honourable House.

Design panel

8. The Petitioner very much welcomes the setting up of the HS2 design panel in November 2015. Our concern is that while the panel may well be influential regarding the design of stations and signature structures, such as the Colne Valley viaduct, its advice will not be taken on board for other parts of the route. While the refurbishment of St Pancras for HS1 was admired around the world, the bleak
concrete overbridges and long lines of the noise barriers jar with Kentish landscapes and have not been a design success.

9. Although the minister told the Public Bill Committee on 8 March that the ‘design of the railway will be awesome in places; in others it will be more sympathetic to the locations’, the Promoter’s QC said that the design panel simply ‘concentrate on some of the most visually conspicuous parts of the project’ (paragraph 186 on 4 February 2016). Although the minister has undertaken to follow the panel’s advice regarding high profile sections of the route, he has not for the route as a whole.

10. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that ‘great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs’, while ‘permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions’ (paragraphs 62-63). Both it and the Highways England licence makes reference to the need for the advice of design panels to be had regard to.

11. By contrast, the Petitioner is seriously concerned about the lack of credible mechanisms to embed and give effect to the advice of the HS2 design panel. There are four stages for which advice from the panel will be crucial to delivering a railway that future generations can be proud of:

- a) the proceedings of this honourable House to decide on the contents on the Bill that could benefit from being able to request independent advice on design;
- b) the detailed design stage after Royal Assent when the method of construction and precise land take of the Authorised Works would be finalised by the nominated undertaker;
- c) the decision-taking by local authorities in relation to applications for individual elements of the Authorised Works that require specific approval; and
- d) appeals by the nominated undertaker against local authority decisions, exercisable by ministers but expected to be carried out by the Planning Inspectorate.

12. Although Information Papers relating to design were updated by the Promoter in March 2016, these still fail to set out the process and the weight to be given to the design panel’s advice. The Promoter has argued that because design panels have
not been mentioned in previous Hybrid Bills, there is no need to do so now. Design panels are a relatively new phenomenon, however, and no design panel has been established prior to Royal Assent of a Hybrid Bill before now.

13. The Petitioner requests that the role of the design panel is integrated into Schedule 17 of the Bill and the associated statutory guidance, as well as the Environmental Minimum Requirements. There should be clear and binding requirements for local authorities, the nominated undertaker and ministers within these to have regard to its advice.

14. Minimising cost is not the same as maximising value; the Petitioner is concerned that the public interest will not be served if a single-minded focus on cost guides the detailed design of the Authorised Works. Some improvements to the Works can be relatively easily valued in terms of private interests, for example reduction in land take could reduce compulsory purchase costs and reduction in noise could mean reduce compensation and insulation. Benefits to the public interest, such as a more attractive view or better permeability for biodiversity cannot be easily quantified, however.

15. After a Government funded study assessed the negative impact of new high speed railways at £14.32 per household nearby, attempts to monetise impacts were stopped. In 2015 the Treasury published Green Book supplementary guidance: valuing infrastructure spend, which simply sets out the need for supplementary analysis. The Petitioner requests that the Promoter publishes guidance before Royal Assent as to how it intends to consider these issues during detailed design and that a draft of such guidance is published for consultation well before hand.

**Community and Environment Fund**

16. Informed by the success of the Rail Link Countryside Initiative, which unlocked benefits for wildlife, heritage, landscape and public access along the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (now called HS1), the Petitioner has called upon the Promoter to set up a dedicated fund since 2011. While the Petitioner welcomes the creation of the Community and Environment Fund, it shares the concern of the Commons Select Committee that the Fund is insufficient and believes that a figure of £120 million would be more appropriate.
Climate

17. The petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction and operation of the Authorised Works on the UK's Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Climate change threatens cherished features of the English countryside, such as bluebells and heritage coasts. If the transport sector cannot be decarbonised more quickly, there will be more pressure for additional renewable energy infrastructure to be constructed to reduce emissions, increasing the likelihood of visual and landscape impacts.

18. The Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change has acknowledged in Parliament on 7 January 2016 that more progress is needed to reduce transport emissions. Currently the Promoter appears content that the Authorised Works should be broadly carbon neutral. This, however, fails to take account of the fact that the baseline the works should be assessed against is not static but, as set by the Climate Change Act 2008, requires a trajectory to deliver reductions in emissions by 2050 of at least 80%.

19. In other words much more than mere carbon neutrality is needed. The Petitioner calls for a package of measures to make sure that the Authorised Works assist in the delivery of the radical reductions in emissions, which should include:

   a) ambitious targets covering construction and operation to reduce emissions further;
   b) improving the connectivity of phase 1 by providing new connections (or at least passive provision) to the rail network at Old Oak Common to HS1 and in Birmingham towards the south west, in order to increase modal shift;
   c) securing the fullest possible use of sustainable travel modes at HS2 stations, particularly through a no net increase in motor traffic policy;
   d) limiting the maximum operational speed of services on the Authorised Works to 300km/h until the carbon intensity of UK grid reaches 50gCO2/kWh.

Traffic and transport

20. The Petitioner is gravely concerned that the Promoter has failed to apply key policy on transport. A core planning principle of the NPPF favours patterns of
development that secure the fullest possible use of walking, cycling and public
transport. This is certainly supported by the minister for HS2 and cycling, who on 1
March 2016 told the Public Bill Committee that he was 'determined that the
opportunities afforded by the land we are procuring are used to the full to increase
cycling and walking along the route.'

21. This has however not been translated into practice, however. The proposed
Birmingham Interchange station has no cycle routes connecting it on three sides of
the compass, which are blocked by major roads. Proposed measures to mitigate the
impact of motor traffic to the station would make conditions for cycling and
walking even worse. The level of cycle parking proposed at Euston would be a
fraction of what Waterloo or Cambridge stations would have. The Petitioner
requests that detailed, funded and long-term plans for maximising cycling and
walking are published before Royal Assent and are integrated with the statutory
Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy.

22. The Promoter claims this can be resolved in detailed design, even though Bill limits
might need to be changed. The danger of such an approach of leaving it to the last
minute is well illustrated by the poor conditions for walking and in particular
cycling provided for the area around St Pancras by the Channel Tunnel Rail Act,
which required emergency works the night before the station reopened, but still
offer poor conditions indeed road deaths and cycle thefts are still common. The
provisions of Schedules 4 and 17 fetter the discretion of local highway authorities
and local planning authorities, preventing them reject highway and building works
that fail to secure the fullest possible use of sustainable travel. The Petitioner
requests these Schedules are amended to reflect the policy in the NPPF.

Station travel plans

23. The Petitioner welcomes the Promoters' intention for there to be station travel
plans for stations in the Authorised Works but is concerned about the very low level
of ambition, which appears to be effectively a worst case scenario based on
extending current forecasts, rather than seeking to plan for sustainable outcomes.

24. This will be particularly important at Birmingham Interchange, where 7,500 spaces
for car parking are proposed. The Petitioner is concerned that traffic accessing this
station would put a great burden on the M42, leading to pressure to widen it in the
Green Belt. By contrast, the potential to reduce motor traffic accessing the NEC,
Airport and International station by leveraging the increased connectivity of the Interchange station and potential for new coach and cycle routes has not been investigated.

25. The Petitioner requests that the Bill is amended to require that the stations create no net increase in private motor traffic. This is achievable by ensuring the fullest possible use of sustainable travel modes for access to the station as well as by reducing car use at nearby existing developments through a 'trip credit' approach, such that any increase in traffic at the station is offset. This is supported by the principles in the Promoter's Circular 2/2013 Planning and the Strategic Road Network, which has not been reflected at all.

26. The management of car parking spaces is one of the most efficient means to influence travel choices. The Petitioner requests that clause 22(1) of the Bill should be amended to limit the provision of parking spaces for cars to 2,000 and to increase the limit on parking spaces for coaches to 25. The phase 'short-term' is currently undefined in the Bill and this ought to be remedied.

Phase 1 connectivity

27. The Petitioner is concerned about the lack of connectivity between HS2 and the existing railway network. This is likely to reduce the scope for modal shift, whether from car from inter-regional journeys or from air between regional cities and the continent. Changing the pattern of services from a Y shape to an X shape would rebalance regional growth and reduce the focus of economic benefits on London and indeed the pressure to build on the Green Belt around it.

28. There is a particular need to reduce pressure on the international station at St Pancras, which is increasingly congested. With the introduction of trains with significantly more seats, the provision of services by other international rail operators and potentially greater border control, this is set to become worse. Enabling passengers to board international trains at Old Oak Common or outside London would tackle this problem, which could otherwise hold back modal shift from air. The Petitioner requests at the very least passive provision for links to HS1 in London and to the south west in Birmingham, if not the links themselves.

Electric overhead lines
29. The Petitioner is concerned by Clause 30(2)(b) of the Bill, which would enable the Secretary of State to block the holding of a public inquiry in relation to the installation of electric lines in connection with or in consequence of the Authorised Works. While it is quite understandable for the usual authorisation requirements not to apply regarding overhead electric lines authorised in the Bill, it is a different matter for lines whose routes have not yet been decided and that are not within Bill limits.

30. The arrangements for supply of electricity to the railway, which is expected to be supplied at four strategic points, have not yet been developed in detail. The Petitioner believes that Clause 30(2)(b) should be amended so that it does not apply to electric overhead lines proposed in National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty or areas of tranquillity.

31. The Petitioner was pleased that the Commons Select Committee shared its views about the potential of undergrounding existing high voltage lines in sensitive areas, so as to offset some of the impacts of new infrastructure. During the Petitioners appearance, the Promoter told that Committee it would publish new evidence about the impracticability of undergrounding next to railway infrastructure. The Swiss are now proposing combining a high voltage and rail line in the same tunnel through a nationally protected landscape (the Grimselbahn). The Petitioner believes that undergrounding is an issue that would merit further consideration by this honourable House, following the publication of a report by the Promoter.

**Green Belt**

32. Much of the Authorised Works, specifically consisting of the Northolt to Wendover and Offchurch to Whittington sections, would be situated in the Green Belt. Despite being one of the most well-known and popular means of protection for the environment, the consideration of the impacts of the scheme in relation to established Green Belt policy is perfunctory at best. This is because the assessment of impacts has been guided by EU legislation rather than English planning policy. In the Environmental Statement, the Green Belt designation has only been considered in terms of a greater sensitivity to impacts in the landscape section of individual Community Forum Areas, rather than in relation to its specific policy objectives.
33. Your Petitioner considers that the Authorised Works, with the exception of the Birmingham Interchange station, would constitute engineering operations, such that it would not constitute inappropriate development insofar as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt. Nonetheless the Promoter should minimise impacts on openness and plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of Green Belt affected by the Authorised Works, so as to better achieve the objectives for the use of Green Belt land. The Petitioner requests that a proportion of an enlarged Community & Environment Fund is reserved for Green Belt objectives.

Acquisition of land

34. The petitioner is most concerned by Clause 48 of the Bill, which enables compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration and relocation. Your Petitioner requests that this power should be removed from the Bill or in the alternative amended by the addition of the word 'reasonable' in relation to consideration by the minister. In addition it should not apply to sites wholly or partly in the Green Belt.

Sound, noise and vibration

35. The Petitioner is gravely concerned about the impact of noise from the railway in quiet areas of open country. The Promoters have designed noise mitigation around the need to minimise noise effect levels for occupants of permanent residential buildings and businesses and hence the need for financial compensation. The Petitioner considers that the Promoters have failed to comply with European and national policy that calls for the protection of quiet areas in open countryside, in particular places prized for their tranquillity.

36. The petitioner requests that the Promoters undertake to extend maximum noise reception limits for outdoor living spaces of $55 \text{ dB } L_{Aeq,T}$, which currently only apply to private residential gardens, to apply places where people are likely to be in the open air for recreation, such as along canals.
GENERAL

37. The Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that 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.

RALPH SMYTH
On behalf of the Campaign to Protect Rural England

18 April 2016
High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF PETER BASSANO

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

i) The petitioner is a professional musician, Music Director of ensembles in Cambridge, Rochester and Wendover, a retired professor and Head of Faculty at the Royal College of Music. He and his wife were the registered proprietors from 16 May 1997 until November 2015 of an HS2 blighted property, Hunts Green Chase, Potter Row, Great Missenden HP16 9LT. He has been a house-owner and mortgage payer since 1972.

ii) His family home and sole residence was subject to an offer dated 4 July 2011 of £2.75m to buy from HS2 under the Exceptional Hardship Scheme. The scheme was launched on 20 August 2010. The petitioner delayed accepting the EHS offer because under the EHS there was no provision for recipients to remain in their home. Due of extreme financial circumstances, acceptance of the offer meant that the petitioner and his family would have had nowhere to live. A new scheme was promised by Philip Hammond, then Secretary of State for Transport in parliament on December 20 2010 which would have allowed the petitioner and his family to remain in their home.

iii) When, in February 2014 Mr Hammond’s promised new scheme still hadn’t been launched, both mortgage companies moved to have the petitioner and his family evicted so he was obliged to accept the EHS offer. Both mortgage companies were aware of the acceptance of the offer, none-the-less, despite an emergency application for a stay of eviction, the petitioner and his family, which included the petitioner’s four children the youngest being twelve year old, were evicted from their home of seventeen years on 27 February 2014. At that point the EHS offer was lost, but compensation was made available to the second charge holder mortgagees after it applied to HS2 under the Need-to-Sell scheme nearly two years later when it was not in possession.

iv) In November 2015 HS2 bought the petitioner’s home from Pure Bridging Finance Ltd for just £2m, £750,000 less than the offer made to the petitioner under EHS four and a half years earlier. Pure Bridging Finance is one of a number of companies with similar names registered in the Isle of Man and whose loan to the petitioner had been deemed unenforceable in an Office of Fair Trading order dated 13 May 2013,

v) During the period whilst the petitioner and his family were homeless both Pure Bridging Finance Ltd and NRAM the first charge holders ran up further mortgage interest payments
that were added to the petitioner's mortgage account. Therefore the Bill has already specially and directly affected and continues to affect the petitioner and his family.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

i) Your petitioner and his family are distressed by the totally inadequate provision for the protection from exploitation by unscrupulous and ruthless mortgage companies for householders who cannot sell their homes because of blight and through illness, falling income, or retirement and who can no longer afford to pay their mortgage interest. The petitioner's experience at the hands of HS2 is one which he would not want any other blighted property owner to experience.

ii) The petitioner relied upon the statement in the House of Commons 20 December 2010. In an oral statement to parliament the Rt Hon Philip Hammond MP then Secretary of State for Transport said:-

iii) "Where a project which is in the national interest imposes significant financial loss on individuals, I believe it is right and proper that they should be compensated fairly for that loss. So I have asked my officials to prepare a range of options for a scheme to assist those whose properties would not be required for the construction of the railway, but who would nonetheless see a significant diminution of value as a result of the construction of the line. The forthcoming consultation will include proposals for such a scheme, which will sit alongside the statutory blight regime which covers those whose properties would need to be taken to build the line”.

iv) Previously to that in an interview with the Daily Telegraph on 11 December 2010 Mr Hammond said "What we are talking about here is going wider, I think this is unprecedented, paying compensation to people who do not have their properties taken, but who will suffer a significant diminution in value.”

v) After the petitioner and his family were made homeless and possession granted by the Deputy District Judge to Pure Bridging Finance Ltd the second charge holder, he contacted the Rt Hon Cheryl Gillan MP ask if she would enquire about the status of the EHS offer. In an email on the 12 March 2014 Mrs Gillan wrote “I was contacted by the journalist that wrote the story on Sunday and I said that I believe that you would not have been in this position if it had not been for HS2”

vi) In a letter dated 31 March 2014 in reply to her question about the EHS offer Sir David Higgins, Chairman of HS2 wrote “unless the mortgage lender takes steps to set aside the Court Order and ceases to be mortgagee in possession, Mr & Mrs Bassano are not in a
position to transfer legal title of the property. Hence the offer that was made to them under EHS in July 2011 is no longer valid.”

vii) The petitioner then contacted both mortgage companies to seek a meeting to discuss the possibility of regaining possession, in order to revive the EHS offer as suggested in Sir David’s letter. Pure Bridging Finance refused to meet and NRAM promised to talk once it had itself taken possession from PBF, which it said it anticipated doing by taking legal action.

viii) The house remained unoccupied and the building and grounds neglected, vandalised and broken into. In October 2013 Pure Bridging Finance, without warning to the petitioner, instructed a family of travellers to remove the petitioner’s and his family’s personal possessions that had remained in the house to an inconvenient storage facility in Evesham. These included a vast collection of books, music, pictures, china and glass. The removal was undertaken without care, so many precious items and items of personal value were removed largely in black dustbin bags and subsequently broken. The bulk of the furniture, including a grand piano remained in the house.

ix) In June 2015 NRAM wrote to the petitioner to inform him that it had taken possession from Pure Bridging Finance Ltd and was intending putting the house on the market and instructing the petitioner to remove all of the furniture that had remained. The petitioner asked NRAM to agree to the meeting it has promised earlier in order to discuss how the EHS offer might be revived. His view was, that since no houses on the south side of Potter Row were selling that reviving the EHS offer would achieve the best sale price. NRAM refused to meet, reneging on its earlier promise.

x) The petitioner and his family were completely puzzled and distressed by this refusal to talk and so he contacted his new MP, the Rt Hon John Bercow. Mr Bercow who had seen Sir David Higgins’ letter mentioning a way that the EHS offer might be revived, wrote to Richard Banks CEO of UKAR-NRAM to request a meeting between the petitioner and his company. This was refused. Mr Bercow also wrote to Simon Kirby CEO of HS2 to enquire of the status of the petitioner’s position regarding any compensation scheme. On 27 July 2015 Mr Kirby wrote to Mr Bercow making reference to Sir David Higgins’ earlier letter but also stating “If Mr Bassano was to regain possession of the property, giving him a qualifying interest and the ability to transfer title, he would be able to apply to the Need to Sell (NTS) scheme”. This gave the petitioner the same hope that Sir David Higgins’ letter had sixteen months earlier and so again he attempted to persuade NRAM to talk. NRAM remained unexplainably recalcitrant.
xi) The majority of the furniture, but not all was removed by NRAM's agent on 23 October 2015 and placed in storage in High Wycombe. Many items owned by the petitioner and his family still remain in the house. Shortly afterwards the house was put on the market with Jeremy Swan Estate Agent at an asking price of £1.2m, exactly 43.6% of the EHS £2.75 offer on July 2011. Interestingly, it very quickly achieved an offer for the asking price. The petitioner was told by the estate agent that it was bought by an internal buyer at NRAM. NRAM, didn't as is normal practice with re-possessed houses, publish a Public Notice.

xii) On 9 December 2015 the petitioner learnt from a friend with access to Land Registry that the house had been sold to Pure Bridging Finance Ltd and that a search had been made by Eversheds on behalf of the Ministry of Transport. This information came as an unpleasant surprise because it was the first inkling that the petitioner had that there may have been some plot hatched to try to make an application to the Need to Sell scheme by Pure Bridging Finance.

xiii) The release of NRAM's file to the petitioner revealed precisely that. A letter from Kevin Cubitt CEO of Pure Bridging to NRAM dated 8 April 2014 stated:-

"You are aware that we have spent in excess of 18 months seeking to take possession from the Bassano's [sic] with the sole purpose being to put Pure Bridging in a position where it can make an Exceptional Hardship Claim"

The NRAM file revealed that Pure Bridging Finance Ltd and NRAM had entered into a secret pre-emption agreement that Pure Bridging Finance would relinquish possession of Hunts Green Chase if NRAM agreed to sell the house to it for £1 more than any acceptable offer.

xiv) This revelation explains why, even though PBF and NRAM knew about the acceptance of the EHS offer which covered the secured lending, they still opposed the petitioner’s stay of eviction application at Aylesbury County Court on the morning of 27 February 2014. The information that Pure Bridging Finance was itself intending to apply for compensation to HS2 was withheld from the Court.

xv) Legal opinion had informed the petitioner that neither of the mortgagees would qualify for an application to the EHS. An exchange of emails between the petitioner and Maya Tung of HS2 confirmed that no mortgagee had been successful under EHS.

xvi) By the time the petitioner had become aware of the secret plot to usurp the compensation scheme it was too late to stop it. In mid November 2015 Pure Bridging Finance had bought Hunts Green Chase from NRAM for £1,200,001 and a week later sold it to HS2 for £2m.
xvii) The transaction raises a number of questions which HS2 has declined to answer. The Need-to-Sell Scheme requires the mortgage company to be 1) in financial difficulties 2) to be in possession 3) to properly advertise the house for sale and 4) not have prior knowledge of the blight. Pure Bridging Finance didn’t qualify under any of these criteria and acceptance of its application could only have been circumvented by special and highly questionable arrangements with the NTS scheme or by a dishonest application.

xviii) The petitioner believes that his experience proves that HS2’s due diligence procedures for its Need to Sell scheme have proven totally inadequate. Once it learned the true nature of Pure Bridging Finance’s application it should have sought to redress the unfairness. Losing the offer of compensation for the petitioner in this way is serious but what is almost as serious is the diminution in value between the £2.75m offer under the EHS in July 2011 and the price paid by HS2 to Pure Bridging Finance of £2m in November 2015.

xix) The property website Zoopla which assesses the rise and fall of house prices in the property market shows an increase in prices in the HP16 postcode of 24.22% over the past five years. This would make Hunts Green Chase worth around £3.4m. The petitioner is seeking unblighted valuations at November 2015 from the two valuers whose 2011 valuations were accepted by HS2 for the petitioner’s EHS application. They are John D. Wood (£2.85m in December 2010) and Fisher German (£2.65m) in June 2011.

xx) The position now is that this leaves PBF getting most of what it claimed it was owed (PBF are still claiming that the petitioner owes it money), including its 48% per annum interest rate for the c. two years after the petitioner was evicted, NRAM losing c. £1m that it says it can chase the petitioner, HS2 saving £1.4m (£750,000 is the difference between the 2011 offer and the 2015 price paid and £666,000 the increase in value that should have been added in four and a half years) the petitioner and his family losing absolutely everything. No home, no money and no hope of either. Hardly what Mr Hammond meant by “compensated fairly”

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Peter Bassano
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF SARAHA STOR

Declares that:

1. The petitioner(s) is/are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. Your petitioner(s) is/are

SARAHA STOR, owner of leasehold flat, 2 bedrooms, Freeholder Camden Council alr 65B ALBERT STREET.

I am a full time resident.
3. Your petitioner's concerns are

- My household will be affected by noise and air pollution.
- Nights will be disturbed by strong light.
- Traffic around my property will be very congested with cars and waste lorries making multiple movements a day.
- My property will decrease in value as the area becomes very unattractive to buyers, making selling very difficult to achieve.
- The bridge will be shaken and disturbed, disabling work on the project.
- The cost of the development is more (by quite a margin) than the UK Government (overdraft) deficit.

How is the cost of the development justified in a time of increasing economic difficulty? Can we afford this project?

Communication with residents needs to be much better so that ordinary people can understand what this HS2 company is planning. There is too much incomprehensible data.

We need an independent adjudicator who can insure decisions are democratically taken.
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: SARAH ASTOR Signature

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................

Name: ............................................... Signature.................................
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

The PETITION OF The Lord Hollenden

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner is an owner of property in Great Hampden, in the county of Buckinghamshire, and within the Chilterns AONB, which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

3. Your petitioner's concerns relate to:
   a/ The damage and destruction to the local Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed railway, and the failure of HS2 Ltd to make any adequate provision for the reasonable and proper mitigation of these adverse effects.
   b/ The failure of HS2 Ltd to adequately assess the extent and consequences of the additional traffic congestion upon local roads, as well as the adverse effect on local villages, local businesses and tourism which would be generated by the construction of the proposed surface route for the railway, and to take this factor into account sufficiently or at all when assessing the arguments for the alternative provision of a long fully bored tunnel throughout the AONB.

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.

Dated ..............................................................

Signed ..............................................................

Ian Hampden Hope-Morley Fourth Baron Hollenden
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF DAVID SHIPMAN

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioner is a full time worker, husband, father and homeowner which the bill will specifically and directly affect.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

   In late 2015, I was sent an invite to a consultation run by Broxtowe Borough Council about the proposed HS2 East Midlands hub which is suggested be constructed there. Broxtowe is the neighbouring borough council to my own of Erewash. They had written to me as they considered that my property will be within 500 metres of this hub. On both and approach and departure, the train lines to the hub will pass through Erewash, and specifically Long Eaton town centre. My property is in Erewash and at no time has the proximity of the proposed hub to my property, the proposed frequency of the trains to and from the hub, their estimated noise levels, the traffic disruption from the construction of HS2 and subsequent use of the line or the pollution and environmental impacts have been communicated to me by HS2 Ltd, Erewash Borough Council or Derbyshire County Council.

   To my knowledge, HS2 Ltd have only been in contact with the residents of Erewash on two occasions; once in January 2013 in which they held a consultation event at the West Park Leisure Centre, and then in February of 2016 in which two representatives of HS2 Ltd came to speak at Erewash Borough Council’s Community Forum. I was not aware of the consultation held in 2013 and therefore feel that this event was not highly publicised enough. If I had been aware of it, I would have most certainly attended. The HS2 Ltd representatives at the community forum were not able to comment sufficiently to the queries put to them by the public and therefore I do not deem this to have been worthy of being considered to have provided information. At no point have I had any contact from Erewash Borough Council or Derbyshire County Council to inform me about HS2.

   Following the receipt of the invitation to attend Broxtowe Borough Council’s consultation on the hub, I made several attempts to meet with the Erewash MP Maggie Throup. I did this, as following some research of my own, she was a member of a campaign group ‘Scrub the Hub’ which campaigned to move the East Midlands hub station away from the Erewash village of Breaston to where it is now proposed to be sited in Toton, Broxtowe. After several calls to her office, I was informed that despite living within the 500 metres of the hub as suggested by Broxtowe Borough Council, I was not affected enough by it, or its construction, to warrant a meeting with her.

   I therefore feel that there has either been a deliberate attempt to hide the effects of HS2 through Long Eaton and Erewash by HS2 Ltd, Erewash Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council and Maggie Throup MP, or there has been severe ineptitude on the part of the aforementioned parties in not consulting with myself or the residents of Long Eaton on the proposed station and route.

   It is only through a letter sent by the neighbouring council to my own that I became aware of the progress HS2 Ltd in the plans for HS2 and that neither myself or any other resident of Erewash has been sufficiently
informed on it.

I propose that HS2 Ltd and the government, look again at the evidence and whether this line is truly needed by the British public or whether the money required for the construction of HS2 would be better spent improving the country's already vast rail network. I propose that if this is not done, then the East Midlands hub is moved to an alternative location, such as the East Midlands Parkway which is already well used, and has basic facilities for the station are already there. It is also further away from other transport links. I propose that whether this suggestion is followed or not, the route is changed to avoid being built across Long Eaton and moves to run entirely through Broxtowe. This could be achieved by including a bend in the line, similar to the one proposed for the route around Chancellor George Osborne's constituency of Tatton. It seems grossly unfair that neighbouring Broxtowe will feel a minimum of disruption from the construction and use of HS2 and many of the claimed benefits whilst myself and the other residents of Long Eaton and Erewash will only receive maximum disruption.

HS2 and the construction of its East Midlands hub will have a permanent negative impact on mine and my family's health, through the increased levels of pollution, stress and noise. Given the proximity of the proposed hub to my property it is likely that the value of my property will drop substantially, possibly never to recover. Having looked into HS2 Ltd, the reports and criticism of their handling of such matters suggests I will never be compensated fully for this loss, if at all. The suggestion made for the route as planned will be a permanent blight on the town myself and my wife have chosen to settle down in and raise a family. Essentially, if HS2 goes ahead as planned, I can see no reason as to why it will not lessen to a very great extent, the health and enjoyment of life, my family and I currently experience, and of which it will never recover.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Mr David Shipman

17/04/2014
To the House of Lords
SESSION 2015 - 16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF: REMAVON LIMITED

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

   The Petitioner is Remavon Limited (hereinafter referred to as ("your Petitioner").

   Your Petitioner is a private limited company registered in England and Wales under company number 02204480 and owns the freehold of the building known as Ivo Building, 151 Scrubs Lane, London NW10 6RH and registered at the Land Registry under title number BGL21424 (hereinafter referred to as "the Property").

   Your Petitioner’s business, amongst other things, is the letting of the Property (whether as a whole or in parts) to commercial tenants and the generation of income as a result.

   Your Petitioner acquired the Property in 1996 and carried out significant works of refurbishment to it prior to granting a lease to Teacrate Plc (now called Teacrate Limited), a public limited company registered in England and Wales under registration number 04383030.

   The principal terms of this lease were that it was granted on a fully repairing and insuring basis for a term of 15 years expiring on 20 August 2013 at a passing rent of £130,850 per annum.

   Your Petitioner has sustained significant loss on account of the Promoter’s decision to initially include the Property within the safeguarding zone and then remove it from the zone subsequently.
At the time of the listing of the property within the safeguarding zone, the term of Teacrate’s lease expired by effluxion of time. Immediately prior to such expiry the passing rent was £130,580 per annum.

Your Petitioner therefore sought to agree terms for a renewal of the lease so as to protect its investment and appointed DTZ to provide it was advice as to market rent. DTZ advised your Petitioner that, but for HS2, the market rent should have been approximately £150,000 per annum.

However, Teacrate would not agree to that level of rent and ultimately, facing the risk of its own insolvency in the light of business rates for the Property calculated against a rateable value of £129,000, your Petitioner had no option but to agree a rent of £55,088 until 17 February 2015 and £100,176 from 17 February 2015 to 31 December 2017.

The new lease was completed on 14 February 2013 and your Petitioner will therefore sustain losses in excess of £300,000 as a direct result of HS2. Further, the losses sustained by your Petitioner may even lead to its total extinguishment. This would not have been the case but for HS2 and the losses it has caused (and will cause in the future).

As is made clear by the foregoing, your Petitioner owns or has an interest in property and/or businesses within the Scrubs Lane area, some of which or part of which is subject to compulsory acquisition under the Bill (whether permanent or temporary) and some of which, whilst not subject to the compulsory purchase proposals of the Bill, is in the immediate vicinity of the proposed works including (but not limited to) the tunnelling works, spoil storage sites and spoil removal routes and they and their employees’ and contractors health, safety and wellbeing and their employment, businesses and livelihoods are liable to be injuriously affected by them.

It is respectfully submitted that the rights, interests and property of your Petitioner, and those of their employees and contractors, tenants and other occupiers are injuriously affected by the Bill if it is passed into law in its present form. Accordingly, your Petitioner objects for the reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3.Your Petitioner’s Concerns

Your Petitioner had thought that, following its appearance before the House of Commons Select Committee, its concerns would have been satisfied. However, your Petitioner’s position is that such concerns have not so been satisfied and this has led
your Petitioner to submit this further Petition to the House of Lords. This despite the comments made in support of its position by members of the House of Commons Select Committee.

Your Petitioner has many substantial concerns respecting the provisions of the Bill as affecting the Scrubs Lane area, the Property and the business and livelihoods of your Petitioner, its employees and contractors, and its tenants and other occupiers.

Your Petitioner estimates on information provided by the Promoter that the construction traffic generated from the tunnel excavation, spoil removal and associated works will impact upon the Property for a period of more than 8 years. Heavy construction traffic will pass along congested London roads creating unprecedented noise, dust, pollution, vibration and safety hazards in the area. It is anticipated that many hundreds of thousands of lorry movements will be required.

Your Petitioner submits that the scale of the excavation and construction is unprecedented for such a densely populated area in the UK. Your Petitioner is greatly concerned by the overall impact which the construction of HS2 as proposed will have upon the neighbourhood, people, the environment and amenity of the Scrubs Lane area and upon the fabric, general amenity and value of the Property, upon the ongoing viability of the business operated by your Petitioner, and upon the ongoing viability of the businesses operated by your Petitioner's tenants and other occupiers. Your Petitioner contends that these works are unacceptable in this area and should not be permitted. In the alternative, and without prejudice to the previous, the works should be designed, operated and controlled with nothing less than the highest standards of design, construction practice and mitigation. It remains unclear to your Petitioner that such standard will be adopted or, if adopted, will be carried through and enforced in the implementation of the proposed scheme.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the powers proposed in the Bill as affecting the Scrubs Lane area and the Property therein are either unjustified and/or unclear. Your Petitioner is also concerned that no adequate provision has been made to compensate the property owners, traders and businesses of the area according to the actual loss they would suffer. Furthermore, no adequate provision has been made to secure that damage and disruption are kept to a minimum or to secure that in other respects their interests are reasonably safeguarded. No mention has been made of penalties for the Promoters or losses to your Petitioner should any breaches of agreement or policy occur so as to result in injurious affection or harm to buildings, to owners, lessees or to occupiers.
In the ordinary course, your Petitioner understands that a project of this sort would now be subject to much more detailed design work that it appears has been undertaken. Significant detail is missing – as such the current scheme and its impact has not been properly analysed and the most appropriate tunnelling methodology, worksites and route alignment have not been chosen taking all criteria including risk assessment, noise, pollution, vibration, environmental harm, traffic levels, health and safety into account. In consequence, the impacts upon the Scrubs Lane area and the Property and your Petitioner's business and interests more generally are still ill-defined and your Petitioner is handicapped in its ability to engage with the Promoters in a positive fashion to safeguard both the interests of the area, the Property and your Petitioner's business and other interests.

Your Petitioner has responded to the Promoters' invitation to submit detailed comments on the Environmental Statement associated with, and deposited at the same time as the Bill. Your Petitioner believes it is its right to expect the large quantity of information that has been omitted from the Environmental Statement. Your Petitioner is currently awaiting proofs of evidence on a number of issues. Your Petitioner respectfully reserve the right to raise again these issues at such time as your Honourable House comes to consider this Petition.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the powers proposed in the Bill as affecting the Property and the Scrubs Lane area more generally are either unjustified and/or unclear.

Your Petitioner is concerned about other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect the rights, interests and property of your Petitioner and the business operated by your Petitioner for whom no adequate provision is made in the Bill.

Your Petitioner respectfully submits that it, its employees and contractors, tenants and other occupiers have rights under the Aarhus Convention (which has largely been transposed into UK legislation through EC Directives and Legislation) concerning:

a. Access to environmental information;

b. Public participation in the decision making process; and

c. Access to environmental justice.

Your Petitioner respectfully submits that the Bill deprives your Petitioner of its rights under this Convention, either in whole or in part.
The HS2 base case as regards its plans in the vicinity of the Property, and London generally, is that there be extensive tunnelling under and/or through substantial parts of London. Further, as regards the Property, there is, in very close proximity, the main construction compound at Old Oak Common and the substantially proportioned North Pole Depot (East). The result of this is that extensive surface works are required to support the tunnelling and other operations, supplying materials, removing excavated soil and storing the excavated soil. Your Petitioner submits that there will be a significant environmental impact as a consequence of these works which, inter alia, will involve significant disruption and congestion to the local road network.

Your Petitioner objects very strongly to the current plans which include the siting of the tunnelling, the siting of the Old Oak Common Station Main Compound and the siting of the North Pole Depot (East) with all the associated construction work, spoil removal and likely site regeneration works which will last many years.

Without prejudice to your Petitioner's contentions as set out above, your Petitioner also objects to the provisions of Clause 4 of the Bill and of Clause 8 (as originally drafted) insofar as the same would enable the Promoter to acquire rights in the subsoil and sub-surface of certain of the Properties. Your Petitioner appreciates that if there is no alternative taking all the relevant criteria into account there may be the need for the Promoter to obtain appropriate subsoil interests for tunnelling purposes but are concerned that the application of the powers as proposed is excessive and unnecessary and that their application will lead to damage to the Scrubs Lane area.

Your Petitioner is concerned about the definition of "Phase One purposes" set out in Clause 62 to the Bill (as originally drafted) and, in particular, to the inclusion of the words "otherwise for the purposes of or in connection with Phase One of High Speed 2 or any high speed railway transport system of which Phase One of High Speed 2 forms or is to form part". This could permit the Promoter to use powers for the purposes of development in addition to those needed for constructing a railway. Your Petitioner would therefore seek sufficient safeguards to protect its property and business interests.

Your Petitioner therefore submits that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless, and to the extent (if any) that proof is provided that, there is no better alternative to the route alignment, the Old Oak Common Station Main Compound and the North Pole Depot (East) taking all criteria into account and unless it can be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. Your Petitioner has not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting the
Property and the Scrubs Lane area generally, and it is not satisfied that it is necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

Accordingly, your Petitioner submits that the Promoter should demonstrate and be put to strict proof of the need for and desirability of the proposals in the Bill, as affecting the Property and the Scrubs Lane area in general and that the proposed line of route, the resulting powers for the compulsory acquisition of subsoil, the power to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the limits of deviation should be restricted in relation to your Petitioner’s property (and the Scrubs Lane area more generally) to the extent (if any) to which they can be strictly justified and so as to prevent interference. In particular, your Petitioner contends that any interest in properties acquired (whether permanently or temporarily and, including but not limited to, in terms of the area over which it is to subsist, the form in which it is to take at law and any express or implied constraints which may be imposed upon the remainder of such property) should be strictly limited only to that which is absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the proposed works. Once the purpose of construction is completed the property rights acquired for this purpose should be returned to the original holders.

Your Petitioner has significant concerns with regards to the noise, pollution and vibration arising from the excavation of the tunnels, the removal of spoil and the construction of the railway and its associated works and structures. Such activities will inevitably also include heavy lorry traffic and is a matter of significant concern to your Petitioner.

The operation of the railway (including the use of ventilation shafts where proposed and other ancillary uses) will inevitably give rise to air and ground transmitted noise, pollution and vibration. There are no clear and binding limitations on such noise, pollution and vibration in either the Bill or the Environmental Statement. There is presently little monitoring of current levels of noise, vibration, pollution, dust, airborne pollution and vehicular disturbance so as to evaluate the impact of any increase in the area. Your Petitioner submits that the Promoter should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the railway and its associated works and structures to ensure that no noise or vibration can be felt or otherwise experienced in or on the Property and such that there are no other adverse effects. Your Petitioner submits that strict standards should be set beyond those currently envisaged by the Promoter to protect the environment and to which the Promoter must be made strictly liable to comply in writing. Appropriate measures and
penalties should be in place to safeguard the interests of all those affected by noise, pollution, vibration and health and safety breaches.

Your Petitioner considers that in the circumstances a noise, pollution and vibration monitoring and mitigation system should be in place before commencement and during construction of any works in relation to HS2. Further, there should be a resultant damage mitigation and monitoring system in place, again before commencement and both during enabling works, construction of the works and operation of the trains. There must also be an evaluation of the cumulative impact of enabling works, construction and the operation of the trains following completion. There must, in your Petitioner's submission be a threshold agreed between your Petitioner and the Promoter of the Bill. If that threshold is exceeded or any damage is caused, the nominated undertaker should be obliged to cease construction or operation of the trains as the case may be until such time as remedial measures are in place, to pay appropriate financial penalties and only be permitted to resume the works once noise, pollution and vibration levels have returned to the levels to be set out under the Bill.

Your Petitioner requests that provision be made for the appointment of a suitably qualified expert or experts in noise, pollution and vibration (to include that generated both during construction and operation of the railway) caused at the Property by the operation of the project. Such an expert or experts should be agreed upon by the parties or in default of agreement should be appointed by the president of the appropriate body on the application of either party to report upon noise, pollution and vibration effects in the Property and the surrounding area. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that the terms of the appointment should be agreed by the Petitioner, and the report should be addressed jointly to the parties whilst his/her fees should be borne by the Promoter. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made for reports to be supplied immediately to the parties. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that all costs, expenses and VAT thus incurred should be borne by the Promoter. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that the noise impact, pollution impact and vibration impact (during both enabling works, construction and operational phases) should be monitored by the relevant experts appointed pursuant to such agreement at the cost of the Promoter for the period of the construction works and at regular intervals after commencement of the running of the trains.

Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that all insulation and other remedial measures for all affected by the works as determined necessary by the expert appointed above be put in place at the cost of the Promoter before the commencement of enabling works and construction works in the vicinity of the
Property, and/or if there is any noise, pollution or vibration impact to the Property or any part of the Property from the enabling works, construction of the works or the operation or maintenance of the trains and tunnels at any time. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made that all statutory consents are to be obtained by the Promoter at its cost. Your Petitioner requests that all such remedial measures and method statements are agreed in writing with them in advance.

Without prejudice to the foregoing your Petitioner requests that provision be made that if, notwithstanding the reports of the experts any noise, pollution or vibration impact or any other health and safety impact is felt by persons or in any of the Property or any part of them or if any damage is caused from any vibration from the project at any time (including the operation of the trains at any time) all insulation and remedial measures are to be installed by the Promoter to your Petitioner's satisfaction immediately upon request by your Petitioner and at the Promoter's cost. Your Petitioner requests that all such remedial measures and method statement are agreed with them in writing in advance.

Having regard to the nature of the Scrubs Lane area and the businesses being carried out at the Property, your Petitioner is also concerned that hours of working should be strictly limited. Your Petitioner believes that the Promoter's proposals for limiting work hours are not satisfactory and seeks the imposition of more appropriate working hours. Enabling works and construction of the works during the hours currently proposed would cause considerable disruption to the occupiers of the Property and the businesses operated therein.

The proposed works will impact significantly upon the use and enjoyment of the Property, as well as on the businesses operated therein. Significant use of unsuitable highways by large multi-wheel vehicles both delivering equipment and supplied to the work site and dealing with spoil as a result of the works is anticipated. The disruptive effect of such vehicle movements will be compounded by the permanent and temporary stopping up of nearby roads. The use and routing of heavy lorries through the vicinity of the Property is a matter of substantial concern to your Petitioner and, in its view, must be strictly controlled.

Your Petitioner is concerned about pollution, dust and dirt produced during the construction of the proposed works. Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, your Petitioner requests that special provision be made to take account of the particular sensitivity of the Properties, the business operated by your Petitioner, the use to which the Property is put and the urban London setting. Your Petitioner would wish to see binding limits of pollution and airborne dust particulates imposed
on the Promoter and the Promoter should monitor pollution levels and dust emissions, at their own cost both before and after enabling works and construction of the works at suitably agreed points at the Properties and in the immediate vicinity. Strict adherence to maximum pollution and particulate levels should be required and where maximum pollution and airborne particulate levels are exceeded the Promoter should be required to cease work and mitigate the excess levels. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made to ensure that the Promoter takes responsibility for the reimbursement of your Petitioner for additional expense caused by dust and dirt such as, for example only, more frequent cleaning of the Property. Your Petitioner requests the adoption of best practice in dust suppression at all times.

Your Petitioner is concerned to ensure that disruption to access to the Property, both vehicular and pedestrian, caused by the construction of HS2 is kept to an absolute minimum during the construction period. Your Petitioner requests that good and open access to the Property be maintained in all cases, that vehicular access be maintained and that compensation be awarded for any costs incurred through inability to access, service or park at the Property due to the works.

Your Petitioner further submits that the nominated undertaker should be required under the Bill to provide detailed plans, method statements and other particulars of works including schedules of deliveries occurring in and around the Property substantially in advance of the commencement of enabling works and all construction operations.

Your Petitioner wishes to be satisfied that there will be no disruption to statutory services provided to the Property as a result of the construction of the proposed works.

The provisions contained within the Bill for compensation for compulsory purchase of property or of subsoil or new other rights (in all cases whether on a permanent or temporary basis) will not enable your Petitioner or other landowners to recover the full loss and expense which they will incur in consequence of the exercise of such powers. Your Petitioner therefore submits that the Bill should be amended to rectify this.

Your Petitioner also objects that the compensation provisions of the Bill are inadequate to compensate your Petitioner or others in circumstances where no land (or interests in land) is acquired by the Promoter under the Bill, but where the value of such land and the properties erected on it is reduced or where such land and the properties erected on it and/or the business interests operated from it is otherwise
adversely or injuriously affected by the construction or use of the proposed works.

Your Petitioner therefore submits that the Bill should be amended to provide for claims for adequate compensation in respect of damage arising to their property by the execution of the works, or for injurious affection thereof by the execution or working of these works, separately from any claim for compensation in respect of acquisition of any land (or interest therein) from your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner further submits that the compensation provisions proposed in the Bill are inadequate to compensate your Petitioner for the loss, damage and inconvenience attributable to blight to the Properties, which it has already suffered or may now suffer as a result of the prospective construction and subsequent use of the proposed works. Your Petitioner fears, for example, (as has already been the case with Teacrate) that prospective lessees of the Property (or any part thereof) will feel that the proposals may so blight some or all of the Property that they would not be interested in acquiring any part or parts of the Property, or that prospective or existing lessees will demand a considerably reduced rent, due to the prospect of the works. Further provisions should, it submits, be included in the Bill including provisions respecting the making and assessment of claims for compensation, in indemnifying your Petitioner for any loss it might suffer (or already has suffered) as the result of unfavourable rent reviews respecting leases insofar as the reduced rent payable (as it may differ from open market rent) is attributable to the proposed works and their effect on the Property. Furthermore, compensation should be available for any loss (so attributable) which your Petitioner might suffer (or has already suffered) in the event of it not being able to let or re-let their properties (in whole or in part) to existing or new tenants or in the event of them only being able to do so at a reduced premium or rent.

In this regard, in respect of the issues raised above and below, your Petitioner submits that it experiences all of the pain without any of the benefit of HS2 unless the provisions on compensation within or in tandem with the Bill are amended.

Your Petitioner further submits that the Promoter should be required to indemnify it from all losses, claims and demands which may be made or suffered in consequence of enabling works and the construction, use or maintenance of the works or the operation of the trains and the maintenance of the tunnels at any time under the Bill, or their failure or want of repair, or in consequence of any act or omission of the Promoter, his contractors or agents in carrying out the operation of the trains and maintenance of the tunnels at any time under the Bill.
As a general matter, your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to repay to your Petitioner all proper cost, charges and expenses (including the proper fees of such professional advisers as it may instruct) reasonably incurred in consequence of the Bill or of any provision made as a result of this Petition.

Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to pay compensation on demand for reduction in market value of the Property caused by any of the foregoing. Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to indemnify the Petitioner for any injury to the Petitioner, its employees, contractors, agents, invitees, tenants and licensees at the Property. Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to indemnify your Petitioner if insurance cannot be obtained by it or only at an increased premium or subject to particular conditions/excesses. Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for interest to be payable by the Promoter on all sums due and not paid. Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for all monitoring costs of your Petitioner to be borne by the Promoter. As a general matter, your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for an overall indemnity by the Promoter to put your Petitioner in the same position as in the "no project" world. Your Petitioner submits that all undertakings and indemnities given by the Promoter should be for the benefit of your Petitioner, its successors in title and assigns and all mortgagees of the Property.

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

CONCLUSION

Accordingly your Petitioner respectfully submits that:

a. the Promoter should provide satisfactory and complete evidence and justification as to why the tunnelling, the Old Oak Common Station Main Compound and North Pole Depot (East) should be located as shown on map number CT-05-008; and

b. the Bill should not proceed in its present form until provision is made for the Promoter to have proved that all outstanding matters of concern and the environmental impact on the Property and the Scrubs Lane area more generally that are set out above have been addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of your Petitioner.
For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that the Bill fails adequately to safeguard and protect the interests of your Petitioner and that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, and unless all of the issues set out herein are fully addressed, the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

4. The Prayer

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

AND the petition remains, etc.

Richard Charles Andrew Elnley
Solicitor of the Senior Courts of England and Wales
Charles Russell Speechlys LLP
One London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1UN
Agent for the Petitioner
18 April 2016
To the House of Lords
SESSION 2015 – 16

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

THE PETITION OF: REMAVON LIMITED

Richard Charles Andrew Ffenfey
Agent for and on behalf of the Petitioner
Charles Russell Speechlys LLP
One London Square
Cross Lanes
Guildford
GU1 1UN
Agent for the Petitioner
18 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF RICHARD AND PHEBE ROBINOW

Declares that:

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

Your petitioners

2. Your petitioners are Richard & Phebe Robinow, joint owners of 28 Park Village East, London NW1 7PZ (The Property), a Grade II* listed Nash semi-detached house with garden (built in the mid-1820s) held on a lease from the Crown Estate (the freeholder), the street being part of the John Nash-designed, Regent’s Park Estate, in the Regent’s Park Conservation Area, which the Bill will specially and directly affect. The subsoil to this property forms plot 128 in the London Borough of Camden which is intended to be acquired compulsorily by the Promoter.

3. Your petitioners live immediately oppose the cutting through which it is proposed the railway will gain access to Euston station. There will be very substantial disruption to the Property, to the lives of your petitioners and to the locality in which they live and shop throughout the period of the construction works.

4. Your petitioners have lived in the property for 35 years. Your petitioners will be 71 and 67 years old when works on the proposed railway, if authorised, begin. Thus they will be in their late 70 and 80s when all works are finished.

5. Your petitioners are members of the Park Village East Heritage Group (PVEHG) and as such fully endorse the Humble Petition of the group.

6. Your petitioners endorse the request for the railway alternatives, written and to be put forward by local groups, to be properly assessed.

Your petitioners’ concerns

7. It appears from HS2’s reports that Park Village East will be one of the worst-affected areas on the entire line but your petitioners cannot see that they will be properly or effectively protected or compensated. The noise, dust, vibration and possible pollution levels which will or may be experienced appear to your petitioners to make the Property uninhabitable, at least for certain periods. The lack of access by any sort of vehicle (apart from the building rigs and vehicles attached to HS2’s chosen contractors) will also severely curtail your petitioners’ lives, for reasons shown below.
8. Your petitioner Phebe Robinow, when she works, works from home; your petitioner Richard Robinow works at home in the evenings and at weekends. If circumstances change, he may be working from home full time. They both work in rooms with windows directly opposite the railway cutting and facing onto the street which will be filled with giant rigs, working at some points for 24 hours a day. It will be hard to concentrate with the amount of construction noise just outside the windows which are 3.21 metres from the street.

9. Mr Robinow’s work necessitates phone calls to the Far East (between 6 and 8 hours ahead of London time) and occasionally to parts of the United States (up to 8 hours behind London time). Daytime and night-time working in the street outside, including the building of the barrettes, the replacing of the retaining wall, the work (from the street) on the new line, the destruction and reconstruction of the Mornington Street bridge and the building of a new ventilation shaft (in your petitioners’ views grossly oversized) will make phone conversations hard to hear. You will have read details of the works in the PVEHG petition so your petitioners will not repeat them here as you will have seen how badly affected your petitioners will be.

10. The Promoter has offered secondary glazing for the main living and bed rooms. As the side of the Property faces a bend in the road and the railway, noise comes in all round the house. Secondary glazing is not, at present, permitted by the Crown Estate, by English Heritage or by Historic England and, were they to make a special case, the Property has original shutters which need to be closed for reasons of security and which are incompatible with secondary glazing.

11. The back of the Property also receives noise bounced from the street or railway onto the very high wall of the Albany Street Barracks. This barracks backs onto the gardens of numbers 28-36 Park Village East. Behind the wall is hard standing, then a tall, wide building containing workshops and a car park. This concrete and brickwork bounces noise, it does not absorb it.

12. The Promoter still appears to believe that the houses, both the single and the pairs, form a terrace. They do not seem to be able to understand that noise and dust flow between the houses so that the backs can be as dirty and noisy as the fronts if works are taking place in the street or on the railway.

13. The Property is, as are all the houses from 2-36, built on footings, not proper foundations. Perched, as it is, on a ridge between the very deep railway cutting (soon to be deeper if the project is completed) and the spur of the Regent’s Canal (filled in since the early 1940s) which runs along the bottom of the gardens, all residents of Park Village East find that the houses suffer from constant cracking and subsidence. Your petitioners fear that the positioning of the ground anchors beneath the Property and the huge construction works just outside and below the Property may have a seriously deleterious effect.

14. Mr Smart, International Director for High Speed Rail, suggested to the Select Committee of MPs on 2nd December 2015 that most of the disruption would be akin to or result from normal utility works. In fact, your petitioners (and neighbours) have never, even with the electrification of the West Coast Main Line, been subjected to
train or utility works of several years' duration with substantial periods of night working.

Habitability and Access

15. As half of Park Village East will be knocked down in order that Line X and the concrete box may be built and as Network Rail does not wish the Promoter's Scheme to affect the day to day running of the existing railway more than necessary, a proportion of the building works will have to be done from Park Village East. HS2's photographs of rigs to be used (or similar) show enormous creatures which will be too heavy to stand right on the edge of the barrette wall. Thus they will take up most of what remains of the street. The street will be closed, according to the Promoter, for one year and therefore probably longer.

16. The result of this is that there will be restricted access for foot passengers and those on bicycles only, no vehicles. Your petitioners will not be able to drive to and from the property in order to carry heavy shopping (large boxes of washing powder, for example), to collect family from an airport, to take their grandchildren to see other relatives (our son and family live abroad and visit us twice a year). Your petitioners will not be able to go out at night in their car or to be picked up or brought home safely by friends or hired vehicles.

17. Numbers 24-36 Park Village East will be further disadvantaged as these houses have been cut out of the Promoter's re-housing scheme since HS2 argues that the residents will have nearby road access. They have not confirmed where this road access will be and there is no clarity as to where, if at all, parking will be available, merely vague indications that parking will be discussed with Camden Council.

18. Neither your petitioner nor her husband can imagine where parking will be found since the residents' parking places for this area are already keenly fought over and, even if this street only were to be closed, there still would not be enough spaces to park. Your petitioners will not be able to access their off-street parking.

19. If your petitioners need a new bed, if the Property needs maintenance, maintenance and service vehicles will be unable to reach anywhere near the Property. Your petitioner Phebe Robinow needs the help of a gardener as she can no longer maintain the garden on her own, due to damaged knees and a bad back.

20. Fire engines, in particular, it appears from a measurement of the street and from the Promoter's own words, will be unable to access the houses in Park Village East, including that of your petitioners. The Promoter asserts that barriers can be taken down in emergencies but if the keyholder is in the lavatory or at lunch, or even if the barriers can be taken down and the construction vehicles moved, a fire may quickly take hold (your petitioners had experience of the speed of destruction by fire while refurbishing the Property in 1980).

21. Your petitioners cannot understand, either, how rubbish and recycling collections will be enabled if no outside vehicles can access the road.
Your petitioners' requests

22. Your petitioners request to be re-housed during the period offered to the residents of other Properties in Park Village East and, throughout the building period, a guaranteed parking space within reasonable proximity of the Property, 'reasonable' given the level of infirmity and of age of your petitioners.

23. Your petitioners request a guarantee of full insurance, maintenance and security of the Property and garden while the Property is uninhabitable.

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.

(Richard Robinow) (Phebe Robinow)

18th April 2016
The petition declares that:

1. The petitioner(s) is/are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. Your petitioner(s) are JANE HIRST MILLER & ROBERT HARLAND MILLER

3. Your petitioners Jane Hirst Miller & Robert Harland Miller do live in one of the most blighted properties affected by the Bill. The property is situated on the corner of Mornington Crescent and Hampstead Road. Granby Terrace is also to one side & it backs on to the Camden Cutting. Your petitioners have lived in the property for twenty years. They live there with their two school aged children.
3. Your petitioner’s concerns are

4. Your Petitioner’s neighbourhood will suffer from 10 years of heavy construction work and our wider community will be affected for at least 18 years.

5. Your Petitioners are extremely concerned that a significant amount of the works will take place at night on the Hampstead Road Bridge and in Camden Cutting.

6. Your Petitioners will be seriously affected by
   a) All the works in the Camden Cutting
   b) Demolition & reconstruction over 8 years of Hampstead Road Bridge - 4.8m higher & twice the existing length.
   c) Demolition & reconstruction of the Granby Terrace Bridge.
   d) Years of ‘Significant noise’ & months of ‘Significant vibration’.

7. Your Petitioners property is situated in a large open area with hard sound reflective surfaces. Mornington Crescent will be completely exposed across the open cutting to the full brunt of the noise.

8. Your Petitioners are concerned about the permanent increase in traffic & the resulting rise in pollution levels.

9. Your Petitioner, Robert Harland Miller is a writer who works from home 2 days a week. His office overlooks the Cutting. He will be seriously affected by the noise. Your Petitioners children will be sitting their GCSEs / A levels over this period & your Petitioners are concerned that their sleep & ability to concentrate will be affected.

10. Your Petitioners have a terrace over looking the Cutting which they like to sit on on a nice sunny day - they will not be able to enjoy this privilege for 10 years. Nor will they be able to open their windows due to the noise. Compensation offered - Secondary glazing. Your petitioners feel punished for happening to live in the path of this project.
11. Affected sleep is a major concern. Your Petitioners bedroom looks out over the Cutting, their daughter’s bedroom looks out over Hampstead Road.

12. Your Petitioners seek relief by
   a) No 24/7 works
   b) Your Petitioners wish to be temporarily rehoused in a like for like property of their choice should their property become uninhabitable.
   c) Should your Petitioners decide they want to sell up and move on they must receive a fair price for their property - not the blight price.
   d) Rail used instead of road for the removal of spoil.
   e) That Old Oak Common be considered as the final destination of #52, thus there would be no negative impact on such a densely populated part of London.

13. Your Petitioners are especially concerned about the new bridge to be built on Hampstead Road (as the plans currently stand). Your Petitioner’s property will be permanently blighted. Our front door will now open out onto a fly over which will also be the vista from our living room & daughter’s bedroom. It’s height & length will create an ugly & inhuman landscape. It will not be in keeping with the Grade II listed Mornington Crescent & will create an unsafe environment. If the plans remain as they are the Petitioners wish #52 to buy their property.
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: HARLAND MILLEX  Signature.

Name: JAYNE HIRST MILLER  Signature.

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................

Name: ...........................................  Signature.................................
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PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF 30-40 GRAFTON WAY AND THEIR SUPPORTERS

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are

Residents of 30-40 Grafton Way, a Camden Council block, on a street that runs between Gower St and Tottenham Court Rd, immediately south of and parallel to Euston Rd. There are 117 flats.

1. Jo Hurford Flat 71

2. Patricia Jarvis

3. Daniel Goodenough

4. Timothy Smyth

5. IAN MCDOWELL

6. DAVID HULSE

7. [Signature]

8. E. DIAZ
9. C. DIAZ

10. R.S. MULANI

11. ABDUR RAHIM

12. TAMJEED RAHIM

13. M.L. BOUKHARI

14. ISTVAN VARGA

15. ADEL ALSHANA

16. NATALIA MAESTRO

17. SEYED NOORY

18. SHARMA WADAY

19. TONY GOMAR

20. BLAINE LYON

21. J. WINKMANN

22. KIRAN SHRESTHA

23. D. DONOHUE
24. C. John
25. Maria Moreira
26. F. Begum
27. Carmen Pene
28. Andrea Carmona
29. Michael Gullan
30. Christine Obina
31. Dennis Obina
32. S. Simpson
33. Clara Yeo
34. Tony Goddard
35. S. Maora
36. R. Mernagh
37. Ye Khur
38. A. Rahim
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

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

**THE PETITION OF 30-40 GRAFTON WAY AND THEIR SUPPORTERS**

3. *Your petitioner’s concerns are*

- There will be additional construction and diverted traffic on your petitioners’ street which will cause your petitioners to be prisoners in their own homes with no fresh air.
- The Additional Provisions 3 Supplementary Environmental Statement states a major adverse significant effect for Grafton Way at 8.4.10.
- Your petitioners ask that the promoter undertake there will be no worsening of air quality from either HS2 construction sites or diverted and construction vehicles. Air quality baselines for Grafton Way and University Street must be taken from before the commencement of any UCLH construction.
- We have experienced construction and the inability of local enforcement to prevent for example dust and out of hours working from the UCLH hospital rebuild on the south side of Grafton Way and the Beaumont Place side which also has unleashed an avalanche of rats.
- We need an independent adjudicator and enforcement officers.
- Spoil must be removed and materials brought in by rail not lorries to minimize the impact on your petitioners homes.
- The flats facing in the direction of Euston Road will be particularly vulnerable to construction noise. This has not been assessed. The large piling machine working on the UCLH site in front of your petitioners building is audible when standing in front of Maria Fidelis school, therefore your petitioners imagine the noise from the construction site that will be situated there will be audible in your petitioners building, especially at night. Therefore your petitioners ask that noise impacts be assessed for every floor of the rear of the building.
- Your petitioners ask for soundproofed glazing and an air filtration system for all flats in the 30-40 Grafton Way building, to be agreed with each householder – and be adequately monitored. The ventilation is to filter out the dust and pollution from the increased traffic as well as the construction sites.
- Your petitioners ask for fair urban compensation.
- Your petitioners ask that there is no temporary or permanent loss of public green/open spaces and trees, to ensure the amenity of residents.
PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF:
J Price, DJ Bennett-Price, D Wilson, S Bentley, N Kalirai, S Kalirai

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by:

   Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway 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.

   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.

   The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill are specified in clauses 1 and 2 of and Schedules 1 and 2 to the Bill. 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.

2. Your petitioners

   The petitioners are owners and residents of properties in the local area and represent the interests of residents in the southern end of Tilehouse Lane, Denham who are directly affected by the works referred to above. The petitioners have lived in Tilehouse Lane for periods varying from 10 years to 32 years. This location was chosen by each family because of the rural area, while being close to London, the local amenities and the natural beauty of the surrounding area. The petitioners properties and everyday lives will be subject to noise, vibration, pollution, disruption and irreversible visual impacts throughout the construction period of at least seven
years, and virtually continuous train noise for up to 18 hours per day during the subsequent years of operation.

3. The petitioner’s concerns

The petitioners and their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which The petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3.1. The petitioners are concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on Tilehouse Lane due to its narrow width, high hedges, frequent bends, lack of lighting and the popularity of this route with cyclists and walkers, like your Petitioners.

3.2. The petitioners request that Tilehouse Lane is not used by HGVs and site workers vehicles at any time. All site traffic for the works at the end of Tilehouse Lane should use the purpose made junction on the M25.

3.3. The petitioners request that due to an exceptionally long construction period HS2 Ltd implements measures to ensure construction and site worker traffic does not use Tilehouse Lane, in such a way that residents of Tilehouse Lane are not inconvenienced.

3.4. The petitioners request that the effectiveness of measures are monitored and those results made available to the residents, together with a means of reporting breaches. The petitioners request that HS2 Ltd is required to take effective action to remedy any breaches within the same day.

3.5. The petitioners are concerned that the country feeling of Tilehouse Lane will be lost after the development of the overbridge as that will expand the width of the road at that section and encourage more drivers to use Tilehouse Lane when the A412 has delays due to problems on the M25.

3.6. The petitioners request that this redevelopment follows the precedent set with the overbridge of Chalfont Lane over the M25 where it joins Shire Lane. This is single track from the A412 until the bridge where it widens and then narrows again.

3.7. The proposed access road to Denham Park Farm Quarry via Tilehouse Lane will create the potential for fatal accidents as the section of road is used by walkers and cyclists, adding to this, the proposed scheme intends to divert the bridleway along the same section of road. The petitioners request that the access road to Denham Park Farm Quarry is taken via the HS2 compound and directly on to the M25 and that the bridleway is not diverted.

3.8. The petitioners are also gravely concerned that temporary closure of the A412 will result in considerable delays and disruption to traffic on Tilehouse Lane. The petitioners request that whenever the A412 is closed or restricted, measures are put in place to ensure that the traffic is not directed down Tilehouse Lane.

3.9. There will be severe traffic congestion for years on the local roads. Access to places of work, schools, shops, medical facilities and work will be compromised. The petitioners request that HS2 traffic access on the A412 through Denham is restricted during the hours of 07:30 to 09:30 and 15:30-19:00. All arrangements to be monitored and any breaches to be dealt with in an acceptable timeframe.
3.10. There will be dust pollution for several years from the construction site and vehicles. The petitioners request that measures are taken to eliminate pollution and that there is continual and effective monitoring of pollution and if it exceeds pre works levels, works shall be halted without delay.

3.11. The value of the petitioners properties has fallen since the announcement of the HS2 project, this is in sharp contrast to the property prices in neighbouring villages such as Gerrards Cross. The petitioners request that HS2 guarantee to purchase their properties at such time that they wish to sell, at the projected prices in the locally unaffected areas had the HS2 project not been announced.

3.12. The geology of the petitioners residential area may lead to vibrations from the construction works and HS2 operations, resulting in possible structural damage and noise pollution. The petitioners request an indemnity that any damage, claims, demands, proceedings, costs and expenses arising from the construction and operation of HS2 will be remedied and properly compensated.

3.13. The construction works and subsequent operations site at the Northern end of Tilehouse Lane will have a detrimental visual impact on the area and restrict or block resident’s access to the Northern end of Tilehouse Lane. The petitioners request that the construction site and subsequent operations are built in harmony with the surrounds and do not spoil the view. It also request that residents access to the Northern end of Tilehouse Lane is not hindered.

3.14. The petitioners are regular users of public footpaths, bridleways and canal towpaths around the Colne Valley and are concerned about the impact of works authorised by the Bill on these footpaths. The proposed works plan to close some of these including the canal towpath. The petitioners ask that the number of local PRoW proposed to be stopped up or diverted be reduced significantly so that an adequate level of local amenity is preserved during the construction period and beyond.

3.15. Overall the petitioners are disappointed that a viaduct is planned for the Colne Valley. This is an area that provides much needed respite from the London sprawl. The petitioners along with many other local residents and people who live further into Middlesex use all of the natural and recreational facilities. Facilities such as Denham Country Park, Colne Valley Country Park, the local marinas, the Denham Water Ski Club, local fishing lakes, the public footpaths alongside the canal and rivers and so on. Much of this will be destroyed forever and the rest permanently damaged.

The petitioners respectfully request that a tunnel is to be constructed under the Colne Valley instead of the viaduct. The petitioners request that the tunnel from Ickenham is continued to form up with the proposed tunnel under the M25, thereby creating a continuous tunnel instead of the proposed Colne Valley viaduct and negating the need for the permanent damage that will result from the proposed route.
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.

Nachhatar Kalirai

Sukhninder Kalirai

Sarah Bentley

David Wilson

Daphne Jane Bennett-Price

John Price

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Burton Green Parish Council

Declares that:

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

Your petitioner

2. The petitioner is Burton Green Parish Council, representing those who live in the parish of Burton Green. Residents in the parish have property that will be compulsory purchased as a result of the bill, plus property and other interests that will suffer serious detriment specifically and directly as a result of the construction and operation of the railway.

Your petitioner's concerns

3. Under the current alignment and construction methods the centre of Burton Green Village will be seriously compromised by HS2 (including demolition/compulsory purchase of some properties) and all residents will see the effects of construction impacts on amenities and travel, plus concerns about health and wellbeing from dust and noise. A significant proportion of the population will leave the village (this process has already started) giving problems with social cohesion and community sustainability. Once operating there will be residual problems with noise for some residents.

4. Solutions to the above mentioned problems are available but to date have to a greater or lesser extent been dismissed by the promoter. We would request that an independent assessment is made using clearly stated and quantitative criteria to ensure that mitigation and cost benefit is made to a consistent fashion in all areas of the line and to avoid any impression that this is made only by political expedience and avoiding expense. The following points cover some specific requests to be assessed.

Noise

5. The latest information we have shows that significant operating noise will remain for many residents and for users of the Greenway. We note that noise maps based on averaging underplay the impact of an intermittent but frequent noise source, and this distortion is even worse for the late evening/early morning periods which are ‘reduced’ only by averaging – clearly a given train will create the same noise regardless of whether it is full or empty and running at 6am or 6pm. Currently this area is relatively tranquil which makes the additional noise even more damaging. Your Petitioners therefore ask that the promoters further improve noise mitigation, noting that the following specific requests should not be considered exhaustive.
6. We request that the cut-and-cover tunnel should be extended southwards by a further 400-500m in order to protect the village hall, Broadwell Woods residential park, Two Oaks day nursery, plus other Red Lane properties and the Greenway which runs relatively close to the alignment in this area. Also benefiting would be the site of the present Burrow Hill nursery on which a large housing development is scheduled.

7. We request that extra and/or improved noise barriers be added to the design going further southwards.

8. We request that the cut-and-cover tunnel should be extended northwards by a further 100m which will reduce noise impacts on Hodgetts Lane residents and on the Greenway, as well as reduce the requirement for land acquisition to generate noise bunds in the field next to the current village hall.

9. We note that as the Greenway continues northwards it runs essentially adjacent to HS2 giving clear concerns over noise and especially the potential for 'startle' effects on horse-riders. We therefore request that the Promoters take all reasonable measures to mitigate these impacts.

10. Regarding noise your Petitioners would lastly request that our community be offered some form of road-show or other method to provide a comprehensive demonstration/simulation of the expected noise after HS2 becomes operational. Attendees should be able to select from any of the sound assessment locations documented within our area (e.g. as shown in SV-02-50a and SV-02-49) plus other key points of interest such as various locations along the Greenway as they deem appropriate to their own position. Such demonstrations would better allow residents to be reassured as to the effectiveness of proposed mitigation and/or to understand where better mitigation is required and/or to better decide on their own decisions regarding staying or leaving the community.

**Auto-transformer site**

11. We continue to have concerns regarding the location of the autotransformer site which is to be placed immediately adjacent to the village (the existing sub-station is a considerable distance away and definitely 'outside' the village). Your Petitioners request that further efforts be made to screen the site from the village, and that guarantees are given that lighting, building facades, etc are designed sympathetically to the location.

**Compensation**

12. Your Petitioners note that even should all of the above requests be fulfilled Burton Green will still be suffering an enormous negative impact from HS2, both at individual and at community levels, and as such it is only right that full and fair compensation be paid.

13. We request that a specific compensation fund be generated for the community of Burton Green, which would be available to spend on approved projects that truly give the community something back as compensation for their sacrifices.

14. Your Petitioners further request that compensation for individuals is further refined, and especially the methodology:

15. We request that an area of properties is defined that do not need to go through the
'pantomime' of trying to sell before starting the need to sell process. We would suggest a distance of 240m from the line as a starting point.

16. We request that every effort be taken to encourage residents to remain within the village. We support the concept of the alternative cash offer for those within 120m, but would ask that this is made non-binding – either the voluntary purchase option should remain available, or at least ‘construction impact’ should be made a single clear qualification for the need to sell scheme.

Construction
17. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern and allow immediate response and oversight of contractors from the promoter. This will go a long way to reassure that their interests will be maintained during the critical construction period.

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

AND the petitioners remains, etc.

Cllr Andrew Gibbs (Agent)

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF MALCOLM BARRY HAFNER

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Malcolm Barry Hafner resident at High Tor, Ballinger Road, Lee Common, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LA, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion, by the proposed HS2 line. Your Petitioner lives in that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

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

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

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

Your petitioner is also seriously concerned about the disruptions to his household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioner needs to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for business, recreation and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London, High Wycombe 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 is also concerned that the extra traffic on all local roads will present a threat to safety of all road users (pedal cyclists, horse riders, walkers and joggers) which the road sizes have not been designed to take. All current routing of footpaths and bridleways are also a characteristic feature of the AONB. Your Petitioner is especially concerned about the re-routing and availability of all footpaths and bridleways during and after construction. Your Petitioner is very concerned about protecting the visual and living nature of the AONB and the detrimental affect any surface rail will have to his, and his family's, enjoyment of the AONB during and after construction. Your petitioner is extremely concerned that the one part of the AONB along the route that is not in a tunnel is the most scenic and characteristic of the AONB. The adjoining hills are among the highest in the AONB and so the railway will particularly intrude on the view from 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, 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 schemes be created to alleviate the volume of traffic on the roads including the extra provision of public transport and to reduce the amount of spoil transported on public roads to an absolute minimum (including increased use of the trace to transport spoil out of the AONB). The Promoter of the Bill to be required to provide, or secure the provision of, the necessary additional finance to fund these schemes.

e. 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.

f. 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.

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

h. 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 and to restrict the ability of the Promoter, their agents and sub-contractors to cut-down or remove the trees by use of Tree Protection Orders or other substantial, continuous and effective measures.

i. 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.

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.

1. 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 nominated undertaker will not use materials which will become visually less appealing over time.

o. 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.

p. 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.

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.

r. 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.

s. 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 including the reduction of both average and peak measures to best in class 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.

Malcolm Barry Hafner

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

PETITION OF SUSAN SELIGMAN  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner is an owner of property in Great Hampden, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns  

I have lived in the Chiltern Area of Natural Beauty ("AONB") for most of my life and I thoroughly appreciate and respect its amenities. In my regular walks, I can understand how the area came to be called "the lungs of London" as I meet so many walkers from London whose close proximity means that they can enjoy its peace and beauty.  

On the, frankly, unspeakable assumption that HS2 was to be constructed, notwithstanding the constantly flawed economic case made for it in the context of ever-rising and still clearly understated costs, I petition to ensure that the irreparable damage to the AONB is restricted to the maximum degree. Moreover, the threat to the wildlife habitat needs to be minimised.  

In my view, HS2 should be tunnelled throughout the AONB to and beyond Wendover. HS2 should be compelled to justify why it has rejected such tunnelling. To-date, HS2 has refused to publish its justification and it should be compelled to do so in the interests of full public transparency.  

4. The prayer  

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that 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.  

SUSAN SELIGMAN  
13th April, 2016
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS  
SESSION 2015-16  
PETITION against the  

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL  

PETITION OF  
LAWNHURST SERVICES t/a WENDOVER WOOD  
(ROBERT HUGH DUGGAN)  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your Petitioner is Lawnhurst Services t/a Wendover Wood, 91, Aylesbury Rd, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6JN, a Toymaking and Ornament making business established in 1998. They will be specially and directly affected by the proposed HS2 line both during construction and after completion.  

3. Wendover Wood is situated on Aylesbury Road, Wendover. Your Petitioners are a vibrant and busy company bringing trade to Wendover.  

4. Although your Petitioner’s business is outside the Safeguarding Zone, approx. 500 metres from the proposed line, there is little between the train line and your Petitioner. Your Petitioner will suffer the same amount of discomfort and inconvenience as those within the Zone during the construction phase. Your Petitioner therefore submits that the vibration and air pollution caused by the close proximity of the construction vehicles will discourage customers from coming to our business.  

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 Petitioner asserts 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 Petitioner respectfully requests a fully bored tunnel under the AONB as this would remove the concerns of your Petitioner and alleviate the vast majority of grievances regarding the upheaval, discomfort and genuine fear felt by those living and working in Wendover.

9. Your Petitioner 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.
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.

Robert Hugh Duggan 17th April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the:  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF JANINE SACHS  

 Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

The petitioner, Janine Sachs, is a householder of Flat d, 47 Eton Avenue, London, NW3 3EP.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns:  

i. I live in a group of Housing Association properties Eton Avenue, London, NW3 3EP – in the Belsize Conservation Area. We are a mixture of ethnicities, age ranges, single tenants and families. I am ‘vulnerable’, having to cope with ME/CFS. I have lived here for 30 years.  

ii. My home has poorly fitting single glazed windows inadequate to insulate from noise and excessive pollution. It is unlikely my HA landlord could afford to install the costly secondary glazing replacements to meet strict conservation requirements.  

iii. The tracks of the proposed HS2 Euston Tunnel are planned to be routed underground very close to your petitioners’ house – such that the Safeguarding zone will be at the edge of the bottom of my garden. Your Petitioners’ property is located within approximately 20 metres of the Safeguarding zone therefore be located immediately adjacent to construction.  

iv. Your Petitioners’ property is also very near to roads which will be used by construction traffic during the construction of the Scheme, namely Adelaide Road and England’s Lane. Your Petitioner understands that HS2 has published a Code of Construction Practice which would permit them to work at night and during weekends, as well as overseeing hundreds of lorry movements every day in our area.  

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

2. Effects of Increased Traffic for Waste Removal - on air quality, noise, local travel, health and safety.  

i. Your Petitioner is concerned that the HS2 estimate of five years of increased traffic – being predominantly HGV’s, will cause excessive noise, dust, air pollution and untold disruption to local traffic, not only in Adelaide but in all neighbouring streets. Your Petitioner is concerned that all of this, along with the noise of the 24/7 hour working will lead to sleep deprivation and other health issues – exacerating pre-existing health conditions, and will impact significantly upon the quiet enjoyment of the Properties and the neighbourhood of Eton Avenue.  

ii. Your Petitioner is concerned that the impact on local communities of the amount of waste to be excavated and removed from the construction of the high speed railway has been underestimated and the environmental impacts of removal and disposal of such waste has been needlessly worsened because of the primacy (in UK and EU law) of the requirement to seek to avoid
disposal of waste and comply with the principles of the waste hierarchy has been ignored by HS2 Ltd.

iii. Your Petitioner is concerned that Eton Avenue itself will inevitably take up some of the brunt of road closures during the 4-6 months of the Adelaide Viaduct and during the five (or more) years of continuing construction, and become a 'rat run' for all other traffic overflow and thus cause untold mayhem and adding to the already existent heavy congestion from the twice-daily four School runs in Eton Avenue - making it unsafe for school pupils and extremely unpleasant for everyone who lives here and uses the street.

iv. 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

v. Your Petitioner currently often chooses to shop in the less polluted England's Lane (compared to Finchley Road) and enjoy the community there. I am now very concerned that I will no longer be able to do so with the proposed diversion of traffic from Adelaide Road and its designated use for construction vehicles and spoil removal - due to resulting increase in air pollution, and likely closure of shops as a result. In this respect the ES fails to properly consider that whilst England's Lane is both highly residential, it is also home to 6 cafés with outdoor seating. There are questions as to how these and other businesses will survive during these diversions and so continue to serve Eton Avenue residents.

vi. Your Petitioner is concerned that the air quality will be badly affected by the gridlocked traffic, extra buses and the 100+ HGVs each day. The particulates produced by diesel exhaust have been identified as being extremely damaging to cardio-vascular systems.

vii. Your Petitioner questions how it will be considered 'safe' to shop in England's Lane or to walk or bus to and from frequent GP appointments via England's Lane and Adelaide Road?

viii. Emergency services will inevitably be delayed by this closure and will add to the congestion, potentially putting your Petitioners lives at risk.

ix. The 31 bus uses Adelaide Road in both directions so would be diverted to England's Lane as well under the current plans - which means doubling the number of buses using the road. At peak times England's Lane can't cope with the volume of traffic it has at present. Outside of peak times all it takes is for a Tesco delivery lorry to meet a bus or other large vehicle and things grind to a halt. The ES shows no awareness of the junction of England's Lane and Primrose Hill Road, which also connects to Eton Avenue (a continuation of England's Lane) and Belsize Park Gardens.

x. The ES proposals to remove parking on one side of England's Lane in an attempt to mitigate congestion will do little to ease the problem, and will only make parking for shoppers there even more difficult than it already is, especially for your Petitioners who need to use their cars for shopping there, due to mobility problems.

xi. In addition, during the 4-6 months closure to Adelaide Road and it's five years or more of construction and heavy HGV use, there would be considerable delays to your Petitioners' local bus services, in particular the 31 and C11, making traveling by those routes close to untenable.

xii. Your Petitioner would also be very concerned for the safety of my cat, which I would not have chosen to have but for Eton Avenue being a quiet street.

xiii. In short, a diversion to England's Lane for six months or so, as well as the proposed on-going heavy HGV use of Adelaide Road, would cause utter chaos and misery for your Petitioner for 5 years or more.
3. **EFFECTS OF NOISE AND VIBRATION - from underground construction and operation of HS2 - on health and safety.**

i. Your Petitioner is concerned about the effects of noise arising from the construction of the high speed railway and associated development.

ii. Your Petitioner is concerned there appears to be no mechanism in the Bill to deliver a properly noise mitigated railway.

iii. Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State or arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the nominated undertaker.

iv. Your Petitioner is concerned that no comprehensive impact assessment has been made in respect to the ground borne vibration from the high-speed trains, predicted to run at one and a half minutes. There are questions as to what extent vibrations may be felt consciously or unconsciously in and around your Petitioner’s Property and what long-term accumulative adverse effects high-speed vibration can have on health and well-being.

v. Your Petitioner is concerned that the fundamental calculations needed for forecasting noise impacts, known as the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) and Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL) have not been correctly identified and were set too high in the Environmental Statement, leading to material underestimation of the adverse noise and significant adverse noise impacts likely to arise from the high speed railway.

vi. Your Petitioner is concerned that noise thresholds used in the ES are inappropriate and have not been justified by reference to relevant British Standards or World Health Organization guidelines. In particular, levels adopted in the ES in respect of ground borne noise do not represent thresholds derived by reference to adverse effects that can be observed; rather they are levels that relate to likelihood of complaint. It follows that the appraisal in the ES of ground borne vibration is entirely flawed. Your Petitioner submits that the noise thresholds adopted by HS2 in respect of ground noise does not reflect recent practice in experience. Your petitioner is also concerned that the prediction methodology detailed in the Environmental Statement is not sufficiently robust.

vii. Your Petitioner is also concerned about the stability of their Properties in relation to the close proximity of deep tunnelling, because one of your Petitioners has recently been refused contents insurance by one insurer who believed this area to be prone to subsidence.

viii. Your Petitioner is further concerned that the development planned to go within the Safeguarding area just below the garden of 53 Eton, along with an awaiting development planned for the garden at no 51, might both clash with high speed rail construction and have a cumulative effect of leading to localised flooding.

ix. In addition there is concern amongst your Petitioners that the development proposed for 100 Avenue Road is entirely overlapping the Safeguarding area, with the tracks right up against the proposed building, raising serious questions of structural safety around Swiss Cottage Library, Leisure Centre and play area.

x. Your Petitioner is also concerned that the construction periods for the high speed rail and the 100 Avenue development will coincide, placing even greater burden on Eton Avenue with the 100 Avenue Road HGV’s and construction site to go at the west end of Eton Avenue – by Swiss Cottage tube.
xi. Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State or arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the nominated undertaker.

xii. Your Petitioner is seriously considering moving – after 30 years of enjoying the peaceful conservation area of Belsize, if the high speed rail go ahead as proposed. Because to stay would certainly exacerbate your Petitioner's existing health problems, yet to move would have the same effect, and would be virtually unaffordable. Your Petitioner is being placed in an impossible situation.

4. **CODE OF CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE**

i. Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaker's ongoing accountability to is unspecified. The proposed Code of Construction Practice has no statutory basis—it is not in the Bill. Assessment in the environmental statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be full effective, however the Code of Construction Practice has no legal status. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply and the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event that the contractors do not comply with the Code of Construction Practice.

ii. 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 with effective oversight and redress arrangements in the event of non-compliance with the Code of Construction Practice.

5. **YOUR PETITIONERS REQUEST THAT** –

i. Structural surveys are to be carried out on your Petitioners Properties, both in advance of tunnelling works and post construction and HS2 Ltd take full responsibility for all remediation works in a timely manner.

ii. **With respect to noise and vibration**

   a) HS2 Ltd be instructed to issue revised noise thresholds covering the LOAEL and SOAEL for noise exposure, in rural and urban areas and during the day and at night-time which reflect World Health Organisation guidelines including World Heath Organisation guidelines on peak noise (60db max pass-by outside, giving 45db inside).

   b) HS2 Ltd be required to set noise limits for construction which are in line with World Health Organisation limits and local authorities be provided with enforcement powers to order the cessation of construction activities in the event such anticipated exposures are breached.

   c) HS2 Ltd be obliged to commit to designing the high speed railway to operate in such manner that the revised noise exposures are not breached.

   d) A binding requirement included in the Bill for noise and vibration monitoring with obligations on HS2 Ltd to introduce additional mitigation measures, including reduction in train speeds, in the event forecast noise levels are exceeded.
e) HS2 Ltd be required to commit to the same threshold for ground borne noise as the Northern Line Extension - meaning groundborne noise levels no greater than 25dB LpAmax for rural areas and 30dB LpAmax for urban areas.

iii. With respect to waste removal

a) Waste removal be transported by rail using a double-deck station at Euston which would incorporate a platform specifically to remove construction spoil by rail, greatly reducing traffic and pollution impacts. There are sidings located at the Adelaide vent shaft, which could be used for access.

b) The entire materials balance and movement from the high speed railway be re-presented in a consistent and more readily accessible form.

c) Clear plans be laid out to show how spoil removal would be achieved by rail, so as not to use Adelaide road, or any other neighbouring roads for transport for waste/spoil removal.

d) The Bill be amended:

e) The Secretary of State and the nominated undertaker be required to comply with the requirements of the Waste Framework Directive and review its decisions on treatment of waste to ensure compliance with the waste hierarchy as detailed in that Directive. Such review should include publishing details of the "integrated design approach" to waste management and subject to consultation to enable effective public participation on this issue.

f) The Secretary of State, the nominated undertaker and the relevant local authority be required to agree arrangements for monitoring and enforcement of mitigation measures designed to safeguard local communities near the construction sites for the high speed railway and associated development from adverse effects created by waste. Such plans to be overseen by an independent body picked by Parliament.

v. With respect to 'Code of Construction Practice'

a) The standards set out in the environmental statement and the Code of Construction Practice is of "reasonableness" and "reasonable endeavours". This should be replaced by a higher standard, i.e. "best practical means" which should be on the face of the Bill.

b) The measures should be agreed with the relevant local authority. Measures should be subject to independent assessment verifiable and challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

vi. All the above concerns and requests be fully and properly addressed

- with all impact assessments and mitigation studies carried out to required standards, if not, then commencement of construction of high speed rail should commence at Old Oak Common, until such time that all conditions of satisfaction for North West London are met.

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

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

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

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

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

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

12. 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.

JANINE SACHS

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF Hero Granger-Taylor  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner is Hero Granger-Taylor  

Introduction  

3. I petitioned the House of Commons against the original Hybrid Bill (number 1800) and against Additional Provision 3. It seems to me that none of my requests have so far been met, either by HS2 or by the House of Commons Select Committee.  

4. I live at 22 Park Village East, NW1 7PZ. Park Village East (PVE) is a quiet residential street which runs along the western side of the cutting carrying the North West Main Line in and out of Euston.  

5. I am 61 years old, am a widow, and have lived at 22 PVE since birth. I currently live here with my 19-year-old son, Roland Abbott. Since 1976 I have been the sole owner of the lease of 22 PVE. The lease is from the Crown Estate and has approximately 27 years left before it expires and reverts to the Crown. Due to the shortness of the remaining lease term, its value in relative terms is diminishing on a yearly basis.  

6. I and my son both have diagnoses of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). The combined effect of our disabilities has greatly restricted my earning capacity. By profession I am an historian of early textiles. I am self-employed, mainly working at home, and have no work pension.  

7. On the death of my husband in 1955 (he and I were estranged), my son inherited, as sole beneficiary of a trust, the lease of a flat, 23 Ainsdale, one of the blocks due to be demolished by HS2 and where my husband had lived since 200. From February 2014 on, the trust (I am one of the trustees) has been trying to sell this flat to HS2/the Department of Transport. This has been an extraordinarily long-winded and frustrating process, which is ongoing as I write.
8. One the eve of my appearance in front of the House of Commons Select Committee (HCSC) on 8th December last year, I received an e-mail message from HS2. This appeared to answer the requests of my second petition in relation to the Ainsdale flat and undertook to buy the flat by 30th January. Despite reassurances from committee member Sir Peter Bottomley that I could trust HS2, this sale has not gone through.

9. Although previously the sale of the flat could be considered to have been held up partly due to disagreement over price (my agents value the flat at £450,000 while HS2 will not offer above £450,000), the letter of 7th December agreed to follow the Blight Notice procedure whereby the purchasers buy the property for 90% of the price offered by them, leaving the actual unblighted value to be established later (up to six years is allowed). Thus for the meantime the trust is not in dispute with HS2 over value and the continued and extremely frustrating delay on their part is without explanation.

10. **My concerns** are particularly in relation to my and my son's home, 22 Park Village East. This is one of the houses making up John Nash's Park Village, a very influential development of picturesque villas of varied style generally considered to be the first garden suburb. My house dates to 1829 and like all the other original houses in Park Village East and West it is listed Grade II*.

11. Park Village East is absolutely on the front line against HS2, with the trains due to thunder by in the Camden Cutting only a few meters from our houses. During the works, the limit of the construction will be less than 10 m away from my house. HS2's plans not only require that a great concrete box or 'birdcage' to take the new high speed trains be constructed in the cutting, our road, which already lost the houses from its east side when the cutting was enlarged in the early 20th century, will have to be cut away by a further third: this is to allow the birdcage to be built under part of what is currently our street. During the estimated six year construction period, the carriageway will terminate in a cliff edge, allowing Park Village East to operate as a work site, with machines lined up along it, undertaking as much construction as possible from it, moved up here from below due to the belated realisation on the part of HS2 that the cutting is too narrow to contain them.

12. After the Camden blocks which will have to be demolished, 22 Park Village East is one of a handful of the homes due to be most directly affected by the HS2 works along the entire line: noise levels are due here to reach 89 decibels, the highest along the whole line; my house is particularly close to the road and the cutting and therefore will be especially vulnerable to the many years of night-time working we are promised; because my house is in the middle of the stretch of the road due to be closed for six years it will become particularly inaccessible. At the hearing of the Park Village East Heritage Group (PVEHG) on 2nd December last year, HS2 undertook to move residents of this central section of PVE out of their houses for up to a year, this being on the basis, we understood but it was never specifically stated, that for this period emergency vehicles would not be able to reach us. My neighbours and I feel that the period we are likely to end up moving out for will be closer to the whole six years.
13. My most pressing concern is the fact that my property is well and truly blighted; professionals consider that the houses in Park Village East have already lost between 25%-30% of their value. There is no possibility of selling 22 PVE in the near future, meanwhile my lease is growing shorter and proportionately losing value.

14. The differential treatment of residents of urban areas as against rural areas by HS2 is truly scandalous and has no basis in fact. It is absurd to say that the residents of Park Village East are used to a level of noise and disturbance which is much greater than in the country. While we just about hear the trains in the cutting at present, they are probably no more disturbing than agricultural machinery; meanwhile the street is quiet and our large gardens on the western side are havens of tranquillity and full of wildlife. (A surprisingly high level of tranquillity in fact characterises almost all the residential areas which for nearly two centuries have surrounded the railway line as leaves Euston.)

15. At the same time we are particularly vulnerable in Park Village East. There is no protection against loud noise should it occur: we cannot fit double glazing and there are great gaps between our houses through which noise can travel. The houses are also delicate structures, with shallow foundations, and prone to movement along the narrow peninsula of clay which remains between the canal bed on the western side and the already-enlarged cutting on the east. My house is currently showing damage and is already the subject of an insurance claim.

16. My main purpose in petitioning is to ask the Select Committee to answer the requests with reference to compensation contained in the petition of our residents group, the Park Village East Heritage Group. Similar and more detailed requests are included in the petition of the umbrella group, the HS2 Euston Action Group.

17. Not only do we need to be covered by the Express Purchase Scheme, we need to have access to a means of selling our properties which actually works in practice. If the absurd delays my son and I have experienced in the selling of Ainsdale to HS2 - in theory a relatively simple transaction - are transferred to the sale of our home, this will be agonising for us, as well as extremely wasteful of our time and energies.

18. My secondary purpose relates to the preservation of the houses in Park Village East. My parents moved here because they were particularly interested in old houses (my father was an architect), and it is heartbreaking to think that they could uselessly damaged to make way for a railway line which has been very poorly conceived and certainly with no regard to the inhabitants or the 'heritage assets' of Camden. Over the years, my mother, my father and I have been very active in efforts to preserve the character and historic buildings of Camden, and HS2's crude proposals really feels like a slap in the face.

19. The petition of the Camden Civic Society goes into some detail about the actual threats HS2 poses to the stability of the Park Village East, as well as the 'harm' to the setting of the listed buildings and the wider Conservation Area this scheme will bring about.

20. So my secondary purpose in petitioning is therefore to ask the Select Committee to answer the requests of the Camden Civic Society, particularly in relation to 'heritage assets'; the houses in Park Village East are probably the most important structures within Camden to need protection against the great powers which the Bill will vest in this heartless 'promoter.'
The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: ........................................... Signature:

[Signature]

[Name]

[Signature]
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF Howard Rose, Nadine Rose and Lydia Rose

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

2. Your petitioners
Your Petitioners are Howard, Nadine Rose and Lydia Rose age 20, all resident at Heathlands, Marriotts Avenue South Heath, HP16 9QL, 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, 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 Petitioners 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 also seriously concerned about the disruptions to our household which will result from the construction of the line and the dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion and access problems and other implications during what will be a long period of construction. Your petitioners need to use the narrow lanes and roads which will cross and be affected by the construction of the proposed line and needs to use the roads for access to Great Missenden and Wendover, in particular, for shopping, recreation, medical services and rail, as well as to gain access to the A413 for London and all other areas. 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 bore 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 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 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.

g. 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.

h. 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.

i. 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.

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

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 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.

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 Petitioners request that the Code should specify, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the best available standards and techniques and to the highest standard of construction and operation of the railway and its associated developments and, in particular, that the Code or requirements in the Bill be so amended to enforce the following measures:

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

Howard Rose 18 April 2016
Nadine Rose 18 April 2016
Lydia Rose 18 April 2016 – Agent Howard Rose
To the House of Lords Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Jeremy and Marji Aspinall

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are Jeremy and Marji Aspinall, residents and owners of 27, Wells House Road, that will be directly affected by the HS2 Old Oak Common interchange construction and operation, and the works described in the HS2 Environmental Statement. Their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill and the Additional Provisions.

We purchased No 27, Wells House Road in November, 2013 and took up residence at the property, along with our then seven-year-old daughter Zara, in April 2014. We moved from a two-bedroomed flat on Holland Road so we could enjoy the space a house and a small garden would offer us. We also expected it would provide some peace, quiet and respite from a busy, noisy thoroughfare like Holland Road, while not being far from our place of work and our daughter’s school. The fact our new home was in a cul de sac and near to a green space like Wormwood Scrubs also attracted us to the property.

In addition, Wells House Road has exceptional views across London to the London Eye and the Shard.

We were aware that HS2 had been mooted as a possible development but had no idea of the scale of disruption that would occur and over what period of time. The CPO of our back garden was also not revealed during the search that was carried out before the purchase of the property. It should be noted that your Petitioners believe that the negative impact of HS2 on communities along the length of the line, the economy, the environment and broader rail improvements far outweigh any tangible benefits. Indeed, as specified in the Environmental Statement, there will be significant job losses in the ‘deprived’ Old Oak Common Park Royal area while demolitions and construction are underway, causing many businesses to close.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Summary of required action via House of Lords Hearing

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Jeremy and Marji Aspinall, residents of 27, Wells House Road, London, NW10 6ED

Date: 15th April, 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Quattro (UK) Limited

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed acquisition of its interests in land pursuant to the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill's (hereinafter referred to as "the Bill") Clause 4 (Power to acquire land compulsorily) and Schedule 5 (Area: London Borough of Ealing; Number of land shown on deposited plans: plots 226 and 228).

Your petitioner

2. The petitioners are QUATTRO (UK) LIMITED (hereinafter referred to as "Your Petitioners").

3. Your Petitioners are the lessees of land known as the Boarshead Warehouse (the former John Lewis carpet depot) on Regency Street off Victoria Street Park Royal, NW10. Your Petitioners are also licensees of the Websters Recycling Yard on Regency Street off Victoria Road, Park Royal, NW10. The Bill seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition of part of your Petitioners' interests at these properties.

4. 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.

5. Your Petitioners petitioned in the House of Commons, and received from the Promoter a Second House Undertaking dated 3 February 2016.

Boarshead Warehouse

6. The Bill seeks to authorise the compulsory acquisition of the Boarshead Warehouse and the private road known as Regency Street off Victoria Road.

7. The warehouse is used by your Petitioners partly as a vehicle servicing depot and partly as general storage. The land is proposed to be acquired for the purposes of a construction compound during construction and otherwise as
8. It is not clear to your Petitioners from the published information whether the proposed compulsory acquisition of the Boarshead Warehouse will be permanent or temporary and therefore future planning for your Petitioners' business is severely restricted.

9. Your Petitioners have not been adequately informed by the promoters of the Bill of the clear purposes for the land and how long it is intended to be used for.

10. Discussions with the promoters of the Bill have not shed any light on this.

11. Your Petitioners seek a written undertaking from the promoters of the Bill that:

a. land at the Boarshead Warehouse and Regency Street will be acquired only temporarily during the construction of the railway works;

b. alternative similar facilities to those at the Boarshead Warehouse will be provided for your Petitioners for the duration of the temporary acquisition of the land to allow them to continue their operations; and

c. on completion of the railway works the land at the Boarshead Warehouse and Regency Street will be returned in its former condition, complete with any structures previously located thereon.

12. Discussions are ongoing between Your Petitioners and the Promoter.

*Acquisition of land at Websters Recycling Yard*

13. The Bill seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition of a 2 acre recycling yard and concrete batching plant, together with the acquisition of the private access road known as Regency Street. The land is proposed to be acquired for the purposes of a construction compound.

14. The yard is leased to your Petitioners and is in use 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It is used to recycle an average of 450,000 tonnes of material per year. This recycling yard is the only facility provided in a 3 miles radius and is clearly a well-used function. Your Petitioners employ 125 full time drivers and maintenance staff at the yard and 15 full time office staff to support the yard. Your Petitioners are not aware of any proposals to re-provide this important community function.

15. Again, it is not clear to your Petitioners from the published information whether the proposed compulsorily acquisition of the Recycling Yard will be
permanent or temporary and therefore future planning for the property is severely restricted.

16. Discussions with the promoters of the Bill have not shed any light on this.

17. Your petitioners seek a written undertaking from the promoters of the Bill that prior to the compulsory acquisition of any interests at this location, an alternative suitable site to which the operations of the existing Recycling Yard could be transferred will be acquired within the Borough of Ealing together with the necessary infrastructure installed. This is vital to allow continuation of the operations of the Recycling Yard and to avoid the closure of this valued business and significant redundancies as a result.

Length of compulsory purchase powers

18. The Bill seeks authorisation for the grant of compulsory purchase powers for a period of 5 years from the date when the Bill received Royal Assent. The Bill further allows for this period to be extended for a further 5 years by the Secretary of State.

19. Your Petitioners consider that 10 years is too long a period of time for landowners to be subject to the threat of compulsory acquisition. Such threat will stall any development plans and could lead to vacant properties. It is submitted that compulsory acquisition powers should be restricted to a period of 5 years only, with no potential for the period to be extended.

20. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clauses 4 to 10, 15 and those seeking to authorise the compulsory acquisition together with the deposited plans so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

21. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
The 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 Richard Guyatt of Bond Dickinson LLP as Agent for your 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 Thomas James and Colin Marron

 Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed acquisition of its interests in land pursuant to the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill’s (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) Clause 4 (Power to acquire land compulsorily) and Schedule 5 (Area: London Borough of Ealing; Number of land shown on deposited plans: 153, 154, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161 and 172).

Your petitioner

2. The petitioners are Thomas James and Colin Marron (hereinafter referred to as “Your Petitioners”).

3. Your Petitioners are the freehold owners of land comprising title number NGL259903 known as Units 3 and 4, Atlas House, Atlas Road, NW10 6DN. The Bill seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition of part of your Petitioners’ interests at this property.

4. 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.

5. Your Petitioners petitioned in the House of Commons, and received from the Promoter a Second House Undertaking dated 3 February 2016.

6. The Bill seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition of the warehouse and premises at Units 3 and 4 of Atlas House.

7. The land is proposed to be acquired for use during construction as a satellite construction compound and for the provision of a conveyor across Victoria Road up to the Willesden Euroterminal.

8. Your Petitioners seek a written undertaking from the promoters of the Bill that:
   a. land at Units 3&4 of Atlas House will be leased to the promoters of the Bill on commercial terms for the duration of the construction of the railway
works rather than through the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers;

b. on completion of the railway works the land at Units 3&4 of Atlas House will be returned to your Petitioners in its former condition, complete with any structures previously located thereon.

9. In the alternative, your Petitioners seek a written undertaking from the promoters of the Bill that on completion of the works, your Petitioners will be granted a right of pre-emption over the acquisition of the land at a price to be agreed with your Petitioners prior to the exercise of the compulsory purchase powers.

10. Your Petitioners have offered to lease their land on reasonable terms to the Promoter for the duration of the HS2 works, but no agreement is in place. Such agreement would save public money while protecting Your Petitioners’ interests in the long term.

Length of compulsory purchase powers

11. The Bill seeks authorisation for the grant of compulsory purchase powers for a period of 5 years from the date when the Bill receives Royal Assent. The Bill further allows for this period to be extended for a further 5 years by the Secretary of State.

12. Your Petitioners consider that 10 years is too long a period of time for landowners to be subject to the threat of compulsory acquisition. Such threat will stall any development plans and could lead to vacant properties. It is submitted that the compulsory acquisition powers should be restricted to a period of 5 years only, with no potential for the period to be extended.

13. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clauses 4 to 10, 15 and those seeking to authorise the compulsory acquisition together with the deposited plans so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

14. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
The 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 Richard Guyatt of Bond Dickinson LLP as Agent for your Petitioner

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF the Crackley Residents' Association and Ashley Ball.

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners

The petitioners are a residents' association for the Crackley area of Kenilworth that consist of approximately 130 member households within Crackley. The association has been established for over 27 years and has fought throughout its existence to protect and maintain the Crackley area and its picturesque countryside, woods, nature reserves and footpaths. Your Petitioners members vary from young family households to retired individuals.

Additionally, your petitioner is the joint freehold owner of the residential property at 2 Crackley Crescent, Kenilworth, Warwickshire, CV8 2FF. Your petitioner resides at this property with his Wife and two children (aged 8 & 5). Your petitioner re-located to this area in 2008 in order to raise his family in the safe and pleasant surroundings that it currently provides. The semi-rural location benefits from surroundings of green belt land, woods, cycle paths and walkways and is served by a high number or reputable schools and colleges. Your petitioner's property is located in the Crackley area of Kenilworth very close to the Crackley Gap. The Crackley Gap is an area of Green Belt land that is facing destruction by the Bill. Your petitioner's property will not be demolished as a result of the Bill but it is located within approximately 350 metres of the centre of the line and even closer to the proposed construction zone. Your petitioners' property is also on a residential road which will be used by construction traffic during the construction of the scheme.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

As your petitioners are predominately a collective group, understandably, their individual properties are spread out across the Crackley area. All households are affected by the Bill but, as one would expect, in different ways. Regardless, all members of the association share several concerns about the Bill.

Your Petitioners feel that the current Property Compensation proposals are inadequate and unfair but fundamentally do not address the reality of the current problems that the Bill has created.

Current proposals require home owners to accept a financial loss of up to 15% of the value of their home if they are able to sell their home on the open market. It is fundamentally wrong that any individual or household should potentially face any level of
financial loss due to this State sponsored proposal.
In the more likely event of not being able to sell your home, the current proposal does not provide any level of exit strategy for those wishing to move house. Residents are therefore trapped in their homes, potentially forever. The 'Need to Sell' scheme requires a 'compelling reason' to sell. Your petitioners feel that this is totally unfair as anywhere else in the country (away from HS2) households are able to choose to move house if they wish to, a totally normal expectation and progression in life.
Your petitioners also have concerns for the potential creation of resentment and disharmony amongst communities created by the distance from the line criteria of the Homeowner Payment Scheme. Additionally, your petitioners feel that the level of financial compensation on offer in no way reflects the loss in value that their homes are facing. Similarly the distance from the line criteria of the Voluntary Purchase Scheme renders this scheme irrelevant in our community.

Your Petitioners are thus petitioning for changes to the property compensation scheme to ensure that those affected have the ability to move on with their lives, as they would living away from HS2, and do not have to incur any level of financial loss. These changes include; the removal of having to demonstrate a 'compelling reason' to move in the Need to Sell scheme with this scheme being changed to 'Wish to sell'. The criteria of having to accept a financial loss of up to 15% should ideally be reduced to 0% or, at the very least, 5% to more realistically mimic normal market conditions. Households facing financial loss due to the Bill should be compensated in full for this loss and the distance from the line criteria should be re-assessed, and at the very least vastly increased, in rural areas but a more sensible approach would be to assess the affected areas on a more localised basis.

Your petitioners are deeply concerned about the area of land known as the Crackley Gap. The Crackley Gap is an area of Green Belt land that is facing destruction by the Bill. The Crackley Gap has always served as a natural divide between the City of Coventry and the Town of Kenilworth. It also represents a refuge for all forms of wildlife. The Crackley Gap also serves as a natural flood plain accommodating vast amounts of rainfall from both Coventry and Kenilworth which is channelled in to the Canley Brook. This area poses a unique combination of engineering problems and constraints with the crossing of the existing railway, Coventry Road (A429) and Canley Brook floodplain. Earthworks on a massive scale are currently being proposed in order to divert the Canley Brook. Your Petitioners have engaged with the Promoters of the Bill during the preceding six years in an attempt to mitigate the effects of the construction and operation of the railway but many major concerns remain. Your Petitioners are not convinced that the Promoters have carried out sufficiently detailed studies on this aspect and ask your honourable House to require the Promoters to carry out a detailed assessment and ensure that the Nominated Undertaker implements any mitigation measures required as a result.

Your Petitioners are also deeply concerned about the roads which will be used by construction traffic during the construction of the scheme specifically Coventry Road, Dalehouse Lane, Stoneleigh Road and the A46 (a six lane A road that connects directly to the M40). Your Petitioners are also deeply concerned about the creation of dust, poor air quality, noise and 24 hour working. This will inevitably lead to a huge amount of disruption, a complete change in day-to-day living and to potential health risks especially to many of your Petitioners' members and their families.
Your Petitioners suggest further consideration of a deep bored tunnel under the Crackley Gap as previously suggested to the promoter in 2012. Not only would a deep bored tunnel avoid the destruction of the environment in the area but it would also avoid the engineering constraints in the area including flood risk. It should also be noted and considered that an extended tunnel either side of the Crackley Gap to include Burton Green and Stoneleigh would also alleviate the destruction of these surrounding communities.

Additionally, your Petitioners suggest that proper consideration is given to a review of the requirements of the Bill for the speed of the trains to reach 250mph. Your promoters have frequently insisted that the need for HS2 is capacity – not speed, so surely a compromise could be reached to mitigate the damage and destruction to the environment by lowering the speed. A reduction in the targeted speed of the trains would allow further flexibility in the design of the route thus allowing problem areas to be circumnavigated. It would still allow for a high speed service to be built between the identified locations.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remains, etc.

Ashley Ball
18th 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 Fosberry

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is a house owner who jointly with his wife Susan Lavinia Fosberry owns a private property Cedar Grange, Tilehouse Lane, Denham, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB9 5DG which the Bill may "specially and directly affect".

3. Your petitioner's concerns

(a) Diversion of the River Colne - impact upon ecology

Your Petitioner is concerned about the potential negative impacts diverting the River Colne will have on ecology in the area. Your Petitioner's property lies close to the River Colne and your Petitioner and his family walk every day with their dogs to enjoy the extensive wildlife and ecology in this wonderful area.

Your Petitioner requests that the diversion of the River Colne is carried out some years prior to construction works commencing to give the local wildlife and habitat the time and opportunity to re-establish itself ecologically before any construction works commence and this must then be subject to regular monitoring thereafter.

(b) Public Rights of Way (PRoW)

Your petitioner is a regular users of PRoW around the Colne Valley and is concerned
about the impact of works authorised by the Bill on PRoW in this area. The PRoW running alongside our property is known as Shire Lane and is the ancient boundary between Mercia and Wessex. It will be impassable during and post the construction process. This has a major impact upon connectivity of PRoW in the area and the current proposals will result in a 2km detour to this route which would directly impact upon the Petitioners and effectively prevent the use of the PRoW.

Your Petitioner requests that the only way of preventing the significant local impact on PRoW arising from the construction of the high speed railway would be to build a tunnel under the Colne Valley connecting underground with the proposed high speed railway tunnel under the Chalfonts.

(c) Noise from HS2

Your Petitioner is also concerned about the level of noise from the high speed railway as the line will run in very close proximity to their property which is identified on the HS2 Ltd map as one that will be impacted by increased noise. This concern is exacerbated by the fact that the noise thresholds chosen by HS2 Ltd do not reflect current World Health Organisation standards or the latest research which confirms adverse health impacts from prolonged exposure to noise above the World Health Organisation limits.

Your petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd be required to ensure that the noise levels of HS2 once in operation should not exceed the World Health Organisation’s stated threshold of 40dB which is considered appropriate for ensuring no long term health issues for persons living nearby. The noise thresholds currently chosen by HS2 Ltd exceed these limits. Allied to this the nominated undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that no noise can be felt in the Petitioner’s property and that there are no other adverse effects. In this regard there should be no element of cutting corners to stay within Budgets as this has a direct health impact upon the Petitioners. Noise levels will therefore need to be monitored so there should be binding mitigation measures in place including an effective noise mitigation and monitoring system which should be in place prior to commencement and during the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated developments. Responsibility for and agreement of the appropriate measures and ongoing assessment should be the responsibility of a truly independent panel of experts in this area. Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (noise control) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State for arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory notice for the nominated undertaker of the works. This could result in works being permitted even though they may impact upon the health of the Petitioner and his family. This is unfair and unjust given that this may result in noise levels exceeding those prescribed by the World Health Organisation. Your Petitioner requests therefore that Clause 35 and schedule 25 are deleted from the Bill to ensure that noise levels do not exceed 40dB as specified.

(d) Vibration
Your Petitioner is concerned about the effects of vibration arising from the construction of the high speed railway and associated development including vibration caused by heavy construction traffic. In addition your Petitioner is also concerned that the operation of the high speed railway will result in significant vibration impacting on their property. Vibration will have a major impact upon the Petitioner's use and enjoyment of their property as well as creating another potential health hazard.

Your Petitioner requests that there must be binding mitigation measures in place to include vibration and resultant damage mitigation and monitoring and that this is in place prior to commencement and during construction and operation. These should include but not be limited to an express obligation to undertake specific measures to limit structural and other damage to the Petitioner's property, installation of noise barriers which ensure compliance with WHO acceptable peak sound levels and the integration of full barriers into the structural design of the Colne Valley viaduct with shallower support structures beneath track level.

(c) Dust

Your Petitioner is concerned about dust and dirt which will be generated during construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development and the impact this will have on their property and environmental quality of the neighbourhood. Your Petitioner is concerned that there are no binding mitigation measures in relation to emissions, especially in the light of the sustainable placement areas for spoil, many in close proximity to the Petitioner’s property, prevailing wind direction and the sheer amount of earth to be moved.

Your Petitioner submits that there should be a precise, comprehensive and binding management plan in relation to dust levels, with a clearly defined authority for the monitoring of its implementation. The nominated undertaker should provide forecasts confirming the quantity and types of emissions that the construction will create based on the Guidance on the planning for mineral extraction in plan making and the application process issued on 6th March 2014. Your Petitioner also requests that there should be provisions made to ensure that the nominated undertaker takes responsibility for reimbursing the Petitioners for any additional expenses caused by dust and dirt.

(f) 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, particularly as their son Jack is an asthma sufferer.

Your Petitioner requests that prior to construction commencing there should be an air quality baseline monitoring study benchmarked against the Air Quality Standard Regulations 2010 and a copy of this report should be provided to the relevant local authorities. The local authorities (3 Rivers District Council and South Bucks District Council) should be provided with funding to undertake responsibility, compliance and enforcement for the monitoring of air quality in accordance with binding mitigation plans and the results of such monitoring should be made publically
available.

(g) Disruption to services

Your Petitioner is concerned that there is the potential for disruption to utilities and other services provided to the Property. Any such disruption is unacceptable to the Petitioner as it will impact upon the quality of our lives and may result in our Property being untenable.

Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to binding measures in relation to any disruption to services and contingency measures in the event of disruption to services. These measures should include implementing alternative proposals prior to any relocation of utilities and indemnifying the Petitioner for any loss or damage arising from such works.

(h) Hydrology

Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact upon the aquifer in the area and the danger of water pollution. In the field next to the Petitioner's residence which is on the route of the high speed railway there has been a recent planning application for gravel extraction. This has been turned down by the Environment Agency due to concerns about the impact of possible contamination on the aquifer which is part of the Thames River Basin management plan and which is currently rated poor but has to achieve a good rating by the mid 2020's. The applicant has made yet another application which is due to be considered by Hertfordshire County Council later this year. Simply put the quality of our water resources are under threat if not from gravel extraction from the construction of HS2. Clearly this a major issue for all local residents given the health implications both for us and for our children, a good rating by the mid 2020's. The land also contains asbestos which was buried there many years ago.

Your Petitioner requests that before construction begins the Environment Agency should produce a report confirming that the construction of the high speed railway and associated development across the land known as Pynesfield carries with it no risk of contamination of the aquifer. At the same time the Environment Agency should be required to investigate the levels of asbestos buried in Pynesfield to ensure that the construction and associated disturbance of the asbestos will not impact upon the health of all local residents in the Colne Valley. This report should be made publically available to allay local concerns.

(i) Impact on the ecology of the Colne Valley

The Colne Valley is often referred to as the lungs of West London. The construction of the high speed railway line and associated development carries with it the threat of scarring this beautiful area forever. The amenity use for the Petitioners and many of those who live in West London will be significantly reduced and impaired. Once construction starts there is no turning back.

Your Petitioner suggests that there is a solution given the potential destruction of the local environment in what is an area of Special Scientific Interest. That is to build a
tunnel under the Colne Valley for the high speed railway and link this underground to the high speed railway Chalfont tunnel as this will ensure the survival of the ecology of the Colne Valley.

(j) Tilehouse Lane

Your Petitioner and his family are regular users of Tilehouse Lane which is within the limit of land to be acquired and used under the Bill. The road will be closed during the construction of the high speed railway line causing significant traffic problems in this area of Denham and beyond particularly if there are problems on the M25 as the Lane is used as a relief road in such circumstances. There is a danger therefore that the whole area could come to a halt if the M25 is closed for any reason. For the Petitioner closure of one end of the Lane means a diversion of almost 4 miles to take their son to school in the morning.

Your Petitioner requests that a detailed traffic survey is conducted prior to the commencement of the construction work for the high speed railway and associated development to map out various scenarios during the period of construction and test how easily these could be coped with. Dependent upon the outcome consideration would need to be given to what other mitigation measures might be put in place in these circumstances. Any analysis of the current traffic issues on the A412 would suggest that the road is already subject to unbelievable strain. There is a danger that the whole of the area will just come to a grinding halt during the rush hour periods for the duration of the construction of HS2 - almost 10 years.

(k) Compensation

Your Petitioner does not believe that the current compensation proposals are fit for purpose as they do not adequately compensate all those affected by the significant property blight which has impacted upon property values all the way along the length of the proposed high speed railway and associated development. The simple fact is that we should all have a right to sell our property at a time of our choosing, not be told by the Government that we can only sell it in the event of specific circumstances such as divorce or death. Your Petitioners should also have the right to sell it at its full market value without the impact of HS2 blight as this was the direct result of a Government decision in which we played no part. Against this background your Petitioner submits that the compensation provisions in relation to property that is not compulsorily acquired and other matters are not sufficient to compensate your Petitioner adequately for the loss and damage they may incur as a result of construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development.

Your Petitioner requests that the Bill should be amended to ensure that your Petitioner and other persons outside the safeguarded area who are injuriously and adversely affected by loss of value should be entitled to claim compensation. Your Petitioners request that the voluntary purchase announced on 9th April 2014 should be extended to all properties outside the safeguarded area and should not be limited to rural areas. All compensation payments should be calculated so that all diminution in value is compensated. Your Petitioner submits that the Bill should also be amended to ensure that your Petitioners are entitled to claim compensation where their property is not compulsorily acquired for, among other matters, structural
damage to the property, 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. Your Petitioner requests a provision to enable such claim to be made separately from any claim for compensation in respect of the acquisition of land or interests under the powers of compulsory acquisition in the Bill. Your Petitioner also requires an indemnity from the nominated undertaker that the proposed works will not be of long term or irreversible detriment to the land and interests of your Petitioner. Such indemnity would also 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.

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

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Michael Patrick Fosberry

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

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

The Petition of The Trustees and Beneficiaries of the Jestico Whiles Retirement Benefit Scheme

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clause no’s 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and Schedule 1(1) work no. 1/1 and 1/2 of Bill 2.

2. Your petitioner.
   The Petitioner is the owner of 1-3 Cobourg Street London NW1 2HP, which lies within the area scheduled for compulsory purchase by HS2 in order to extend Euston station to the west.
   The property is the only remaining building of the original 19th century Euston station development, being the former stable block to the station’s freight yard. It housed generators to provide the first electrical lighting installation on any station in the UK.
   The building is locally listed and comprises 4 floors of 5000sq ft of offices with 7 residential apartments over. An open yard provides additional working space. The bicycle storage area to the west of the building is the subject of an adverse possession claim.
   The building was acquired in 1994 and the offices have been continuously let since then to the architectural practice Jestico + Whiles and Associates Ltd. It currently has a 10 year lease from 29 March 2014.
   This petition concerns the freehold interest in the building. The property was acquired for the purpose of providing pensions for the trustees/beneficiaries of the Jestico Whiles Retirement Benefit Scheme, who are or have been directors of the aforementioned architectural practice, Jestico + Whiles and Associates Ltd., The practice has occupied buildings in the Drummond street area for over 30 years and is a significant employer of, and contributor to, local businesses in the immediate neighbourhood.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns.
   1. Despite attending several public consultation meetings with HS2 representatives with the sole purpose of opening constructive and meaningful discussions regarding the compulsory purchase of the building, we have received no responses to our direct questions or any replies to subsequent emails and telephone calls. Our initial cooperative intentions have not been met by any constructive response from HS2. This has resulted in significant consequences for the building owners and their tenants.
   2. As a consequence, the building is blighted by the HS2 scheme and its future is uncertain. The petitioner requires HS2 to immediately open negotiations in order to agree terms for the compulsory purchase of the property.
   3. The petitioner needs to plan for the future of the retirement benefit scheme and, upon the receipt of CPO funds, to invest in another property. The complete absence of any Agreement with HS2 is injurious to the scheme’s beneficiaries.
   4. Under the first published programme for HS2 a constructive dialogue would have been concluded by now, resulting in some surety and the reasonable cooperation of both the freeholder and the tenant. The absence of any attention by HS2 is damaging to the freeholder and the business activities of its tenant.
5. The petitioner, as freeholder, has a close relationship with the offices tenant and seeks to act in the best interests of both parties, whose interests may be mutually similar. It is possible that this relationship would be in the best interests of HS2, if only it would act immediately.

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 the Bill.

And the petitioner remains

Tom Jestico
18 April 2016
Your petitioner is a trustee and beneficiary of the Jestico Whiles Retirement Benefit scheme. Appointed as Agent for the aforesaid scheme by the other trustees/beneficiaries.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015 – 16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London To West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION of ZURICH ASSURANCE LTD  

Declares that:  

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

2. 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”. 

3. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLoughlin, supported by the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mrs Secretary May, Mr Secretary Vince Cable, Mr Secretary Duncan Smith, Mr Secretary Pickles, Mr Secretary Paterson, Mr Secretary Davey and Mr Robert Goodwill. 

4. The Bill is promoted by the Secretary of State for Transport (hereinafter called “the Promoter”)  

Your Petitioner  

5. Your Petitioner is Zurich Assurance Limited (company registration number 02456671) 

6. Your Petitioner has an interest in the following Properties affected by the scheduled works or in the vicinity of the proposed railway: 

6.1 Chandos Park Estate, Chandos Road, London NW10 6NF (‘Chandos Park’). Your Petitioner has a freehold interest in Chandos Park which is registered under Title Number AGL38207. 

6.2 The Pentagon, 7-9 Orton Way, Castle Bromwich Business Park, Birmingham B35 7AG (‘Pentagon’) Your Petitioner has a long leasehold interest in the Property which is registered under Title Number WM757161. The freehold interest is registered under Title Number WM441565 (the ‘Properties’) 

7. Your Petitioner has received the following notices for the Properties: 

7.1 For Chandos Park notice (ref. C271/004168) which states that plots 173-175 shown on plan numbered 1-48 are to be compulsorily acquired outright (the ‘Chandos Park Notice’). Acquisition will not be limited to any category of compulsory acquisition.
land proposed to be compulsorily acquired forms part of the Property and forms the communal rear service yard at the Property.

7.2 For the Pentagon notice (ref C274/001275) which states that plots 63 and 63b shown on plan numbered 3-103 are to be compulsorily acquired outright (the 'Pentagon Notice'). Acquisition will not be limited to any category of compulsory acquisition. The land proposed to be compulsorily acquired forms the entirety of the Property. Any compulsory acquisition would therefore destroy a viable business interest and cause a considerable loss in potential future rental income for your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner's concerns

8. Your Petitioner supports the principle of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and associated development between London and the West Midlands. Your Petitioner seeks to work together with the Promoter, the Government, HS2 Ltd and the relevant local authorities to facilitate the provision of Phase 1 of HS2. Your Petitioner also seeks to enter into an agreement with the Promoter to address its concerns.

9. Your Petitioner is, however, apprehensive about the provisions of the Bill as they may affect Chandos Park and the Pentagon. For this reason and having regard to the more detailed particulars referred to below, Your Petitioner petitioned against the Bill on 15 May 2014 in the House of Commons with petition reference number 312 (the "Original Petition") together with Threadneedle Asset Management Limited and Threadneedle Property Investments Limited. Your Petitioner objects to the Bill and its provisions as set out in this Petition and it alleges and is prepared to prove that it and its property, rights and interests are injuriously and prejudicially affected by the Bill for the reasons (amongst others) set out below.

10. Your Petitioner has liaised with representatives of HS2 Ltd in an effort to reach agreement on the proposed acquisitions affecting the Property, and the provision of assurances to control and limit the effects of the construction and operation of HS2 on the Property. Despite significant progress, no conclusion on these issues has been reached with HS2 Ltd to date in the form of completed agreements. Without completed agreements, Your Petitioner has no certainty over what is proposed by the Promoter and how the Properties are affected. Therefore, Your Petitioner is also now submitting this Petition in the House of Lords.

11 Under the Bill, part of Chandos Park forming the communal rear service yard is to be compulsorily acquired. Your Petitioner has been in correspondence with the Promoter to try and obtain clarification as to the purpose of the compulsory acquisition of the land. The response received is that access to the land is required to "safely install, maintain and remove the conveyor" during construction. Under current proposals, the centre line of the conveyor is located on land owned by Network Rail. Therefore, your Petitioner believes that it is not necessary to compulsorily purchase the land at all as only intermittent access is required. Map CT-05-09a accompanying Community Forum Area Report Volume 4 – CFA4 Kilburn (Brent) to Old Oak Common (the 'Chandos Park Plan') also shows that Chandos Park is in close proximity to:

11.1 Atlas Road Satellite Compound,
11.2 Construction conveyor route between Victoria Road and the Atlas Road Satellite Compound;

11.3 Victoria Road Bridge;

11.4 Victoria Road Tunnel Drive Compound, and

11.5 Old Oak Common Station Main Compound (amongst others).

12. Under the Bill, the Pentagon will be compulsorily acquired. The purpose of this compulsory acquisition of the entirety of the Pentagon is unknown. The environmental statement accompanying the Bill does not adequately identify the purpose for which the land is to be acquired and indicates only that the Property falls within a large area of land designated as land potentially required during construction.

13. The Bill reveals that the purpose for which plot number 63b may be acquired or used is for the reinstatement of businesses and facilities. The Bill gives no further information and this description lacks clarity. Reference to plot 63 is not included in the Bill although limited discussions with the Promoter have indicated that the compulsory acquisition relates to the need for access to an electricity pylon.

14. Your Petitioner has been in correspondence with HS2 Limited to try and obtain clarification as to the purpose of the compulsory acquisition of plot 63 but to date, no substantive response other than the indication noted above has been received.

15. Your Petitioner is apprehensive about the provisions of the Bill as they may affect the Properties. For this reason, Your Petitioner submitted the Original Petition.

16. Notwithstanding various proposed changes to the Bill through Additional Provisions, Your Petitioner is still uncertain as to how the Properties will be affected by the Bill.

17. Your Petitioner objects to the Bill and its provisions as set out in this Petition and it alleges and is prepared to prove that it and its property, rights and interests are injuriously and prejudicially affected by the Bill for the reasons (amongst others) set out below.

Compulsory purchase and acquisition of airspace, subsoil, rights and related matters

18. Your Petitioner objects to the provisions of Clauses 4 to 18 and 47 of the Bill which adversely affect and interfere with the Properties. Under these provisions and in particular those in Clauses 4 to 9 of the Bill, the Promoter would be able to acquire compulsorily any one or all of those of your Petitioner's Properties within the limits of deviation, or at least so much of the airspace, subsoil and undersurface, or such new rights, under or over the Properties, as the Promoter may require for the purposes of the construction and use of the scheduled works. In respect of these Properties, your Petitioner questions the need for such extensive powers, fearing that their exercise could lead to damage to these Properties and to a serious detract from your Petitioner's and their tenants' quiet enjoyment of them, with the result that significant loss and damage could be suffered by your Petitioner.

19. Your Petitioner humbly submits that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless and except to
the extent (if any) that this can be demonstrated both to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest.

20. Your Petitioner has not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting their Properties and it is not satisfied that it is necessary or appropriate for the limits of deviation to be drawn so widely or that it is necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

21. Your Petitioner also humbly submits that clause 47 of the Bill is unjustified and without precedent as the power to acquire land is not limited spatially or by time and should therefore be removed from the Bill as it may be used against other properties owned by your Petitioner at any time.

22. Accordingly, your Petitioner humbly submits that the Promoter should demonstrate and be put to strict proof of the need for and desirability of the proposals in the Bill, as affecting your Petitioner’s Properties and that the limits of deviation, the resulting powers for the compulsory acquisition of land or of interests in land, the powers to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the limits of deviation should be restricted in relation to your Petitioner’s Properties to the extent (if any) to which they can be strictly justified so as to minimise or prevent interference with those Properties. In particular, your Petitioner contends that any interest in its Properties acquired by the Promoter (in terms of the area over which it is to subsist, the form in which it is to take at law and any express or implied constraints which may be imposed upon the remainder of your Petitioner’s Properties) should be strictly limited only to that which is absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the proposed works.

23. Your Petitioner further humbly submits that such provisions with regard to compensation in respect of compulsory acquisition and other matters as are proposed in the Bill are inadequate to compensate your Petitioner for the loss, damage and inconvenience which it might suffer as a result of the construction and subsequent use of the proposed works. Further provisions should, your Petitioner submits, be included in the Bill, including provisions respecting the making and assessment of claims for compensation and amendments to the Compensation Code, as well as provisions indemnifying your Petitioner for any loss they might suffer as the result of losses incurred in the shadow of the HS2 proposals, unfavourable rent reviews or lease negotiations respecting the leases currently affecting some of their Properties insofar as the reduced rent payable (as it may differ from open market rent) is attributable to the scheduled works and their effect on your Petitioner’s Properties or for any loss (so attributable) which your Petitioner might suffer in the event of them not being able to re-let their Properties (in whole or in part) to existing or new tenants or in the event of them only being able to do so at a reduced premium or rent.

24. Your Petitioner also objects to the compensation provisions of the Bill in that those provisions are totally inadequate to compensate your Petitioner in circumstances where no land (or interests in land) is acquired by the Promoter under the Bill, but where the value of such land and the Properties erected thereon is reduced or where such land and the Properties erected thereon is otherwise adversely or injuriously affected by the construction or use of the proposed works. Your Petitioner therefore
submits that the Bill should be amended to provide adequate compensation in this regard.

Your Petitioner’s concerns in relation to Chandos Park

25. Purpose of Compulsory Acquisition

25.1 The Chandos Park Notice states that plots 173-175 shown on plan numbered 1-45 are to be compulsorily acquired outright. Acquisition is not limited to any category of compulsory acquisition. Reference to plots 173-175 shown on plan numbered 1-45 is not included in the Bill and the accompanying documents do not adequately identify the purpose for which plots 173-175 are to be acquired.

25.2 The Chandos Park Plan states that plots 173-175 are potentially required during construction and appears to show that an aerial conveyer route (approximately 3.3m above ground level at the highest point) runs along the title boundary of Chandos Park.

25.3 Your Petitioner has been in correspondence with the Promoter to try and obtain clarification as to the purpose of the compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175. The response received is that access to plots 173-175 is required to “safely install, maintain and remove the conveyor” during construction. Under current proposals, the centre line of the conveyer is located on land owned by National Rail. Therefore, your Petitioner believes that it is not necessary to compulsory purchase plots 173-175 at all as only intermittent access (at most) is required.

25.4 Lack of clarity as to the purpose of the compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175 impedes your Petitioner’s ability to assess the impact of the HS2 project on Chandos Park and so your Petitioner reserves the right to reconsider and/or further elaborate or revise any of the impacts noted. Further, your Petitioner contends that the impacts of the HS2 project on the Chandos Park cannot have been adequately assessed if the purpose of the compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175 is unclear.

25.5 Finally, it appears that plots 202-204 shown on plans 1-45 and 1-16 may fall within Chandos Park. However, this land is not identified as falling within Chandos Park but as being owned by Quattro Holdings Limited. We draw this issue to your attention as it needs to be clarified.

25.6 Your Petitioner does not consider that part of Chandos Park is required for the purposes of the Bill. Alternative sites exist and can be used by the nominated undertaker thus avoiding your Petitioner’s property.

25.7 The Additional Provisions of the Bill propose to alter how Chandos Park is affected by the Bill. Your Petitioner is still uncertain about how Chandos Park will be affected by these Additional Provisions and what is proposed by them.

26 Business

26.1 Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development will seriously inhibit your Petitioner’s ability to carry out their business at Chandos Park as the land proposed to be compulsorily acquired forms a large part of the communal rear service yard at the Property.
26.2 The proposed compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175 severely impacts on Chandos Park as it severely limits the potential of the units for beneficial use, thereby affecting your Petitioner's ability to retain tenants and impacting on the economic viability of Chandos Park as a whole.

26.3 The Promoter has not considered the impact of the compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175 on the employment of people at Chandos Park. Your Petitioner and its tenants have businesses employing many people which would be significantly detrimentally affected by the compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175. This will inevitably lead to vacancies at Chandos Park and a reduction of jobs in the area.

26.4 Currently, Chandos Park is carefully managed to provide an excellent environment in which businesses can thrive and work together. The potential relocation of the tenants due to the compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175 would severely impact on the local business community and would irreparably damage Chandos Park in all likelihood leading to a thriving business community being decimated.

27. Power to acquire land, rights in land, airspace and subsoil

27.1 Your Petitioner believes it is unnecessary and inequitable to seek to acquire permanent rights in relation to Chandos Park where limited and temporary rights are sufficient for construction of the works, especially in relation to Chandos Park where only intermittent access (at most) is required to plots 173-175 by the nominated undertaker.

27.2 Your Petitioner requests that the Bill be amended so that the nominated undertaker may only acquire limited and temporary rights in relation to Chandos Park if such rights are in fact reasonably necessary, which your Petitioner does not believe is the case.

28. Construction of works proposed to be authorised by the Bill

28.1 Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and its associated development including but not limited to construction compounds, storage compounds, the use of overhead cranes and construction conveyor routes.

28.2 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker be subject to binding mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of any works at

28.2.1 Atlas Road Satellite Compound;

28.2.2 Construction conveyor route between Victoria Road and the Atlas Road Satellite Compound;

28.2.3 Victoria Road Bridge;

28.2.4 Victoria Road Tunnel Drive Compound;

28.2.5 Old Oak Common Station Main Compound; and

28.2.6 Any other works at locations which may reasonably impact on the Property

28.3 These binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to restrictions on noise, dust, vibration, construction hours, vehicle movements and operating
hours, monitoring compliance with these restrictions and enforcement of these restrictions. The nominated undertaker should also mitigate the impact of noise, dust and vibration through measures such as noise insulation and barriers, sheeting of haulage vehicles, dust dampening, hand piling, and sympathetic design in keeping with the surrounding area.

28.4 Your Petitioner submits that a different alignment of the construction conveyor route would lead to fewer and less severe impacts on Chandos Park, the neighbourhood and the environment. Your Petitioner requests that a different alignment between Victoria Road and the Atlas Road Satellite Compound is provided for in the Bill or alternatively, the land owned by Network Rail on which the proposed construction conveyor is to be constructed could be used to construct and maintain the construction conveyor negating the need to compulsorily acquire plots 173-175.

28.5 Your Petitioner requests that in any event the nominated undertaker should be subject to binding mitigation measures to minimise adverse impacts.

29 Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaker’s ongoing accountability is unspecified. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply with the Code of Construction Practice, nor does it specify the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event that the contractors do not comply with the Code of Construction Practice. Assessment in the HS2 Environmental Statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be fully effective, however the Code of Construction Practice has no legal status.

30. 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.

31. The standards set out in the HS2 Phase 1 Environmental Statement and the Code of Construction Practice are “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, verifiable and challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

32. Your Petitioner submits that a specific construction management plan should be produced to manage and coordinate the operation of construction camps which should clearly outline the phases of activity and a co-ordinated management of their interaction, and a framework for enforceable measures. A construction management plan should be available to each Community Forum Area showing the timetables and community impact, as well as mitigation measures.

33. Your Petitioner is concerned that having regard to the noise-sensitive nature of the tenants at Chandos Park, the construction of the high speed railway and its associated development is likely to create considerable disruption.
Your Petitioner requests that under binding mitigation measures hours of construction should be limited to between 18:30 to 08:00 Monday to Friday and 12:00 onwards on Saturday and at anytime on Sunday.

Highways

Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction of the high speed railway and associated development in the vicinity of Chandos Park (including but not limited to the location of main and satellite compounds, the new interchange at Old Oak Common and increased traffic as a result of roadworks) and on the wider area will impact significantly upon the quiet enjoyment of Chandos Park and the neighbourhood by way of noise, disturbance, visual intrusion and traffic increases.

Your Petitioner is concerned about the use of unsuitable highways by large vehicles delivering equipment and supplies, and removal of spoil during the construction works as well as use of highways by other vehicles. The disruptive effect of these vehicle movements will be compounded by road diversions, temporary road closures and temporary substitution or closure of public rights of way including the closure of Old Oak Common Lane for 12 months which will require a diversion on Victoria Road/Wales Farm Road constituting a major adverse effect on the Property from daily traffic increases. The use and routing of large vehicles within the vicinity of Chandos Park is also a matter of concern to your Petitioner.

The impacts of the increase in traffic on Chandos Park will be severe with journey time to and from Chandos Park increasing due to its proximity to main and satellite construction compounds and construction traffic routes. This will impact on the ability of the tenants to service their customers and therefore the efficiency and profitability of the tenants' businesses.

Your Petitioner requests that hours for the movement of construction traffic be limited, and that there be limits on the number of vehicle movements, limits on the size of vehicles, and other miscellaneous related matters.

Your Petitioner requests that large vehicles as well as other construction traffic must be strictly controlled, having regard to the particular sensitivities of the area. Your Petitioner therefore requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to binding mitigation measures in relation to the control of all construction traffic, assessment of suitability of roads for construction traffic, routing of lorries and other vehicles in accordance with a list of routes to be agreed with the nominated undertaker and your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner requests that binding mitigation measures should include traffic management plans to be agreed between the nominated undertaker, the relevant local authority and the relevant highway authority to be monitored and enforced by environmental health officers.

Your Petitioner is concerned about the risk to public safety posed by the large, heavy lorries and articulated vehicles, especially in light of the fact that the roads are narrow. Your Petitioner is also concerned about the access leaving and entering the construction site(s)
35.8 Your Petitioner requests that risk assessments be completed by the nominated undertaker, relevant statutory undertakers and emergency services in relation to the access and transport issues raised by construction activity for each Community Forum Area. Your Petitioner requests that the results of the risk assessment should be available to the public.

35.9 Your Petitioner is concerned about the wear and tear, and degradation to the highways as a result of construction traffic.

35.10 Your Petitioner requests that appropriate funding should be provided by the nominated undertaker to the highway authority for the maintenance, repair and reinstatement of highways required as a result of use by construction traffic.

36. Prohibiting and/or restricting construction traffic/alternative routes

36.1 Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of construction traffic on Chandos Road, St. Leonards Road, School Road, and Victoria Road as well as other routes in the vicinity of the Property. Many of the routes surrounding Chandos Park are not suitable for construction traffic because as key supply routes the road network is already congested. The increased traffic will restrict the movements of business users of the road network impacting on their ability to carry out their business, inhibit access to Chandos Park, pose a risk to health and safety of other road users and pedestrians and will result in Chandos Park being subject to intolerable noise and vibrations.

36.2 Your Petitioner requests that all construction traffic be fully prohibited from using Chandos Road, St Leonards Road, Bashley Road, School Road and Bethune Road and instead construction traffic be routed by main roads such as Victoria Road to minimise impacts on the area and, in particular, the impact of construction vehicles. When the road is no longer required for construction traffic your Petitioner requests that it should be reinstated to the former land use.

37. Objection to road closure

37.1 Your Petitioner requests that at no time Chandos Road, St Leonards Road, Bashley Road, Victoria Road, Chase Road, School Road and Bethune Road are closed as the closure of any of these routes would cause severe disruption to the operation of Chandos Park.

37.2 Your Petitioner requests that if Chandos Road, St Leonards Road, Bashley Road, Victoria Road, Chase Road, School Road and Bethune Road be closed at any time, an alternative route is provided. The alternative route must be agreed with the relevant highways authority and your Petitioner.

38. Access to the Property

38.1 Your Petitioner is concerned, in respect of highway works and the use as a construction traffic route of the roads in the vicinity of Chandos Park, in particular but not limited to Chandos Road, St. Leonards Road, Bashley Road, School Road Bethune Road and Victoria Road. Your Petitioner believes that highway works and use as a construction traffic route will cause considerable disruption and result in severe difficulties for those wishing to access and travel to Chandos Park as well as
risks to health and safety. Your Petitioner therefore requests that during construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development the roads in the vicinity of Chandos Park and in particular, those noted above should at all times be kept open and available for use by vehicular traffic and pedestrians.

38.2 Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker should be required under the Bill to provide detailed plans, method statements and other particulars of works including the work programmes and schedules of deliveries (in particular abnormal deliveries) occurring in proximity to Chandos Park substantially in advance of the commencement of construction operations.

Access within the Property

39.1 Your Petitioner notes that no rights of access via the estate road through Chandos Park have been proposed by the Promoter. Your Petitioner requests that at no time is any right of access sought through Chandos Park to access plots 173-175. Your Petitioner is concerned about any such rights of access for the reasons which follow. Any right of access would further increase the traffic and congestion issues already experienced by the occupiers of Chandos Park and this would have a significant impact on the businesses at Chandos Park. Your Petitioner is concerned about the inevitable wear and tear that any construction traffic would cause to the estate road and is further concerned that any construction traffic would cause health and safety concerns within Chandos Park. Your Petitioner reserves the right to consider any further reasons should any rights of access across Chandos Park be sought by the Promoter.

39.2 Plots 173-175 shown on plan numbered 1-45 are in constant use throughout working hours as a service yard with large delivery trucks entering and exiting the yard for the purpose of loading and unloading at regular intervals throughout the day and for the parking of vehicles. The compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175 will remove the communal rear service yard for Chandos Park.

39.2.1 Units 10-14 at Chandos Park

(a) Units 10-14 are currently occupied by Toughglaze Ltd. Their business requires that they maintain access to the roller shutter doors, loading bay, parking and turning area to the rear of Units 10-14 which falls within plots 173-175 to be compulsorily acquired. This will be inaccessible should plots 173-175 be compulsorily acquired.

(b) Further, Units 10-14 benefit from a further area of service yard behind the Units. This area will be inaccessible should the compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175 proceed as it is accessed via plots 173-175. This will further impact on the Toughglaze Ltd’s ability to carry out its business.

(c) Your Petitioner’s agent is concerned that in the future it is very unlikely that the Unit backing onto plots 173-175 which is currently let to Toughglaze Ltd will be capable of being independently re-let without access to a loading bay or the car parking which forms part of plots 173-175 when the current tenant’s lease expires and should they choose to relocate.

39.2.2 Units 4-8 at Chandos Park

(a) Units 4-8 are currently occupied by Enotria Winesellers Ltd. Their business requires that they maintain access to the roller shutter doors, loading bay,
parking and turning area to the rear of Units 4-8 which falls within plots 173-175 to be compulsorily acquired. This will be inaccessible should plots 173-175 be compulsorily acquired.

(b) Your Petitioner's agent has confirmed that creating an alternative loading bay in the flank wall facing the main access road to Chandos Park will cause increased and severe congestion within the estate as the space between Units 4-8 and Units 10-14 is too limited.

(c) Your Petitioner's agent is concerned that it is very unlikely that Unit 8 will be capable of being independently re-let without access to a loading bay or the car parking which forms part of plots 173-175 when the current tenant's lease expires and should they choose to relocate. Unit 4 and 6 will also prove difficult to re-let due to the consequential increase in congestion and lack of loading facilities along the main estate road.

39.2.3 Whole of Chandos Park

(a) The main access road through Chandos Park is very congested. Therefore, it is not a realistic proposition that this area could accommodate the loading, unloading and parking that currently occurs on plots 173-175.

(b) Further, some of the external yard areas in the remaining land are not level and this affects the ability of the current or any future tenants to load and unload in the area. In particular, fork lift truck loading and unloading in these areas may be too dangerous to be carried out.

(c) Your Petitioner's agent is concerned that Units 10 and Unit 8 will be unlettable when the current tenant's lease expires and should they choose to relocate and that the other Units are likely to be unmarketable due to the access and congestion issues which will occur at Chandos Park.

39.2.4 In conclusion, the relocation of the current tenants due to the compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175 would leave an unmarketable property with a significant loss of value. Therefore, the impact of the compulsory acquisition of plots 173-175 on your Petitioner's interest in the entire property is severe, potentially leading to the demise of the entire estate.

40. Services

40.1 Your Petitioner is concerned that there is the potential for disruption to utilities and other services provided to Chandos Park. Any disruption in the services to Chandos Park is unacceptable to your Petitioner because it is essential that such services are provided in order that the tenants of Chandos Park can carry out their businesses and your Petitioner can operate Chandos Park in accordance with their lease obligations.

40.2 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to binding mitigation measures in relation to any disruption to services and contingency measures in the event of disruption to services. The binding measures should include implementing alternative proposals prior to any relocation of utilities and indemnifying your Petitioner for any loss or damages arising from such works.
41. **Noise**

41.1 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 and the construction conveyor route between Victoria Road and the Atlas Road Satellite Compound along the boundary of Chandos Park.

41.2 Your Petitioner is also concerned that the operation of the high speed railway will give rise to noise. Noise would severely impact upon the use and enjoyment of Chandos Park by your Petitioner and its tenants.

41.3 Enotria Winesellers Ltd, the tenant of Units 4-8, specialise in the storage and distribution of high value wines. They are an example of a tenant at Chandos Park who would be severely detrimentally impacted by the location of the construction conveyor route and potentially the HS2 tunnel itself. High value wine requires careful storage and any excessive sound, noise or in particular vibration could damage the wine irreparably.

41.4 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development including the construction conveyor route to ensure that no noise can be heard in Chandos Park and there are no other adverse effects.

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

41.6 The 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 include but not be limited to full noise barriers and noise insulation for buildings and re-housing. The trigger levels at which point noise mitigation becomes necessary should be reduced.

41.7 Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State for arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the nominated undertaker.

41.8 Your Petitioner requests that Clause 35 and schedule 25 are deleted from the Bill.

42. **Vibration**

42.1 Your Petitioner is concerned about the effects of vibration arising from the construction of the high speed railway and associated development including heavy
construction traffic and the construction conveyor route between Victoria Road and
the Atlas Road Satellite Compound along the boundary of Chandos Park.

42.2 Your Petitioner is also concerned that the operation of the high speed railway will
give rise to vibration. Vibration will severely impact upon the use and enjoyment of
Chandos Park by your Petitioner and its tenants.

42.3 As noted above, Enotria Winesellers Ltd, the tenant of Units 4-8, specialise in the
storage and distribution of high value wines. They are an example of a tenant at the
Property who would be severely detrimentally impacted by the location of the
conveyor route and potentially the HS2 tunnel itself. High value wine requires careful
storage and any excessive sound, noise or in particular vibration could damage the
wine irreparably.

42.4 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be compelled to use
best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway
and its associated development including the construction conveyor route to ensure
that no vibration can be felt in Chandos Park and there are no other adverse effects.

42.5 Your Petitioner requests that there should be binding mitigation measures including
vibration and resultant damage mitigation and a monitoring system in place before
commencement and during construction and operation. Binding mitigation measures
should include but not be limited to an express obligation to undertake specific
measures to limit structural and other damage to the Property, installation of noise
barriers which ensure compliance with WHO acceptable peak sound levels and the
integration of full barriers into the structural design of viaducts with shallower support
structures beneath track level.

43. Dust

43.1 Your Petitioner is concerned about dust and dirt produced during construction and
operation of the high speed railway and associated development including heavy
construction traffic and the construction conveyor route between Victoria Road and
the Atlas Road Satellite Compound and the effects of this on Chandos Park and
environmental quality of the neighbourhood.

43.2 The impact of the location of the conveyor route on Chandos Park has not been
effectively considered despite the documents accompanying the Bill confirming that
the use of the construction conveyor route will result in dust emissions. Dust
emissions of this nature will significantly impact on the tenants of Chandos Park due
to the nature of their businesses. In particular, Toughglaze Ltd produces glass. This
business is likely to be severely detrimentally affected by increased dust produced
by the construction conveyor.

43.3 Your Petitioner is concerned that there are no binding mitigation measures in relation
to emissions, especially in light of the siting of the sustainable placement areas for
spoil, prevailing wind direction and the amount of earth to be moved.

43.4 Your Petitioner submits that in relation to dust there should be a precise,
comprehensive and binding management plan, with a clearly defined authority for
the monitoring of its implementation.
43.5 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 the planning for mineral extraction in plan making and the application process issued 6 March 2014.

43.6 Your Petitioner requests that there be a requirement to carry out additional mitigation if dust becomes a nuisance to Chandos Park 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 for additional expense caused by dust and dirt.

Your Petitioner’s concerns in relation to the Pentagon

44. Purpose of Compulsory Acquisition

44.1 The Pentagon Notice states that the land which includes the entirety of the Pentagon is to be compulsorily acquired outright. Acquisition is not limited to any category of compulsory acquisition.

44.2 The environmental statement accompanying the Bill does not adequately identify the purpose for which the land is to be acquired and indicates only that the Pentagon falls within a large area of land designated as land potentially required during construction.

44.3 The Bill reveals that the purpose for which plot number 63b on Plan 3-103 may be acquired or used is for the reinstatement of businesses and facilities. The Bill gives no further information and this description lacks clarity.

44.4 In addition, reference to plot 63 on plan 3-103 is not included in the Bill although limited discussions with HS2 Limited have indicated that the compulsory acquisition relates to the need for access to an electricity pylon. If this is the case, your Petitioner does not consider that it is reasonably necessary to compulsory purchase plot 63 in its entirety or at all.

44.5 Your Petitioner’s consultant has been in correspondence with HS2 Limited to try and obtain clarification as to the purpose of the compulsory acquisition of the Pentagon but to date, no substantive response other than the indication noted above has been received.

44.6 Your Petitioner does not consider that the Pentagon is required for the purposes of the Bill. Alternative sites exist and can be used by the nominated undertaker thus avoiding your Petitioner’s Property.

44.7 The Additional Provisions of the Bill propose to alter now the Pentagon is affected by the Bill. Your Petitioner is still uncertain about how the Pentagon will be affected by these Additional Provisions and what is proposed by them.

45. Business

45.1 Should the Pentagon be compulsorily acquired in its entirety the current tenant of the Pentagon would be forced to relocate leading to a reduction of jobs in the area.
45.2 The Pentagon is carefully managed to provide an excellent environment in which the tenant’s business can thrive. The compulsory acquisition of the Pentagon would severely impact on the local business community.

45.3 Lack of clarity as to the purpose of the compulsory acquisition of the Pentagon impedes your Petitioner’s ability to assess HS2 Limited’s requirement for compulsory purchase of the Pentagon and so your Petitioner reserves the right to reconsider and/or further elaborate or revise any potential impacts on the Pentagon. Further, your Petitioner contends that the Bill and accompanying documents cannot have adequately assessed the impacts of the HS2 project on the Pentagon if the purpose of the compulsory acquisition of the Land is unclear.

45.4 Should the Property not be compulsory purchased in its entirety then it will be impacted by traffic, transport, noise and vibration issues in the same manner as Chandos Park and your Petitioner reserves the right to review these impacts once the purpose of the compulsory acquisition is clear. These issues should be properly assessed and mitigation proposals should be provided. Your Petitioner looks forward to receiving clarity on the extent of the proposed compulsory purchase.

Your Petitioner’s general concerns in relation to both Properties

46. Environmental Statement

You Petitioner requests that the HS2 Environmental Statement be revised to correct the numerous deficiencies identified in your Petitioner’s response to the HS2 Environmental Statement consultation, that the amended HS2 Environmental Statement be reconsulted and that the Select Committee only consider specific petitions when the HS2 Environmental Statement has been corrected so there is a sound factual basis against which petitions may be considered. The non-technical summary needs to be rewritten to accurately reflect the environmental affects.

47. Blight

Your Petitioner respectfully submits that the proposals contained in the Bill are causing a blight on your Petitioner’s Properties, and has done so for some time before the Bill’s submission to Parliament. Your Petitioner fears that prospective purchasers and lessees will state that the proposals so blight the Properties that they are not interested in acquiring any part of them, or that prospective or existing lessees will demand a considerably reduced rent, due to the prospect of the works. Your Petitioner has already experienced this in trying to sell Chandos Park and can provide evidence. Moreover, the Bill does not contain adequate provisions for compensating such blight and your Petitioner respectfully suggests that it should do so. Your Petitioner would like a binding commitment from the Promoter not to acquire its Properties before a specific date

48. Indemnity

Your Petitioner submits that the Promoter should be required to indemnify them from all claims and demands which may be made in consequence of the construction, use or maintenance of the works under the Bill, or their failure or want of repair, or in consequence of any act or omission of the Promoter, his contractors or agents in carrying out the works under the Bill.
49. Costs

Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to repay to your Petitioner all proper costs, charges and expenses (including the proper fees of such professional advisers as they may instruct) reasonably incurred in consequence of the Bill or of any provision made as a result of this Petition.

50. Conclusion

50.1 In light of the above, your Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to your Petitioner's expressed concerns that may occur in due course.

50.2 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the clauses of the Bill are removed or amended as requested, then the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

50.3 There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their rights, (including their human rights) interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect 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 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.

Christopher Stanwell
Partner
on behalf of
NABARRO LLP
Acting as Agent for the Petitioner

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

(1) Ivan Gerald William Banister,  
(2) Heather Rose Banister, and  
(3) Nancy Openshaw Banister

Declarations that:

1.1 Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill's objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway mentioned in paragraph 1 above. They include provision for the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, the compulsory acquisition of land and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. They include clauses which would disapply and modify various enactments relating to special categories of land including burial grounds, consecrated land, commons and open spaces, and other matters, including overhead lines, water, building regulations and party walls, street works and the use of lorries.

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

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

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

1.5 A paper of amendments of provisions ("AP2") makes provision, amongst other matters, for the carrying out of additional works, the compulsory acquisition of additional land and rights over land, the stopping up and realignment of public footpaths and bridleways and for the alteration or disturbance of the surface of highways.

1.6 Land in the ownership of your Petitioner is liable to compulsory acquisition under clauses 4 to 8 of the Bill and "AP2". The Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the Clauses of the Bill and AP2 that affect the compulsory acquisition of land and the potential temporary use of land.

2. Your petitioner

2.1 Your Petitioners are the freeholders of Warden Farms which is run from Warden Hill, Chipping Warden Nr Banbury OX17 1AJ which is a Farm in the County of Northamptonshire affected by the provisions of the Bill.

2.2 Your Petitioners also farm further land in the area on contract farming arrangements which will be affected by the provisions of the Bill.

2.3 Your Petitioners additionally farm land rented on Farm Business Tenancies also directly affected by the provisions of the Bill.

2.4 Your Petitioners are the freeholders of land which is acquired and which is listed in the Book of Reference as plot numbers: 77, 81, 86, 87, 95, 99, 104 and 105 with additional plots in the Book of Reference A to AP2: AP2-12, AP2-13, AP2-14, AP2-15, AP2-17, AP2-18, 81a, 81b, 81c, 81d, 87a, 87b, 87c. These plots are located in the Parish of Chipping Warden and Edgcote in the district of South Northamptonshire. The Plot numbers of land that is farmed under contract farm agreements are Plots 92, 94, 96, 101 and 102 together with additional plots affected as a result of the Chipping Warden Bypass proposals in AP2 but these plot numbers have not been clarified. The Plot number for land in which there is a Leasehold interest is 70.

2.5 The Book of Reference does cite your Petitioners as having an interest in certain plots when, in fact, they have none.
2.6 It is proposed by the Bill to authorise the compulsory acquisition of certain interests in land or property of your Petitioner. Works to take place over the holding owned, farmed and leased by your Petitioners include, but are not limited to, construction of HS2, the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel, the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel Main Compound, storage of soil while the green tunnel is constructed on your Petitioners’ land, diversion of rights of way, tree planting to screen the railway, temporary diversion of the A361, construction of the Chipping Warden A361 bypass and other works unknown at this stage due to engineering drawings of the proposed railway being unavailable.

2.7 Your Petitioners and their 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.

3. Your petitioner’s concern

3.1 It was unclear from the Bill whether land required for a temporary use of land would be used under a lease on commercial market terms or acquired from the landowner. Schedule 15 has helped to clarify, but the issue is a great concern to those significantly affected by temporary use of land such as your Petitioner. This is due to the particular concern that the Bill does not take into account the impact that Capital Gains Tax and Inheritance Tax has on those affected, which can have implications on the land required for a temporary use but also directly on the capital tax position on all land owned by the landowner, including land not affected by the Bill. Your Petitioner is potentially at a significant disadvantage due to this.

3.2 Your Petitioner is therefore concerned by the possibility of land being acquired permanently for a temporary purpose and consider it not appropriate for the Bill as proposed to contain compulsory purchase powers in respect of their land when the nominated undertaker’s requirement illustrated on the plans in the Environmental Statement and Supplementary Environmental Statement show land being required for a temporary use only, such as for the construction of green tunnels, soil storage and site compounds. The terms offered and options available need to take into account how the landowner is affected by capital taxation implications, which affects the Petitioner and which the Bill fails to consider.

3.3 The area of Warden Farms owned and affected by HS2 is over 16%. This has been increased following publication of AP2 although no revised Environmental Statement has been prepared to assess how much of Warden Farms is affected following introduction of the Chipping Warden bypass, the case for which was supported by your Petitioner.
3.4 The Tables in the Environmental Statement illustrating the impact of HS2 on your Petitioners' farm business do not take into account the implications of capital taxes payable on the compensation to be received by owners of land and which, depending on the age of the owner, can be significant both in terms of Capital Gains Tax and Inheritance Tax. The impact of this should be considered when analysing the impact of the Bill on farming businesses which cannot just move to new premises.
4. **The prayer**

The Petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that them, 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.

Ivan Gerald William Banister

Heather Rose Banister

Nancy Openshaw Banister

18 April 2016
IN PARLIAMENT

THE HOUSE OF LORDS

SESSION 2015–16

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON -- WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Against — on Merits — Praying to be heard by Counsel, &c.

THE HUMBLE PETITION of TRANSPORT FOR LONDON

YOUR PETITIONER DECLARES that:

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced and is now pending in your noble 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 Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes."

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

YOUR PETITIONER

3. Your Petitioner is Transport for London, a body corporate established under section 154 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 ("the 1999 Act"). Section 141 of the 1999 Act imposes upon the Mayor of London ("the Mayor") a general duty to develop and implement policies for the promotion and encouragement of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport facilities and services to, from and within Greater London. Your Petitioner is tasked with facilitating the discharge by the Mayor of his duties under section 141 of the 1999 Act, with responsibility for most aspects of London's public transport, managing London's main roads and planning and building new infrastructure. Your Petitioner is also responsible for delivering the Mayor's transport policies and strategy for London, as set out in the Mayor's Transport Strategy, a statutory document and a key part of a strategic policy framework to support and shape London's social and economic development.
4. Your Petitioner, together with its subsidiaries, currently manages London's buses, the London Underground railway network, Docklands Light Railway, Overground and Tramlink. Your Petitioner also runs Santander Cycle Hire and Cycle Superhighways, London River Services, Victoria Coach Station, the Emirates Air Line and London Transport Museum. As well as controlling a 580km network of main roads (known as the "Transport for London Route Network" or "TLRN") and all of the city's 6,000 traffic lights, Your Petitioner also runs London's Congestion Charging scheme and is responsible for the regulation of taxis and private hire vehicles on London's roads.

5. Your Petitioner, its subsidiaries and its respective rights, interests and property are specially and directly affected by the Bill, and acting on its own behalf and on behalf of its subsidiaries, objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

YOUR PETITIONER'S CONCERNS

6. Your Petitioner is supportive, in principle, of the proposal to construct a new high speed railway between London and the West Midlands ("HS2 Phase 1"). The Mayor regards the development of a high speed rail network in the UK as representing a key element in reshaping the nation's transport network to enable economic growth, as identified in the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

7. Your Petitioner previously raised concerns as to whether the proposals for HS2 Phase 1 provided the best integrated transport solution for London and sufficiently addressed a number of adverse impacts arising out of the construction of the proposals. In particular, Your Petitioner identified the following concerns:

(a) transport provision for the successful delivery of Old Oak Common as a major new transport interchange;
(b) impacts at London Euston including design;
(c) adverse impacts on London's public transport; and
(d) adverse impacts likely to arise during construction of HS2 Phase 1.

8. Your Petitioner has been in detailed discussion with the Secretary of State for Transport in relation to the proposals for HS2 Phase 1 and both parties have made good progress. Your Petitioner has entered into an agreement with the Secretary of State and has received a number of further undertakings and assurances from him in relation to the implementation of the powers in, and the carrying out of works that would be authorised by the Bill. Those undertakings have dealt with most of Your Petitioner's concerns.
9. On 1 July 2015, the Secretary of State provided Your Petitioner with a set of assurances ("the July 2015 Assurances") dealing with the provision by the Promoter, Your Petitioner and others with a series of pedestrian and cycle links to link the station proposed at Old Oak Common as part of the works authorised by the Bill and surrounding transport networks, particularly the London Overground.

10. Most recently, on 7 December 2015, the Secretary of State provided Your Petitioner with a further set of assurances (provided jointly to Your Petitioner and to the Mayor of London acting on behalf of the Greater London Authority) ("the December 2015 Assurances") dealing with:

(a) the delivery of the vision for Euston Station and the surrounding area;
(b) the design of Euston Station;
(c) the connection of HS2 Phase 1 at Euston with the proposed Crossrail 2 scheme;
(d) a link through Euston Station from east to west;
(e) the works proposed for the Hampstead Road Bridge;
(f) construction traffic and the use of rail;
(g) the protection of Your Petitioner’s assets at Euston Station, Euston Bus Station and the proposed Cycle Superhighway;
(h) the Code of Construction Practice and Environmental Minimum Requirements to be adopted in relation to the works authorised by the Bill; and
(i) reducing traffic impacts at Hillingdon.

11. While Your Petitioner sets out below more detail on certain of the above issues, in many cases, those assurances make provision for the Secretary of State to carry out further studies and associated work to provide solutions that will deal with Your Petitioner’s concerns. The Secretary of State is to consider Your Petitioner’s comments on those studies once they are completed and will then determine whether or not to implement the solutions identified. Progress has been made on a number of the assurances. However, as at the date of this Petition, those studies, etc. have not been completed and accordingly, Your Petitioner does not know what solutions will be identified to deal with its concerns listed above or, indeed, whether the Secretary of State will determine to implement those solutions. Accordingly, Your Petitioner is
oblige[d] to petition your noble House in order that Your Petitioner can bring these issues before the Select Committee or your noble House pending, or following, (as the case may be) the Secretary of State's determination on the solutions. However, Your Petitioner does not intend the bringing of this petition to impute any criticism of the Secretary of State or the Promoter of the Bill at this stage.

Old Oak Common Pedestrian and Cycle Links

12. Your Petitioner has been concerned to ensure the delivery by the Promoter, Your Petitioner and others of a series of pedestrian and cycle links to link the station proposed at Old Oak Common as part of the works authorised by the Bill and surrounding transport networks, particularly the London Overground as well as a vehicular link leading over the Grand Union Canal at the eastern end of the proposed station at Old Oak Common.

13. In the July 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed to require the nominated undertaker to agree an outline specification of the designs for the relevant links by 31 December 2015 and to agree detailed specifications by 30 June 2016.

14. While a draft outline design has been produced, no design has yet formally been agreed; as at the date of this petition the final design specifications for the links haven't been seen or approved by TfL and no changes to the HS2 Station designs to accommodate the links have been seen or agreed. The final situation on the design therefore cannot be known. Your Petitioner petitions In order that if need be, the Select Committee can consider the issues and give a direction or recommendation to the Promoter if the Select Committee considers it appropriate.

Delivery of the vision for Euston Station and the surrounding area

15. Your Petitioner wishes to see a coherent, integrated redevelopment of the Euston area, comprising not only the new station at Euston for HS2 but also a redevelopment of the existing Network Rail ("NR") station at Euston and provision for overstation development and regeneration in the area.

16. In the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed that he would set up:

(a) the Euston Station Strategic Redevelopment Board ("ESSRB"), to include as members, Your Petitioner, the Greater London Authority, the Department for Transport and NR. Full terms of reference for the Board and a forward work programme for the following year were to be agreed by the end of March 2016. Although a meeting of the ESSRB has taken place, the full terms of
the Euston Integrated Programme Board ("EIPB"), comprising Your Petitioner, the Greater London Authority and others. The EIPB is to bring together HS2 work streams; provide member organisations with information on progress; support coordination between member organisation activities; report to the ESSRB and work with the Euston Strategic Board; make recommendations on scheme changes that would facilitate integration of the different schemes proposed at Euston; and monitor the progress of community engagement in accordance with the Promoter's Community Engagement Framework. Two meetings of the EIPB have taken place.

17. Further, the Secretary of State committed to agree before the end of 2016 a working schedule for all activities required to deliver all the relevant schemes in the Euston Station area (i.e. the HS2 Euston station, rebuild of the existing NR station, the Crossrail 2 proposals at Euston and the oversite development and related development opportunities). At least two months in advance of the publication of the NR Initial Industry Plan for Control Period 6, NR is to be invited by the Secretary of State to present any relevant elements of that draft plan which relate to the development of the Euston NR station for the ESSRB to consider.

18. Bearing in mind, for example, that the NR Initial Industry Plan for Control Period 6 is expected in September 2016 and that no preliminary information has been produced or provided to Your Petitioner, Your Petitioner is now concerned that the timeframes for these deliverables referred to above may not be met. Your Petitioner asks the Select Committee to ensure that these steps are woven into the implementation of the powers under the Bill to ensure that these steps cannot be disregarded, or carried out too late in the process to be of use. If the timeframes are not met, the ability to develop and agree an integrated plan which optimises both the transport solution and regeneration will likely be lost.

19. Your Petitioner raises these issues given the importance that it places not only on the need for the HS2 Euston station to integrate into the existing transport network and a desire to mitigate construction impacts, but also by the Mayor's wider ambitions for growth and development in the Euston area and a pressing requirement for the rebuild of the NR Station. Your Petitioner believes that the carrying out of the works authorised under the Bill give rise to a once in a lifetime opportunity to revolutionise not just the NR Station but a whole area at the heart of London. There is an

reference for the Board that include a forward work programme have not yet been produced and agreed.
opportunity now to future-proof for the NR Station redevelopment and mitigate or reduce future construction impacts and costs.

20. Opportunities to (1) combine construction worksites and coordinate works and (2) avoid or mitigate impacts on other transport infrastructure (including the London Underground ("LU") network, bus station and strategic road network) must be maximised via the structures that the Secretary of State has agreed to put into place.

21. Progress on developing an integrated plan at Euston has been slower than was envisioned at the time of the December 2015 Assurances. It is critical that an integrated masterplan which establishes the designs for the HS2 station, Crossrail 2 station, rebuild of the NR station and OSD development is finalised by early 2017 in order for the plans to be optimised and synergies between the schemes to be maximised. More broadly, Your Petitioner hopes that through the work of the ESSRB in particular, a comprehensive rebuild of the NR Station can be brought forward which could avoid the need to retro-fit changes and result in sub-optimal design solution for the existing NR station.

22. Your Petitioner asks the Promoter to commit to ensuring that the ESSRB and the EIPB have a real tangible influence on the design and implementation of the works authorised by the Bill. For example, it is in the nature of a complex interaction as that between the HS2 works proposed at Euston and Your Petitioner's existing assets there, that numerous issues will arise over time. Presently, the Promoter has instructed Arup to undertake many studies to improve the programme and the designs for HS2 Phase 1. Your Petitioner has no full vision of the list of studies and – more importantly- has not been asked to provide input in these studies. A lack of collaboration could trigger further delays if the new proposals are not agreed with Your Petitioner, examples of the new studies are:

(a) the LU substation/vent shaft at Euston – it is important that the LU substation/vent shaft works include Your Petitioner's functional requirements specifications as well as minimises the operational disruption to the LU services (risks of power failure Impacting on the secure running of the LU services); and

(b) Fleet Sewer relocation – Your Petitioner has raised concerns about the feasibility of the current design which could affect both Your Petitioner's LU assets and surface transport assets.

23. Your Petitioner believes that matters of asset protection such as these can be dealt with by the structures established in the December 2015 Assurances if those structures have sufficient influence on the design and implementation of the works.
authorised by the Bill. Your Petitioner asks that the Promoter give the necessary undertaking that they will. If the Promoter develops HS2 Phase 1 in a transparent and visible manner with Your Petitioner, Your Petitioner can process the agreed asset protection mechanisms agreed between Your Petitioner and the Promoter expediently to assist the Promoter in meeting its timetable for the implementation of HS2 Phase 1.

Construction traffic and the use of rail

24. Your Petitioner has raised concerns about the daily volume of HGVs currently predicted to be using routes in and around the Euston worksite, having regard to the capacity of the road network in this area and noise, vibration and air quality impacts.

25. Your Petitioner considers that transportation of a significant proportion of spoil and other construction materials and waste by alternative methods, particularly rail is the only way in which the Promoter will be able to reduce construction traffic using the road network.

26. In the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed to seek to maximise, in so far as reasonably practicable within the existing Bill powers, the volume of excavated and construction material from the construction of the HS2 Euston station and approaches to be brought in by rail and removed by rail, whilst balancing the wider environmental impacts to the local community and on passenger services.

27. Also in the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed to require the nominated undertaker to develop the scoping brief for and a plan that seeks to achieve the commitment set out at paragraph 26 above. That plan will include consideration of ambitious options that may require, amongst other things, separate planning permissions and the plan will include the identification of targets to measure future progress.

28. By May 2016, the plan is to be submitted to the EJPB for comment. The nominated undertaker is then to use reasonable endeavours to incorporate comments from the EJPB into the final plan. That plan is then to be submitted to the Secretary of State for his consideration within a month as to whether its proposals will be implemented. That plan is underway but, as at the date of this petition, the final recommendations on that plan have not yet been reached and as such the Secretary of State's likely views upon it cannot be known. Your Petitioner petitions in order that if need be, the Select Committee can consider the issues and give a direction or recommendation to the Promoter if the Select Committee considers it appropriate.
Cycle Superhighway

29. In the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed to require the nominated undertaker to carry out a study ("the Cycle study") to assess proposals for reasonable alternatives for the lorry holding facility at Park Crescent, Camden proposed as part of the works authorised under the Bill. This was in light of Your Petitioner's concerns regarding the possible impact of the movements of HGVs to and from the holding facility on Your Petitioner's proposed cycle superhighway in the area.

30. The Cycle study is to be submitted to the EIPB for comment no later than May 2016. The nominated undertaker is then to use reasonable endeavours to incorporate comments from the EIPB into the final Cycle study. That study is then to be submitted to the Secretary of State for his consideration within a month as to whether its proposals will be implemented. That study is underway but, as at the date of this petition, the final recommendations on that study have not yet been reached and as such the Secretary of State's likely views upon it cannot be known. Your Petitioner petitions in order that if need be, the Select Committee can consider the issues and give a direction or recommendation to the Promoter if the Select Committee considers it appropriate.

Crossrail 2 connection

31. With the HS2 services in operation, there will be a significant increase in passengers passing through Euston. Your Petitioner welcomes the proposed upgrade in the LU station to cope with the additional demand. However, if the benefits of the scheme are to be fully realised post Phase 2 completion, additional capacity will be required to guarantee passengers travel with ease beyond Euston to locations across London and the surrounding region. Transport for London analysis shows that major new capacity will be required to relieve severe overcrowding and long queues for onward journeys on the LU Victoria and Northern Lines southbound from Euston. Hence the HS2 scheme will rely heavily on Transport for London's Crossrail 2 ("CRL2") proposals for a new regional rail route linking south west London to north east London and beyond, which will include a station at Euston-St Pancras.

32. While CRL2 is not yet a fully committed project, CRL2 will have significant benefits for London as a whole but also the Euston-St Pancras area in particular by further enhancing the area's development potential.

33. As a result of the complex transport infrastructure interfaces in this area, the design and delivery of the Euston HS2 Station and the NR Station would both have a significant impact on the potential for the CRL2 station. Your Petitioner therefore considers that a commitment to deliver a coordinated design for the HS2 Euston
Terminus and the NR Station as part of a cohesive redevelopment is also the best way to ensure that the CRL2 benefits can be delivered.

34. In the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed to require the nominated undertaker to carry out a study ("the Crossrail study") to assess proposals for the provision of a shorter passenger link between HS2 Euston Station and CRL2 beneath the existing Euston NR station, which would require changes to the spine building proposed as part of the HS2 Euston Station and the safeguarding of space within the footprint of the Euston Mainline Station to provide for connection with that passenger link.

35. That study is to be submitted to the EIPB for comment no later than May 2016. The nominated undertaker is then to use reasonable endeavours to incorporate comments from the EIPB into the final Crossrail study. That study is then to be submitted to the Secretary of State for his consideration within a month as to whether its proposals will be implemented. That study is underway but, as at the date of this petition, the final recommendations on that study have not yet been reached and as such the Secretary of State's likely views upon it cannot be known. Your Petitioner petitions in order that if need be, the Select Committee can consider the issues and give a direction or recommendation to the Promoter if the Select Committee considers it appropriate.

East-West Link

36. The Euston Area Plan proposes new east-west and north-south pedestrian streets routes across the station and its approach. The current station at Euston and approach does not allow this movement through the Euston station site, frustrating access to The Regents Park and Somers Town areas by requiring pedestrians and cyclists to travel north or south to Euston Road and Mornington Crescent in order to make this movement. The effect of this is evidenced by the pattern of development around the existing station as the eastern and western perimeters, in particular, are devoid of activity due to a lack of active frontages. The Promoter's revised designs for Euston does not alleviate these problems, with the spine building proposed to join the Euston HS2 station with the NR Station providing insufficient open space and walking routes for local residents, visitors and passengers using Euston station easily to connect to areas east and west of Euston station.

37. A lack of an east-west link will leave Euston Road and busy streets further north in Camden Town centre as the only east-west routes for cyclists and pedestrians in this area. Exacerbation of east-west permeability problems could mean the new hub of activity on the western side of Euston Station will remain poorly connected to the major new developments of the Francis Crick Institute and Kings Cross on the east side which will house major multi-national companies such as Google. These hi-tech,
science and research organisations are likely to generate considerable demand for the high-speed services in terms of both staff and visitors. The value of time needs to be recognised. Direct, convenient links between the west side of Euston (which itself is likely to house high-value jobs) and the hub of activity to the east are crucial to maximising the agglomeration benefits of all the new development in this part of London. Community severance could also be exacerbated by the relocation of an existing local secondary school from the west of the station to the east in order to provide space for the construction of the Euston HS2 station, with children and parents being required to take a much longer route along the busy Euston Road. In addition, linkages between the Euston HS2 station and the regional and international services from St Pancras depend on an adequate east-west link.

38. In light of the above concerns, in the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed to require the nominated undertaker to carry out a study ("the Parcel Deck study") to assess proposals for the provision of a pedestrian route across the end of Euston NR station utilising the existing Parcel Deck. The Parcel Deck study will consider options that may require separate planning permissions that may be granted from the London Borough of Camden or use the Permitted Development Rights of NR.

39. That study is to be submitted to the EIPB for comment no later than May 2016. The nominated undertaker is then to use reasonable endeavours to incorporate comments from the EIPB into the final Parcel Deck study. That study is then to be submitted to the Secretary of State for his consideration within a month as to whether its proposals will be implemented. That study is underway but, as at the date of this petition, the final recommendations on that study have not yet been reached and as such the Secretary of State's likely views upon it cannot be known. Your Petitioner petitions in order that if need be, the Select Committee can consider the issues and give a direction or recommendation to the Promoter if the Select Committee considers it appropriate.

Hampstead Road Bridge

40. Your Petitioner has raised concerns about the reconstruction of Hampstead Bridge which is required in order to provide access for trains to the new HS2 Euston Station.

41. As stated in the original requirements agreed between the Promoter and Transport for London in June 2014, Your Petitioner considers that the width of the bridge should be reduced to better reflect the existing road layout in the area. The construction of a smaller bridge, with 4 vehicular lanes plus segregated cycle lanes and pedestrian walkways would reduce construction impacts, shorten the construction period and also have a positive long term environmental effect.
42. Another reason the reconstruction of the bridge requires such significant works is the apparent need to raise the bridge above its existing height. The increased height of the road will result in: severance of roads abutting the approach to the bridge which must now be stopped up; increased levels of noise for nearby receptors; more significant landscape and visual impacts; longer construction times; and drainage concerns. Your Petitioner understands this originates from route-wide height tolerances required to allow passage for the new trains travelling at a high speed. However, as the trains are approaching a terminus at Euston, speeds will be significantly lower. Your Petitioner understands that this in turn should be reflected by a reduction in required minimum tolerances, in line with standard railway practice.

43. Your Petitioner has sought from the Promoter commitments to: (a) reduce the height of the bridge by at least one metre; (b) work in collaboration with Your Petitioner and the London Borough of Camden to reduce further the impact of the bridge on the local area; and (c) agree with Your Petitioner's effective construction plans for the bridge.

44. In the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed to design the replacement Hampstead Road Bridge with 4 vehicular lanes plus segregated cycle lanes and pedestrian walkway.

45. Also in the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed to require the nominated undertaker to carry out a study ("the HR Bridge study") to assess proposals for minimising the height increase of the Hampstead Road Bridge as a result of the works to be authorised under the Bill.

46. That study is to be submitted to the EIPB for comment no later than May 2016. The nominated undertaker is then to use reasonable endeavours to incorporate comments from the EIPB into the final HR Bridge study. That study is then to be submitted to the Secretary of State for his consideration within a month as to whether its proposals will be implemented. That study is underway but, as at the date of this petition, the final recommendations on that study have not yet been reached and as such the Secretary of State's likely views upon it cannot be known. Your Petitioner petitions in order that if need be, the Select Committee can consider the issues and give a direction or recommendation to the Promoter if the Select Committee considers it appropriate.

Traffic impacts around Hillingdon

47. Your Petitioner has concerns in relation to the volume and intensity of HGV movements through the London Borough of Hillingdon, particularly in the Ickenham area. Your Petitioner was disappointed that the longer tunnel proposals put forward by the London Borough of Hillingdon which would significantly reduce the construction and longer term impacts of HS2 Phase 1 in the borough was not pursued further.
48. In the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed to require the nominated undertaker to carry out a study ("the Hillingdon study") to reduce HGV movements in the Ickenham area of Hillingdon, including proposals to maximise movements by rail; alterations to the Copthall cutting; greater reuse of excavated material; changes to the Harvil Road railhead design and footprint; acceleration of the Harvil Road rail sidings; and the reduction of the number of road vehicles associated with workforce travel. The Hillingdon study will seek to set a target reduction in HGV movements compared to earlier HS2 Phase 1 proposals.

49. That study is to be submitted to TfL, LB Hillingdon and the Secretary of State for comment no later than May 2016. The nominated undertaker is then to use reasonable endeavours to incorporate those comments into the final Hillingdon study. That study is then to be submitted to the Secretary of State for his consideration, who will use all reasonable endeavours to implement the plan, taking into account the safe, economic, efficient and timely delivery of HS2 Phase 1. The Secretary of State will then notify Your Petitioner and LB Hillingdon as to what extent the study will be implemented. As at the date of this petition, Your Petitioner has not seen that study and does not know the Secretary of State's likely views upon it. While progress is being made, Your Petitioner, along with the London Borough of Hillingdon, is concerned that the significant impacts resulting from the construction of HS2 through Hillingdon may still be too high. Your Petitioner petitions in order that if need be, the Select Committee can consider the issues and give a direction or recommendation to the Promoter if the Select Committee considers it appropriate.

Code of Construction Practice

50. Your Petitioner expects to see a fourth draft of the Promoter's Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) in relation to the works authorised by the Bill at the end of April 2016. In the December 2015 Assurances, the Secretary of State committed that the CoCP will reflect best practice from other major infrastructure projects (including in London, any guidance issued by the Mayor) and areas of the CoCP to be considered through the HS2 Planning Forum would include provisions relating to:

(a) air quality;

(b) the safety of vulnerable users;

(c) the mechanisms for the amendment of the CoCP over time to reflect changes in standards, legislation and guidance; and

(d) a Route Wide Traffic Management Plan and associated documents.
51. As at the date of this petition, the next draft of the CoCP has not yet been completed and Your Petitioner cannot know whether the provisions above have been included. Your Petitioner petitions in order that if need be, the Select Committee can consider the issues and give a direction or recommendation to the Promoter if the Select Committee considers it appropriate.

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 the Bill.

AND YOUR PETITIONER REMAINS, &C.

PINSENT MASONS LLP
Parliamentary Agents for Transport for London

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Paul Houghton

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

2. Your petitioner
The petitioner and his family live at Yew Tree Cottage, The Pyghtle, Denham and whose quality of life will be specifically and directly affected by the Bill.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

My wife and I are enthusiastic users of the spaces around us through our running, walking, cycling, and open water swimming. Our twin daughters have just turned one and we are excited to be introducing them to the possibilities of the area. We are concerned that the construction and operation of HS2 will substantially impact the experiences of our family in a number of ways, most significantly:
- Significant works in the Colne Valley Regional Park, with the permanent loss of some of the finest sections and other construction activity affecting our access to our closest countryside.

Your petitioner requests that the Bill establishes a principle that rerouted footpaths should be planned and managed for the highest ascetic so they are not tracks around perimeter fences;
- increased traffic on key local routes which will increase traffic through our village, increase journey times (particularly on school routes) and reduce cycling safety;
- we believe that the noise from the trains over the viaduct will be significant to our home and have grave doubts over the suitability and relevance of the sound modelling performed by HS2 Ltd.

Your petitioner accepts that some impacts are inevitable but seeks comfort that the impacts will be no worse than those quantified by HS2. Your petitioner therefore proposes that the impact assessments are rolled forward into audited operational thresholds within which HS2 must stay contained.
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.

Paul Houghton
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Thomas James

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed acquisition of its interests in land pursuant to the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill’s (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) Clause 4 (Power to acquire land compulsorily) and Schedule 5 (Area: London Borough of Ealing; Number of land shown on deposited plans: plots 119, 149, 150, 163 and 164).

Your petitioner

2. The petitioner is Thomas James (hereinafter referred to as “Your Petitioner”).

3. Your Petitioner is the freehold owner of land comprising title number AGL186812 known as the Boarshead Warehouse (the former John Lewis carpet depot) on Regency Street off Victoria Street, Park Royal, NW10. The Bill seeks to authorise the compulsory acquisition of part of your Petitioner’s interests at this property. Your Petitioner is also the freehold owner of land comprising title number AGL149264 known as the former Makro car park on Atlas Road, Park Royal, NW10 6DD. The Bill seeks to authorise the compulsory acquisition of part of your Petitioner’s interests at this property.

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

5. Your Petitioner petitioned in the House of Commons, and received from the Promoter a Second House Undertaking dated 3 February 2016.

Boarshead Warehouse

6. The Bill seeks to authorise the compulsory acquisition of the Boarshead Warehouse and the private road known as Regency Street off Victoria Road.

7. The notice served on your Petitioner fails to schedule Quattro (UK) Limited (company number 02744918) as lessee of the warehouse. The warehouse is used partly as a vehicle servicing depot and partly as general storage. The land is proposed to be acquired for the purposes of a construction compound during construction and otherwise as proposed railway sidings.
8. It is not clear to your Petitioner from the published information whether the proposed compulsory acquisition of the Boarshead Warehouse will be permanent or temporary and therefore future planning for the property is severely restricted.

9. Your Petitioner has not been adequately informed by the promoters of the Bill of the clear purposes for the land and how long it is intended to be used for.

10. Discussions with the promoters of the Bill have not shed any light on this.

11. Your Petitioner seeks a written undertaking from the promoters of the Bill that:

   a. land at the Boarshead Warehouse and Regency Street will be leased to the promoters of the Bill on commercial terms for the duration of the construction of the railway works rather than through the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers;

   b. alternative similar facilities will be provided for the operations of the existing tenant of the Boarshead Warehouse, Quattro (UK) Limited, to allow them to continue their operations for the duration of the temporary acquisition of the land; and

   c. on completion of the railway works the land at the Boarshead Warehouse and Regency Street will be returned to your Petitioner in its former condition, complete with any structures previously located thereon.

Former Makro Car Park

12. The Bill seeks authorisation of part of the former Makro Car Park for a satellite construction compound and conveyor works across Victoria Road to Wales Farm Road. This former car park is leased to Monier Redland Limited and is used as an open storage yard.

13. It is not clear to your Petitioner from the published information whether the proposed compulsory acquisition of the land at the former Makro Car Park will be permanent or temporary and therefore future planning for the property is severely restricted.

14. Your Petitioner has not been adequately informed by the promoters of the Bill of the clear purposes for the land and how long it is intended to be used for.

15. Discussions with the promoters of the Bill have not shed any light on this.

16. Your Petitioner seeks a written undertaking from the promoters of the Bill that:

   a. land at the former Makro Car Park will be leased to the promoters of the Bill on commercial terms for the duration of the construction of the railway works rather than through the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers;
b. on completion of the railway works the land at the former Makro Car Park will be returned to your Petitioner in its former condition, complete with any structures previously located thereon.

17. Your Petitioners have proposed to the Promoter a lease of Your Petitioner's land to HS2 for the duration of the HS2 works. No agreement has yet been reached, and discussions continue.

Length of compulsory purchase powers

18. The Bill authorises the grant of compulsory purchase powers for a period of 5 years from the date when the Bill received Royal Assent. The Bill further allows for this period to be extended for a further 5 years by the Secretary of State.

19. Your Petitioners consider that 10 years is too long a period of time for landowners to be subject to the threat of compulsory acquisition. Such threat will stall redevelopment plans and lead to vacant properties.

20. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clauses 4 to 10, 15 and those seeking to authorise the compulsory acquisition together with the deposited plans so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

21. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
The 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 Richard Guyatt of Bond Dickinson LLP as Agent for your 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 Osbourne Investments (UK) Limited

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed acquisition of its interests in land pursuant to the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill’s (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) Clause 4 (Power to acquire land compulsorily) and Schedule 5 (Area: London Borough of Ealing; Number of land shown on deposited plans: plots 219 and 220).

Your petitioner

2. The petitioners are OSBOURNE INVESTMENTS LIMITED (hereinafter referred to as “Your Petitioners”).

3. Your Petitioners are the freehold owner of land comprising title number NGL128715 known as Boden House (formerly Elliot House) on Victoria Road, Park Royal, NW10 6NY. The Bill seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition of part of your Petitioners’ interests at this property.

4. 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.

5. Your Petitioners petitioned in the House of Commons, and received from the Promoter a Second House Undertaking dated 3 February 2016.

6. The Bill seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition of the car and cycle parking area at the front of Boden House, together with the ramp up to the roof top car park above Boden House. The compulsory acquisition of this land would effectively acquire the entirety of the parking area for Boden House, as the ramp area identified for compulsory acquisition is the only access point to and exit point from the roof top car park.

7. The car parking at the front of and on the roof of Boden House (providing 137 spaces in total) services this five-storey office building, which is used by 350 full time staff members. No alternative offering of car parking has been offered to your Petitioners and without such car parking the building will be unable to operate at full capacity. It will significantly reduce the value of the property.
8. The notice served on your Petitioners fails to schedule JP Boden & Co. Limited (company number 02692601) as lessee of Boden House. The Bill poses a blight to the future occupation of these buildings which are unlikely to be let without the car parking arrangements.

9. Boden House is the only property in this stretch on Victoria Road, Park Royal which has been excluded from compulsory acquisition. The remainder of this area is to serve as a main construction compound. This blight is compounded by the acquisition of the front and roof car parking facilities which serve these buildings.

10. Discussions with the promoters of the Bill indicate that the car parking area at the front of Boden House and the ramp to the roof top car park is temporary only and is only intended for access to utility services. However, this is not clear to your Petitioners from the published information and therefore future planning for the property is severely restricted.

11. The land is identified as land potentially required during construction and then as proposed railway sidings. Your Petitioners seek a written undertaking from the promoters of the Bill that access to the front and roof top car parking and services to Boden House will not be affected or impeded by the railway works either during construction or operation of the railway.

12. JP Boden & Co Ltd received assurances from the Promoter dated 3 February 2016 protecting Boden House's access and parking against HS2 works. Your Petitioners seek the same assurances from the Promoter.

13. Discussions are ongoing between Yours Petitioners and the Promoter, but these have not reached an agreement.

Length of compulsory purchase powers

14. The Bill seeks authorisation for the grant of compulsory purchase powers for a period of 5 years from the date when the Bill receives Royal Assent. The Bill further allows for this period to be extended for a further 5 years by the Secretary of State.

15. Your Petitioners consider that 10 years is too long a period of time for landowners to be subject to the threat of compulsory acquisition. Such threat will stall any development plans and could lead to vacant properties. It is submitted that the compulsory acquisition powers should be restricted to a period of 5 years only, with no potential for the period to be extended.

16. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clauses 4 to 10, 15 and those seeking to authorise the compulsory acquisition together with the deposited plans so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

17. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as
they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
The 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 Richard Guyatt of Bond Dickinson LLP as Agent for your 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 Quattro Holdings Limited  

 Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed acquisition of its interests in land pursuant to the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill’s (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) Clause 4 (Power to acquire land compulsorily) and Schedule 5 (Area: London Borough of Ealing; Number of land shown on deposited plans: plots 202, 203, 204, 222, 223, 224, 225, 227 and 229).  

2. The petitioners are QUATTRO HOLDINGS LIMITED (hereinafter referred to as “Your Petitioners”).  

3. Your Petitioners are the freehold owners of land comprising:  
   a. title number AGL214309 known as Black Arrow House on Chandos Road, Park Royal, NW10 6NF;  
   b. title number AGL75240 known as Websters Recycling Yard on Regency Street off Victoria Road, Park Royal, NW10; and  
   c. title number AGL72414 known as Neale’s Yard off Victoria Road, Park Royal, NW10 6NR, London.  

4. The Bill seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition of part of your Petitioner's interests at these properties.  

5. 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.  

6. Your Petitioners petitioned in the House of Commons, and received from the Promoter a Second House Undertaking dated 3 February 2016.
Acquisition of land at Black Arrow House

7. The Bill seeks to authorise the compulsory acquisition of part of the car parking area surrounding Black Arrow House, together with the foreground area of the property, for the purposes of the provision of the Railway and the road works from Old Oak Lane along Victoria Road. The 49 space surface car park services the 150 full time staff employed by the lessee JP Boden & Co Ltd within the 5 storey Black Arrow House office building which was fully refurbished in 2011 and acquisition of part of the car park area impairs the ability to provide adequate parking facilities for the size and nature of this office building. No alternative offering of car parking has been offered to Your Petitioners and without such car parking the building will be unable to operate at full capacity. The property is severely blighted and the prospect for leasing the property in the future has been greatly diminished.

8. The notice served on Your Petitioners fails to schedule JP Boden & Co Ltd (company number 02692601), Everything Everywhere Limited (company number 2382161) and Hutchison 3G UK Limited (company number 03885486) as lessees of Black Arrow House. The Bill poses a blight to the future occupation of the building without the car parking arrangements.

9. It is not clear to Your Petitioners from the published information whether the proposed compulsory acquisition of Black Arrow House will be permanent or temporary and therefore future planning for the property is severely restricted.

10. Your Petitioners have not been adequately informed by the promoters of the Bill of the clear purposes for the land and how long it is intended to be used for. From the published plans, it is not clear to Your Petitioners why the acquisition of this land at Black Arrow House is necessary.

11. Discussions with the promoters of the Bill have not shed any light on this.

12. Your Petitioners seek clarity from the promoters of the Bill of whether the land at Black Arrow House is sought to be acquired on a permanent or temporary basis.

13. If the land is to be acquired permanently, Your Petitioners seek that Black Arrow House be acquired in addition to the land currently identified for compulsory acquisition. This is as a result of the blight caused by the acquisition of the parking facilities serving this property which mean that the current tenants will be unlikely to renew their lease and it will be very difficult to attract new tenants to the building.

14. If the land is to be acquired only temporarily during construction, Your Petitioners seek a written undertaking for the provision of alternative similar car parking facilities in close proximity to Black Arrow House during
construction and on completion of the works the return of the land to its former condition, including any structures thereon.

15. Discussions between Your Petitioners and the Promoter are ongoing.

**Acquisition of land at Websters Recycling Yard and Neale's Yard**

16. The Bill seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition of a 2 acre Recycling Yard and concrete batching plant, together with the acquisition of the private access road known as Regency Street, and of Neale's Yard. The land is proposed to be acquired for the purposes of a construction compound.

17. *Websters Recycling Yard* is leased to Quattro (UK) Limited, a connected company of Quattro Holdings Ltd. The yard is in use 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and is used to recycle an average of 450,000 tonnes of material per year. This Recycling Yard is the only facility provided in a 3 miles radius and is clearly a well-used function. Quattro (UK) Limited employs 125 full time drivers and maintenance staff at the yard and 15 full time office staff to support the yard. Your Petitioners are not aware of any proposals to re-provide this important community function.

18. Again, it is not clear to Your Petitioners from the published information whether the proposed compulsory acquisition of the Recycling Yard will be permanent or temporary and therefore future planning for the property is severely restricted.

19. Discussions with the promoters of the Bill have not shed any light on this.

20. Your Petitioners seek a written undertaking from the promoters of the Bill that prior to the compulsory acquisition of any interests at *Websters Recycling Yard and Neale's Yard*, alternative suitable sites to which Your Petitioners' existing operations could be transferred will be acquired within the Borough of Ealing together with the necessary infrastructure installed. This is vital to allow continuation of Your Petitioners' operations at the Recycling Yard and Neale's Yard, and to avoid the closure of this valued business and significant redundancies as a result.

**Length of compulsory purchase powers**

21. The Bill seeks authorisation for the grant of compulsory purchase powers for a period of 5 years from the date when the Bill received Royal Assent. The Bill further allows for this period to be extended for a further 5 years by the Secretary of State.

22. Your Petitioners consider that 10 years is too long a period of time for landowners to be subject to the threat of compulsory acquisition. Such threat will stall any development plans and could lead to vacant properties. It is
submitted that compulsory acquisition powers should be restricted to a period of 5 years only, with no potential for the period to be extended.

23. For the foregoing and connected reasons Your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clauses 4 to 10, 15 and those seeking to authorise the compulsory acquisition together with the deposited plans so far affecting Your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

24. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect Your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect Your Petitioners.
The 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 Richard Guyatt of Bond Dickinson LLP as Agent for your 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 Thomas James and Eamon O’Loughlin

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the proposed acquisition of interests in land pursuant to the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill's (hereinafter referred to as "the Bill") Clause 4 (Power to acquire land compulsorily) and Schedule 5, pursuant to which the petitioner’s access to land in which it has an interest is threatened.

Your petitioner

2. The petitioners are Thomas James and Eamon O’Loughlin (hereinafter referred to as "Your Petitioners").

3. Your Petitioners are the freehold owners of land comprising title number AGL139308 known as the Coach Park Site, Atlas Road, Park Royal, NW10. The Bill (following House of Commons Additional Provision 2) no longer seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition of your Petitioners’ interests at this property. However, the Bill does propose the compulsory acquisition of land comprising Atlas Road which gives access to Your Petitioners’ land.

4. Thereby 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.

5. The Bill’s provisions for the compulsory acquisition of land comprising the highway giving access to Your Petitioners’ land would remove rights of access to and from that land. This would be of significant detrimental effect on Your Petitioners’ use of the land, and Your Petitioners seek assurances from the Promoter to preserve their permanent and unfettered right of access for all reasonable purposes.

6. Discussions are ongoing between Your Petitioners and the Promoter to resolve this issue, but have not yet achieved the assurances sought by Your Petitioners.
7. Your Petitioners petitioned in the House of Commons, and received from the Promoter a Second House Undertaking dated 3 February 2016.

Length of compulsory purchase powers

8. The Bill seeks authorisation for the grant of compulsory purchase powers for a period of 5 years from the date when the Bill receives Royal Assent. The Bill further allows for this period to be extended for a further 5 years by the Secretary of State.

9. Your Petitioners consider that 10 years is too long a period of time for landowners directly affected by the Bill to be subject to direct effects of compulsory acquisition. Such threat will stall any development plans and could lead to vacant properties. It is submitted that the compulsory acquisition powers should be restricted to a period of 5 years only, with no potential for the period to be extended.

10. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, the Bill’s clauses for compulsory acquisition together with the deposited plans so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

11. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.
The 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 Richard Guyatt of Bond Dickinson LLP as Agent for your Petitioner

18 April 2016
IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015-2016

PETITION AGAINST HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF RICHARD BOULTON

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

2. The petitioner lives at Barn Farm, Bromley Hayes, Lichfield, Staffordshire which he understands is the first property to be affected by Phase 2a. Your petitioner is submitting a petition at this stage as inevitably when Phase 1 goes ahead phase 2a will follow.

He has a small farm of 106 acres which is directly in the path of the proposed rail and will be decimated if it goes ahead. Your petitioner heard about this via the internet and within 2 days had a letter advising of the possibility of compulsory purchase. The proposed line splits the farm in 2 and even more devastating is the fact that it goes within initially 40 metres of the house and buildings at an elevation of 5 metres. This, at the moment, has been moved to 65 metres away which may take your petitioners homestead out of the compulsory purchase zone which is potentially even worse as it will be completely untenable to live there. Your petitioner is 68 years old and 3 generations of his family have lived on the farm. Since the age of 15 your petitioner has worked full time on the farm living with his parents until their deaths 21 and 20 years ago. Your petitioner routinely worked from 4.00am to 7.00pm, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year with
no holidays and little pay. The reward for this was to eventually be able to own
the farm. It was a dairy farm so the work was highly routine and relentless. For
many years the farm lacked basic amenities; electricity and indoor sanitation
which made life much harder. Since his parent’s deaths the petitioner has
modernised the farm which has been a real uphill struggle. It is now a beautiful,
comfortable home with a good set of buildings. 9 years ago his petitioner
stopped producing milk concentrating on beef production and the workload has
finally decreased to manageable proportions. The petitioner had thought that he
was finally achieving some reward for many years of back breaking work and
commitment. You can imagine, perhaps, how devastated the petitioner is by the
proposed rail which has had a serious and ongoing impact on his daily existence,
health, business plans etc and has thrown everything into a state of uncertainty.

3. The proximity of the house and buildings to the line is also unclear having
received letters advising that it is 40 metres and 65 metres away respectively.
On a practical, day to day level, the fact is that the line will sever the land and the
lane on which the farm is located which means that there will have no direct
access to a third of the farm other than a 3 mile round trip, and it will also have
an enormous impact on access to the farm generally. The journey to Lichfield,
the petitioner’s local town, will become 7 miles rather than 4. There is also the
question of disruption to underground drainage etc.

Given the proposed elevation as the line passes the farm, the petitioner is
assuming that the ground reprofiling will take up more land but it also means
living facing a large embankment at very close proximity. More generally the
reprofiling along the line is going to take up very valuable agricultural land.
The Petitioner and their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the
Bill, to which the petitioner objects for the following reasons.

This proposed scheme will destroy the petitioner’s farm, homestead, livelihood and
way of life. The farm will no longer be viable and has already effectively become
worthless. The petitioner has dedicated his life to the farm and business. The
petitioner’s health has already significantly deteriorated, with a serious, ongoing
physical illness which is necessitating hospital treatment.

The Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker to
do construction works which will take many years to complete and will decimate the
petitioners daily life with huge disruption, 24 hour working etc.

The compulsory purchase schemes are complex and unlikely to achieve the principle
of putting the petitioner back in the position he would have been in if it weren’t for
the proposed line. The petitioner has serious concerns about the nature scope of the
proposed compulsory purchase powers, timing of payments etc which is particularly concerning given that the farm's value has already been decimated.

The Petitioner objects to the powers that are proposed to be provided by the Bill to the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker and respectfully submits that the Bill should be amended or undertakings should be required so that HS2 Limited, the Secretary of State and/or the Nominated Undertaker must review the construction strategy for the project and its related works by considering their cumulative impacts on communities. They need to suggest necessary changes from the results of that review before works design and construction strategies have been finalised or construction contractors employed.

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

4. THE PETITIONER therefore asks the House of Lords that his agent, in accordance with the rules and standing orders of the House, be given the opportunity to give evidence on the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains

Richard Boulton

Sylvia Gristock (Sister)
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF [the Boatyard Residents, namely, 
Tony Tucker 
John Goatley 
Steve Bullas 
Rachel Harvey 
Nadja Daehnke 
Hugo Vaughan 
Joseph Rodger 
Mike Collis 
Laura Skinner 
Sharon Burke 
Paula Entwisle 
Philip Thomson 
Anthony Todd 
Dan Davies 
Darren Jackson 
Laurence Bugeon 
Franze Progatzky 
Niel K Bolsom 
John Bolsom 
Stuart Silver 
Phil Wyatt 
Geoff Price 
Ross Armor 
Matthew Skeaping 
Harriet Grindley 
Jan Treweek 
Helen Lawson 
Adrian Armstrong 
Tom Groves 
Leo Winslow
Geraldine Zanaska
Sarah Clarke
Laura Price
Felicity Amor

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Additional Provision 4 (October 2015)

2. Your petitioner

The petitioners are The Boatyard Residents, the Owners and Inhabitants of 45 dwellings at The Boatyard, Mansion Lane, Iver, Buckinghamshire, SL09RG, directly North of the proposed Heathrow Express rail yard at Langley, who are directly and specially affected by Additional Provision 4. The dwellings on this site are narrowboats, barges and static caravans sited on residential moorings and residential plots and are the permanent long-term homes of 70 people. The petitioners' homes will be seriously impacted by the provisions as they stand and agents for the project have repeatedly failed to recognise that the majority of the narrowboats upon the canal at the High Line Yachting Boatyard are residential, pay council tax to South Bucks Council, consume grid electricity and are in all other legal respects, including Canal and River Trust status, residential. As a consequence, not only were residents not notified of potential impacts in the same manner as nearby residents in brick and mortar homes, but activities deemed high impact and intended to be carried out more than 100m from residential areas will, under the current proposal, take place closer than this to the canal homes. The residents of these homes ask to be given equal consideration to other residents affected by the plan, in accordance with their residential status.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your petitioners have given evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee and as a consequence has gained proper recognition. A list of individual dwellings has now been sent to the promoters. Nevertheless your petitioners have some serious remaining concerns.

Relocation of the residents during construction work.

In house of Commons your petitioners have been given guarantees that they will be relocated for an expected minimum of 6 months and according to their “special needs” (as stated by the Promoter). Hotel accommodation was mentioned in this connection, but it is not seen as a viable option by your petitioners. The promoter is asked to give the petitioners clear details of how they intend to manage any relocation to ensure that there is no undue disruption to their working and personal lives. A number of residents have young children, pets and local obligations and as
such require continued access to local schools, amenities and the community. Relocation away from the community they are part of will be deleterious to their quality of life.

Compensations

Your petitioners ask that appropriate compensation be considered to mitigate any negative financial and quality-of-life repercussions of the project during both its construction and working phases. Residents’ concerns regarding quality-of-life impacts during construction are outlined in the ‘relocation’ section above. Additionally, residents’ quality of life is liable to be affected after construction by the increased noise and light pollution, alterations to local access and increased local traffic loads associated with a busy train depot and train line. These concerns are also likely to have a negative effect on the on-mooring value of residents’ boats, just as brick-and-mortar properties are expected to decline in value in locations close to the main HS2 line and associated works. Other potential financial impacts include the possibility of extra costs to the residents relating to relocation during construction, for instance from increases in the distance and cost of travel to local schools and amenities.

Community Engagement

Your petitioners are disappointed that there has been no effort to engage with the residents most affected by the proposals. Thus it has not been possible for the residents who live directly by the proposed site (i.e. on the canal) to have any input into the development of the proposals, unlike the situation elsewhere along the route. We ask that this situation is rectified as soon as possible.
4. The prayer

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that the Council, 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.

Signed:

Mr. A.S. Tucker
Mr. J. Goatley
Mr. S. Bullas
Miss R. Harvey
H. Daugton
A. Dachene
J. Roger
M. Collis
L. Skinner
S. Burke
P. Entwistle
G. Thomson
A. Todd
D. Davies
N. Mathew
Signatures (cont.)

Dr Laurence Bugeon
Dr Frantisek Pogatzky
Wendy Bolton
John Bolson
Martin Bullock
Phil Browne
C Gray
A Cross
Matthew Skeaping
Nigel Gilley
Pat Treasure
HELEN LAWSON
Adrian Armstrong
Tom Jones
Leo Armstrong
Gwendoline Armstrong
Simon Clarke
Laura Prince
Felicity Francis

Date: 17/04/16
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS

SESSION 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Terence Patrick Ewing

Declares that:

1. The Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the provisions of the whole Bill, but especially Compulsory acquisition of land, clauses 4-10, Extinction and exclusion of rights over land, clauses 12-19, Planning, clauses 20-22, Deregulation, clauses 25-36, Railway matters, clauses 38-43, Regeneration, reinstatement and environmental works, clauses 48-50, Further high speed rail works, clauses 52-54, Grants, clause 55, Deposited plans and sections, clauses 60-62, Miscellaneous, clause 62, Final, clause 68, schedule 1, scheduled works, regarding the London Borough of Camden, schedule 4, Table 1 relating to Part 2 of schedule, relating to the London Borough of Camden, Table 3, relating to the London Borough of Camden, schedule 5, Acquisition of land for particular purposes, relating to the London Borough of Camden, schedule 7, Acquisition of rights in land: Power to impose Restrictive Covenants, relating to the London Borough of Camden, schedule 8, Land in which only rights may be acquired compulsorily, regarding the London Borough of Camden, schedule 11, Restriction of power of compulsory acquisition to land under the surface, regarding the London Borough of Camden, schedule 12, Highways: Restrictions on powers to use subsoil and acquire land, regarding the London Borough of Camden, schedule 16, Part 4, Land which may be occupied and used for construction of works, regarding the London Borough of Camden, schedule 17, Conditions of deemed planning permission, schedule 18, Listed Buildings, Table I, regarding the London Borough of Camden, County of Buckinghamshire, County of Northamptonshire, City of Birmingham, Metropolitan Borough of Solihull, County of Warwickshire, County of Staffordshire., Table II, London Borough of Camden, London Borough of Brent, London Borough of Ealing, Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea, City of Westminster, London Borough of Hillingdon, County of
Buckinghamshire, County of Northamptonshire, County of Warwickshire, City of Birmingham, Metropolitan Borough of Solihull.

2. The Petitioner is therefore concerned regarding the proposed redevelopment of Euston Station and its environs, the route of the proposed railway through the London Borough of Camden, and in particular, the proposed route through Euston and Camden Town, Parkway and Chalk Farm until the border with Brent and its environmental effects and all related matters thereby, as well as the listed buildings along the whole route of the proposed line to Birmingham.

Your Petitioner

3. Your Petitioner is a resident of the London Borough of Camden and has been involved in environmental issues and challenges within that borough and elsewhere.

Your Petitioner's concerns

Introductory

Standing of Petitioners

4. Your Petitioner is concerned at the limited test for standing for the lodging of Petitions opposing the proposals for both the Euston Station proposed redevelopment and the HS2 scheme in general.

5. The current Parliamentary Standing Orders of the House seem to *prima facie* have imposed an overtly limited and restrictive test that the Petitioner must be "directly affected" by either the proposals for both the Euston Station proposed redevelopment and the HS2 scheme in general.

6. However, this test may not be compliant with articles 2.5, 6 and 7 of the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, (the Aarhus Convention) as incorporated into EU law under the now consolidated Directive 2011/92/EU as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU4.
7. For the definition of “The public”, see article 2.4 of the Aarhus Convention, and “The public concerned”, see article 2.5 of the Aarhus Convention and article 1(d) and (e) of Directive 2011/92/EU.

8. This test is applied further in articles 6 and 7 of the Aarhus Convention relating to the requirements for “Public participation in environmental decisions on specific activities” as set out in article 6.1-11, and/or also “Public participation concerning plans, programs and policies relating to the environment” as set out in article 7, and again made applicable to this Bill under articles 6.2-7 and 7 of Directive 2011/92/EU as applied by section 2(1) of the European Communities Act 1972.

9. Whilst your Petitioner accept that the test of “directly affected” would satisfy the “public affected or likely to be affected” test in the first limb of article 2.5 of the Aarhus Convention, and article 1(d) and (e) of Directive 2011/92/EU, it would appear not to satisfy the test of “having an interest in, the environmental decision-making”.

10. It is contended that this latter test enables both individuals and organisations that although may not be “directly affected” by an environmental decision, may have a more general interest in the “environmental decision-making” of public bodies.

11. Your Petitioner contends that they satisfy the definition of “The public” in article 2.4 of the Aarhus Convention and “The public concerned” in article 2.5 of the Aarhus Convention and article 1(d) and (e) of Directive 2011/92/EU, as “having an interest in, the environmental decision-making” relating to this Bill, being a resident of the London Borough of Camden and being a person “having an interest in, the environmental decision-making” concerning Euston Station and the proposed route through the London Borough of Camden accordingly.

12. “Public authority” is defined in article 2.2(a), (b) and (c) of the Aarhus Convention and article 1(f) of Directive 2011/92/EU, although referred to as the “competent authority that the Member State has “designated as responsible for performing the duties arising from this Directive.

13. Your Petitioner contends that this definition clearly would cover both Government at a national level under article 2.2(a) of the Aarhus Convention and the present
functions of this Honourable House under this Hybrid Bill when examining Petitions under article 2.2(b) and/or (c) of the Aarhus Convention and article 1(d) and (e) of Directive 2011/92/EU.

14. Your Petitioner raised the compatibility of the Hybrid Bill procedure before the Aarhus Compliance Committee in ACCC/C/2011/61, but the Committee left the matter open in their determination dated 23 October 2013, leaving it to be decided by the domestic court if the matter later arose for determination.

15. During the hearing of that application, Mr. James Maurici QC appearing on behalf of the United Kingdom stated that all persons who deposited Petitions under the Hybrid Bill procedure would be heard.

16. Your Petitioner is therefore concerned that a number of Petitioners were refused permission to present their Petitions before the House of Commons Select Committee, purportedly on standing grounds.

17. Your Petitioner believes that this was in breach of the principles of environmental justice and the definitions of “The public” in article 2.4 of the Aarhus Convention and “The public concerned” in article 2.5 of the Aarhus Convention and article 1(d) and (e) of Directive 2011/92/EU.

18. Your Petitioner is therefore particularly keen to have the current Hybrid Bill procedures applied during the passage of this Bill examined by the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee.

19. Your Petitioner submits that your Honourable House should therefore investigate whether the current standing test of “directly affected” needs to be amended and whether it currently would be compliant with the requirements of article 2.5 of the Aarhus Convention and article 1(e) of Directive 2011/92/EU in order to ascertain whether it has been Aarhus Convention compliant and also compliant with EU law, and if not how that may be remedied before your Honourable House.
Conduct of the Petitions regarding HS2 in the House of Lords Select Committee

20. Regarding pursuing objections to HS2, your Petitioner is mindful of mistakes and errors made during the passage of the Cross Rail Bill and wishes to see that all objectors are allowed to proceed with their Petitions and that none are withdrawn.

21. It may be that with the Cross Rail Bill, again a too narrow a test was imposed to allow Petitions to be heard, and your Petitioner therefore hope for the reasons already stated that this can be rectified.

22. For instance, during the progress of the Cross Rail Committee of your Honourable House hearing Petitions, it appears that one or two were withdrawn, for instance regarding Tottenham Court Road.

23. No explanation as to why this occurred has been given, but it is clear that legitimate objections to the demolition of the Astoria theatre and the adjoining terrace on the corner of Charing Cross Road and Tottenham Court Road weren’t fully explored.

24. Your Petitioner believe that this should have been thoroughly examined by your Honourable House to see whether those buildings could have been saved and incorporated into the designs for the new Tottenham Court Road station.

25. Similarly at Paddington Station, Grade I listed and designed by Isambard Kingdom Brunel, your Petitioner is concerned to see that the House of Commons Select Committee didn’t appear to have explored other options rather than approve the new scheme being constructed next to Paddington Station at Eastbourne Terrace.

26. Your Petitioner is certainly a supporter of the Cross Rail scheme that unlike HS2, will bring much needed social and economic and transport benefits to the capital, but feels that there are a number of issues such as Tottenham Court Road and Paddington that could have been handled more thoroughly and far better.

27. Your Petitioner is therefore keen to ensure that similar errors and mistakes don’t take place during the passage of the current Bill if the scheme is to proceed.

28. Concerns have also been raised by Peers during the 2nd Reading of the HS2 Bill in your Lordship’s House as to the manner that HS2 have been handling requests for
information from objectors, along with the general lack of consultation with the community and certainly in the London Borough of Camden concerning the Euston Station development plans and the route and environmental protection measures to be implemented.

29. Your Petitioner therefore has grave concerns as to the lack of information and proper consultation emanating from High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. and would request that your Honourable House imposes clear duties on High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. to provide all relevant information to objectors and fully consult with the community regarding all aspects of its plans within the London Borough of Camden.

30. One of the peers also commented that it would be a great shame if the scheme was hurried at this moment with some make do solutions that only lead to remedial measures having to be taken within the coming years to rectify mistakes that could and should have been ironed out at the drawing board stage.

31. Lord Berkeley and other members of your Honourable House also supported these comments during the 2nd Reading debate.

32. These sentiments are echoed by both the London Borough of Camden in their Petition and other campaign groups within the borough, and your Petitioner therefore urge your Honourable House to ensure that there are sufficient measures in the Bill for provision of full information to be provided to the community regarding all aspects of HS2’s proposals and that it interacts with the community in providing solutions to objections and provides requested information promptly.

33. Your Honourable House should also be aware that there are several matters pending before both the Information Commissioner and the 1st Tier Tribunal (Information Rights) regarding High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. and the Secretary of State’s refusal to provide access to relevant documents, including the Major Project Reports for 2012-2015.

34. In addition, peers also raised concerns during the 2nd Reading debate on 14th April 2016 regarding the handling of objectors and their concerns by the House of Commons Select Committee hearing the Petitions in that House.
35. Hopes were also expressed that your Honourable House would deal with objectors fairly and listen and take on board their environmental and other concerns and ensure that full responses and answers were forthcoming from High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd.

36. Peers also expressed concerns that the House of Commons Select Committee were also tending to blindly accept everything that HS2 informed them and to rubber stamp their views, including Lord Berkeley and Lord Turnbull.

37. In particular, Lord Berkeley, supported by Baroness Randerson suggested that your Honourable House appoint a special technical adviser to the House of Lords Select Committee to advise on environmental and technical matters as a level playing field between High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. and objectors.

38. They also hoped that your Honourable House would conduct its Petitions hearing procedures far more professionally and adequately, and your Petitioner therefore hopes that this will prove to be the case in accordance with the long and honourable traditions of your Honourable House in such matters.

**General opposition regarding HS2 and plans for the London Borough of Camden**

39. Your Petitioner as a resident of the London Borough of Camden is strongly opposed to the decision to construct the HS2 railway line with a terminus station at Euston because of the devastating impact the construction and operation of the line will bring to parts of the borough, which no amount of mitigation or compensation can address.

40. Across the borough, the proposals will include demolition of 223 homes (including 136 units of social housing in the Euston area), and over 62 businesses will be forced to close or relocate due to demolition with 242 businesses located within the safeguarded area and many hundreds of additional homes and businesses put at risk due to their proximity to the proposed line, a negative impact on local schools, the loss of open spaces and community facilities, and demolition of listed buildings.

41. Your Petitioner is therefore lodging objections in respect of all aspects of the implementation of this Bill and the proposals for the proposed redevelopment of Euston Station and the HS2 scheme generally.
42. In addition to the impact around Euston, tunnelling is also proposed to go through parts of the borough and as a result two ventilation shafts would need to be built within the borough at Alexandra Place and Adelaide Road, in respect of which your Petitioner objects in its entirety.

43. Your Petitioner like other campaign groups, believes the London Borough of Camden and its environment will be unnecessarily injuriously affected by the proposed plans for Euston Station and generally in the borough, unless measures are implemented in an attempt to mitigate the impact of the proposed works, and the plans are substantially amended accordingly, in particular to permit community involvement with full consultation accordingly.

**The proposed plans for Euston Station**

44. Your Petitioner fully concurs with all of the submissions made by other campaign groups regarding the temporary citing of the West Coast mainline terminus at Old Oak Common in order to enable effective consultation to take place regarding the future plans for Euston Station.

45. Your Petitioner objects to the implementation of the current plans to extend the station **environments** to include the 13 additional platforms over and beyond Melton Street, with the loss of St James’s Gardens and the loss of homes including several listed buildings such as 14-15 Melton Street, the removal of railings and Grade II listed structures in St. James’s Gardens and other structures and monuments in Euston Square Gardens, although relocated, and the unlisted underground station in Melton Street and other surrounding buildings.

46. Your Petitioner contends that the case hasn’t been made out for the rebuilding of Euston Station over the current footprint, and that all other options have not been adequately or sufficiently explored.

47. Your Petitioner is concerned that before the House of Commons Select Committee, its members appeared for the most part not to have explored other options an blindly accepted and thereby rubber stamped all of High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd.’s explanations for the necessity of extending the footprint of Euston Station, notwithstanding the issues and arguments raised by other campaign groups.
48. Your Petitioner also contends that the case for 13 additional platforms hasn’t been made out, and High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. has given no satisfactory explanation for requiring this number of platforms or extending the station footprint.

49. It appears from the vague plans that have so far been put forward by High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd., without proper consultation and the involvement of the community in the London Borough of Camden, that the majority of additional space is for offices and shops, and it would appear that the extension over and beyond Melton Street is purely for the building of a glorified shopping mall.

50. This appears to be at the expense of the local community and is being built purely for profit and is totally unacceptable.

51. Your Petitioner also fully concur with other campaigning groups regarding the complete lack of consultation with the local community as to the viability of the proposed redevelopment of Euston Station, and the complete lack of opportunity for input by the local community regarding the proposed redevelopment.

52. This may by itself be a serious breach of article 5 of the Aarhus Convention regarding the “collection and dissemination of environmental information, and/or also involvement of the general public concerning matters affecting the environment in breach of article 6 and annex 1 paragraph 20 of the Aarhus Convention, being a matter requiring an environmental assessment, and/or further article 7 of the Aarhus Convention relating to “public participation concerning plans, programmes and policies relating to the environment”.

53. Your Petitioner also refers your Honourable House to the provisions of articles 6.2-7 and 7 of Directive 2011/92/EU as applied by section 2(1) of the European Communities Act 1972.

54. Your Petitioner therefore requests your Honourable House to enact measures in the Bill to ensure proper consultation by High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. with the local community and also to provide full details of all of their proposals and to engage with the community throughout the whole planning process accordingly.
55. Your Petitioner also objects the piecemeal development of Euston Station being currently proposed, and would contend that either the station is totally redeveloped or it isn’t.

56. The opportunity to create a landmark building and terminus worthy of the HS2 scheme and the capital city of the UK is being squandered on make do and mend principles, and appears to be cost cutting solutions at every juncture.

57. Your Petitioner submits that there are other options available to utilise the present footprint of Euston Station, by either building the new platforms underground, where there is already a large car park, or extending it further to the present bus terminus and concourse.

58. Equally, there would appear to be large spaces between the current platforms that in a number of cases are extremely wide, and there is space to construct additional platforms within the confines of the current station by reducing the width of the platforms, particularly on the Melton Street side and also the Eversholt Street side as well.

59. Additionally, there are large unused spaced above the current platforms and also the present inside entrance concourse that could be used for additional platforms, or the building of additional office and commercial and office space if so required.

60. There has also been very little information regarding all of these options so far published by High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. who have veiled themselves in an unnecessary cloak of secrecy regarding the justification for their current misconceived proposals.

61. Your Petitioner submits that the proposed outline design for the new Euston station are uninspired and of poor quality design, consisting of an airport style façade of supermarket genre, with unrelated shoebox style additions on either side.

62. In particular, in an attempt to sex up the proposed design, the designers have incorporated an uninspired conch style shell roof that bears no relationship whatsoever to the remainder of the composition.
63. The opportunity to incorporate a design of the highest quality by a leading architect in conjunction with the local community has been completely lost with the present make shift plans.

64. In other locations, such as Birmingham New Street, and the new Reading Station, the opportunity has been take to create landmark station buildings of high qualify, and in the case of Reading Station to incorporate the original heritage 1860’s station building into the new design.

65. It is also to be noted that the existing footprints of those stations were utilised without the necessity to extend the area of the stations unnecessarily, as with the present scheme.

66. Another example has been the Berlin Hauptbahnhof, where a modern station has been created of the highest architectural style and quality worthy of a leading European capital city, consisting of multi floored platforms and other stylish innovations.

67. The present proposals may also lead to the loss of the National Temperance Hospital building that could be utilised and converted in its present state without unnecessary demolition at all if required for office and administration facilities.

68. However, it doesn’t appear to be listed in the buildings scheduled for demolition in the current Bill, and your Honourable House is requested to seek clarification regarding the plans for that building.

69. The community are as a result understandably angry and outraged at the present lacklustre and uninspired proposals and the resultant missed opportunity for a scheme of the highest quality worthy of our capital city.

70. In the premises, London deserves better than this, as does the scheme itself, and your Petitioner therefore invites your Honourable House to completely reject the proposed plans for Euston Station and environs as proposed in the current Bill in its present form.
The proposed route and plans for the line through the London Borough of Camden

71. Your Petitioner objects to the current proposed route of the line through Camden Town, Parkway and Chalk Farm.

72. Your Petitioner again contends that the case hasn’t been made out for the present plans for the line through the London Borough of Camden, and that all other options have not been adequately or sufficiently explored.

73. Your Petitioner is again concerned that before the House of Commons Select Committee, its members appeared for the most part not to have explored other options and blindly accepted and thereby rubber stamped all of High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd.’s explanations for the necessity of extending the footprint of Euston Station, notwithstanding the issues and arguments raised by other campaign groups.

74. Your Petitioner fully concurs with the views expressed by Lord Berkeley both during the debate during the Bill’s 2nd Reading on 14th April 2016 and his expressed views generally regarding the complete failure of High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. to explore and adequately consider alternative solutions and routes.

75. Your Petitioner further fully supports the proposed alternative tunnel route proposed by Lord Berkeley and would argue that this provides a solution which avoids all of the proposed environmental damage within the London Borough of Camden.

76. Your Petitioner draws your Honourable House’s attention to the solutions reached regarding HS1 and the tunnel from Kings’ Cross to Ebbsfleet with the majority of the line tunnelled under east London, and therefore avoiding the mass demolitions and above ground engineering works that would have been necessary otherwise.

77. In addition, the final adoption of the east London route also avoided the environmental damage and demolition of homes that would have been necessary had the route adopted the south easterly route via Peckham and its environs to the former Waterloo terminus that was originally proposed by the promoters of that particular scheme.
78. Your Petitioner laments the complete lack of vision from the current Secretary of State regarding the proposed present route, and the fact that he appears to have allowed High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. carte blanche to carry out whatever scheme they want, unlike the former Secretary of State at the time of HS1, the Rt. Honourable Michael Heseltine as he then was.

79. In addition, your Petitioner would urge your Honourable House to take on board all of the views and evidence of other campaigners, including the Cutting Group relating to the unnecessary demolition of the Camden Town Cutting and related structures, and the environmental damage that will be caused to the surrounding community along the route, including the residents of Harrington Square who will suffer years of inconvenience from lorries removing spoils from the proposed works and also Parkway and its environs.

80. Your Petitioner would urge your Honourable House to request High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. to consider other alternative schemes, even if the Lord Berkeley scheme may eventually prove to be unviable, although your Petitioner fully supports its alternative suggestions.

81. Your Petitioner considers that underground tunnelling could be effected outside Euston Station to carry the line to the Brent border and possibly beyond, under the route of the existing line.

82. Alternatively your Petitioner considers that other options for tunnelling to the side of the existing line in the cutting leading to Parkway could also be considered as an option.

83. Your Petitioner would also draw to your Honourable House the long cutting wall on the Euston side of the Mornington Street railway bridge and immediately afterwards, which would give ample opportunity of constructing a tunnel entrance to take the proposed line underground at that stage, rather than leaving it until Parkway tunnel as presently proposed.

84. Your Petitioner also draws to your Honourable House the current engineering expertise that is available to construct tunnels that have been demonstrated with the
Channel Tunnel itself and HS2 1, and which is also being applied so well with the construction of Cross Rail.

85. Therefore, your Petitioner would submit that HS2’s arguments that more extensive tunnelling isn’t possible or practicable isn’t correct, and indeed if it were adopted would be far more convenient and efficient than the current above ground proposals.

86. Additionally, your Petitioner considers that other options may be viable including using the current existing track area to run the new tracks, which will only be two sets of tracks along that route, as is currently the case with HS1.

87. It is also to be noted that the current route of the West Coast Mainline from Euston to Parkway tunnel is fairly straight and would lend itself to having fast running tracks replacing some existing ones very easily, although possibly at the expense of local services, although these could still run on the remaining existing lines.

88. In the event that the present scheme is approved by your Honourable House, your Petitioner would further seek guarantees from High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. regarding environmental protection for the residents of Harrington Square and its proposed use for the removal of waste and spoils during the long construction phase of the scheme.

89. Your Petitioner also has concerns regarding the current proposed sites of the ventilation shafts at Adelaide Nature Reserve, causing further environmental damage, along with Alexandra Place and would urge that further environmental protection measures be incorporated into the Bill in the event that the present proposed route is constructed.

**High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd.’s Environmental Statements**

90. Your Petitioner has serious concerns regarding the adequacy of High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd.’s Environmental Statements, which your Petitioner considers to be inadequate.

91. Your Petitioner therefore requests that for the purpose of the proceedings in your Honourable House, an independent technical adviser is appointed to deal with the engineering and environmental issues that arise regarding both the redevelopment of Euston Station and the proposed route through the London Borough of Camden.
92. This would ensure a level playing field between High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. and the various campaign groups and individual objectors, not only within the borough, but also throughout the length of the proposed route to Birmingham.

93. Your Petitioner would also urge that an updated Environmental Statement, as an Environmental Impact Assessment is referred to in the Bill, be directed that fully accords with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 and articles 2-5 of Directive 2011/92/EU.

94. Your Petitioner contends that the present Environmental Statements are vague and inadequate and don’t adequately address all of the environmental issues concerned with the proposed redevelopment of Euston Station or the route of the line within the London Borough of Camden.

95. Your Petitioner also objects to the disabling of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 regarding 22 Melton Street and 40 Melton Street in the London Borough of Camden in clause 62(2)(a)(b) of the Bill, as no adequate evidence has so far been provided for such an exemption.

96. In any event, these issues are related to the proposed extension of Euston Station beyond the present footprint, and your Petitioner contends that all parts of this proposed scheme should be the subject of any revised Environmental Statement.

97. In any event, your Petitioner would contend that it is unlawful to seek to disable any application of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 and articles 2-5 of Directive 2011/92/EU, as these provisions being mandatory EU law cannot be disabled.

98. Whether an Environmental Impact Statement is required for any particular part of the project is entirely a matter for individual assessment, but cannot in your Petitioner’s submission be completely disabled.
Heritage preservation issues regarding the proposed outline design of the new Euston Station and route of the proposed new line through the London Borough of Camden

99. Your Petitioner has serious concerns regarding the proposed demolition and alteration of a number of heritage assets near the environs of the proposed development, including some listed structures.

100. As with the previous scheme, it is proposed that a number of heritage assets would be demolished, including and 1 Melton Street.

101. In particular, your Petitioner objects to the removal and/or demolition of the following:

(a) St. James Gardens: An important green open space of heritage value (on the draft Local List). The gardens are on the site of the 18th and 19th St James Burial Ground and former St James Chapel, contain three Grade II listed monuments and may contain over 50,000 burials. The heritage assets that will be removed here should be stored in a secure, dry environment in or near the borough and reinstated like-for-like within the remaining portion of St James Gardens once construction is completed or, if that is not achievable, in an appropriate location to be agreed with Camden Council;

(b) Total demolition of two Grade II listed buildings at 14-15 Melton Street; 1-3 Cobourg Street (on draft Local List) and a number of other properties on Camden Council’s Petition draft local list, including the National Temperance Hospital, and the piers of Mornington Street Bridge (grade II listed);

(c) Alterations to Euston Square Gardens protected under the London Squares Preservation Act, 1931, which also contains Grade II listed structures being boundary railings and the war memorial.

(d) Other large number of heritage assets in the Borough that may also be indirectly affected by the construction of the works under the Bill. For example Park Village East contains 17 grade II* listed buildings which may be impacted by construction activities associated with the demolition of the Park Village East railway retaining wall, the associated underpinning works and the retaining wall
replacement works. The ES contained no assessment in relation to these listed buildings.

102. Your Petitioner considers that this is both short sighted and without justification and fails to satisfy the current tests for demolition under national planning law and policies.

103. In particular, your Petitioner is concerned that no evidence or justification has been given to your Honourable House as to the reasons for these demolitions or that they are absolutely necessary for the scheme to proceed without them.

104. It would seem therefore that the mistakes connected with the original demolition of the Euston Arch and Euston Station in the early 1960’s are again being perpetrated in the context of the present proposed scheme, without any consultation or lawful justification.

105. In particular, the Grade II listed buildings at 14-15 Melton Street would be a major loss of a heritage asset, as part of the original buildings that were in situ before the demolition of Euston Station in the early 1960’s.

106. In addition, no justification appears to be given for the demolition of the road bridges to the north of the present station, as this cannot have any bearing on the rebuilding of the station itself and appears to be totally unnecessary for the carrying out of the proposed scheme.

107. In addition, the loss of St. James Gardens is to be regretted and is also avoidable, as the scheme for these additional platforms seems ill conceived and totally unnecessary.

108. Likewise the deprivation of the use of Euston Square Gardens for the duration of the building works associated with the scheme have been ill thought out and unjustified.

109. In addition, further damage to the cutting and tunnel entrances appears to be proposed, which again appear unnecessary and unjustified.

110. Your Petitioner would urge that your Honourable House require the developers to provide concrete and un-rebuttable evidence that the damage to heritage assets and
the total demolition of heritage assets where proposed cannot be avoided and is absolutely necessary which is required under the current National Planning Policy Framework “Conserving and enhancing the historic environment” at paragraphs 126-141 to justify demolition.

111. In addition, your Petitioner would urge that in the event of demolitions having to proceed of listed buildings and structures, that they are all relocated and rebuilt elsewhere, as occurred where possible along the line of HS1.

112. Your Petitioner doesn’t accept the arguments put forward by High Speed 2 (HS2) Ltd. that such relocation and rebuilding wouldn’t be possible or feasible.

113. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submit that, unless the Provisions to the Bill are substantially revised and amended, so far affecting your Petitioner, should not be allowed to pass into law.

**Heritage preservation issues regarding the whole route of the proposed new line**

114. Your Petitioner has serious concerns regarding the proposed demolition and alteration of a number of heritage assets near the environs of the proposed development, including some listed structures along the whole route of the proposed line.

115. Your Petitioner therefore objects to the demolition or alteration of Listed Buildings along the whole proposed route and requests that your Honourable House enquire as to their necessity and whether there are remedial measures that could be put into place to avoid this.

116. In addition, your Petitioner requests your Honourable House to enquire as to the possibilities of moving any of the buildings listed in schedule 18, and whether this would be feasible in each case, as was carried out very successfully with HS1 through Kent.

**Subsequent legal challenges**

117. Your Petitioner is concerned regarding the possible effect of article 9 of the Bill of Rights 1689 on any possible legal challenges that might be mounted to the passing of the Bill.
118. This raises an important issue as to whether that was in conflict with the “access to justice” provisions of article 9.1-5 of the Aarhus Convention as also incorporated into EU law under article 11 of Directive 2011/92/EU.

119. If the matter were taken before the Planning Court of the Administrative Court, an issue would therefore arise as to whether article 11 of Directive 2011/92/EU would override article 9 of the Bill of Rights 1689 under section 2(1) of the European Communities Act 1972, as applied in R. Secretary of State for Transport ex p. Factortame Ltd. and ors. (No. 2) [1991] 1 A.C. 603.

120. In the event of any doubts about the matter, the Planning Court of the Administrative Court might have to refer the matter to the Court of Justice of the European Union at Luxembourg under article 267 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and CPR Part 68.2(a)(b) for a preliminary ruling on interpretation.

121. Your Petitioner would therefore request that your Honourable House recommend that provisions be made in the Bill to dis-apply article 9 of the Bill of Rights 1689 to any future court challenges in order that it may be fully compliant with article 9.1-5 of the Aarhus Convention and article 11 of Directive 2011/92/EU.

122. This would seem proportionate, in view of the extensive disabling of the requirements for Listed Building Consent and planning permissions throughout the Bill as a whole.

General

123. 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 the Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

The Prayer

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

Signed

Terence Patrick Ewing

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF DEREK MESSECAR of 21 ALBERT STREET, NW1 7LU
(AGED 70 - RESIDENT SINCE 1978)
AND RESIDENTS OF SOUTH ALBERT STREET, LONDON, NW1

Declares that:

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

1. Your petitioners are:

All residents of Albert Street South which is the South end of a terrace of Georgian/Victorian properties that are owner occupied, council owned, and rented privately. Occupied by a mix of families with young children, older children who have grown up in the street, young single people, professionals and pensioners from a mix of ethnic groups.

1. Derek Messecar
2. Elizabeth Messecar
3. Jessye Romeo
4. T Romeo
5. E Romeo
6. Edward Gatehouse Jackson
7. Amanda Baird
8. Sebastian Tennant
9. Veronika Kraal
10. Ion Dasioglou
11. Dick Leonard
12. Trane Leogosd
13. Peter Simai
14. Nick Pahl
15. Kate Pahl
16. Frank Auerbach
17. Vincent Craplet
18. Anne Claire Craplet
19. Alice Lucas Trotz
20. Jose Duorkin
21. Cecil Woolf
22. Jean Moorcroft Wilson
23. G. F. Jones
24. M. T. Proudlock
25. Jessica Franco Ruiz
26. Penny Thexton
27. Kate Holmes
28. Rosie Thompson
29. Hazel Abel
30. Flora Allen
31. Ian Dewar
32. Sally McHugh
33. Christopher McHugh
3. Your petitioner's concerns are

That the road closures and ensuing congestion on Hampstead Road will lead to Albert Street and adjacent streets becoming 'rat runs' for traffic throughout the day but especially for morning and evening commuter traffic. This will add to the pollution and noise we are already expected to bear, also making the street more dangerous for all residents, but especially for cyclists, children and elderly people.

Your petitioners request that:

Bearing this in mind please can HS2 be requested to make plans to erect 'no entry' signs at the Mornington Crescent end of Mornington Place and Arlington Road so that should our fears about the streets becoming rat runs prove to be correct they can be erected at short notice.

Please can further consideration be given for a temporary delay in bringing HS2 into Euston, (terminating for the moment at Old Oak Common), giving time for further thought as to how best to proceed with the whole Euston plan.

We also would ask you to understand that we entirely agree with all made in the petitions lodged by:

THE CAMDEN CUTTING GROUP
THE ALBERT STREET NORTH RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
THE HS2 ACTION ALLIANCE
CAMDEN BOROUGH COUNCIL
THE CAMDEN CIVIC SOCIETY

Especially those points regarding noise, dust, traffic, blight, and the virtual end of Camden Market as one of the largest tourist attractions in the UK.
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, Yours sincerely,

1. Name: DEREK MESSECAR Signature
2. Name: ELIZABETH MESSECAR Signature
3. Name: JESSYCE ROMCO Signature
4. Name: T. ROMCO Signature
5. Name: E ROMCO Signature
6. Name: EDWARD GATEHOUSE-JACKSON Signature
7. Name: AMANDA BAIN Signature
8. Name: SEBASTIAN TENNANT Signature
9. Name: VESNA KRAL Signature
10. Name: ION DASCOLOU Signature
11. Name: Dick Leonard
   Signature.

12. Name: Peter Simai
   Signature.

13. Name: Nick Pahl
   Signature.

14. Name: Kate Pahl
   Signature.

15. Name: Elsa Pahl
   Signature.

16. Name: Frank Auerbach
   Signature.

17. Name: Vincent Craplet
   Signature.

18. Name: Anne Claire Craplet
   Signature.

19. Name: Alice LucasTan
   Signature.

20. Name: Josie Duquemin
   Signature.

21. Name: Cecil Woolf
   Signature.

22. Name: Jean Morecroft Wilson
   Signature.

23. Name: G. F. Jones
   Signature.
24. Name: [Signature]
25. Name: [Signature]
26. Name: [Signature]
27. Name: [Signature]
28. Name: [Signature]
29. Name: [Signature]
30. Name: [Signature]
31. Name: [Signature]
32. Name: [Signature]
33. Name: [Signature]
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF BURTON GREEN VILLAGE HALL TRUSTEES

Declares that:

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

Your petitioners

2. The petitioners are the operators and trustees of the Burton Green Village Hall, which will be demolished under the proposed works.

Your petitioner’s concerns

3. It is already agreed that a replacement village hall will be built at an alternative site as part of AP2 and discussions with HS2 representatives are ongoing regarding the design and implementation of this facility, including factors such as construction schedule, connection of services (especially mains sewerage), and other project elements such as siting, parking, heating and lighting facilities etc. The new hall needs to be fit for purpose to meet the needs of a growing community and maintenance and running costs minimized for future generations of trustees. Unless a formal written agreement is reached on these issues the petitioners may have to address the select committee of your right honourable House about them.

4. Your Petitioners are also concerned that the location of the new Village Hall is close to the south portal of the cut and cover tunnel and hence will experience increased noise both within and outside the hall. HS2 have not provided any detailed information regarding operating noise despite several requests and we are concerned that significant operating noise will remain at the site for the new Hall. The hall hosts a range of activities including those such as religious services and yoga that rely on a peaceful and quiet environment and we are concerned that the currently proposed noise mitigation will not provide the community with an equivalent peaceful facility. We therefore request that the cut and cover tunnel be further extended to achieve the necessary reduction in the peak noise at the site.
The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Andrew Gibbs (Roll B Agent)

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 KENILWORTH STOP HS2 ACTION GROUP.

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner, The Kenilworth Stop HS2 Action Group was formed in 2010, following the publication of the 2010 Command Paper. Your Petitioner represents what is demonstrably the majority view of the residents of Kenilworth, in that we believe HS2 should not go ahead under any circumstances. Whilst Your Petitioner acknowledges that the principle of the Bill is, your Petitioners’ view on the subject are so strong, they must be recorded in this petition. Your Petitioner represents homeowners and businesses not only within Kenilworth, but the Parishes of Burton Green and Stoneleigh, as well as the City of Coventry.

3. Your Petitioner has always taken a pragmatic approach to HS2. Whilst our primary aim has been to aid the campaign against the project, we have consistently argued for better mitigation and compensation if the project were to go ahead, having partaken in meetings with HS2 Ltd as early as August 2010, before being present at every community forum, as well as attending bilateral meetings with HS2 Ltd. Despite taking this approach, Your Petitioner feels that engagement with The Promoter has been a one-way street, with HS2 Ltd denying all the mitigations proposed by Your Petitioner.

4. Your Petitioner is concerned that The Promoter has completely ignored the following statements, advice and statues:

a. It is a stated policy of the Defra/Forestry Commission statement on ancient woodland *Keepers of Time* that "existing areas of ancient woodland should be maintained". This implies that there should be no further losses of this habitat. However, several ancient woodlands in the area suffer losses as a result of HS2.

b. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that loss of ancient woodland should not be permitted "unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss". No consideration of whether the HS2 proposal satisfies this test has been given in the Environmental Statement, or elsewhere.

c. The Natural England and Forestry Commission publication *Standing Advice for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees* advises, in paragraph 6.1, that where
proposals "seek to address issues of loss or deterioration of ancient woodland veteran trees", measures that rely on mitigation or compensation "should be issues for consideration only after it has been judged that the wider benefits of a proposed development clearly outweigh the loss or damage of ancient woodland".

d. HS2 Ltd have stated that they will use narrow cuttings ‘wherever possible’ through ancient woodlands, however this is not the case with any of the four ancient woodlands in the area.

e. Following a reassessment, more of these woodlands were defined as ancient and ‘high value’ by the promoter, yet no more mitigation was proposed by the promoter.

5. Your Petitioners do not believe that all the likely significant effects on the environment have been adequately described in the ES and are of the view that the mitigation measures proposed have not been adequately described. In many instances, no mitigation is offered or what little mitigation is referenced, is left to the draft Code of Construction Practice ("COCP"). That is inadequate because the COCP is in draft form and will remain as such until after the Bill has been enacted. The term, ‘reasonably practicable’ has been used frequently throughout the COCP but it is not clear who will decide what is ‘reasonably practicable’. Your Petitioner is also concerned to ensure that the Nominated Undertaker is required to adopt the very highest standards in respect of the mitigation of the effects of noise, vibration, dirt and dust.

6. Your Petitioner is concerned that there is no measurable independent method of compliance by contractors and other organisations in relation to noise, vibration, dust and other issues. Your Petitioner requires The Promoter to adequately fund local authorities along the route to monitor these issues, ensure compliance and deliver enforcement. We believe that, given the prevailing attitude of HS2 Ltd, independent supervision of the body is required.

7. It is vital that the deficiencies in the ES identified by the Environmental Audit Committee of your honourable House, amongst others, are remedied by the Promoter of the Bill, whether by way of an addendum to the ES or otherwise. One reason this is so important is that the Environmental Minimum Requirements, which have been produced by the promoter of the Bill in draft, contain important obligations which will fall on the Nominated Undertaker when constructing and operating the railway, and a number of those obligations are specifically tied in to the ES and depend upon its accuracy. For anyone to have faith that the promises made in the EMR document will be kept, those requirement should be made part of the bill.

8. Your petitioner is concerned that the ES seems to underplay the impact on ecology and the severance of routes used by various species. Whilst Your Petitioner is not in a position to comment in more detail about some of these issues, even from the
position of a layman it is evident that assessment of species such as bats, snakes, deer, otters and amphibians is incomplete.

9. Your Petitioner has huge concerns about the area of Green Belt land known as the Crackley Gap. The Crackley Gap has always served as a natural divide between the City of Coventry and the Town of Kenilworth. It is also home to a diverse variety of wildlife - fauna and flora. The Crackley Gap also serves as a natural flood plain accommodating vast amounts of rainfall from both Coventry and Kenilworth which is channelled in to the Canley Brook. This area poses unique engineering problems and constraints and, under current proposals, faces a colossal level of engineering works and destruction in order to accommodate HS2 including the proposed permanent and temporary diversions of the Canley Brook itself. Despite the proposal to change the course of Canley Brook, the HS2 flood risk assessment for the area has stayed exactly the same. The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 explains that Lead Local Flood Authorities have responsibility for surface water flooding, but HS2 Ltd as of yet have been ignoring this legislation and only liaising with the Environment Agency, whose competence surrounding the issue of flood risk, management and prevention has recently been demonstrated to the entire country.

10. Taking these constraints into consideration, your Petitioner does not believe that the correct level of analysis has been carried out by HS2 Ltd in this area and that consequently the current design proposal is inadequate, does not solve the engineering issues, especially regarding potential flooding and the impact on natural aquifers, and causes unnecessary destruction of the area together with the associated carnage during construction. Your Petitioner is thus petitioning for the protection of this area of Green Belt land and for further analysis of the area with proper consideration given to an alternative solution to the current proposals for this area.

11. HS2 will significantly impact on travel in and out of Kenilworth during the construction phase. Out of the nine roads into Kenilworth, six will be impacted by around a decade of construction. Additionally, the six-lane A46 Kenilworth Bypass will be re-routed during construction. Currently, Kenilworth Railway station is due to reopen in 2016, before the construction of HS2 starts, as such construction of HS2 will impact on services between Kenilworth and Coventry as soon as they open. Your petitioner believes that these travel constraints will have a significant effect on everyone trying to get in and out of the town. While this will lead to increased journeys to work, the greater concern is for the viability of businesses in Kenilworth. Your Petitioner seeks that suitable arrangements be made to prevent total gridlock in the area.

12. Kenilworth is a town of 23,000 people and is one of the largest communities affected by the proposed railway excepting the urban areas of London and Birmingham. Kenilworth has a high proportion of pubs and restaurants, which rely on custom coming in from out of town. Your petitioner is concerned that years of disruption will affect the viability of these businesses and the jobs of those employed within them. A
few years ago, when Severn Trent replaced sewers, a compensation scheme was available for businesses, and your petitioner believes the Nominated Undertaker should be required to implement a similar scheme to compensate for lost business. Your petitioner is also concerned about the impact on Stoneleigh Park, a major employer for the area.

13. Your petitioner requests that the proposed works to the A46 are revised. This road is a major route through the area and a part of a national network of principal trunk roads and motorways. In this instance, the A46 links together the M40, M69 and M1. At the moment the proposal is to divert the A46 to one side, to excavate and build a retaining structure for the route under on the temporarily extinguished carriageway and then to repeat the process to the other side to create a covered route under. Such a potential disruption to a major road will cause traffic chaos to the route and traffic gridlock to the area.

14. Your petitioner is concerned that the promoter has clearly underestimated the impact there will be on traffic, especially around Dalehouse Lane, and Stoneleigh Road, which are exceptionally busy, both as an access from the town to the A46, and as the main access to the University of Warwick. We have no faith whatsoever in the ability of HS2 to deal with these issues, and suggest that building a second bridge to turn the A46 junction at Stoneleigh Road into a roundabout is considered, and potentially paid for by The Promoter. Changes made in both AP2 and AP4 prove that HS2 Ltd had initially underestimated traffic impacts to the area, which we continue to believe they have done.

15. Your Petitioner objects to the adverse noise and intrusive impacts which will be injurious across the area. Your petitioner believes that HS2 Ltd have significantly under-estimated the impact of noise generated by HS2 on Kenilworth, and notes that HS2 Ltd have rather conveniently projected that noise impacts end just where houses start. Your petitioner find this hard to accept, firstly because Kenilworth is a tranquil area where any increase in noise will be felt, and secondly because HS2 is placed at the base of a valley through the Crackley Gap, noise will transmit and be amplified. Your petitioner believes that the use of a sixteen hour day time LAeq masks the significance of impacts generated by the project. There is a lack of detail on noise mitigation in the COCP, and Your Petitioner is also concerned that clear accountability and enforcement protocols are not defined in the COCP. Your Petitioner asks your honourable House to require the Promoters to address these issues. No proper information has been made available to your Petitioners about the design of noise barriers. Your petitioners have a particular concern about this, because whilst barriers can be an effective way of mitigating noise, they can also be visually intrusive.

16. Your petitioner believes that compensation must be fair and proportionate; and those affected must be afforded a proper opportunity to influence the final
determination. Regrettably these principles have not been observed in the current HS2 proposals. Your petitioner hopes that the Select Committee considers previous rulings by the CTRL Select Committee, which ordered the Nominated Undertaker to buy properties which had failed the hardship test, and the Croydon Tram Select Committee which made a ruling around the issue of negative equity. Your petitioner seeks that compensation should be paid on the sole criteria of suffering loss of value, irrespective of personal circumstances.

17. Your Petitioner requests your honourable House to require the Promoters to consider the benefits that would arise the provision of a tunnel, starting just south of the A46, and ending north of Berkswell Station. This option was proposed in bilateral meetings with HS2 Ltd by the Kenilworth Stop HS2 Action Group, and no reasons for dismissing this option were ever provided by the promoter. These provisions would provide protection to the community, protection to the local economy during construction, save the Kenilworth Greenway in its entirety, and mean that Crackley Woods, and Broadwell Wood, both areas of ancient woodland would also be saved.

18. Your Petitioner does not understand why HS2 is being designed for a speed of 250mph, when these would require a significantly higher power input than conventional trains, or even Eurostar which has a maximum speed of 186mph. The 250mph design speed is responsible for a large proportion of the damage to communities and the natural environment. The 186mph design speed of HS1 allowed for more sensitive routing, and the ability of that railway to follow existing transport corridors, which brought some benefit to the natural environment, in creating new habitats in islands of land created between the railway and the M2 and M20. Your petitioner does not understand why the ‘Kent Principles’ were abandoned by HS2, and ask that HS2 is redesigned for a lower speed, 186mph, which would allow more sensitive and sensible routing options.

19. 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
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF THE SOMERS TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is Somers Town Neighbourhood Forum, constituted and approved by LB Camden to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan as set out under the Localism Act 2011.

The petitioner's neighbourhood boundaries include land safeguarded by HS2 that will directly impact on the petitioner's members' homes, livelihoods and health. Somers Town has a unique and diverse community. At 14.4%, the proportion of school-aged children is higher than the Camden average of 10.1%. It has a higher proportion of residents who are Bangladeshi (18.8% compared to 5.7%) and Black African (10.7% compared to 4.9%) than Camden as a whole. Unemployment is at 10.9% for the Somers Town CIP area and the average household income is some £10,000 or so below the Camden average. Life expectancy is 10 years less than in wealthier parts of the Borough. It is a designated 20mph Home Zone. Within the boundary area are two nurseries, four primary schools (three with attached nurseries) and two secondary schools.

The boundary area includes Ampthill Estate, and the petitioner supports the concerns raised by Ampthill Square Tenants and Residents Association.

The following outlines a range of significant negative impacts facing residents both in the wider area and those faced by Somers Town residents specifically.

3. Your petitioner's concerns are

GENERAL

Promoter assurances
The petitioner feels that the assurances set out by the promoter in a letter to LB Camden dated 23 February 2016, fall far short of what is required to adequately tackle a range of major issues. Flowing from these assurances, the promoter undertook to carry out a number of studies into transporting construction materials and spoil by rail rather than road, into air quality and into altering the height of Hampstead Road Bridge. None of these studies is available to the petitioner at this time, so that it is possible that our 'asks' may need review once the contents and implications of the studies have been assimilated.

HL: 762
Euston Station design
The petitioner will be severely impacted unless a solution for the design of Euston Station is embraced that integrates high speed and classic rail, as well as Crossrail 2. Without this integrated approach, a new station for Crossrail 2 will be built in Somers Town, thereby destroying around 130 homes and 17 businesses and making life for hundreds of residents unbearable. Community facilities in the area would also be destroyed. It is essential for the health and wellbeing of Somers Town residents that an integrated station design is embraced.

Old Oak Common
To ease construction and limit disruption at Euston for all stakeholders, the petitioner urges a full independent investigation of Old Oak Common as a temporary terminus.

Dispute arbitration
The petitioner supports the appointment of an independent Assessor funded by, but totally independent of, HS2 Ltd. Access to dispute arbitration with the power of enforcement to adjudicate fairly is vital. Recruitment of such a post should be undertaken prior to the beginning of any work and continue throughout the project.

Air quality
The petitioner echoes the concerns articulated by the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee in their February Report:

‘We want monitoring of air quality to feed into an assessment of whether re-housing 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’. (p.60, para 232)

The agreements between HS2 Ltd and Camden Council on air quality make no provision for any residents' involvement. Dozens of petitions to the House of Commons included mitigation concerns about air quality and they remain unaddressed. The petitioner asks for resident groups to be accorded a formal interface with HS2 Ltd (separate from Camden Council's) over the location of air quality monitoring stations, an obligation of public access to the output data in real time with community groups empowered, given serious exceedances, to stop demolition/construction work until acceptable remedial measures have been put in place.

Spoil and construction materials
Spoil removal, plant, machinery and construction material should be transported by rail to reduce traffic congestion that further deteriorates air quality. This in turn increases risks of respiratory disease. The petitioner understands results of a study commissioned by HS2 Ltd to assess the viability of transporting spoil and materials by rail are imminent and may be publicly available before the petitioner is called to give evidence. These conclusions may alter what is requested.

Traffic congestion
Road and lane closures, bridge demolition and traffic diversions will increase congestion giving rise to deterioration of air quality and increased risk of road traffic accidents.

HGV routes
HGV haul routes should be significantly reduced and kept to a minimum and limited to main roads unless demonstrably impossible. Because of the serious associated health risks all HS2-generated traffic must meet the most up-to-date standards for low emissions.
Traffic Management Plans
The petitioner believes that a joint TfL, HS2 Ltd and LBC Traffic Management Plan will be published shortly. However, there remains a high degree of concern that the area could well suffer terminal gridlock. To reassure local people and test the worst-case scenario, the petitioner requests a simulation to mimic the situation when roads and bridges are put under most stress to demonstrate viability of the plan with emergency service input.

Compensation
The petitioner concurs with the contents of the LB Camden Petition with regard to compensation and agrees that the current situation is totally unsatisfactory. We draw attention to the statement made in their final report by members of the House of Commons HS2 Select Committee that:

"Camden is exceptional and needs special treatment. Many residents are going to have to put up with disturbance on a scale beyond the experience in most other locations." (para 237)

The petitioner would urge therefore that at least the equivalent compensation proposals are available to residents in Camden as are available to residents in rural areas. The petitioner concurs with LB Camden that compensation should not only be limited to property owners but also all those who will be badly affected by the works.

Construction Impacts
Specified limits should be agreed in advance of work commencing and must be imposed to reduce disruption and nuisance from a range of impacts including noise, air pollution, vibration, dust and particulates, hours of work, etc. All breaches should be dealt with swiftly and appropriate remedial action taken. Serious disruption over an extended period should attract monetary compensation.

Loss of open space
Assurances provided by the promoter to LB Camden do not go far enough in mitigating loss. There should be no overall loss of open space. We do not consider replacement proposals to be adequate in terms of accessibility, quality or quantity.

Loss of trees
Assurances provided by the promoter to LB Camden do not go far enough in mitigating loss. Current replacement plans are wholly inadequate in terms of replacement numbers, size and maturity.

Cumulative impacts
Most residents in the Euston area, including Somers Town residents, will be subject to multiple adverse impacts from the construction of the scheme. These must be fully taken into account so that compensation is commensurate with cumulative impacts

SITE-SPECIFIC

Maria Fidelis School
The petitioner supports LB Camden in its request that the consolidation of Maria Fidelis School onto one site at Drummond Crescent/Phoenix Road is done as quickly and smoothly as possible, to minimise the disruption to the academic lives of pupils and to limit the impacts on the health of students and staff.
The petitioner requests that the construction impact limits set for the HS2 works are matched by those for the Maria Fidelis works. The environmental impacts of the new school build – which is necessitated by HS2 – need to be included in HS2 figures.

Noise
Monitoring of noise levels needs to take place in those homes and schools that will be badly impacted by construction works and traffic. In addition to external monitoring, internal noise levels within homes and schools should not exceed safe levels. Should these be exceeded those impacted will need rehousing as excessive noise can cause permanent hearing loss.

Utility works
Main utility works are planned for Chalton Street and Phoenix Road. These utility works will disrupt businesses, including the Chalton Street market. The petitioner requests that measures are put in place to safeguard the long-term viability of the market.

Hundreds of pupils travel to school along Chalton Street and Phoenix Road every day. The petitioner requests that measures are put in place to maintain safe routes to school.

The petitioner requests that any accidental damage to utility services will be remedied immediately and timely financial penalties made payable to all residents who endure loss of any service.

Taxi rank
The use of Drummond Crescent and Doric Way as a temporary taxi stand is totally unsuitable for a residential area with already unacceptably poor air quality. The petitioner requests that that the promoter comes up with an alternative solution.

Phoenix Road
The petitioner is aware that as part of the assurances secured by LB Camden, a linear park is to be created along Phoenix Road, improving east-west links between Euston and St Pancras stations. While the petitioner welcomes “greening” opportunities in the area, the petitioner is concerned about the loss of parking, including disabled parking, along the route. The route includes a church, two schools and an organisation that protects the rights of people with disabilities. Proper access to these organisations, as well as to homes, needs to be maintained and residential parking needs to be reprovided in the area.

Loss of open space/playground
The petitioner notes the proposed loss of part of Lancing Street/Churchway Estate play area. Few homes in Somers Town have access to private gardens and this loss, when combined with the loss of the nearby Euston Square Gardens, will impact greatly on children in West Somers Town. The petitioner requests that during any construction works, and in addition to relocated play equipment to an adjacent area, the promoter fund opportunities for local children and young people to play and exercise in less polluted areas.

Damage to landscaping and environment
Any environmental damage must be made good in a timely fashion and shrubbery of equal quality provided as replacement in agreement with local community. There should be no loss of trees. In particular, every protection should be afforded to the trees along Chalton Street and Phoenix Road during proposed utility works.
Loss of parking bays
Plans by the promoter are likely to involve a significant loss of allocated resident parking bay facilities, including disabled parking facilities, in West Somers Town. The promoter must assume responsibility to identify suitable accessible replacement parking bays in close proximity to existing bays. Current plans also involve the loss of loading bays and pay and display bays in Eversholt Street and Lancing Street. The petitioner requests that alternative provision be found so that local businesses can continue to function.

Pest control
Adequate pest control measures must be put in place and strictly monitored, not only to deter pests through good housekeeping around satellite compounds, but also to deal with displaced colonies of rats disturbed during excavation and construction. Local residents, businesses, schools and other organisations should not have to bear the cost of additional pest control measures.

Japanese knotweed
An effective plan to ensure the eradication, prevention and spread of Japanese knotweed known to be prevalent and arising from the cutting wall is urgently required.

Code of Construction Practice
Your petitioner has concerns that the use of modifiers, such as ‘where reasonably practical’, will exonerate the promoter from addressing problems which residents consider need adequate mitigation/speedy action. We request that these terms are clearly defined and a final arbitrator of “reasonableness” identified. Without clearly defined penalties for failure to comply with the CoCP we believe there will be no incentive to meet agreed terms and regulations that could therefore be breeched at will.

Working hours
Blanket permissions for night working should not be granted. Given the health impacts on local communities, the Approved Undertaker must make specific application on a case-by-case basis for night working to LB Camden as the planning authority. The petitioner is particularly concerned about proposed 24-hour working at the Lancing Street compound. Out of hours working at the Royal Mail NW1 Delivery Office will also have an impact on residents and on the nearby St Mary’s Church.

4. Your Petitioner

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Slaney Devlin
Acting Chair
Somers Town Neighbourhood Forum
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Dr Paul Thornton

Declares that:

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

2) Your petitioner

a) The petitioner is a freeholder resident at 390 Cromwell Lane, Burton Green, Kenilworth, Warwickshire. The dwelling is bisected by the line which runs parallel to the centre of the proposed line at a distance of 120 metres.

3) Your petitioner’s concerns

a. The provisions for attenuating noise from the trains have not been made to the extent that could or should be appropriately achieved. Further amendments to the design of the line in the location of my property are required in this regard.

b. Proper publication of information in respects of the vibration generated by the high speed trains has not been made such that the exposure of residents and property to those vibrations cannot be properly assessed. Further publication and clarification is required along with appropriate design amendments.

c. The land take for the HS2 construction requirement, in respect of both the line and the construction compounds etc is excessive. Standards to limit land take that have been used in the cross rail initiative in respect of tunnelling in areas of high commercial property value should be applied in respect of land that has previously been so protected by society that it cannot be given a meaningful commercial value. This should particularly apply in respect of ancient woodland, the replacement plans for which are incompetent from an ecological perspective. Better protection can be achieved by amendment of the bill.

d. Your petitioner is a regular user of the existing linear park green-way bridle path at Burton Green. The proposed alteration to that bridle path incorporates a tunnel for horses and riders, pedestrians and cyclists that is included in the same concrete infrastructure through which passes the high speed trains. There has been no published risk assessment in respect of the safety of that design for users in that confined space, in respect of the potential for horses to be spooked by unexpected noise and vibration. Understandably no analysis of the line design from an antiterrorist security perspective has been published, but this same publically accessible bridle path tunnel within the portal structure of the railway tunnel would appear to provide a major security vulnerability. From all these perspectives,
design of the bridle path arrangements at this location should be reviewed.

e. In the course of petitioning in the House of Commons, I was given verbal assurances that when a property such as ours is bisected by the 120 metre line parallel to the railway, it is deemed to fall entirely within the zone created by that line for compensation purposes. I have subsequently received no written confirmation of that assurance specifically in respect of my property. Such a specific assurance is required.

f. Your petitioner and his family commonly make use of the railway services from the existing nearby Tile Hill station which is on the Birmingham section of the West Coast mainline. Amendments to the bill are required to safeguard the provision of services on that line. Such amendments would be consistent with statements that the promoter has made in respect of such services but should be protected in the legislation.

g. HS2 Ltd has appointed a “Residents commissioner”. With all due respect to the individual concerned, responses received by neighbours from the commissioner indicate that her role is curtailed by the terms of her appointment and as she is an employee of HS2 Ltd, and accountable to the managers and board of that organisation. This is a reversal of the necessary powers and independence required by a legitimate commissioner. The solution here should be for the promoter to provide resources to the office of the Parliamentary Ombudsman to enable the appointment of a Residents Commissioner in respect of HS2 that is accountable to the Ombudsman and so independent of both the promoter and HS2 Ltd. The bill should be amended to reflect this.

h. Similarly the establishment of a “Construction Commissioner” has been announced. It has been claimed that this Commissioner will be independent of HS2 Ltd but there is no clarity of how this will be achieved. Independence from the Department of Transport is also required. Amendments to the bill are required to ensure that the resources, autonomy, authority and independence of the role are enshrined in law, along with considered confirmation of the Commissioners terms of reference.

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.

Dr Paul Thornton

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Michael and Deirdre Vernon of 28 Hodgetts Lane,
Burton Green CV9 1PJ

Declares that:

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

Your petitioner

2. The petitioners are Michael Edward Vernon and Deirdre Joy Vernon, both resident at
28 Hodgetts Lane, Burton Green, Kenilworth CV9 1PJ for the past 27 years. Our
property lies 80 metres from the centre line of the proposed railway and therefore
within the 60m to 120m zone as designated by the promoter.

Your petitioner’s concerns

3. The petitioners believe that that compensation offered to property owners within
the 60-120m zone who wish to sell their properties is inadequate, and will leave them
financially disadvantaged because it does not cover the full costs involved in moving
home. In the case of owners in the 60-120m zone who choose to remain, the
compensation package currently on offer is also inadequate because the 10% payment
on offer is considerably less than the devaluation of the property resulting from the
construction of the railway. The present financial payments on offer for both those
wishing to leave and those wishing to remain not only fail to cover the financial losses
involved, but also fail to offer any additional compensation for either the distress
suffered as a result of having to move home, or, for those who choose to remain, for
the detrimental effects resulting from the construction and operation of HS2.

4. The petitioners are concerned that the proposed measures to mitigate the
detrimental effects of the construction and operation of the railway are inadequate.
In particular, reduction of noise and other environmental impacts could be further
improved with comparatively small additional expenditure. The petitioners’ home lies
close to the northern portal of the proposed “cut and cover” tunnel and to the
proposed auto transformer station and we remain concerned about noise emanating
from both sources.

5. The petitioners have fundamental concerns over the methodology used by the
promoter to assess noise impact. We consider that the use of mean noise levels
rather than peak levels as a measure of noise nuisance is completely inappropriate
when applied to a residential situation.
In order to address the above mentioned problems the petitioners require that the compensation packages be re-examined with a fundamental requirement that nobody should be financially disadvantaged by the construction of HS2. Payments to those within the 60-120m zone should cover the full cost incurred in moving home, including sale and purchase costs, legal fees, removal costs and Stamp Duty on the new purchase. In addition those who suffer severe disruption as a result of its construction or operation should receive some form of recompense in addition to the payment to cover their financial loss.

6. The mitigation of environmental impact issues affecting residents of Burton Green would be very considerably enhanced by the construction of a deep-bored tunnel. If it is considered that the benefits resulting from a bored tunnel would be outweighed by the financial cost, then a very cost effective alternative would be to extend the cut and cover tunnel in both directions in order to relocate the exit portals beyond the residential properties within the village. In the case of the southern portal, an extension of 100 metres would not only reduce the noise affecting residential properties along Hodgetts Lane but would also remove the need for construction of various noise barriers in the field opposite our houses adjacent to the existing village hall.

7. While we welcome any measures designed to encourage residents to remain within the village, we are concerned that at present the acceptance of the alternative cash offer removes the right of residents in the 120m zone to choose voluntary purchase option if they should change their minds and repay the 10%. There is evidence that the restrictions on being accepted for the Need to Sell scheme are sufficient to deter some residents within this zone from accepting the alternative cash offer. The petitions request that in such circumstances residents should retain their right to the voluntary purchase option.

The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remains, etc.

Michael Vernon  Deirdre Vernon

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF BRITISH OVERSEAS BANK NOMINEES LIMITED AND W G T C NOMINEES LIMITED

Declares that:

1. Your petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by clause 1 of the High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill ("the Bill") that proposes that a nominated undertaker appointed in accordance with clause 44 of the Bill should be authorised to construct and maintain the scheduled works specified in schedule 1 of the Bill. Clause 2 of the Bill contains additional provisions with regard to the works identified in schedule 1 of the Bill and provides that schedule 2, which contains further and supplementary provisions about works, should have effect. Clauses 3 to 18 of the Bill deal with the acquisition of land, supplementary rights and matters relating to highways, extinction of rights, temporary possession of land and use of roads etc.

2. Schedule 1 of the Bill authorises the nominated undertaker to carry out works in the Parish of Fradley and Streethay specifically a diversion of Mare Brook commencing at a point 520 metres west of the junction of Nanscawen Road with Wood End Lane and terminating at a point 250 metres north-west of its commencement (work number 3/91C). This includes the realignment of Wood End Lane to allow it to pass under the proposed railway line and the provision of worksites, compounds and access for construction traffic.

3. Your petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by, amongst others, work number 3/91C and the temporary mitigation works at the junction of the A38 and Wood End Lane known as Hilliard’s Cross as indicated on map CT-05-126-R1 in the Supplementary Environmental Statement 3 ("SES3") and Additional Provision 4 Environmental Statement ("AP4 ES") volume 2, CFA22 Map Book.
Your petitioners

4. Your petitioners are the registered owners of the freehold interest in a property known as Fradley Park forming part of the larger Fradley Business Park, located to the north and south of Wood End Lane in the parish of Fradley & Streethay in the area of Lichfield District Council, Staffordshire.

5. Fradley Park takes access from Wood End Lane and benefits from convenient access to the A38 via the Hilliard's Cross junction, located approximately 200 metres east of the main site access junction of Wood End Lane and Common Lane. Fradley Park is located approximately 350 metres north west of the proposed route alignment of the railway.

6. Your petitioners are both single purpose nominee companies. The nominee companies are appointed by National Westminster Bank Plc ("NatWest") to hold scheme property such as Fradley Park. NatWest acts as depositary of Legal & General Investment Funds ICVC, a sub-fund of which is the Legal & General UK Property Fund. The nominee companies hold Fradley Park in their capacity as nominees for NatWest and NatWest act in their capacity as depositary of the said fund. The fund is managed by Legal & General (Unit Trust Managers) Limited and Fradley Park was purchased by your petitioners in December 2014 under the instruction of Legal & General (Unit Trust Managers) Limited. It is held in a trust structure. Your petitioners each have an issued share capital of 100 shares. Royal Bank of Scotland Plc hold 99 of those shares and one share is held by Glyns Nominees Limited. These companies fall within the Royal Bank of Scotland group umbrella (as does NatWest). Accordingly, your petitioners are wholly owned by Royal Bank of Scotland Group Plc.

7. NatWest, is the largest retail and commercial bank in the United Kingdom. Since 2000, it has been part of The Royal Bank of Scotland Group, ranked among the top 10 largest banks in the world by assets. It has in excess of 8,000,000 customers.

8. Legal & General Plc are one of the UK's leading financial services groups. They have been in existence for over 175 years. At the end of 2014, they had over £710 billion of assets under management. They have some 9,000,000 customers within the UK for life assurance, pension, investment and general insurance products.

9. Fradley Park is a major storage and distribution centre extending to approximately 185 acres in total area. It is strategically located for distribution due to its position adjoining the A38 being within a short distance of the M1, M5, M6, M6 Toll, M42 and M54, providing rapid access to the whole of central England.

10. Over 1.75 million square feet (162,000 sq. m.) of space at Fradley Park comprises 18 storage
and distribution units (15 of which are let to 10 tenants with a further three units currently void) and two multi-let office buildings let to five tenants. All of these units are let on a short term basis. Many of those tenants operate logistic operations 24 hours per day (with many heavy goods vehicle ("HGV") movements during the night), seven days per week from Fradley Park. Current tenants include DHL, Palletways (UK) Limited, Newell Rubbermaid UK Services Limited, Amethyst Group Ltd, Great Bear Distribution Ltd, Tile Giant Limited and Norgren Limited.

11. In addition to the 1.75 million square feet of space let to tenants on a short term basis, your petitioners have let part of their land to distribution companies on long leases. In total there are 11 long leases let to nine different tenants. The distribution companies have built their own facilities on the land while your petitioners retain the freehold interest.

12. Currently, Fradley Park generates for your petitioners a rental income of over £7.1 million per annum.

13. Fradley Park also includes approximately 20 acres of undeveloped plots which are ready for future development, subject to obtaining planning permission.

Your petitioners' concerns

14. Your petitioners and their rights interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill to which your petitioners object for the following reasons.

15. The Bill contemplates the nominated undertaker and its contractors using Wood End lane as a major HGV route to the A38 via the Hilliard's Cross junction to service a number of work sites and storage compounds to the west of your petitioners' land.

16. Your petitioners consider that the scheduled works proposed by the Bill are likely to substantially increase the already large number of HGV movements along Wood End Lane and that the additional HGV movement proposed is likely to lead to high levels of congestion at Hilliard's Cross. The congestion created is likely to lead to serious delays for HGVs approaching, entering and exiting Fradley Park and this will have a substantial impact on your petitioners and their tenants.

17. The environmental baseline section of SES3 identifies, in relation to the Hilliard's Cross junction, that existing traffic flows along Wood End Lane using the Hilliard's Cross junction total 17,000 vehicles per day and that future baseline traffic for construction assessment is forecast to grow by circa 11% from 2012 to 2021. Paragraph 3.3.9 of SES3 states, "the SES and AP2 ES reported that changes in traffic flows during construction will result in a significant increase in congestion and delay for vehicle users at the western part of the
junction between A38 Rykneld Street and Wood End Lane, considered to be a major adverse effect”.

18. The SES3 and AP4 ES propose, at paragraphs 2.2.2 and 2.2.7, a temporary scheme to mitigate the impact of the congestion and delays at the Hilliard’s Cross junction as a result of construction traffic associated with the scheduled works. It is proposed that all works associated with the temporary scheme will be within the highway boundary and will include:

- the introduction of traffic lights to control part of the junction;
- the widening of all approaches to the signalised junction to provide two lanes from all directions; and
- the construction of a retaining wall following the widening of the approach for the slip road overbridge.

19. Paragraph 3.3.9 of SES3 states “as a result of the mitigation works proposed by SES3 the junction will operate within capacity and there will be no significant increase in delay and congestion due to HS2 construction traffic. The SES3 change therefore removes the major adverse effect reported in the SES and AP2 ES”. Further, paragraph 3.3.10 of SES3 states, “the analysis shows that the proposed junction improvement scheme works satisfactorily and HS2 construction traffic would have limited impact on the operation of this junction”.

20. Despite this, your petitioners remain concerned that the proposed temporary solution contains insufficient information to properly assess (a) the impacts of the construction traffic, (b) the proposed mitigation and its likely impacts on the local highway network and (c) whether the proposed mitigation will enable the junction to meet the performance figures reported within the SES3 and AP4 ES documents. In addition, your petitioners are aware that, in developing the solution of temporary signalisation, the promoter did not give consideration to the impact on the junction as a whole and specifically impedance accessing the A38 due to a lack of acceleration lanes. It is also unclear where the temporary signals will be placed. Previous planning applications have considered this approach and Highways England have stated it unsafe given the lack of forward visibility to the junction from the A38 northbound approach. Your petitioners also anticipate that signalisation could lead to traffic queuing on the local highway network from the slip roads to the north and south. Accordingly, your petitioners seek an assurance that the promoter provides them with sufficient information to enable them to properly assess the impacts of the proposed mitigation works at the Hilliard’s Cross junction.

21. Your petitioners are also concerned that there is no certainty of the delivery of an adequate mitigation scheme and that therefore, the resulting situation will be an unmitigated major
adverse impact on traffic delays at the Hilliard's Cross junction, which will result in a major adverse impact on traffic wishing to access or egress from Fradley Park. Specifically, your petitioners are concerned about the deliverability of any mitigation scheme within the highway boundary and therefore seeks an assurance from the promoter that he will use the necessary powers, including the acquisition of any further land required to allow the delivery of a junction improvement scheme that mitigates the impacts identified.

22. Your petitioners are aware that, it was originally envisaged that the construction vehicle traffic generation and work durations affecting Wood End Lane to the A38 would commence in 2018 and could continue to 2023. However, on 30 November 2015, it was announced that the proposed opening of the section of the railway from Handscare to Crewe ("Phase 2a") be accelerated so that it opens six years earlier than planned in 2027. The works envisaged by Phase 2a will also have a significant impact on the Hilliard's Cross junction in terms of construction vehicle traffic generation either consecutively with the works proposed by the Bill or concurrently. In view of this, the impact on the Hilliard's Cross junction of the works proposed by the Bill and Phase 2a, could be for up to ten years. Accordingly, without adequate mitigation of the construction traffic there could be major adverse traffic impacts at the Hilliard's Cross junction for up to ten years. This could lead to serious commercial consequences for your petitioners and the tenants at Fradley Park which could damage the local economy and the level of employment for the following reasons:

- Your petitioners are concerned that, because a number of their tenants' leases expire before the end of 2018, there is a risk that the tenants will not renew their leases as a result of the likely impact of the scheduled works on access to and from Fradley Park and therefore the anticipated disruption to their businesses. Fradley Park has built up over 20 years a reputation as a good logistics location and this will be lost if tenants do not have confidence and certainty that they will be able to conduct their business from Fradley Park especially as many of the tenants will be in a position to relocate to any other location on the expiry of their leases.

- If your petitioners' tenants decide to relocate to alternative distribution parks on the expiry of their leases at Fradley Park, local unemployment is likely to rise as collectively, the tenants occupying Fradley Park represent the largest employer in Fradley. In addition, there will be a reduction in rates income for the local authority.

- Further, if the existing tenants at Fradley Park fail to renew their leases, your petitioners anticipate that, given the congestion that will arise from the
scheduled works, either, (a) it will be very difficult for them to secure replacement tenants or (b) if your petitioners can secure replacement tenants, it is probable that this will be for a less than market rent taking into account the impact of the congestion. This would result in significant loss of income to your petitioners and lead to a substantial fall in their investment value. Your petitioners' freehold interest in Fradley Park was recently valued at in excess of £120,000,000.

23. In addition, despite discussions between the promoter, Highways England and Staffordshire County Council, your petitioners are aware that agreement has not been reached in relation to how best to mitigate the impact of the construction traffic at the Hilliard's Cross junction specifically in relation to safety impacts on the A38 northbound and southbound, and the risk of traffic queuing back from the northbound and southbound slip roads to the local highway network. Accordingly, your petitioners seek an assurance that the promoter be required to develop and implement an improved layout to the Hilliard's Cross junction in conjunction with Highways England, Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council (as appropriate) in order to mitigate the impact of the increased traffic arising from the scheduled works and Phase 2a. Given the length of time that the Hilliard's Cross junction will be affected by construction traffic, your petitioners request that the promoter gives consideration to making permanent, rather than temporary, improvements to the junction.

24. In the absence of a clear undertaking from the promoter for delivery of adequate mitigation measures to the Hilliard's Cross junction, your petitioners seek an assurance from the promoter that he will mitigate the forecast impacts for Hilliard’s Cross and thus Fradley Park by using alternative routes for construction vehicles via Wood End Lane to the west of Fradley Park.

25. Your petitioners seek an amendment to the Bill to provide compensation to them if they suffer such losses as are contemplated in this petition as a result of the additional construction traffic using the Hilliard’s Cross junction as the present compensation rules will render it difficult for your petitioners to claim for such losses.

**General**

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

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

KATIE HICKMAN
VEALE WASBROUGH VIZARDS LLP
Agent for BRITISH OVERSEAS BANK NOMINEES LIMITED and W G T C NOMINEES LIMITED
18 April 2016
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF HS2 ACTION ALLIANCE (HS2AA)  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioner  

Your Petitioner, HS2 Action Alliance Limited (hereinafter referred to as 'your Petitioner') is a non-profit organisation incorporated in 2010 whose directors serve on a voluntary basis without remuneration. Your Petitioner's objects, as set out in Clause 3.1.1 of its Article of Association, are as follows:  

- to question and evaluate the economic case and environmental impact of the proposals for the HS2 rail link and to communicate the facts about the HS2 rail link in a clear, accurate and timely manner;  

- to facilitate co-ordination of community level organisations, specialist companies and government groups to ensure efforts are maximised without duplication and to pool the best resources and talent;  

- to investigate and implement ways of minimising any adverse impacts the HS2 Rail Link may have on individuals, communities and the environment.  

Your Petitioner is backed by thousands of people residing across the United Kingdom who have signed up as registered supporters and who donate funds and provide practical support as well as over 100 community and action groups which have become affiliated to your Petitioner (of which three-quarters represent phase 1 of the route). A significant number of your Petitioners' registered supporters are persons who live in properties which will be compulsorily acquired, or if not being compulsorily acquired, are located within close proximity of the high speed railway and associated construction sites and will therefore be injuriously affected by the works authorised by the Bill to which your Petitioner objects for the reasons set out below.  

Since 2010 your Petitioner has worked to raise awareness of the poor business case of HS2 and the adverse environmental impacts of HS2, and campaigned for effective compensation and mitigation for communities located near the proposed route. Your Petitioner has drafted numerous documents concerning the business and environmental case for HS2, including providing a detailed response to the 2011 High Speed Rail Consultation. Your Petitioner commenced judicial review proceedings against the Promoter in respect of the decision taken in January 2012 to proceed with the high speed railway without undertaking a Strategic Environmental Assessment and to proceed with a hardship based compensation scheme.  

Your Petitioner's case concerning the failure to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment was determined by the Supreme Court in January 2014. The matter has now been heard (in March 2016) at the United Nations Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee, where a decision is awaited. Your Petitioner's case on compensation succeeded in the High Court and the Government was required to re-consult on this issue.  

Representatives of your Petitioner have appeared before the House of Commons Transport Select Committee, the House of Commons Select Committee considering the Bill and the House of
Commons Environmental Audit Committee. A representative has also appeared before the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee. Your Petitioner has met with representatives of HS2 Ltd, including the former Chief Executive of HS2 Ltd and the current Chairman of HS2 Ltd and representatives of the Promoter, including the current Secretary of State for Transport on matters concerning the high speed rail proposals. Your Petitioner submitted a detailed response to the Phase 1 Environmental Statement Consultation, which included additional reports on biodiversity, carbon, visual impacts and waste prepared by independent specialists in these fields. They have also responded to every consultation on compensation since 2010 and championed alternative approaches such as the property bond.

Your petitioners’ submission covers a range of route-wide matters. Some are complex in nature and require specialised expertise which, your Petitioner submits, is beyond the skills and experience of any single individual affected by the Bill. This was recognised by the House of Commons Select Committee (HoC SC) as was the fact that individual petitioners wished HS2AA to present these issues for them, and while your Petitioner’s locus was challenged by the Promoter, the HoC SC overturned their challenge. Your Petitioner then appeared before the HoC SC on three separate occasions bringing a range of issues supported by more than ten technical experts on issues ranging from noise, compensation, waste, carbon, ecology, trees, landscape, train speeds and air quality.

The costs of petitioning and the related expert evidence is met exclusively by donations from members of the general public.

Your Petitioner submits that this petition is in furtherance of the interests of the large number of its registered supporters who are specially and directly affected by the measures proposed in the Bill. Furthermore, both the members of the Petitioner are themselves specially and directly affected by reason of the location of their homes’ proximity to the proposed route and as a result of the provisions of clause 47. Your Petitioner also submits that compliance with the Public Participation requirements of the Aarhus Convention means the matters in this petition should be considered by the Select Committee of your honourable House.

3 Your petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioner’s members will suffer a range of adverse effects which require measures to address them, as detailed below.

Noise

The Promoter’s approach to noise results in the large scale exposure of HS2’s future neighbours to injurious levels of noise with inadequate justification for doing so. In particular it is now clear from the proceedings of the HoC SC that:

- The Promoter is not applying World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines; the Promoter has set LOAELs and SOAELs for HS2 noise only (and not total noise) permitting noise levels greater than WHO recommend. It is hard to see how this can be justified.
- HS2 Ltd will expose many people to injurious levels of peak night-time noise on the basis that it is not ‘reasonably practicable’ to implement measures that reduce noise to harmless levels. Noise above LOAEL will have adverse health effects on at least some people. It is immoral to do so without their consent or compensation or even without appropriate data or contour maps to assist their identification.
- There is no special provision for protecting relatively quiet places eg in rural areas (consistent with the WHO and NPSE objectives). The Promoter has adopted the same thresholds route-wide, and their approach to mitigating noise works to actually disadvantage quieter areas.
• The Promoter has made the avoidance of exposing people to harmful levels of noise subject to a test of 'reasonable practicability'. This test involves assessing the costs and benefits of achieving further reductions in noise, using small sums of money per household to achieve 1db reductions in noise. This is an inappropriate approach for those suffering noise from HS2.

• The register of undertakings refers to the Information Paper and reasonable practicability - it does not guarantee that the ES noise estimates will not be exceeded:
  - Estimates may be underestimates - HS2 Ltd say they have taken account of all reasonably foreseeable circumstances, yet have assumed ballasted track outside tunnels with the decision on whether noisier slab track is to be used, still outstanding. Even more households may be exposed to injurious levels of noise with slab track.
  - Currently assumed mitigations may be subsequently removed on the basis that they are not reasonably practicable

Your petitioner requests that the ES noise estimates are binding on the promoter - the risk should not fall on the residents, but on those responsible for the noise.

• People living near the tunnel portals may be exposed to tunnel boom - both a serious annoyance and causing adverse health effects. The Promoter will not give a guarantee that there will be no tunnel boom. Their lesser assurances that it will not occur is not enforceable.

• Even if noise is assessed only on the basis of HS2 specification trains (that are assumed to be 3dB quieter than TSI compliant trains there would still be a considerable number of homes with noise levels above the night-time peak LOAEL, i.e. above the level injurious to health.

Your Petitioner believes that HS2 should be limited to a reduced top speed, and that the ES should be revised to reflect the true likely impacts - especially for noise - so that properly informed decisions on noise exposure can be taken.

Blight

HS2 has depressed the values of many properties in the vicinity of its proposed line of route. This reduces the value of the local property inventory during construction and to a lesser degree permanently. HS2 Ltd have not adequately taken into account the destruction of housing stock value as a result of HS2. Your Petitioner has developed a method to assess the net present cost of this depression in property values using assumptions taken from Price Waterhouse Coopers study for DfT.

The method can either be used to assess the overall loss of value from HS2, or to assess the additional cost of building HS2 on the surface compared to tunnelling (in either a bored or cut and cover tunnel (the property cost implications are different). The former is of interest only to inform the economic analysis of HS2, which is not the matter before the HoL Select Committee. The latter is relevant where more tunnelling is at issue.

Your Petitioner believes that the loss in value of the housing stock should be incorporated into the analysis which supports decisions on further tunnelling.

Safety

There are a number of unresolved technical problems with HS2 that mean that there will be some combination of:

• Excessive risk from derailment or train collision, relating to the instability of the track bed, and embankments and the operation of trains without sufficient headway to prevent collisions in the event of a train stopping rapidly.
• Additional cost from the installation of slab track with noise prevention features, and track bed and embankment stabilisation
• Lower operational speeds, with a resultant reduction in journey time savings, but with the option for less environmentally damaging routing (as a greater curvature is practicable)
• Additional adverse environmental impacts from the generation of additional noise

HS2 is due to start being constructed within a year, so there is no realistic possibility that technical development will resolve the problems with little additional cost.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the alternative methods of construction that avoid the need for these additional costs, eg tunnelling, should be assessed against the full cost of HS2 Ltd’s currently preferred method of construction – not a cost excluding the additional costs which though unavoidable have not been included by HS2 Ltd.

There is also a risk of sabotage, as causing a derailment of a very high speed train would cause catastrophic damage. The risk is primarily where HS2 will operate in the open. Your petitioner is concerned that HS2 Ltd are not regarding this risk as something that needs to be minimised by design, which would add cost, if they did so.

Independent oversight

There is an overwhelming need for an independent authority to oversee the implementation of HS2.

Under the existing proposals the Minimum Environmental Requirements are enforceable, but only via a complaint to Parliament. This is an unrealistic route for your Petitioner’s members, as it is beyond the reach of ordinary citizens, and Parliament is not suited to address a large number of infractions which HS2 Ltd may well commit. Collecting the data needed to demonstrate either compliance or non-compliance is a major undertaking, and it is one that should not be left to HS2 Ltd.

HS2 Ltd have a 6-year track record that falls well short of what is expected of a public body regarding their communications and engagement with those who are most directly affected by the scheme. This was the finding of a recent PACAC report (2016) where the chair, Bernard Jenkin, reported that “there is still a culture of defensive communication and misinformation within this public body and that is not acceptable. Your petitioner would agree. HS2 Ltd have treated many communities and individuals poorly and in some cases very badly. Information released has far too often been inadequate, unclear, misleading, or simply absent. In other cases it has been incorrect. Your Petitioner’s members have been unable to require or enforce better standards, and it would be wholly unreasonable for that situation to continue when HS2 is introduced.

Your Petitioner therefore has no confidence that HS2 Ltd could be relied upon to act appropriately. An independent regulatory body is necessary both to ensure that the requirements of the Bill are met and that the Promoter is seen to do so.

Speed

Your Petitioner is concerned at the environmental damage that arises from the decision taken at the outset of the HS2 proposals to design to a line-speed of 400km/hr, and operate trains (initially) at a maximum of 360km/hr. The decision to operate and design to such speeds is not supported by the experience of other high speed railway systems elsewhere in the world. It has also had a significant impact on the design of the railway itself, eg the maximum curvature of the line, the extent to which it could follow existing transport corridors or avoid especially sensitive landscapes.

---

1 The Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee (PACAC), March 2016
Your Petitioner notes that HS1, while a high speed railway, operates at a maximum of 300km/hr, enabling its route to extensively follow the line of route of the M2 and M20 motorways.

There is also no survey evidence that passengers seek faster journey times. Rail travellers are already more satisfied with their journey times (ie speed) than any other aspect of rail services.

The Promoters justification for the ultra-high speed relies upon an assumption that the journey time savings are especially valuable, and account for the lion’s share of the scheme benefits. The Promoter values the journey time savings made by businessmen as if it were additional productive time, despite the fact that business travellers already work on trains. The Lords Economic Affairs Committee Report 2015 did not find the figures used convincing. Your Petitioner (in the company of many others) contends that the Promoter has mistaken the balance between the value of journey time savings and the environmental damage caused by the proposed high speed railway.

Reducing the speed to the HS1 level would cost just 4.5 minutes in extra journey time on Phase 1. Even without considering a change in route alignment, some SSI’s could be avoided, carbon emissions would be reduced, there would be greater protection for biodiversity and reduced noise impacts in communities.

Compensation

The prospect of proximity of HS2 or works in connection with construction has blighted properties near the Phase 1 route, and areas on phase 2.

There are significant concerns with the compensation arrangements for blight.

‘Need to Sell’ scheme

The ‘Need to Sell’ (NtS) scheme has a bad track record causing the HoC SC to make a number of recommendations. Unfortunately the Promoter has chosen to address these concerns by adapting its operation of the scheme, rather than by changing the rules.

A problem is that the NtS rules allow for extensive discretion with no independent appeals process, and no auditing of conduct. This can create arbitrary actions and even maladministration. HS2 Ltd and DfT have already attracted considerable official criticism for their behaviour. A major concern is that, without clearly expressed and universal rules, the Promoter may revert to unacceptable behaviour when parliamentary scrutiny has ended.

Your Petitioner brought a number of cases before the HoC SC, and the Promoter undertook to respond to our witness2 and HS2AA, following her detailed submission. This never happened, although we understand the HoC SC received a response. Your Petitioner is aware of current cases where HS2 Ltd’s behaviour does not meet an acceptable standard.

Key features NtS that are unacceptable from the point of view of fairness are:

- Lack of independent appeals process. The Resident’s Commissioner is unable to champion applicants and neither organisationally nor personally independent. There is no mechanism in place to ensure HS2 Ltd/DfT act fairly or consistently between cases.
- The location criterion is unreasonable as it substitutes the panel’s perception of what merits being blighted for whether or not there is real blight in the market. It is the market’s perception that is the problem from which applicants are applying to the scheme to seek relief.
- There is no compelling reason to sell is what the panel decides it to be. There is no body of case law that can be cited, and there are no clear specifications. The examples imply that it is difficult for

---

2 Sandra Trickett, Assistant to Dan Byles MP
the elderly to qualify under ‘age and stage’ unless it relates to financial hardship. While
discretion may currently be exercised to help the elderly, there is nothing formally in the rules to
which they can appeal. If the Promoter’s conduct changes, the range of qualifying
circumstances is too narrow, eg there is no reference to suffering from construction.
- The scheme has a reputation for being stressful and overly intrusive. It is also complex and not
sufficiently accessible to everyone, especially the most vulnerable
- The valuation system for unusual or high value homes is unfair, due to: use of out of area
valuers; how blighted property values are used; the lack of clarity about advertised prices; and
the absence of an independent arbitration process
- The 15% offer rule and the business rateable value limit are inappropriate – especially for
London

Retrospective compensation for those who have ‘sold and lost’ apparently exists but is virtually
unknown. People who could be applicants are unaware of it. We are aware of potential claimants

Urban arrangements

There are no equivalent arrangements in urban areas to the rural support zone or homeowner
payment schemes. Urban areas, London in particular will suffer lengthy and extensive construction
for more than a decade, which they are being expected to suffer without compensation. Many of your
Petitioner’s members support the ‘Fair deal for London’ compensation charter.

Alternative approaches to blight

The current arrangements do nothing to protect property prices in blighted areas, or avoid the break­
up of communities. Both are of huge concern to your Petitioner’s members. Your Petitioner has
championed an alternative Property Bond approach that acts as an insurance policy for affected
residents. The Property Bond approach would reduce blight by restoring confidence in the market. It
does this by acting as purchaser of last resort, and:

- Provides reassurance to the owners – allaying their fears and reducing stress
- Reassures the purchaser – who knows they can get their money back if they have to
- Reassures the mortgage provider – as the bond is backed by government

The mortgage lenders declared their support for this sort of approach, and it would provide fairer
compensation. It can also be largely self-financing as PwC demonstrated for Government in an
extensive report on the Bond. It provides a win-win approach – as both sides benefit. Essentially it
avoids opposition to HS2 that is driven by the fear of a large uncompensated losses

Carbon emissions

The central plank of achieving carbon neutrality for HS2 is the planning of 2 million trees to sequester
carbon. Your Petitioner is concerned that there are not adequate commitments from the Promoter to
ensure that such a number of trees are planted, and there is no provision that ensured that these
trees will be maintained. Without clear and enforceable commitments there is simply no basis to
expect that sufficient trees will be planted, and those which are planted will survive

Other matters

Your Petitioner made a number of other submissions to the HoC High Speed Rail Select Committee
concerning other environmental impacts that had not been properly identified or mitigated. In our
view the Promoter has not remedied or undertaken to remedy these deficiencies that concern in
particular

- Air quality as it is affected by construction activities
• The failure to adopt best practice on ecology
• Failure to achieve effective means of addressing waste in the context of the waste hierarchy, as there is insufficient capacity to accommodate the volumes planned to go to landfill.

Remedy

Your Petitioner believes that the Promoter should be obliged to change his policy on noise so that:

• The LOAELs adopted for HS2 should correspond to the WHO recommendations
• Lower noise targets should be specified for relatively quiet areas
• Harmful levels of noise should be prevented
• The excuse for failure to reduce noise levels to below a harmful level that it is too expensive to be reasonably practicable should not be admissible

Your Petitioner believes that the discretionary compensation arrangements be amended so that:

• There are clear and comprehensive rules concerning eligibility of ‘Need to Sell’
• The rule concerning location is dropped
• Persons prepared to suffer the costs of moving should automatically be eligible if they can demonstrate that HS2 is blighting their property (a ‘Right to Sell’ scheme)
• There is an independent appeals process
• The ‘retrospective compensation’ arrangements referred to by the HoC SC for people who have ‘Sold and Lost’ should be clarified and publicised
• The compensation schemes are better tailored to meet the impacts on urban areas
• The property bond alternative is reconsidered if changes to the ‘Need to Sell’ rules are not made.

Your Petitioner believes that the various safety and environmental issues to which HS2 gives rise would be partly alleviated by reducing the maximum speed, and that a reduced top speed should be specified. There should also be firm undertakings on trees.

Your Petitioner believes that the achievement of the Minimum Environmental Requirements and implementation of the Construction Code should be enforced by an independent regulatory body.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Hilary Wharf (Roll B agent)

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

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

THE PETITION OF  
a. Brendan and Linda Connor  
b. Bruce and Susan Fischer  
c. Mark Fisher-Beards  

Declares that:  

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

The petitioners are freeholders of land and property required for HS2 and will have their homes and livelihoods affected by the HS2 project. They live in properties adjoining the land to be acquired by CPO powers set out in the Bill and associated legislation. The land and properties concerned with this petition are:  

a. Beechwood Farm House owned by Mr and Mrs Connor  
b. Beechwood Farm owned by Mr and Mrs Fischer  
c. Bridge House owned by Mr Fischer-Beards  

2. Your petitioner’s concerns  

The land that is proposed to be acquired by HS2 far exceeds that which is actually necessary for the rail line. The land required is set out in C274-TRQ-LP-COS-040-000159 (HS2 Land Referencing document) areas 131,128,129, and 127. The impact of this degree of land acquisition beyond that required for HS2 line will divide the land owned by Mr and Mrs Fischer, and deprive others named in the petition of access rights to their land which they currently enjoy. The purpose of such a large land acquisition beyond that identified in the rail route is unclear. The post HS2 position of the land is unclear as it will not be required (if it is necessary at all) by HS2 once the project is completed.  

The petitioners would propose that if the land is required for a temporary period for as yet unspecified purposes relating to HS2 then the most appropriate and reasonable approach would be to agree a licence to occupy and modify the land, thus avoiding the unnecessary costs and process involved in CPO.  

The petitioners have already made a similar suggestion to the House of Commons Select Committee, and appropriate agreements have been established in draft terms and are awaiting final approval by National Grid, HS2 and the petitioners.  

3. The prayer  

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they be given an opportunity to
give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill, and respectfully request that their petition be accepted.

Brendan Connor

Linda Connor

Bruce Fischer

Susan Fischer

Mark Fischer- Beards

All signatures given on 18 APRIL 2016
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Somers Town Community Association

 Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

3. The petitioner is a community association that runs a community centre that has been at the heart of the community of Somers for over 30 years. We deliver activities and services to the whole of Somers Town. There are approximately 12,500 people living in an area which is amongst the most diverse and most deprived in the country.

Our centre is managed by volunteer representatives from local tenants, residents and people working in the area. We have 20 full, but mostly part-time staff. We run a full time 48-place nursery, children and families drop-ins, youth groups, full time community café, the Somers Town Job Hub, a lunch club for the over sixties and English Spoken as an Other Language classes with IT skills and conversation. Whilst acting as host to Camden Safer Neighbourhood Board, Visually Impaired Camden, Food Cycle, Good Gym, Shelter, and the Sports Activators team.

4. Your petitioner’s concerns

Having served the community of Somers Town for over 30 years we are increasingly concerned as to the effect of the development of High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands); as we feel that the most vulnerable in our community whom we serve will be disproportionately affected by this development.

We would there fore ask that all possible consideration please be given to the following:

a. The hugely detrimental impact of placing satellite construction sites on children’s play grounds (as identified in safe guarding maps), in a community that has an increasingly large % of its residents living in overcrowded accommodation.

b. The impact of the loss of open space in a community that predominantly resides in dwellings that do not have access to gardens, so therefore rely on open access to good quality open public spaces. A situation that simply cannot be allowed to happen, given the already poor health indices for this community.

c. The impact of any increase on traffic through a community that has 6 primary and senior school premises based at its heart; both in terms of the safe movement of children through their community and in terms of any further deterioration of air quality.

d. The impact of any further deterioration of the air quality; in a community that suffers some of the worst air quality measurements possible, due to its proximity
to the Euston road.

e. The impact of the disruption to the regeneration of the Chalton street market, due to the placing of utilities down Chalton street. A position we believe will deal a massive blow to our plans around, access to quality affordable healthy produce, jobs and training opportunities and social activity programmes. As laid out in our Community Economic Plan and our Neighbourhood Plan.

f. The impact on those less mobile, due to age and or mobility issues from the increased traffic movement through Somers Town

We would also ask that serious consideration be given to the development of an integrated station at Euston that will house Crossrail 2. As we feel the accumulative impact of yet further construction work to come must at all costs be offset/mitigated where at all possible and that an integrated station would help to prevent a living hell situation for the residents of one of the most deprived wards in the country.

5. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Sarah Elia
Somers Town Community Association

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

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

THE PETITION OF Mrs Margaret Catherine Rand  

Declares that:  

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by Clause 11  

2. The petitioner Mrs Margaret Catherine Rand who lives at 11 Brudenell Drive, Stoke Mandeville, Bucks, HP22 5UR and Stables which are at The Silver Nugget, Marsh Lane, HP17 8SN.  

3. My concern is that Stopping up Marsh Lane which is an ancient route along which I have travelled for over 30 years on foot, bike, horse, car will have a detrimental effect on my life. The new route is much longer and will cost more money in diesel and more time to travel. It will be harder for me to use my bike and to walk. 

A tunnel under HS2 in Marsh Lane is asked for. This will enable me to get to the stables on firm ground and not have to travel further with cost of time and money when on my bike or walking.  

4. The prayer  

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

and the petitioner remains, etc.  

MARGARET CATHERINE RAND  

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF the Camden Civic Society

Declares that:

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

Your petitioners are the Camden Civic Society.

Introduction

1. Your Petitioners, the Camden Civic Society, lodged a Petition against the Bill (number 1837) and an additional Petition against AP3. Our first petition describes the Camden Civic Society and its membership and sets out the reasons why we are directly and specially affected by the Bill. In many respects AP3 exacerbates rather than mitigates the effects of the original Bill. We continue to rely on the matters set out in our previous petitions.

2. The Camden Civic Society has always campaigned for improved public transport. We recognise the need for increased rail capacity of all kinds and in principle are in favour of a new high speed line as long as this is well planned, causing minimum disruption and damage, and does not operate at excessive and wasteful speeds. We see the sense in bringing this line into Euston, a station which is relatively underused in comparison with other London termini. But we have very grave reservations about HS2 AP3 proposal as it affects Camden and strong objections to it.

Our experience so far as petitioners and our current position

3. Nothing in HS2 Ltd’s Promoters Response Document sent to us on 30th October last year suggests that any of our requests has been unfounded. Yet we have received no Assurances from HS2 Ltd.

4. As is the experience of perhaps every other independent Camden petitioner, we also find that almost none of the requests in our original and our AP3 petitions has received a response in any of the reports of the House of Commons Select Committee on HS2.

5. We are therefore obliged to repeat most of them again here.

6. In the House of Commons Select Committee (HCSC) Final Report, the only statements which answer a request from us are on the subject of Euston Station. In our AP3 Commons
petition, at paragraph 68, we asked for 'a coherent design for the redevelopment of the whole station'. The HCSC Final Report includes the following: at paragraph 255, 'A coherent plan for Euston station is needed' and at paragraph 243, 'We share the view that Euston's ultimate design needs an holistic approach. The Committee agrees with Camden [Council] that the opportunity for such a redevelopment should not be wasted and that the final appearance of the station should be a coherent whole.'

7. There has been no engagement on the part of HS2 Ltd with us or any other group within Camden since September 2015 and we have heard nothing directly from them about a revised station design. The impression gained from Camden Council is that HS2 Ltd will not be seeking a new Additional Provision to authorise any revised plans for Euston and that any new design will go through the normal planning procedures in Camden.

8. If it is true that any revised plans will be submitted to Camden Council for planning consent, we look forward to being involved ourselves in this local democratic process. On the condition that this takes place we withdraw our detailed requests in relation to station design. Outlined in our paragraph 68 of our last petitions, these cover station architecture, development around and on top of Euston station, the Seifert buildings, the reinstatement of Euston Square, and arrangements for above-ground local transport (buses and taxis).

Lack of clarity as to what the Commons Select Committee's recommendation covers

9. We wish to record that at this point we remain uncertain as to what is covered by the HCSC's statement that 'the final appearance of the station should be a coherent whole'. On present evidence do not believe that it equates to our own broad request for 'a coherent design for the redevelopment of the whole station'. We take up this issue again below, at paragraphs 15-21.

10. We are in general uncertain about Parliament's intentions for a new station design and how the SC's advice accords with the Bill itself. We note that the Assurances obtained by Camden Council include provision for a new Euston Station Strategic Redevelopment Board, of which Camden will be a member, and that a competition has been announced for a new 'architect-led' design for Euston station (reported for example in bdonline.co.uk on 6th April). But we also note that these potentially positive steps have not been absorbed formally into the Bill and that on the occasion of the Commons Third Reading on 23rd March this year the Labour Amendment on Euston Station, NC22, was voted down by the Government. The first clause of this amendment read:

1) The Secretary of State will require the nominated undertaker to take reasonable steps to develop integrated and comprehensive design and construction plans for Euston Station that include integration with other Euston Schemes.

(We ourselves were not in favour of this amendment since in detail it was based on 'The enlarged Euston Station' and the Euston Area Plan, both of which we have objected to.)

Our concerns are as follows:
Temporary effects of HS2 up to the completion of the high speed lines and platforms.

11. As before, the Camden Civic Society is not attempting in our petition to cover the so-called 'temporary effects' of HS2 though our position remains that, within Camden, these are far too great to be acceptable. We also cannot agree that effects which are due to continue over such a very long construction period can be considered, for mitigation and compensation purposes, as 'temporary'. It is also our position that to divide residents and businesses for compensation purposes into 'urban' and 'rural' on no factual basis is grossly unfair; we note the opinion of local MP, the Right Hon Sir Keir Starmer MP QC, that it does not accord with European Convention on Human Rights (House of Commons petition of the HS2 Euston Action Group, 1686, paragraph 65).

12. We support the agreed community aims as listed, for example, in the petition of the Regent's Park Estate residents. ‘Asks’ on matters not covered in the body of this petition include: fair urban compensation and the appointment of an independent adjudicator; mitigation for twenty years construction work, agreed and adequately monitored and enforced; minimal disruption and duration of every aspects of HS2 construction; enforcement and fines for breaches of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP); Local Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) actively enforced by officers on the ground; no demolition until there is a formally agreed integrated plan for Euston station authorised by Camden council; no worsening of air quality from HS2 pollution; timely information from HS2 enabling genuine engagement.

13. In more detail, on the subject of mitigation we support the requests in the House of Lords (HL} petition of the Camden Cutting Group. On the very important issue of compensation we support the HL petition of HS2 Euston Action Group. On air pollution we follow the HL petition of Netley School, and on green spaces and trees the HL petition of the Vicar of St Pancras.

Proposals which affect Camden between Parkway and Kilburn High Road.

14. Although the London Borough of Camden extends as far as Kilburn High Road, we are not attempting here to cover HS2 issues between Kilburn and Parkway. HS2 will have substantial effects west of Parkway, but in these are less interconnected than those between Parkway and Euston Road and are ably covered by local groups, including the Gloucester Avenue Association, Belsize Residents Association, and Dinerman Court Limited.

Proposal for a new ‘coherent’ design for Euston station: timescale.

15. We trust that the proposal for a new ‘coherent plan for Euston station’ is not just a device for putting off important decisions about our area. We would like to record that the residents and businesses in the parts of Camden directly affected by the HS2 scheme have by now been in a state of uncertainty for six years, since the announcement of the HS2 in March 2010. This prolonged uncertainty has already led to their experiencing very considerable stress.
16. Our request is that a final proposal for Euston station is put forward as soon as possible and that residents and businesses are not condemned to a further long period of personal and financial uncertainty.

Proposal for a new ‘coherent’ design for Euston station: we do not believe that a phased construction programme is compatible with a coherent design.

17. The Euston proposal published with first Environmental Statement in November 2013, Option 8, while it divided the platforms into three sections, did envisage a single elevation right across the front of the station as well as that reconstruction of the whole station should be a single undertaking. The phased approach introduced with AP3 lost any coherence that might have been inherent to Option 8, and left the rump of the classic platforms, B2, the eastern side of the station, without a design or timetable. This was never going to lead to building which looked good and worked well, and we have serious doubts as to whether the eastern side would or could have been rebuilt under this scheme. (See below, paragraphs 25-29). We are not clear whether the current proposal for a coherent design extends to platforms and tracks, but we believe, for a good design to be achieved, and one that can be carried out within a reasonable time, the phasing envisaged in AP3 needs to be abandoned for all aspects of the station redevelopment.

18. Our request here is that the station is redeveloped as a single undertaking which is carefully planned and organised to take as short a time as possible.

Proposal for a new ‘coherent’ plan for Euston station: what is covered by it outside the station itself?

19. As explained paragraphs 9 and 10 above, we are not clear how far the recommendation of the House of Commons Select Committee (at their paragraph 255), for ‘a coherent plan for Euston station’, extends geographically. As just mentioned, we are also not whether it covers the platforms and tracks.

20. We note indications that Camden Council understand the area as extending as far as Parkway; for example, residents of Park Village East (PVE) concerned about the proposed intervention building opposite 30 PVE, have been told that this is considered to be part of ‘Euston’ and will be covered by the new design.

21. Taking the largest possible interpretation therefore of ‘Euston’ and ‘Euston station’ our requests relevant to a new coherent design continue as follows, starting with shared community ‘asks’: that an integrated plan for Euston be developed which fits within the present station and railway footprint; that in this new design, provision for local transport, including a station for the new Crossrail 2 line, is fully integrated; that demolitions on the east side of the station are avoided by integrating the western end of the Crossrail 2 station into the Euston station design; that no additional rail services are brought into Euston station until local transport has the capacity to take the additional passengers. Our own requests continue: that the new coherent design extends as far as Parkway and includes platforms, tracks, track alignment and tunnel portals; that the new coherent design covers Hampstead Road Bridge, Granby Terrace bridge, Mornington Street bridge, any boundary...
structures, ancillary structures including the headhouse opposite 6 PVE, the slab over the tracks alongside the Park Village carriage sheds, and the two ‘intervention’ buildings, one opposite 30 PVE at the corner of PVE and Mornington Street and the other at the corner of PVE and Granby Terrace.

Railway questions: many details of HS2’s scheme remain uncertain and we do not have evidence that they have been resolved, or that all of them can be resolved.

22. Everyone directly affected by HS2 within Camden have experienced a failure on the part of HS2 to engage and properly communicate to us what their scheme means in detail. In this way we have become aware that many aspects of the AP3 scheme remain unresolved. This is particularly well demonstrated by the experience of the residents of Park Village East (the Park Village East Heritage Group – PVEHG), in trying to obtain details of the concrete box structure or ‘birdcage’ to be built partly under their street, what the construction process will entail and how close it will come to their houses. They have found that over time HS2 has become gradually less open, a change reflected in the dwindling number of documents that HS2 were prepared to share: in 2013 they were given a Powerpoint file by HS2 with images showing construction sequence; in early 2014 they were given full-size measured plan and section drawings of the proposals for the cutting; in the September 2015 Environmental Statement (ES), the design for the ‘birdcage’ is only referred to in a footnote in very small script where it is described as a ‘conceptual design’ (SES2 & AP3 ES, Vol.2, p.71, n.41); in October 2104, they were given a revised set of drawings, but not full scale and not showing the buildings surrounding the cutting; at the PVEHG’s HCSC appearance on 2nd December last year the ‘PVE Pack’, P.11849, included at slide 13 a single section drawing from what was evidently a further modification of the birdcage structure, but without scale or number and with very poor resolution; in an e-mail of 4th February this year Damian Cox, Area Petition Advisor- Euston, wrote to the PVEHG - “I am unable to provide further drawings as the detailed design is still progressing”; in an e-mail of March 21st March this year Damian Cox wrote to the PVEHG - “the actual method of construction would be determined at a later date by the contractor undertaking the work”. (A summary of the experience of the PVEHG in trying to get information from HS2 is contained in their submission to Commons Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee and has been published together with the PACAC report on HS2.)

23. It is now over a year since the Option 8 proposal was withdrawn and more than six months since the AP3 scheme was published: we ask ourselves, if the scheme is workable how is it that there is still no detailed design which can be shared with residents directly affected?

24. We request in relation to the above that: the House of Lords Select Committee does its best to establish, in open session, and with reference to independent technical advice, whether HS2 as it comes through Camden into Euston has a design which is workable in concept and in detail; that the Select Committee ensures that updated detailed drawings of HS2’s proposals together with construction sequences are available to all participants in the petitioning process.
Railway questions: the phasing of the construction of the new railway and of the reconstruction of Euston station.

25. Our view is the phased proposal inherent to AP3 has never been properly thought through in practical terms. We believe that the main reason for the phasing is probably financial (finance is given as one reason for it in Professor McNaughton’s evidence to the Commons Select Committee on the afternoon of 30th November 2015, at paragraphs 32-33). The stated advantages to the classic services and rail operating companies are very much doubted by us (ibid., paragraphs 34-39; the opening speech of Lord Ahmed at the Lords Second Reading 14th April 2016 - We will deliver the new HS2 station at Euston in a phased approach to reduce disruption to the existing railway and help better manage impacts on the wider area. – we trust the noble lord was unaware how very dubious this statement is, there is absolutely no doubt that the impact on the wider area would be significantly increased under AP3’s phased programme; see also SES2 & AP3 Vol 2 CFA1, 1.1.5). Our belief is that the phasing might result in minimised disruption of the ‘classic’ services’ during the construction of HS2 phases A and B1 but would result in very much increased disruption of them in the B2 phase.

26. In particular we are unclear how the platforms in the rump of the station, B2, and tracks leading to them, can be reconfigured according to a ‘coherent’ station design if phases A and B1 have already been constructed.

27. At the end of Phase B1 of the AP3 scheme, the undeveloped part of the station (B2) would be left with eleven platforms. Several train service plans for the post-construction period have been published over time: taken with Network Rail’s ‘Rules of the Route’ and its most recent passenger forecasts, it seems likely that at peak hours in the early to mid-2030s (the earliest that Phase B2 could be redeveloped) most, if not all, of these platforms would be needed.

28. The situation will be worsened if Camden Council’s request for a ‘level deck’ station is accepted; this would involve integrating the HS2 and Network Rail parts of the station together with a section of the proposed Crossrail 2 station and would require the lowering of the remaining ‘classic’ platforms to the below-ground level of the HS2 platforms. Consequently the classic tracks approaching the station from the north would additionally have to be lowered.

29. Here our request is that Network Rail be required to produce a scheme that demonstrates that phase B2 is in fact buildable before work starts on the HS2 station.

Railway questions: track layout in the throat and Camden Cutting and the necessity for concrete box or ‘birdcage’ structure below Park Village East.

30. As set out in paragraphs 22-24 above, the incomplete information provided by HS2 on track layout in the throat and Camden Cutting and the need for a concrete box or ‘birdcage’ structure, suggests to us that this part of the railway design has also not been fully thought through.
31. Meanwhile, on one of the drawings provided by HS2 Ltd on 15th October last year (C22-ARP-CV-DSK-01A-432055), the PVEHG discovered text with misgivings about the effect during the operation of the railway on the Grade II* listed PVE villas: “Greater flexibility of propping arrangement may mean increased movement of barrette retaining walls (which may mean increased effects on PVE properties)”. This ‘movement’ would be on top of ‘settlement’ caused to the houses by the rebuilding closer to the houses of the Camden Cutting’s western retaining wall as well as by and the insertion of ground anchors into the ground beneath the houses (the purpose of the permanent anchors being to pin the birdcage against the retaining wall and the ground behind); this settlement itself might extend many years beyond the completion of the construction of the new railway.

32. Residents are concerned that, because of lack of space within the cutting, the birdcage on its western side is propped against the retaining wall itself, rather than being contained on each side within its own structure; they also understand that the arrangement of the high speed tracks within the birdcage is comparatively complex, and that this also adds to the stresses on the structure; finally, they have been told that the potential for movement has increased since the reinstatement of Line X which, for a short stretch, sits on top of the birdcage.

33. The Camden Civic Society in turn questions the comparatively high speed HS2 has given as the purpose for undercutting Park Village East. Speed is also given as the reason for the distance required to accommodate at this point, within the birdcage and well away from the station, the ‘grade separation’ which is required to allow the high speed trains to make use all of the platforms dedicated to them. We have been led to understand that the given speed is connected with the ‘refresh rate’ for the High Speed platforms, something we may wish to go further into when we address the House of Lords Select Committee.

34. Our asks are here that: that HS2’s current design for the birdcage and its relationship to the new retaining wall and the listed villas be assessed and evaluated by an independent expert; that a new design is developed which would allow the birdcage to be supported independently of the retaining wall; that any research carried out for HS2 Ltd into the need for particular speeds to be achieved in the Cutting are made publicly available.

‘Heritage Assets’: poor consideration given to the short and long term effects of the construction work and of the operational railway.

35. As we demonstrated in our presentation to HCSC, in the original Environmental Statement (ES) and in the AP3 ES ‘Heritage Assets’ are poorly represented. Individually listed buildings are not marked separately on the maps supplied, and Conservation Areas (CAs) are not shown at all. But Camden as a whole is rich in Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, and the area through which HS2’s new railway would pass is typical in this respect. The impression given by the maps and the ES text is that little consideration has been given to these assets. This is an opinion that Camden Council evidently shares: in its detailed comments on the original ES, at 6.3.2. ‘Camden Council points out that the Cultural Heritage section fails to provide a sufficiently detailed assessment of the temporary and permanent
impacts on these important heritage assets which are likely to occur during the construction of the Proposed Scheme.’

36. Once again the example of Park Village East is particularly telling, and Camden’s summary number EUS003 on p.452 of its response to the original ES, sets this out: ‘Camden Council wishes to stress that the construction impacts on the 17 grade II* listed houses in Park Village East and on the Regent’s Park Conservation Area is likely to be severe. The residential properties and the street itself will suffer access issues for a period of seven years, which is likely to put these nationally significant Nash properties at risk and in danger of serious decay. The impacts from structural works to the railway cutting retaining wall and from potential settlement and vibration have not been assessed. The scale of impact of ‘medium’ underestimates the potential impacts, which should be ‘high’. Camden Council supports the ‘major adverse’ effect rating.’

37. Camden’s position was supported by English Heritage in its letter of 24th February 2014 in response to the original ES: ‘There are risks associated with the widening of Euston Cutting, above which sit the Grade II* listed paired villas of Park Village East. These properties may be vulnerable to ground movement caused by construction of the expanded cutting.’

38. The issue of decay has become more acute since the introduction of the longer AP3 scheme. In PVE, from the AP3 documents and from informal conversation with HS2 Ltd employees, residents have been able to deduce that much of the construction work needed for the ‘birdcage’ will take place from the PVE carriageway. During the six years during which PVE will be closed and this construction work will take place, the houses are likely to be left empty for extended periods (HS2 Ltd has issued an Assurance to PVE to cover rehousing for a period up to a year, but residents believe that the time away from PVE is likely to be much longer).

39. At meetings and in conversation with HS2 Ltd employees, the impression given is that any damage can be repaired after the event, and the building ‘reinstated’. But in good Conservation practice, reinstatement and replacement have long since become a poor second best to maintenance and preservation.

40. Our requests here are: that the avoidance of direct damage and damage by neglect is given urgent consideration by HS2 Ltd; that HS2 guarantees vehicle access at short notice to Listed Buildings and other heritage assets, throughout the period of the railway’s construction, for the purposes of maintenance and repair.

‘Heritage Assets’: poor understanding shown by HS2 Ltd of the concept of the ‘setting’ of Listed Buildings and of Conservation Areas.

41. In the original ES and the AP3 ES, insufficient consideration is given by HS2 Ltd the question of the ‘setting’ of Listed Buildings and of Conservation Areas. We note that, in the AP3 ES, in Chapter 12, on Landscape and Visual Assessment, better and more detailed consideration is given to setting than in Chapter 9, on Cultural Heritage. Once again, PVE provides a useful example, in the words of Camden’s response to the original ES p.198,
under the heading 'Verifiable Photomontages': 'The setting of the villas and the conservation area will be affected by the large bulk and mass of the portal/headhouse structure in the cutting.'

42. In the AP3 scheme, two additional railway buildings are proposed for Park Village East, in addition the headhouse just mentioned. These will be two intervention buildings, also rising 8 m above ground level, one situated in front of 30 PVE, at the corner of PVE and Mornington Street, and the other at the southern end of PVE, at the corner with Granby Terrace (the Conservation Area boundary extends as far as this). In the views up Mornington Street over the bridge to PVE, the first of these two intervention buildings will hide the Nash villa behind it, 30 PVE. To say, as Camden have written to residents, that the detailed and exterior treatment of this building has yet to be decided, gives us little reassurance given the proposed building’s height and width.

43. Our requests in relation to the setting of Listed Building and of Conservation Areas are as follows: heritage assets and their care must not be an afterthought and must be considered from the conception of any new proposal; assessments should involve properly trained staff and not left to HS2 employees or consultants without qualifications in this area; the relevant statutory consultees – the Georgian Group, the Victorian Society and the 20th Century Society – should be brought in at an early point to any discussion of new impacts on Listed Buildings which would occur as part of the new Euston design.

Our proposal for the establishment of a Starcross Conservation Area in a triangle to west of Euston station.

44. Much of Camden – apparently over 50% - is already covered by CA status. But both listings and the designation of CAs has been a long-drawn-out process and there remain some significant gaps. One such is the triangle of land bounded on the south by Euston Street, on the west by North Gower Street/Hampstead Road and the east by Melton Street/Cardington Street, which particularly around Drummond Street and North Gower Street retains much of its very early 19th century character and scale, as well as a high proportion of original buildings.

45. Since the inception of the CAs in the late 1960s, many of Camden’s CAs have been designated at the instigation of the Camden Civic Society, and we have notified Camden Council officers of our intentions in relation to this ‘Starcross’ area.

46. The purpose of the Starcross CA, if Camden Council and Historic England agree to its designation, would not be to put a stop to development, but to ensure that proposals which would affect the new CA and its setting, are considered with a good deal more thought and expertise than has been apparent in HS2’s attitudes to heritage assets so far.

Euston Arch.

47. At our presentation to the HCSC we stated that we are strongly opposed to the reconstruction of the Euston Arch within Euston Square, particularly in the position proposed by the so-called Euston Arch Trust, squeezed between the much smaller and also historically and architecturally important surviving mid-19th century lodges facing onto Euston Road.
48. If a position for the Euston Arch could be found within the structure of new station, as envisaged by the DDD scheme, this might be something which we would agree to.

We repeat our request to HS2 that they establish a platform from which to view the Primrose Hill portals.

49. Our request to HS2 that they establish a platform to view the Primrose Hill was included in our AP3 petition, at paragraphs S1-S1. As stated there: The creation of a viewing platform will soon be become possible because an electricity substation, used for the cooling of railway power cables, is about to come out of commission...... If this small building was demolished, a very fine view of the portals would be opened up. The failure of HS2 Ltd so far to engage with us on this question - the only information offered by HS2, that the site of the electricity substation belongs to Network Rail, hardly presents a major obstacle - forms part of our PACAC submission of February this year.

Clause 48 (previously Clause 47).

50. The information provided on Clause 48 (previously Clause 47) in the Promoters Response Document of October last year, rather than reassuring us, has made us even more concerned. In particular, the following sentence (p.39) reinforces the impression that this clause is completely unsuited to the Euston area: When pursuing regeneration and development opportunities in relation to infrastructure projects, amongst other factors, local authorities will need to ensure there is appropriate provision of land in the surrounding vicinity of stations and depots and that it is appropriately packaged to achieve the wider ambitions of the area.

51. This envisages a situation where a station is bordered by Railway Lands, as at King's Cross and St Pancras. Exceptionally, at Euston there are no Railway Lands adjacent: from the time the station was first established, in the 1830s, the associated Railway Lands have been over a mile away to the north, between the Regent's Canal and Chalk Farm. We made this point forcefully at the HCSC and we are sorry it has been reflected in their report.

52. One site which the AP3 ES appears to identify for Clause 48 exploitation is the rump of St James's Gardens left after the majority has been absorbed into the station. It is not acceptable that land which has been public open space for more than two centuries should be sold off for commercial use in this way.

53. We are almost as worried about a site on Melton Street, also identified in the AP3 ES as suitable for commercial development. This is to the south of the above-ground parts of the AP3 station, though possibly on top above some underground areas of the new construction. It is not acceptable that a plot which has been in local authority ownership, forming part of a long-established network of rights of way, should be exploited in this manner. In any case, to construct a large building here would restrict flexibility of access to the new station.
54. Our request, following the petitions of the HS2 Euston Action Group and of our GLA member, Andrew Dismore, is that clause 48 is removed altogether from the bill.

Railway alternatives: overview

55. An important part of our two earlier petitions dealt with alternative railway schemes and the great improvements we believe these are able to offer over HS2 Ltd’s scheme, particularly in its impacts on its Camden

Since submitting our AP3 petition we have worked closely with the authors of three alternative schemes and one phasing variant and would like to recommend all of these to the Select Committee: they are Euston Express (EE), Double Deck Down 3* (DDD), High Speed UK (HSUK) and Old Oak Common as a Temporary Terminus (OOCTT). DDD, EE and HSUK, are all able to accommodate the platforms and tracks for the high speed trains within the station’s existing footprint, thus avoiding the need to expand to the station and the railway to the west.

56. To some extent these alternatives are complementary: a Double Deck design for Euston Station could be used in conjunction with Euston Express or High Speed UK as well as with HS2 AP3; High Speed UK offers a neat link to HS1 at St Pancras via the Midland Main Line and Euston Express could also link to HS1 by making use of the WCML tracks and then the North London Line as far as the junction with HS1 at Camley Street. (As already stated in our evidence to the Commons Select Committee, in a scheme such as HS2 Ltd’s, where all the high speed trains come on into central London from Old Oak Common there is no easy way of forming a link with HS1, a situation recognised in the Government’s report on the HS2-HS1 link published in November last year.)

57. While the DDD scheme accommodates all the platforms envisaged in HS2’s AP3 proposal, a theme common to EE, HSUK and OOCTT alternatives is the necessity of diverting some classic trains away from Euston. A reduction of commuter services coming into Euston would be achieved most simply by extending Crossrail 1 on from Old Oak Common north-west onto the West Coast Main Line and replacing most of the commuter services currently coming in to Euston from stations between Tring, Hemel Hempstead, Watford and Wealdstone. This scheme has its origins in Network Rail’s Route Utilisation Strategy Report for London & the South East (July 2011) and has been subject to various modifications since. It would involve construction of a short length of new line from a point on the Willesden Relief Lines of the WCML to the “New North Line” which runs into Old Oak Common above the line of the tunnelled HS2 route from Ruislip. Passive provision for such a link has been included in AP2.

58. Diversion of some services away from Euston, at least in the short term, is in our opinion essential. This is because, as set out in paragraphs 25-29 above, we doubt it is possible to comprehensively rebuild Euston without such diversions. The OOCTT proposal would allow high speed trains coming into London via OOC (i.e. as in HS2’s own Phase 1 trains) to terminate temporarily at OOC in the platforms and station box structure forming part of the
Hybrid Bill scheme, thereby freeing up more space at Euston and perhaps facilitating the movement of materials and spoil by rail. (It is assumed that this scheme would use the tunnelled link from Old Oak to Euston which forms part of the Hybrid Bill scheme: it is likely that these tunnels would have to be completed before the station at OOC could be brought into operation, one or both tunnels could be used for the delivery of materials and removal of spoil to and from Euston).

59. Our first request in relation to these schemes is that the House of Lords Select Committee agree to hear presentations of these alternatives; our second is that, as in Lord Berkeley’s withdrawn second Motion on the occasion of the Bill’s Second Reading in the House of Lords on 14th April, that an independent technical advisor is appointed to attend the Lords Select Committee – this would avoid the risk of the overdependence of committee members on HS2’s Ltd own experts for the explanation of technical matters; our third request is that the Select Committee request that the Government commission a detailed technical, economic and social analysis of HS2 Ltd’s current proposals for the route into Euston alongside equivalent studies of the alternatives, and that this be done as soon as possible; our fourth is that, if HS2 Ltd and the Government have considered the various alternative solutions in any depth, that all relevant research, analysis and correspondence by and between HS2 Ltd, the DfT and the Treasury is made public.

The High Speed UK scheme: relevant background.

60. The Camden Civic Society would like ourselves to present the High Speed UK scheme to the House of Lords Select Committee. We were very grateful for the opportunity to do so to the HCSC.

61. There is no mention of HSUK in the HCSC report. HS2 Ltd themselves have also not engaged with us on this subject: HSUK was not mentioned in the Promoters Response Document and no evidence on HSUK was included by HS2 Ltd in their evidence pack submitted to the HCSC. (We have outlined this lack of engagement in our submission to PACAC.)

62. The reason given by HS2 Ltd for this non-engagement is that HSUK is considered by them to be non-compliant with the principle of the bill; this is technically correct in so far that HSUK, up to now, had no services passing through OOC. To remedy this lack, the authors of High Speed UK, Quentin Macdonald and Colin Elliff, have added a ‘Parliamentary Loop’ to the scheme, taking some trains to Old Oak Common en route to Euston, making possible a direct connection at that point with Crossrail 1 (and so allowing travel by Crossrail 1 to Heathrow) and with the Great Western Railway.

63. Members of the Lords Select Committee will be aware that HSUK made a presentation of their scheme to the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee during its Inquiry into The Economic Case for HS2; we would like to think that what they learnt then at about HSUK may have influenced the conclusion of that Committee that “it is not at all clear that HS2 represents the best, most cost-effective solution to the problems it is intended to solve.” (Report Summary, p.5.) At the Second Reading debate at the House of Lords on 14th April
this year, HSUK’s alternative scheme was referred to by four members, Lord Rowe-Beddoe, Lord Framlingham, Lord Turnbull and Viscount Simon.

The High Speed UK scheme: further details.

64. High Speed UK 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. Taking advantage of the opportunities to divert commuter services away from Euston, HSUK would 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.

65. The main approach to Euston would be by four single-track tunnels of ‘Continental’ size between West Hampstead and south of Parkway. With no complicated crossover movements to accommodate, the tunnel entry structure would be much simpler and more robust, thus greatly limiting the potential for ground movement. This would remove the need for the HS2 ‘birdcage’ construction in Camden Cutting. The tunnel alignment would pass under Belsize Park and a vent shaft might be sited at Juniper Crescent.

66. With train flows into Euston reduced during reconstruction works, the West Coast Main Line from Euston to Willesden Junction and beyond could be used to transport materials and spoil. It might also prove possible to use a completed tunnel for spoil removal directly to the Midland Main Line at West Hampstead.

67. The ‘Parliamentary Loop’, which we have introduced in order to comply with the principle of the HS2 Hybrid Bill, would turn take some trains from Brent Cross to Old Oak Common. Travelling on from OOC to Euston, these trains would first use tunnels up to the West Coast Main Line (as in the Euston Express scheme) and would then follow the WCML tracks to the Euston approach. Finally these trains would join the HSUK ‘high speed’ tracks (arriving at Euston directly from West Hampstead) in the throat of Euston Station.
The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Name:........................................ Signature:

Hero Granger-Taylor,
Committee member, Camden Civic Society
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Baroness Lydia Ann von Maltzahn of Home Farm, Shelswell Park, Bicester, Oxfordshire, OX27 8EH

Declarations that:
1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill
2. Your petitioner
   The petitioner is the freeholder of Shelswell Park, Fringford, Bicester, which is a predominantly arable farm with some livestock together with forestry and woodchip enterprises and rental properties. The north eastern part of this property is affected by the Bill.
3. Your petitioner’s concerns and proposed solution
   Replacement agricultural building
   The proposed scheme involves the demolition of an agricultural barn that was erected around five years ago. It is currently used for storing woodchip and firewood arising from the farm’s forestry enterprises.
   Your petitioner is looking for an equivalent barn to be provided elsewhere on her farm. This needs to be erected before the old one is demolished to ensure business continuity.
   To date HS2 has offered to pay for the cost of planning permission for the replacement building. It has yet to agree that it will pay for the cost of building the new barn.
   Your petitioner feels that her request is straightforward and follows the principle of equivalence.
   In essence providing a replacement building will leave her in the same position as she was before HS2 acquired her property.
4. The prayer
   The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that she, or someone representing her in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Mr Paul Robert Allen
Agent for the Petitioner  

Dated 18 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF STEEPLE CLAYDON PARISH COUNCIL

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner represents the Parish Council of the village of Steeple Claydon situated in north Buckinghamshire. Steeple Claydon is a village of approximately 800 houses and boasts a community-run library, a primary school with over 170 pupils, a thriving nursery school, a busy doctors’ surgery, several public houses and shops which serve the village and surrounding areas. Steeple Claydon enjoys a rural setting while having many amenities. It is this aspect which attracts most people to the village.

Steeple Claydon will be directly affected as a result of Scheduled Works 2/80 and 2/80A. The Calvert Railhead – a structure twice the size of Wembley Stadium – will be operational over a ten-year construction period within our village boundaries and, once HS2 is operational, a smaller but still significant Infrastructure Maintenance Depot will remain permanently to service the railway.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Although your petitioner has engaged with the Promoter and given evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee (HoCSC), there are many matters which still cause your petitioner great concern.
Traffic Measures

The Parish of Steeple Claydon requested a rail station on the East-West Rail line in our petition to the HoCSC which was not granted. East-West Rail has made passive provision for a station at Steeple Claydon and this was supported by Buckinghamshire County Council and Aylesbury Vale District Council. We feel that as a community, we are going to be very negatively impacted by the building of HS2, a rail line which will offer no benefit to our community. A station on the East-West Rail line built at the expense of the Promoter, we had hoped, would go some way towards mitigating this disruption and would serve to bring workers to the site during construction. We are disappointed that no other funding models working with the Promoter were examined.

Your petitioner is concerned about the measures put in place to protect our rural roads and the safe passage of pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and other road users. While there is provision for large vehicles to use the dedicated haul routes in the Route Wide Traffic Management Plan, your petitioner is concerned there are no controls on the high daily traffic of the workers to and from the IMD and by visitors to the site. We request that the Committee compel the Promoter to make use of technological solutions such as ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition) or RFID (Radio Frequency Identification) at the Promoter's expense to monitor the traffic, and that any contracts issued by the promoter will compel the workforce to use only the designated routes. We would expect Buckinghamshire County Council and the Promoter to formally review these in a timely matter over the construction period and for there to be a mechanism in place to adequately penalise contractors who do not adhere to the designated routes. Resources should be provided to the County Council to fulfil this requirement.

HS2 and East West Rail (EWR)

As a village that will be severely affected by both EWR and HS2, we ask that the House directs the Promoter to work with EWR to maximise the integration of the two networks. We are concerned that unless the two work together, there will be a doubling up of works which result in even more disruption in our area. The Integration Report on HS2/EWR has not been shared with the local parishes, and we request the Lords ensure that as much as possible is done to make these two entities work together to limit disruption.

Local jobs, skills and economic opportunities

The construction of the works authorised by the Bill may provide additional local employment and during the HoCSC hearings, this was raised with the Promoter. Your petitioner requests that the
promoter works with the relevant authorities to provide a procurement strategy which will include a commitment to use the local workforce and suppliers during the construction period and beyond.

Lighting at the IMD

Your petitioner notes that the Promoter recognises the need for sympathetic lighting in our parish, according to the Campaign for Rural England, one of Buckinghamshire's 'dark skies' areas. However, your petitioner would be reassured if the House of Lords supported our request for 'best in class' lighting which minimises the light pollution not only during the construction of the IMD, but for the life of the IMD site. We recognise this may change over time as lighting improves, but it is important to this petitioner that the rural nature of our parish is maintained as much as possible and plans for lighting are done in consultation with this parish. We ask that Promoter's lighting arrangements are formalised as soon as practicable in consultation with the local communities.

Noise from the IMD

The Promoter has given very few assurances on noise levels of the working IMD and your petitioner would like more detail on how the Promoter plans to minimise the disruption to the local residents. As Parishioners whose lives will be greatly disrupted by the IMD, we request that the House ask the Promoter to limit as much as possible excessive noise.

Local Mitigation Funding

The promoter has been asked to set aside £1 million pounds to be used locally for funding projects to be split amongst four parishes (Calvert, Twyford, Charndon and Steeple Claydon) over a ten year period. We feel that for the disruption caused to our Parishes and the cost to our health and wellbeing over the construction period and beyond, an amount double that should be the starting point of negotiations.

Note:

We support the petitions of Calvert Green Parish Council, Charndon, Parish Council, Twyford Parish Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council who are all petitioning for the best mitigation for our scattered communities.
General

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

4. The prayer

The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the council, 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.

Édi Smročkum
Roll B Agent
Steeple Claydon Parish Council

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF LESUE FRANK ROBINS

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

2. Your petitioner
Your Petitioner is Leslie Frank Robins, resident at "Crocketts", Lee Common, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 9JR, 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 views with dismay the prospective desecration of the countryside in which he has hitherto spent a quiet retirement (after 43 years of public service); and the imminent turmoil in his daily life caused by the racket, squalor and chaotic traffic conditions associated with the construction of a railway.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 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.

LESLIE FRANK ROBINS

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF ANDREW and THEA GIBBS  

Declares that:  

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

Your petitioner  

1. The petitioners are the Gibbs family, owners of 293 Cromwell Lane, Burton Green, Kenilworth, CV3 1PN. We purchased this property in 2006 as a house in a tranquil semi-rural location with spacious grounds, a place to bring up our two children and a place that we would never need to leave. The property is just over 60m away from the centre line of the route in the heart of Burton Green village.  

Your petitioner's concerns  

2. Your petitioner's property is described in the documentation as being subject to significant effects during the lengthy construction phase including noise and dust plus visual intrusion from the works adjacent including extensive earth movements and demolitions. We have concerns about health implications of these effects and especially on our children (and the knock on effect on their education and psychological well-being). We note that while 'temporary' the planned construction period essentially lasts the remainder of our children’s childhoods.  

3. Your petitioner’s property is shown in the documentation to suffer in perpetuity from increased noise created by the operation of the proposed railway which will continue to prevent our peaceful enjoyment of gardens and outdoor spaces.  

4. Your petitioners assert that we (and many others in the village) are unreasonably and unnecessarily affected by the HS2 railway current design, as described in the Bill plus Additional Provisions and in the supporting documents including the Environmental Statements, in that the proposed design is insufficiently effective at mitigating the effects of the scheme at completion whilst technical solutions do exist. We would request that an independent assessment is made using clearly stated and quantitative criteria to ensure that mitigation and cost benefit is made to a consistent fashion in all areas of the line and to avoid any impression that this is made only by political expedience and to avoid expense. Such an independent assessment could usefully be applied to the justification for the entire project in order to reassure citizens who are negatively affected and taxpayers in general that this scheme and its implementation is in the national interest.  

5. Your petitioners request improved mitigation measures be implemented to reduce the impact of the operation of the railway line. Particular consideration should be given to extending the length at both ends of the currently proposed cut-and-cover
tunnel and to other measures beyond the tunnel along the line which would significantly reduce the visual and noise impacts on property and amenities such as the Greenway and village hall.

6. Your petitioners note that while not wishing to leave our home or the village and friends around which we have built our lives we are effectively being forced to do so by the unacceptable impacts to be caused by both the construction and operation of the proposed scheme. However as only part of our property is in the original blight zone our ‘choice’ to leave is under the RSZ, which would cost us not only the heartache of the loss itself but also the entire effort and financial costs of moving — effectively paying the government Stamp Duty for a sale forced by their actions. We would request therefore that properties within the RSZ at the very least should be provided with all moving expenses.

7. Your petitioners request that homeowners in the RSZ who opt to stay and receive the ACO should maintain their rights to sell their property to the government at a later date, of course minus the value of the payment already received, should they choose to do so. Your petitioners believe it is unreasonable to withhold this right to sell given the substantial impact on Burton Green village. Should living within the construction zone for an extended period of time become untenable for any reason, homeowners within the RSZ should be able to exercise the right to sell, as distinct from the “need to sell” scheme.

8. Your petitioners request that the valuation of properties within the RSZ be conducted fairly and with local market knowledge in order to reach a proper valuation for sale or ACO purposes. Currently there is no independent assurance that this process is being conducted fairly, and a local sense that the opposite is the case. Your petitioners request an independent arbitration process to ensure that homeowners are fairly treated in the valuation of their properties. We understand that such a scheme may be in the process of being implemented however if that is not the case the petitioners may have to address the select committee of your right honourable House about this issue.

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Andrew Gibbs
Thea Gibbs

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF JOHN MCKEON AND DOREEN MCINTYRE

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioners are the owner occupiers of the freehold property Lock Cottage at Widewater Lock in Harefield, which will be close to the line of the proposed railway and to construction compounds associated with it. Lock Cottage is a Grade II listed building, situated in the Widewater Lock Conservation Area. The petitioners have owned the property for over 20 years.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

   3.1. In addition to the substantial visual and environmental impacts in an area that is currently protected by several designations (Green Belt, Conservation Area and adjacent Site of Special Scientific Interest), your petitioners are principally concerned about the effects of noise and vibration from the proposed railway. The railway will be on viaduct in the area of your petitioners’ property, curving round it so that there will be impacts from two sides. The building is over 200 years old and somewhat fragile, with single glazing, and subject to listed building constraints in relation to alterations.

   3.2. Your petitioners are concerned that the noise and vibration that is likely to emanate from trains using the viaduct will cause intolerable nuisance to them and will cause damage to their property. They have similar concerns about potential noise and vibration during the construction phase. Your petitioners have asked that the special physical circumstances of their property be considered by the Promoter in relation to noise and vibration assessments but this has not been done.

   3.3. Your petitioners suggest that the noise and vibration impacts could be avoided by placing the railway in tunnel in this area instead of on a highly prominent and lengthy viaduct, which maximizes rather than minimizes the likelihood of noise in
this valley setting. As there is limited scope to alter the petitioners’ property, your petitioners believe that these effects, in combination with the environmental and visual effects, will reduce their quality of life to such an extent that they will have to move away from the area. This would be a decision of absolute last resort, as your petitioners would have no other reason to move, having considerable emotional attachment to the property. Compensation schemes as currently proposed do not cover the substantial losses your petitioners would suffer from having to give up their home.

3.4 Your petitioners ask that in deciding the relative costs of a tunnel through the Colne Valley, consideration be given to the full range of costs arising from the viaduct solution including the likelihood that your petitioners will be forced to leave. If a tunnelsed solution is still not deemed preferable, your petitioners ask that compensation packages be designed in a way that addresses the full range of losses that will be suffered, and that the packages will be accessible to your petitioners at a time of their choosing.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

John McKeon

Doreen McIntyre

18 April 2016
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF

Declares that:

1. The petitioner(s) is/are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

2. Your petitioner(s) is/are

My husband and I, Christopher and Sally McHugh, have lived at 22 Albert Street NW1 9NW for 28 years. We will be impacted by noise pollution, dust and air pollution and traffic for 20 years.
3. Your petitioner’s concerns are

I am concerned about noise and pollution that will wreck the health and well-being of my husband and myself. I am 68 years old and fear that the last years of my life will be blighted by constant noise, lorries travelling and blocking up our roads, dust and dirt affecting our health.
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: S A L L Y M C H E E T H Signature.

Name: ............................................... Signature .........................

Name: ............................................... Signature .........................

Name: ............................................... Signature .........................

Name: ............................................... Signature .........................

Name: ............................................... Signature .........................

Name: ............................................... Signature .........................

Name: ............................................... Signature .........................

Name: ............................................... Signature .........................

Name: ............................................... Signature .........................
To the House of Lords
Session 2015 -16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London –West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Sheila Elizabeth Bulpett and Robert Bulpett

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners

The petitioners are local residents of Wendover, who have lived there for over 30 years of their married life. They own a property in Grenville Avenue, Wendover which has been the family home for that time. Sheila is a retired Chemistry teacher who raised a family of four children all of whom attended local schools. Robert is a retired University Head of Department who has lived in Wendover since 1954. They are both heavily involved in the local community.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Our main concerns are with the line as it passes by /through Wendover. The use of the viaducts, cut and cover region and the 6m high “sound barriers” to both the north and south of the town, will cause enormous disruption to both residents, wildlife and the Chilterns area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The amount of earth removal, by road, its storage and replacement will cause major traffic issues in an already congested area. Dust produced will be blown straight across the proposed route, by the prevailing wind, towards many houses (including our own) and allotments, causing health issues. Similarly the noise will invade our daily life. The ground water and hydrogeology issues are an issue which HS2 Ltd has yet to address and is determined to ignore until it is too late and millions of pounds will be needed to rectify the situation.
We have worked hard to enjoy our retirement which is now set to be disrupted all day, every day for years to come. Unable to drive down roads because of heavy lorries and diversions, unlikely to have access to an ambulance in peak hours due to traffic, only able to enjoy the garden when it is raining so as not to be covered in chalk dust!!!

The solution to this is to bore the tunnel under the hill. Waste can move along the rail. The lower level of the rails will help improve the noise issues. The hydrogeology would be less affected by a tunnel. Much less rock etc will need to be stored and this government will not be responsible for destroying the landscape for the future. A little extra cost at the beginning but a much better outcome for the 8000 people of Wendover and all those who drive through it on their daily commute.

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

Sheila Elizabeth Bulpett Robert Bulpett

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF - Martyn John Swain of Flat 22, Rydal Water, Hampstead Road, London NW1 3ED

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner is a long leaseholder of the property know as Flat 22, Rydal Water, Hampstead Road, London NW1 3ED, a one-bedroom top floor flat situated 5 meters away from Robert Street, approximately 30 meters away from the A400 (Hampstead Road) and approximately 50 meters away from the proposed location of a 24-hour HS2 depot, which will serve as a base for HS2 employees and HGVs for many years.

The petitioner is a professional composer who has won three globally acknowledged awards, all for commissions written solely at his address in Rydal Water, where he has enjoyed the unblighted use of his property for the last 32 years.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns are many and varied and can be summarised thus:

Air Pollution:

Others will offer a long list of carefully compiled information regarding air pollution both in London at present and in the Camden area over the expected 20 years of HS2 development. Currently, approximately 10,000 Londoners die prematurely from the effects of pollution every year (of which, less than 300 typically live in Camden). There is a growing burden of proof which suggests that foetuses in the womb are capable of suffering permanent damage, both physical and emotional, when the mother is exposed to excessive amounts of diesel and other toxic fumes.

As an asthma sufferer, my symptoms are currently controllable. With the massive increase in traffic, dust and HGV movements over 2 decades, along with the inevitable congestion caused by road and road lane closures I’m as sure as I can be that my health will be badly effected by HS2 works.

Solution - With HS2’s environmental statement containing various anomalies and inaccuracies (there’s no clear acknowledgement that 20 years of demolition and construction work in Camden will give rise to any emissions of dust) I would ask that the entire document is subjected to rigorous scrutiny by an appointed team of independent experts with any recommendations and legal compliance with UK and European law to be rigorously adhered to.

HS2 Employees’ Behaviour & Human Rights:

It is a matter of public record that accusations of maladministration against the promoter have been upheld and I have, on more than one occasion, been the victim of abuse at the hands of HS2’s Regional Development Director for Euston, simply for honestly and openly suggesting improvements to HS2’s method of communication.
- The same Director has also made untruthful statements at HS2 meetings on more than one occasion including, but not limited to, offering a wholly inaccurate summary of the ‘Need to Sell’ scheme. When challenged there was no response and no record of the statement appeared in the threadbare and completely inaccurate minutes, reluctantly supplied by HS2 weeks later.

- HS2 Ltd have consistently refused to engage with the local community in Euston and Camden and have consistently failed to follow up on numerous specific requests aired to them at meetings. HS2’s email lists are entirely unreliable and to this day, despite numerous attempts to rectify the situation, I’m frequently informed about HS2 events by other community members rather than HS2 themselves.

Solution - With Human Rights clearly being breached and with all previous attempts to rein in the worst aspects of HS2 employees’ behaviour having failed, I believe there is a strong basis for legal action against HS2, with regard to Human Rights abuses and I would suggest that a public call for evidence of wrongdoings would garner sufficient evidence to take that action.

With these failings reported up and down the line now clearly endemic in nature and as suggested in other solutions I’ve offered, I think it entirely appropriate that all engagement with the public is conducted through a third party agency, given the powers to demand pertinent information and facts to convey to the public, rather than the limited and frequently misleading information that HS2 chooses to divulge at present.

HS2 Employees’ Contracts:

HS2 employees have a clause in their contracts forbidding them to allow video or audio recordings of public, private or ‘one-to-one’ meetings. When pressed on the need for this clause HS2 employees immediately become angry and defensive and terminate the meeting until the recording is stopped.

The negative impact of the clause is fourfold:

- Firstly, it renders HS2 employees completely unaccountable.

- Secondly, it makes me a party to a contract I haven’t signed and which, in my opinion, is contrary to the law of the land.

- Thirdly, it offers HS2 employees a ‘licence to lie’ knowing that any accusations of inappropriate behaviour can be rebuffed as hearsay with a simple denial.

- Fourthly, an already massive lack of trust in HS2 is made even worse.

Solution - Remove this clause from HS2 Employee Contracts!
The Performance of the Select Committee in the House of Commons

The Select Committee process in the House of Commons showed HS2 Ltd to have an undue influence over proceedings, with the promoter’s ‘word’ heard as the voice of arbitration on far too many occasions. Others petitioners will, no doubt, expand on this.

The committee itself showed a level of disinterest in proceedings which I found shocking, with the committee apparently unable to move the hearing dates for Camden residents (a clear priority in view of the immense upheaval to that community) forward - leaving HS2 and their vast legal team apparently ‘running the show’.

Many assertions made by HS2 were simply accepted, whereas petitioners’ assertions were frequently challenged by HS2 on a highly questionable basis. Many expert petitioners left the committee room certain that HS2 ‘facts’ used to counter their arguments were simply made up.

When studying the report as relates to the Euston/Camden area, a task that took only a few minutes, it emerged that a ‘small but significant population of hedgehogs’ appeared to be more important to the committee than more than 7,000 residents on the adjoining Regent’s Park Estate.

I would also like to state that on the day of my own appearance before the committee, bullying tactics were used on 3 separate occasions, with Mr Sym’s chairmanship proving extremely weak. 2 members of the committee, during the day I attended, made no comment whatsoever and committee members frequently left the room for long periods, often half way through a particular petition.

I would characterise the attitude exhibited by HS2’s legal team as high-minded and confrontational, with the minimal contributions from HS2’s team of ‘experts’ fleeting, vague and uninformative.

As I said after my day at the committee hearing - “If anyone still believes that the UK is run on democratic lines, a day before the HS2 Select Committee will cure them of that absurd belief”.

Solution - As an experienced committee member myself, I can say that the process I was subjected to bore no relation to a democratic process whatsoever. It is my view that the Commons Select Committee was not fit for purpose and the entirety of it’s very brief report, much of which consisted of meaningless platitudes, should be struck from the record.
Compensation & Mitigation - Personal

Your petitioner believes that compensation should be based on the simple principle that the seeker should be rewarded with compensation that allows him or her to continue with their lives unblighted by any of the effects of HS2.

For the next 2 years, my ability to work from home is being blighted by the two year build of Camden Council’s ‘Replacement Housing Scheme’, which includes the erection of a 7-storey residential block 17 meters away from my property.

I’ve already proved that I can’t work from my home address for the duration of that build (due to unpredictable construction site noise) and with a 24 hour depot due to be put in place only approx 50 meters away from my property when the HS2 works start, along with the demolition of the old National Temperance Hospital, also only 50 meters away, it’s no longer realistic for me to be able to carry on my career whilst based at Rydal Water. For that reason I am seeking compensation, from HS2, whose current offer falls well short of what I will need in order to continue my life and career unblighted by HS2.

There are a number of factors that HS2 are not prepared to consider when looking at compensation:

- I have 141 potential clients with offices located within walking distance of Rydal Water. 60% of my business is generated as a result of my being a highly respected local composer. Being able to walk to my studio (or have me attend a meeting within a few minutes) whenever necessary to iron out score issues is a massive bonus in a business as time-critical as mine.

- A previous move to York proved near fatal and my necessary recent move to Battersea is also taking its toll.

- The unpredictable nature of building site noise has the capability of ruining a crucial meeting – leaving my ‘employability’ in severe jeopardy. News travels fast in my business and even one lost meeting can have a devastating impact on one’s reputation.

- HS2’s ‘Need to Sell’ scheme is based on occupancy by the homeowner for 6 months prior to claiming. In my case, that would mean sacrificing my career for 6 months before being offered derisory compensation which I would could not afford to accept.

- In order to remain within walking distance of the heart of my industry, leaving my earning potential unaffected, it would cost me, based on extensive market research, one and a half times the current market value of my property. The extensive additional work (to soundproof a new property and isolate the power source for some very sensitive equipment), plus the additional time that I’d be ‘off the air’ would add to this sum considerably.

- The Secretary of State’s assertion that compensation currently being offered by HS2 is ‘extremely generous’ is not a credible statement, when compared to packages offered in other European countries. The claim that compensation represents ‘an additional and unnecessary burden on the tax payer’ is also a completely false claim.

- Real estate in Camden is one of the most buoyant and valuable commodities in the UK. HS2 could easily afford to pay me double the realistic market value of my flat and still make a good profit in 20 years’ time, or whenever the project is completed.

- Because of its importance to anyone working in my industry, studio space in the Fitzrovia area is extremely expensive. A fellow composer recently asked if I wanted to take over his studio, at an annual charge of approx £60,000. He found a new lessee within 3 weeks. As someone who writes
at a piano with pencils and manuscript, I'm able to achieve all I need to fulfil a commission by working legitimately from home. This represents a massive saving and one I have the right to preserve.

- HS2 have informed me that despite the proximity of their works, I do not qualify for any mitigation whatsoever. The mitigation they're offering is antiquated and unrealistic, expecting the recipients to accept their offer unconditionally within a strict time frame. Their offer also assumes that during the summer months a very basic air in/air out ventilation system will mitigate against the heat - an assumption which I consider contemptible.

- Noise mitigation, in the form of domestic double or secondary glazing can only limit noise levels by 30db. As things stand, a frequently used time and money saving device is to record some acoustic instruments (acoustic guitar, piano etc) in my home studio. Again, even a limited amount of background noise during a recording session can be very costly and time consuming.

Solution - As per 'HS2 Employees' Behaviour' above, I believe it's imperative that responsibility for compensation and mitigation claims is removed from HS2 and passed to a third party independent and transparent assessor.

Compensation & Mitigation - General

A DfT spokesman recently announced that “Rural areas will feel the effects of HS2 more than urban areas, where major construction projects are commonplace and properties relatively close to railways or building sites are often shielded from their effects by other buildings and background noise”.

As someone who's studied sound and acoustics in depth, I can say categorically that this is a misleading statement for the following reasons:

In layman's terms, sound travels in straight lines. Hard surfaces (city buildings) reflect sound, causing 'reverberation', which extends the duration of the sound and can easily 'bounce' the sound through dense built up areas. It is often very difficult to locate the source of an alarm bell, for instance, in a city, as the reflections triggered by surrounding buildings will spread the sound far and wide, the first reflection heard often being from a source other than the original sound source.

By contrast, softer and more irregular surfaces (trees, grass, wooden surfaces etc) will either absorb sound or diffuse (scatter) it, making the impact of the sound far less significant to the adjoining area. Simple sound barriers like wooden hoardings are therefore many times more effective in a rural area.

In summary - a gunshot in a city will be heard at a far greater distance and will reverberate for far longer than the same gunshot in a rural area.

It's a function of the brain to 'forget' about consistent background noise, as the brain will simply shut out non-threatening noise, such as that emitted by a fan. You will know from experience that you'll notice a noisy fan when it's turned off, but not while it's running. The 'background noise argument is therefore irrelevant as it is sound spikes (such as an HGV hitting bump in the road at 3am) that will cause most disruption - something that those in rural areas will not be effected by to nearly the same degree.

Although construction projects are common in urban areas, Planning Committees have enough powers to insist on mitigation or compensation measures. HS2 are not constrained in this way and are clearly taking advantage of their status in this regard, with no meaningful restrictions on night time or weekend activities.
The negative impact of HS2 will be felt several times longer in urban areas, with the impacts felt 24 hours a day, as opposed to during normal working hours.

Solution - The real reason for the disparity in urban and rural compensation is the cost involved. If people in Camden are treated fairly, it will simply cost too much. It is essential that HS2’s meaningless assertions on noise pollution are challenged vigorously and the necessary costs of a fair compensation/mitigation scheme reassessed. I would suggest that an equitable starting point, based on the fact that disruption in the Camden area will last approximately 10 times longer than in rural areas, would be to offer urban residents 10 times the financial compensation being offered in rural areas.

Security and Personal Danger

With Camden Council’s Replacement Home Scheme now underway (to build new homes for those displaced by HS2’s demolition programme) on a number of local sites, the incidence of ‘bogus caller crime’ has already shot up. Lovell, the contractor tasked with building the new homes have been positive, open, informative and responsible in terms of their engagement with local residents, in stark contrast to HS2.

They are doing their best to counteract the opportunist crimes by visiting elderly and vulnerable residents and offering them hotline numbers to contact if they’re worried about the status of a caller. Nobody expects HS2 to do the same, with good reason.

Solution - Even HS2 admit that with the huge number of HGVs currently set to travel through the Regent’s Park Estate 24 hours a day, there will be accidents. These issues all need to be addressed and the ‘spoil by rail’ issue properly investigated.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

MARTYN SWAIN
17th April 2016
The petition of FCC Waste Services (UK) Limited

Declares that:

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

2. 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".

3. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLoughlin and supported by the Prime Minister.

4. The Bill is promoted by the Secretary of State for Transport (hereinafter called "the Promoter").

5. The Petitioner is FCC Waste Services (UK) Limited (company registration number 988844) (hereinafter referred to as "the Petitioner").

6. Calvert Landfill (the "Property") is owned by Your Petitioner under freehold title BM232086. The Property consists of 260 hectares of land, and is one of the UK’s largest waste management sites and has capacity to accommodate around 1 million tonnes of residual waste and soils per annum.

7. Your Petitioner’s landholding at the Property comprises operational and restored landfill, rail sidings (owned by Network Rail leased to DB Schenker and sub-leased to FCC), an energy from waste ("EfW") facility and associated facilities in conjunction with Buckinghamshire County Council; a 4km (2.5 mile) site access road (the "Access Road"); agricultural land and bio diversity areas (as required by section 106 planning obligations).

8. The northern part of the Property is situated within the "Calvert, Steeple, Claydon Twyford and Chetwode" Community Forum Area (the "Calvert CFA"). The southern part of the Property is situated within the "Waddesdon and Quainton" Community Forum Area.

9. Your Petitioner’s Property is adjacent to the land required for the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development and Your Petitioner
is concerned about the individual and cumulative impacts on their Property which will be injuriously affected by the works authorised by the Bill.

Your Petitioner's concerns

10. Your Petitioner supports the principle of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and associated development between London and the West Midlands. Your Petitioner seeks to work together with the Promoter, the Government, HS2 Ltd and relevant local authorities to facilitate the provision of Phase 1 of HS2. Your Petitioner also seeks to enter into an agreement with the Promoter to address its concerns.

11. Your Petitioner is, however, apprehensive about the provisions of the Bill as they will adversely affect the Property as well as the inhabitants and businesses of Calvert and Calvert Green. For this reason, Your Petitioner petitioned against the Bill on 15 May 2014 in the House of Commons, with petition reference number 316 (the "Original Petition"). Your Petitioner also submitted a petition against Additional Provision 2 on 13 August 2015 in the House of Commons, with petition reference number AP2:74/1. Your Petitioner submitted a further petition against Additional Provision 4 on 12 November 2015 in the House of Commons with petition reference AP4:167 ("the Petitions") and is also now submitting this Petition in the House of Lords.

12. Your Petitioner alleges and is prepared to prove its property, rights and interests are injuriously and prejudicially affected by the Bill for the reasons (amongst others) set out below.

Proposed relocation of rail sidings

13.1 Rail sidings are located at the Property, which receive deliveries of waste by train for depositing at the landfill site and excavation and construction wastes for recovery/reuse/restoration. The sidings consist of circa 2,800m of track with two parallel tracks for offloading, a southern headshunt for train and wagon set storage, a cripple sidings and a static overhead crane gantry (approximately 72m in length). Containerised waste is unloaded by use of the overhead gantry crane and soil is unloaded by excavator and dropped into dumpers for transportation to the site.

13.2 The sidings and its associated gantry are in frequent use, during times permitted by the relevant planning condition, including at night. Waste imported by rail can be moved or disposed of on the site between 4:30 am to 11:00 pm Monday to Friday and from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm on Saturdays. The railway siding can be used for winching and unloading refuse container trucks between 5:00 am to 11:00 pm Monday to Friday and between 7:00 am to 3:00 pm on Saturdays.

13.3 The Calvert CFA report, which forms part of the original HS2 Environmental Statement, states that the development of HS2 will necessitate the relocation of the rail sidings from their existing location on the west side of the Aylesbury Link railway line to the eastern side of both HS2 and the realigned Aylesbury Link railway line.

13.4 It is stated in the Calvert CFA report that construction works in this area will include widening of the existing cutting, construction of a new siding access road over the Calvert Green overbridge, installation of sidings and gantries, and connections to the realigned Aylesbury Link railway line.
Since 2012 Your Petitioner has liaised with representatives of HS2 Ltd in an effort to reach agreement on the location and layout of replacement rail sidings. Your Petitioner's proposed connection to the rail network via dedicated sidings to the south of Sheephouse Wood on agricultural land it owns ("Southern Sidings") is in its view vital for the longevity of rail operations at the Property and residents and businesses in Calvert and Calvert Green. Despite significant progress no conclusion on these issues has been reached with HS2 Ltd to date.

Specifically, following the hearings held on 25 November 2015 and 7 December 2015 the Select Committee in the House of Commons ("the Select Committee") requested that HS2 Ltd and Your Petitioner have further discussions on the alternative ways of delivering the Southern Sidings. In this respect the Select Committee stated in its Second Special Report at paragraph 101 that its strong preference was for the Southern Sidings.

Accordingly HS2 Ltd and Your Petitioner have agreed, in principle, that the Promoter shall either promote an order pursuant to the Transport and Works Act 1992 or a planning application and any other applications necessary to secure the powers and other necessary consents to construct the Southern Sidings in sufficient time to allow the relocation of Your Petitioner's operations at the existing sidings to the Southern Sidings. However, notwithstanding Your Petitioner's negotiations with HS2 Ltd no agreement to this effect has been entered into although as stated above significant progress has been made.

Given that the Bill still provides for a location to the north east of the Property, close to the village of Calvert Green as the most suitable location for the relocated railway sidings and in the absence of a completed agreement governing the applications for the consents for the Southern Sidings Your Petitioner respectfully submits that the intended location is not suitable.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the restrictions of School Road Bridge and ancient woodland means that the operational capacity currently enjoyed will be severely restricted by the proposed replacement.

Your Petitioner has concerns about the proposed replacement of the Claydon Loop which Your Petitioner currently uses for a train runaround. Your Petitioner requires clarification of the number of trains that Your Petitioner could offload/accept at the same time within the sidings as well as the ability to accept trains from Oxford, so that Your Petitioner can understand if the severe restrictions imposed by the site constraints will be further worsened.

Your Petitioner also has serious concerns about the proposed design of the bridge over the proposed railway. In particular, the gradient of the proposed bridge is too steep on the bend and as a result is not viable or safe for Your Petitioner's A25 waste container vehicles. Your Petitioner also has concerns about the need for fixed grab/gantry. Its provision means that trains need to be pulled through the grab/gantry instead of remaining stationary with a mobile grab/gantry to offload. This requires a continual running of a diesel train which results in noise and air quality impacts that will adversely affect the residents of Calvert.
13.12 Your Petitioner also has concerns about there being insufficient room for A25 waste container vehicles to exit when a waste train is being unloaded. Furthermore, Your Petitioner is of the view that the proposed traffic management system is inefficient, unsafe and reduces operational capacity. Your Petitioner also notes that the southern headshunt is too short and there are capacity conflicts with IMD and East West rail passenger services.

13.13 Your Petitioner also has concerns about the impact of the proposed sidings on the ancient woodland to the north east of Calvert and the significant loss of the ancient woodland given its importance as a habitat for a wide range of species and in particular roosting bats including Bechstein's bats. In this respect Your Petitioner also has concerns about the level of mitigation currently proposed to the south of Sheephouse Wood. The proposed "Green Bridges" (COU/36) and Benfields Overbridge (GUN/28) are not located at bat crossing points. Furthermore, the Hewins-Grendon-Finemere link hedgerow which has been used by bats for generations is not proposed to be mitigated by HS2 Ltd.

13.14 Your Petitioner has grave concerns about the impacts of the construction and operation of the sidings on Calvert and Calvert Green. In particular, the noise and air quality impacts (including dust and odour impacts) on residents have not been adequately assessed in the context of the relevant guidelines and British Standards (for example BS4142:2014).

13.15 The location for the re-located sidings proposed by HS2 Ltd will cause noise and nuisance for residents in nearby Calvert and Calvert Green, including increased levels of noise at night from train arrivals, departures and shunting frequently occurring in the middle of the night. It may be necessary to restrict the operation of the relocated terminal severely in order to prevent nuisance, meaning the accommodation works proposed in AP4 will reduce rail freight capacity and the ability to handle waste and spoil by rail in particular. This is contrary to Government Policy.

13.16 The Property currently receives two waste trains per day (one with 45 bins and one with 66 bins) and three soil trains per day (all with 18 wagons). The current terminal has a capacity for 8 trains per day. Typically there are 380 heavy plant movements per day between the sidings and landfill (and these movements will also be directed to the energy from waste facility once complete). The relocation of the rail sidings would necessitate an extra 500 metres per round trip to the landfill and a considerably greater travel distance to the energy from waste facility.

13.17 This additional distance equates to 49,530 km (30,777 miles) per year. This is not sustainable or justifiable when a more suitable location for the rail sidings can be established within Your Petitioner's ownership, south of Sheephouse Wood. HS2 Ltd's proposed location for the rail sidings would result in Your Petitioner incurring significant additional costs due to the additional travel distance required.

13.18 Your Petitioner therefore objects to the provisions of the Bill which adversely affect and interfere with the Property specifically through the relocation of the rail sidings at the Property. Under these provisions, and in particular those in Clauses 4 to 9 of the Bill, the Promoter would be able to acquire compulsorily part of Your Petitioner's Property.
within the limits of deviation, or at least so much of the airspace, subsoil and undersurface, or such new rights over this land as the Promoter may require for the purposes of the construction and use of the scheduled works. In respect of the Property Your Petitioner questions the need for such extensive powers, fearing that their exercise could lead to damage to the Property and to a serious detractio n from Your Petitioner’s quiet enjoyment of the Property, with the result that significant loss and damage could be suffered by Your Petitioner.

15. Your Petitioner has not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting their Properties and it is not satisfied that it is necessary or appropriate for the limits of deviation to be drawn so widely as to, or that it is necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to, apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

16. Your Petitioner also humbly submits that Clause 47 of the Bill is unjustified and without precedent as the power to acquire land is not limited spatially or by time and should therefore be removed from the Bill as it may be used against other properties owned by Your Petitioner at any time.

17. Your Petitioner further humbly submits that such provisions with regard to compensation in respect of compulsory acquisition and other matters provided for in the Bill are inadequate to compensate Your Petitioner for the loss, damage and inconvenience which it might suffer as a result of the construction and subsequent use of the proposed works. Further provisions should, Your Petitioner submits, be included in the Bill, including provisions respecting the making and assessment of claims for compensation, and amendments to the Compensation Code, as well as provisions indemnifying Your Petitioner for any loss it might suffer as the result of losses incurred in the shadow of the HS2 proposals, unfavourable rent reviews or lease negotiations respecting the leases currently affecting some of their properties, as well as the reduced rent payable (as it may differ from open market rent) is attributable to the scheduled works and their effect on Your Petitioner’s properties, or for any loss (so attributable) which Your Petitioner might suffer in the event of it not being able to re-let the Property (in whole or in part) to existing or new tenants or in the event of it only being able to do so at a reduced premium or rent.

18. Your Petitioner also objects to the compensation provisions of the Bill in that those provisions are totally inadequate to compensate Your Petitioner in circumstances where no land (or interests in land) is acquired by the Promoter under the provisions of the Bill, but where the value of such land and buildings is reduced or where such land and buildings is otherwise adversely or injuriously affected by the construction or use of the proposed works. Your Petitioner therefore submits the Bill should be amended to provide adequate compensation in this regard.

19. Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be subject to a binding obligation with your Petitioner that no alterations are made to the railway network, including but not limited to line closures, line alterations, changes to frequency and timing of services, increases in the number of trains using the railway network and reductions in capacity, that would adversely affect the current and projected levels of service and impede access to the sidings Your Petitioner uses and any other parts of the railway that your Petitioner may utilise.
20. Your Petitioner's concerns over future capacity of any siding redesign, and Your Petitioner's opinion that a more suitable location is available, are of particular importance when considering the unknown effect that the construction and operation of HS2 will have on current, existing and future rail freight paths to and from Calvert and the wider network. Whilst one of the principal justifications for the HS2 project is to increase the capacity for freight on the existing rail network, Your Petitioner respectfully submits that this should not be provided at the expense of future paths and network performance into Calvert.

20.1 The proposed road amendments in the vicinity of the Property set out in the Bill may prevent or affect the proposed road connection for the road bridge in Your Petitioner's rail sidings relocation proposal.

20.2 The road amendments proposed in the Bill severely prejudice the ability to relocate Your Petitioner's rail sidings in a location and layout which (amongst other benefits) minimises harm to the nearby residential population and minimises cost to the public purse.

20.3 Your Petitioner humbly submits that the road amendments as set out in the Bill should be amended to enable a future connection so as to accommodate Your Petitioner's preferred location and layout for Your Petitioner's relocated railways sidings.

21. Disruption caused to traffic using the Access Road

21.1 Your Petitioner is concerned as to how the Promoter intends to carry out works to the Access Road (authorised by the Bill), without disrupting the traffic that uses that Access Road to access Your Petitioner’s EfW facility. That Access Road is the primary means of access into the landfill site and EfW facility, and up to 276 heavy goods vehicles ("HGVs") can use that road every day.

21.2 Any disruption to that means of access would severally affect Your Petitioner's ability to operate its business and fulfill its contracts with local authorities for the benefit of the nearby residents. This includes servicing of Buckinghamshire County Council’s residual waste requirement under a 30 year contract signed in 2013, which commenced in February 2016 upon completion of the £275 million EfW facility. The Access Road is also specifically being constructed to minimise the extent to which HGVs need to use the surrounding road network, to protect the environment of residential properties located on the transport routes of vehicles delivering waste to the EfW facility. If Your Petitioner is unable to use that Access Road, there will be a potentially severe effect on nearby properties from the increased HGV movements on nearby roads.

21.3 Your Petitioner humbly submits that provision should be made in AP2 and the Bill to prevent disruption to its HGVs and other vehicles accessing Your Petitioner’s Access Road during the Promoter's works to that Access Road.

22. Railway provisions

22.1 As the relocated railway sidings and associated road network will necessitate that a bridge is provided over railway lines. Your Petitioner is concerned that paragraph 4 of Schedule 27 to the Bill does not provide for section 71 of the Railways Clauses Consolidation Act 1845 to be incorporated with the Bill.
22.2 Your Petitioner requires rights across the railway land to install the bridge over the railway for implementation of Your Petitioner's revised rail sidings and for its operation generally. Your Petitioner humbly submits that the powers in section 71 of the Railways Clauses Consolidation Act 1845 should be incorporated into AP2 and the Bill.

23 Nuisance

59.1 Your Petitioner has set out its concerns to HS2 Ltd with respect to nuisance and the real risk of an increase in costs and liabilities it may incur as a result of the relocation of the sidings. Your Petitioner requires an adequate remedy to the issues it has raised particularly in the context of the use of the replacement sidings. In this respect Your Petitioner is of the view that the only appropriate solution is to relocate the sidings to the south of Sheephouse Wood, which it believes can be appropriately mitigated environmentally.

24 Power of owners of land to make additional accommodation works

24.1 Your Petitioner is concerned about the provisions relating to the modification and discharge of the railways regulatory regime in particular Clauses 37 to 42 of the Bill and the related Schedules. Your Petitioner is concerned that the provisions threaten the current and projected level of service to the railway and sidings that it utilises.

24.2 Your Petitioner requests that prior to the implementation of Clauses 37 to 42, appropriate safeguards are put in place to protect the interests of existing rail operators and users in relation to design, line closures, line alterations, access to depots, current and projected levels of service, and frequency and timing of services, capacity and congestion.

25 Your Petitioner therefore objects to the provisions of the Bill which adversely affect and interfere with the Property and its wider land holdings adjacent to and in the vicinity of the railway, specifically through the amendments to the Bill detailed in this Petition.

26 Indemnity

26.1 Your Petitioner respectfully submits that the Promoter should provide Your Petitioner with an appropriate form of indemnity as a result of the exercise of the powers under the Bill.

27 Costs

27.1 Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to repay to Your Petitioner all proper costs, charges expenses (including the proper fees of such professional advisers as they may instruct) reasonably incurred in consequence of the Bill, the Petitions or of any provision made as a result of this Petition.

28 In light of the above, Your Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to Your Petitioner's expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to Your Petitioner's representation before the Select Committee.
For the foregoing and connected reasons Your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the clauses Bill are removed or amended as specified above, AP2, AP4 and the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect Your Petitioner and their rights, (including their human rights) interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect 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 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.

Christopher Stanwell
Partner
on behalf of
NABARRO LLP
Acting as Agent for the Petitioner

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF DINA and AMENDRA SHRESTHA

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are

Your petitioners have lived on the Regents Park Estate since their marriage in 2001 and in Cartmel on the 1st floor with their three sons now aged thirteen, ten and three years for the last two and a half years. Your petitioners are the leaseholders having purchased under the right to buy. Cartmel is next to the block Silverdale which is due for demolition, and your petitioners’ flat faces directly onto the Hampstead Road which will have massive additional construction traffic which the amendments will increase by over 20%. Therefore your Petitioners are specifically affected and will be exposed to dust, noise, vibration and pollution day and night for eighteen years. The duration and severity of the works will be intolerable for your petitioners, and renders their home uninhabitable as three young children cannot be exposed to the detriment of such pollution and disruption for their entire childhoods. Camden Council is currently building HS2 replacement housing outside their flat windows between Cartmel and Varndell St and already there is unacceptable levels of noise and dust impacting every day on your petitioners.

3. Your petitioners’ concerns are

Your petitioners have the following concerns about the proposals for HS2, which will seriously interfere with their lives and enjoyment of their home; and also impact on the continued work by Dina Shrestha as a registered childminder, as this work takes place in your Petitioners’ flat:

3.1 Traffic will be congesting the roads and polluting the air. There will be up to 800 heavy goods vehicles driving past your Petitioners’ windows on the first floor overlooking the main HS2 compound; and the pollution will be to the detriment of your Petitioners’ own three children as well as children who are cared for in the flat under a childminding agreement. The impact on everyones health, the children’s development and life expectancy is unacceptable and your Petitioners seek protection from these proposals.
3.2 The duration of the construction of just half the station has been extended by six years making the length of time intolerable for your Petitioners. 18 years of the continuing impact of construction noise, vibration, and pollution means that their three year old son would never know a peaceful night’s sleep or be able to play outside his home. Proposals are to turn green spaces and playgrounds into construction compounds for the duration of the work, and to build housing on anything remaining. Mature trees will be felled and your petitioners will be left with no relief from pollution and traffic, deprived of the amenity of green space next to their home where replacement housing is being built.

3.3 The Hampstead Road Bridge is to be rebuilt and raised by four and a half meters or a significant amount, putting the traffic outside the first floor window of your petitioners who will therefore be deprived of the quiet enjoyment of family life in their home. It is hard to imagine the Hampstead Road raised to this level, and it will cause severance and disruption after the construction period as well as during.

3.4 Your Petitioners take the view that the above provisions of the bill render their home uninhabitable and ask to be rehoused.

3.5 Alternatively, Euston station and approaches could be redeveloped within the same footprint so that the mass destruction on the Regents Park Estate is not necessary. Having HS2 terminate at Old Oak Common instead of Euston would also be a solution.

3.6 Spoil should be taken out by rail, not by hundreds of HGV lorries on residential streets, it is just wrong to be sending HGVs into a residential area as if it were a brownsite where no one lives.

3.7 There should be proper monitoring of air quality and all the other impacting factors, and these residual impacts should be considered together, over time periods of many years, used to formulate habitability criteria so that we know our entitlements and are treated decently.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: Dina Shrestha Signature.

Name: Amendra Shrestha Signature.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF LIONBROOK NOMINEE (NETWORK PARK) NO 1 LIMITED AND LIONBROOK NOMINEE (NETWORK PARK) NO 2 LIMITED AND CBRE UK PROPERTY FUND LP (ACTING BY ITS GENERAL PARTNER CBRE UK PROPERTY FUND (GENERAL PARTNER) LIMITED)

Declares that:

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

2. 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".

3. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLoughlin and supported by the Prime Minister.

4. The Bill is promoted by the Secretary of State for Transport (hereinafter called "the Promoter").

5. Your Petitioner is Lionbrook Nominee (Network Park) No.1 Limited (company registration number 4299899) and Lionbrook Nominee (Network Park) No. 2 Limited (company registration number 4299873) (the Nominees) and CBRE UK Property Fund LP (acting by its general partner CBRE UK Property Fund (General Partner) Limited (company registration number 3377515)) (the Partnership) (together the 'Petitioner').

6. The Nominees jointly hold the legal title to the Property for and on behalf of the Partnership. The Nominees and the Partnership (acting by its general partner) together therefore comprise Your Petitioner.

7. The Partnership is a pooled vehicle investing solely in commercial real estate across the UK on behalf of a range of institutional investors. The Property is one of a portfolio of properties which each have been specifically purchased due to their specific characteristics to collectively create a balanced portfolio.

8. Your Petitioner is the owner of Network Park Birmingham B8 1AU, with title number WM556389 (the 'Property').

9. The Property is affected by the scheduled works or in the vicinity of the proposed railway within Birmingham City Council including (but not limited to) those plots falling within plots 300, 300a and 300b on plan number 3-114 and 3-115.

10. The Property is a purpose built warehouse/industrial estate completed in 2004 comprising 182,517 square feet of industrial and warehouse space. The estate is made up of six
buildings, two fronting Duddleston Mill Road and the remainder abutting one another in the centre of the rectangular site. The main access is off Duddleston Mill Road with a one-way estate road circling the main block of buildings. The buildings are split into sixteen single storey units (two of which are in single occupation) with parking and yard areas fronting the estate road. Fifteen units at the Property are currently let. Tenants at the Property include a mix of local and national manufacturing and distribution companies.

Your Petitioner's concerns

11. Your Petitioner supports the principle of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and associated development between London and the West Midlands. Your Petitioner seeks to work together with the Promoter, the Government, HS2 Ltd and relevant local authorities to facilitate the provision of Phase 1 of HS2. Your Petitioner also seeks to enter into an agreement with the Promoter to address its concerns.

12. Your Petitioner is, however, apprehensive about the provisions of the Bill as they may affect the Property. For this reason, Your Petitioner petitioned against the Bill on 16 May 2014 in the House of Commons, with petition reference number 447 (the "Original Petition").

13. Since Your Petitioner's Original Petition, Your Petitioner appeared before the House of Commons Select Committee for this Property on 8 September 2014. The House of Commons Select Committee asked HS2 and Your Petitioner to work together to find a resolution to the outstanding issues.

14. Your Petitioner has liaised with representatives of HS2 Ltd in an effort to reach agreement on the acquisition of additional units at the Property and the provision of assurances to control and limit the effects of the construction and operation of HS2 on the Property. Despite significant progress, no conclusion on these issues has been reached with HS2 Ltd to date in the form of completed agreements. Your Petitioner has regularly experienced delays of two to three months at a time before receiving meaningful responses from HS2 Ltd. Therefore, Your Petitioner is also now submitting this Petition in the House of Lords.

15. Your Petitioner objects to the Bill and its provisions as set out in this Petition and it alleges and is prepared to prove that it and its property, rights and interests are injuriously and prejudicially affected by the Bill for the reasons (amongst others) set out below.

Compulsory purchase and acquisition of airspace, subsoil, rights and related matters

16. Your Petitioner objects to the provisions of Clauses 4 to 18 and 47 of the Bill which adversely affect and interfere with the Property. Under these provisions, and in particular those in Clauses 4 to 9 of the Bill, the Promoter would be able to acquire compulsorily any part or all of Your Petitioner's Property within the limits of deviation, or at least so much of the airspace, subsoil and undersurface or such new rights, under or over the Property as the Promoter may require for the purposes of the construction and use of the scheduled works. In respect of the Property, Your Petitioner questions the need for such extensive powers fearing that their exercise could lead to damage to the Property and to a serious detraction from Your Petitioner's and their tenants' quiet enjoyment of them, with the result that significant loss and damage could be suffered by Your Petitioner.

17. Your Petitioner humbly submits that the Promoter should not be permitted by means of the Bill to interfere with private property rights and interests unless and except to the extent (if any)
that this can be demonstrated both to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest.

18. Your Petitioner has not been provided with full justification for the proposals in the Bill affecting the Property and it is not satisfied that it is necessary or appropriate for the limits of deviation to be drawn so widely or that it is necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

19. Your Petitioner also humbly submits that clause 47 of the Bill is unjustified and without precedent as the power to acquire land is not limited spatially or by time and should therefore be removed from the Bill as it may be used against other properties owned by Your Petitioner at any time.

20. Accordingly, Your Petitioner humbly submits that the Promoter should demonstrate and be put to strict proof of the need for and desirability of the proposals in the Bill, as affecting Your Petitioner’s Property, and that the limits of deviation, the resulting powers for the compulsory acquisition of land or of interests in land, the power to construct works and the exercise of works and ancillary powers within the limits of deviation should be restricted in relation to Your Petitioner’s Property to the extent (if any) to which they can be strictly justified, so as to minimise or prevent interference with the Property. In particular, Your Petitioner contends that any interest in the Property acquired by the Promoter (in terms of the area over which it is to subsist, the form in which it is to take at law and any express or implied constraints which may be imposed upon the remainder of Your Petitioner’s Property) should be strictly limited only to that which is absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the proposed works.

21. Your Petitioner further humbly submits that such provisions with regard to compensation in respect of compulsory acquisition and other matters as are proposed in the Bill are inadequate to compensate Your Petitioner for the loss, damage and inconvenience which it might suffer as a result of the construction and subsequent use of the proposed works. Further provisions should, Your Petitioner submits, be included in the Bill, including provisions respecting the making and assessment of claims for compensation and amendments to the Compensation Code, as well as provisions indemnifying Your Petitioner for any loss it might suffer as the result of losses incurred in the shadow of the HS2 proposals, unfavourable rent reviews or lease negotiations respecting the leases currently affecting some of the Property insofar as the reduced rent payable (as it may differ from open market rent) is attributable to the scheduled works and their effect on Your Petitioner’s Property or for any loss (so attributable) which Your Petitioner might suffer in the event of it not being able to re-let the Property (in whole or in part) to existing or new tenants or in the event of it only being able to do so at a reduced premium or rent.

22. Your Petitioner also objects to the compensation provisions of the Bill in that those provisions are totally inadequate to compensate Your Petitioner in circumstances where no land (or interests in land) is acquired by the Promoter under the Bill, but where the value of such land and the Property erected thereon is reduced or where such land and the Property erected thereon is otherwise adversely or injuriously affected by the construction or use of the proposed works. Your Petitioner therefore submits that the Bill should be amended to provide adequate compensation in this regard.

Extent and clarity of compulsory purchase
23. Your Petitioner is concerned that from the information provided to Your Petitioner and publically available from the HS2 Environmental Statement, the extent to which the Property is due to be compulsorily purchased pursuant to the Bill is not clear.

24. Under the Bill, parts of the Property will be compulsorily acquired for provision of worksite and access for construction, diversion and installation of overhead electric lines (plot 300) and provision of worksite and access for construction, diversion or installation of, or works to, utility apparatus (plots 300a and 300b). Reference to the purpose for which the land may be compulsorily acquired or used is missing for plot 302.

25. Plan CT-05-141 from the Community Forum Area Report 26 (Washwood Heath to Curzon Street), forming part of the HS2 Environmental Statement ("the Plan"), shows that substantial parts of the Property is land potentially required during construction, required for main utility works amongst other works and part of the rail alignment formation.

26. Your Petitioner believes that the Property is being acquired for the construction of the scheduled works, in particular the construction of the rail alignment.

27. Your Petitioner objects to the compulsory acquisition whether temporarily or permanently, of any part or the entirety of the Property, particularly as there are no reasons or justification given for such acquisition in the information accompanying the Bill or the Bill itself.

28. If part of the Property is to be compulsorily acquired as proposed, any remaining part of the Property would not be sufficient to continue operating the Property as a warehouse/industrial estate, rendering the Property as effectively unusable and requiring the Property to be radically reconfigured causing existing tenants' uncertainty. Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter mitigate these effects at its earliest opportunity as it is not reasonable to leave Your Petitioner to deal with the issues that will arise as a result of the compulsory purchase.

29. Further, Your Petitioner requests that if part of the Property is to be compulsorily acquired then the entirety of the Property should be compulsorily acquired. In addition, Your Petitioner notes that it is well established practice and compliant with relevant compulsory purchase policy that efforts should be made to acquire landed interests by negotiation prior to seeking powers of compulsory purchase.

30. To the extent that the Property is not compulsorily purchased pursuant to the Bill, Your Petitioner has the following further concerns.

Constitution of works proposed to be authorised by the Bill

31. Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction and operation of a high speed railway and its associated development on the Property including (but not limited to):

31.1 the construction of the high speed railway on and in the vicinity of the Property;

31.2 the demolition of three buildings containing eight commercial properties which Your Petitioner understands from the HS2 environmental states includes: (a) a single storey warehouse and two single storey warehouses at the Property (each warehouse contains three properties - unit 10, 11, 12 and 13 in one and units 14, 15 and 16 in the other);

31.3 the construction and operation of the multiple satellite compounds in the vicinity of the Property.
31.4 the construction and use of the haul road in the construction area through the Property;

31.5 the utility works which Your Petitioner understands from the HS2 Environmental Statement relates to a 1.8m diameter sewer, approximately 380m in length, in a north to south direction within the Property; and

31.6 substantial works to the highway at Salley Viaduct, the main access to the estate.

32 Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker be subject to binding mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of these works. These binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to restrictions on noise and vibration, construction hours, vehicle movements and operating hours, monitoring compliance with these restrictions and enforcement of these restrictions. The nominated undertaker should also mitigate the impact of noise and vibration through measures such as noise insulation and barriers.

33. Your Petitioner is concerned that the nominated undertaker's ongoing accountability is unspecified. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply with the Code of Construction Practice, nor does it specify the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event that the contractors do not comply with the Code of Construction Practice. Assessment in the HS2 Environmental Statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be fully effective, however the Code of Construction Practice has no legal status.

34 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.

35. The standards set out in the HS2 Phase 1 Environmental Statement and the Code of Construction Practice are "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, verifiable and challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

36. Your Petitioner submits that a specific construction management plan should be produced to manage and co-ordinate the operation of construction camps which should clearly outline the phases of activity and a co-ordinated management of their interaction, and a framework for enforceable measures. A construction management plan should be available to each Community Forum Area showing the timetables and community impact, as well as mitigation measures.

37. Your Petitioner requests that under binding mitigation measures hours of construction should be strictly limited to between 08:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday.

Access and Traffic

38 Your Petitioner is concerned that the substantial works to the highway at Salley Viaduct will remove the main means of vehicular access to the Property and other surrounding roads. The Petitioner believes that the impact of works on Your Petitioner's Property and businesses at
the Property were not properly assessed in the HS2 Environmental Statement, and that proper mitigation has not been provided for.

39. The HS2 Environmental Statement also states that the proposed scheme will cause changes to the internal circulation of traffic within the Property and that new permanent access roads to the north of the Property are proposed which will be used as construction traffic routes. Further, it states that as a result of land required for the proposed scheme, the western section of the internal circulation road within the Property will be closed, disrupting the internal road network over approximately five years.

40. Without vehicular and pedestrian access and adequate internal circulation, Your Petitioner's business and the businesses of its tenants at the Property cannot reasonably continue. Further, there would be severe difficulties for those wishing to access and travel to the Property as well as risks to health and safety. Your Petitioner therefore requests that during construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development, the main access to the Property should at all times be kept open and available for use by vehicular traffic and pedestrians and that adequate internal circulation is maintained throughout the estate at all times.

41. In addition, Your Petitioner is concerned about the proposed acquisition of the car parking at the Property. Any acquisition of the car parking will further increase the traffic and transport issues at the Property.

42. Overall, Your Petitioner submits that the impacts of the proposed works and compulsory acquisition will severely detrimentally affect the ability for the Property to operate as a warehouse/industrial estate due to increased access and traffic issues.

43. Your Petitioner further requests that the nominated undertaker should be required under the Bill to provide detailed plans, method statements and other particulars of works including the work programmes and schedules of deliveries (in particular abnormal deliveries) occurring within and in proximity to the Property substantially in advance of the commencement of construction operations.

Objection to road closure or closing a public right of way

44. Your Petitioner notes that the HS2 Environmental Statement reveals that as a result of land required for the proposed scheme, the western section of the internal circulation road within the Property will be closed, disrupting the internal road network over approximately five years.

45. This will cause serious disruption to access and traffic circulating within the Property, inhibiting the carrying out of Your Petitioner's and its tenants' businesses. Your Petitioner requests that this road is not closed as the effects of such closure have not been adequately assessed. Should such closure occur, Your Petitioner requests that provision be made to enable adequate internal circulation at the Property.

Noise

46. 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.

47. Your Petitioner is also concerned that the operation of the high speed railway (and specifically its associated development) will give rise to noise. Noise would impact upon the use of the Property by Your Petitioner and its tenants.
Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that no noise can be heard in the Property and there are no other adverse effects.

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.

The 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 include but not be limited to full noise barriers and noise insulation for buildings and re-housing. The trigger levels at which point noise mitigation becomes necessary should be reduced.

Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the Bill and Schedule 25 provide that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State for arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the nominated undertaker.

Your Petitioner requests that Clause 35 and schedule 25 be deleted from the Bill.

Vibration

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

Your Petitioner is also concerned that the operation of the high speed railway will give rise to vibration. Vibration will impact upon the use of the Property by Your Petitioner and its tenants.

Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be compelled to use best available techniques in the construction and operation of the high speed railway and its associated development to ensure that no vibration can be felt in the Property and there are no other adverse effects.

Your Petitioner requests that there should be binding mitigation measures including vibration and resultant damage mitigation and monitoring systems in place before commencement and during construction and operation. Binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to an express obligation to undertake specific measures to limit structural and other damage to the Property, and installation of noise barriers which ensure compliance with WHO acceptable peak sound levels.

Highways

Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction of the high speed railway and associated development at highways on or in the vicinity of the Property and on the wider area will impact
significantly upon the use of the Property as a warehouse/industrial estate by way of noise, disturbance and traffic increases.

Your Petitioner is concerned about the use of unsuitable highways by large vehicles delivering equipment and supplies, and removal of spoil during the construction works as well as use of highways by other vehicles. The use and routing of large vehicles within the vicinity of the Property is also a matter of concern to Your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner requests that hours for the movement of construction traffic be limited to 08:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday, and there be limits on the number of vehicle movements, limits on the size of vehicles, and other miscellaneous related matters.

Your Petitioner requests that large vehicles as well as other construction traffic be strictly controlled, having regard to the particular sensitivities of the area. Your Petitioner therefore requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to binding mitigation measures in relation to the control of all construction traffic, assessment of suitability of roads for construction traffic, routing of lorries and other vehicles in accordance with a list of routes to be agreed with the nominated undertaker and Your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner requests that binding mitigation measures should include traffic management plans to be agreed between the nominated undertaker, the relevant local authority and the relevant highway authority to be monitored and enforced by environmental health officers.

Dust, Dirt and Disturbance

Your Petitioner is concerned about dust and dirt produced during construction of the scheduled works. Your Petitioner would wish to see binding commitments imposed on the Promoter to require adherence to agreed measures to reduce dust, and to carry out additional mitigation if dust continues to be a nuisance to Your Petitioner's Property. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made to ensure that the Promoter takes responsibility for the reimbursement of Your Petitioner for additional expense caused by dust and dirt, such as more frequent cleaning and painting of its affected Property and more frequent replacement of air conditioning filters.

The surface works, particularly the use of working sites and the removal of spoil, will further impact upon the quiet enjoyment of properties in the vicinity. Major increases in lorry movements during the construction period are to be expected, the disruptive effect of which will be compounded by the permanent and temporary stopping up of nearby roads.

Services

Your Petitioner is concerned that there is the potential for disruption to utilities and other services provided to the Property. The HS2 Environmental Statement states that there will be permanent utility diversions (sewers) at the Property.

Any disruption in the services to the Property is unacceptable to Your Petitioner because the businesses at the Property are dependent upon being able to provide adequate utilities and services to its tenants.

Your Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to binding mitigation measures in relation to any disruption to services and contingency measures in the event of disruption to services. The binding measures should include implementing alternative
proposals prior to any relocation of utilities and indemnifying Your Petitioner for any loss or damages arising from such works.

67 Power to use roads

Your Petitioner does not consider that the nominated undertaker requires the roads for the purposes it indicates and that alternative accesses exist and can be used by the nominated undertaker with less impact on Your Petitioner's interests.

68 Business

Your Petitioners are concerned that the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development will seriously inhibit Your Petitioner's and its tenants' ability to carry out their businesses. The Property comprises a broad range of tenants and a thriving business community which is threatened by the effects of the current HS2 proposals.

69 The HS2 Environmental Statement specifically states in relation to the Property that businesses may be deterred from using services if they perceive a risk to deliveries or site access, leading to a potential for the diversion of trade to elsewhere. Therefore, the proposed scheme is considered to represent a potential significant isolation effect on this group of businesses during construction. Your Petitioner believes that this threat is not merely potential but will come to pass should the HS2 proposal be passed in its current form.

Your Petitioner's general concerns in relation to the Property

Blight

70 Your Petitioner respectfully submits that the proposals contained in the Bill are causing a blight on Your Petitioner's Property. Your Petitioner fears that prospective purchasers and lessees will state that the proposals so blight the Property that they are not interested in acquiring any part of them, or that prospective or existing lessees will demand a considerably reduced rent, due to the prospect of the works. Moreover, the Bill does not contain adequate provisions for compensating such blight and Your Petitioners respectfully suggest that it should do so. Your Petitioner would like a binding commitment from the Promoter not to acquire its Property before a specific date.

Indemnity

71 Your Petitioner submits that the Promoter should be required to indemnify them from all claims and demands which may be made in consequence of the construction, use or maintenance of the works under the Bill, or their failure or want of repair, or in consequence of any act or omission of the Promoter, his contractors or agents in carrying out the works under the Bill.

Costs

72 Your Petitioner submits that provision should be made for the Promoter to repay to Your Petitioner all proper costs, charges and expenses (including the proper fees of such professional advisers as they may instruct) reasonably incurred in consequence of the Bill or of any provision made as a result of this Petition.

Conclusion

73 In light of the above, Your Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise
from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to Your Petitioner's expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to representation before the Select Committee.

74. For the foregoing and connected reasons Your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the clauses of the Bill are removed or amended as requested, the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

75. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand, will prejudicially affect Your Petitioner and their rights (including their human rights), interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect 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 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.

Christopher Stanwell
Partner
on behalf of
NABARRO LLP
Acting as Agent for the Petitioner

18 April 2016
Minutes of a meeting of the directors of the Company duly convened and held at the offices of the Company on 15 May 2014 at 9:30 am:

Present: Mike Daggett
Ahmed Makele
Josh Dale-Harris

(The "Chairman")

In attendance: All of the above

1. QUORUM

The Chairman reported that notice of the meeting had been given to all directors entitled to receive it; announced that the meeting was quorate in accordance with the Company’s articles of association (the “Articles") and declared the meeting open.

2. PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

2.1 The Chairman reminded the meeting that the Company holds the legal title to the land known as Network Park, Birmingham, B8 1AV (the “Property") jointly with Lionbrook Nominee (Network Park) No.2 Limited (“Nominee 2”), for and on behalf of the CBRE UK Property Fund LP, which is the beneficial owner of the Property (the “Partnership”)

2.2 The Chairman reported to the meeting that the Company had received notice in relation to the Property (the “Notice") (a copy of which was presented to the meeting), to the effect that, under the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill (the “Bill"), it is intended that parts of the Properties are acquired or used in the construction of the proposed London to West Midlands high speed rail (“HS2")

2.3 The Chairman reported that the construction of HS2 could have a significant detrimental effect on business at the Properties and would thereore injuriously affect the Partnership’s rights and interests in relation to the Properties. The Partnership is therefore "specially and directly" affected by the Bill and the Partnership’s legal advisers Nabarro LLP have therefore prepared a petition against the Bill (the "Petition")

2.4 The Chairman further reported that in accordance with Parliamentary guidance on how to petition against a bill of Parliament, in order to submit any petition, it is necessary to appoint an agent to act on behalf of the Company: Nominee 2 and the Partnership in all matters relating to the Petition (“Roll B Agent")
2.5 The Chairman therefore reported that the purpose of the meeting was for the Company in its capacity as a nominee which holds the Property for and on behalf of the Partnership, to consider and, if deemed fit, to:

2.5.1 approve the appointment of Christopher Stanwell, solicitor, as agent ("Roll B Agent") to act on behalf of the Company in all matters relating to the Petition, and

2.5.2 authorise the deposit of the Petition for and on behalf of the Company.

3. DIRECTORS' INTERESTS

Each of the directors present declared his interest in the business to be transacted at the meeting in accordance with sections 177 and 182 of the Companies Act 2006 (the "Act") and the Company's Articles and such declarations were taken as sufficient for all purposes.

4. TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

The following documents were produced to the meeting:

4.1 a copy of the draft Petition and

4.2 a copy of the draft letter of authorisation addressed to Christopher Stanwell authorising him to act as Roll B Agent ("Letter of Authorisation"),

(together the "Documents").

5. RESOLUTIONS

5.1 The Chairman referred the meeting to the provisions of sections 171 to 174 of the Act (inclusive). The meeting noted that under section 172 of the Act, each director must act in the way he considers, in good faith, would be most likely to promote the success of the Company for the benefit of its members as a whole, and in doing so have regard (amongst other matters) to certain factors set out in that section. Each director acknowledged that he understood his statutory duties set out in such sections.

5.2 After careful consideration of the Documents and the directors' own duties and obligations, including but not limited to, consideration of the matters referred to in section 172(1) of the Act, IT WAS RESOLVED that:

5.2.1 the approval of the Petition and the execution of the Letter of Authorisation by the Company was in the best interests of the Company and the transactions contemplated therein will promote the success of the Company for the benefit of its members as a whole;

5.2.2 Christopher Stanwell be and is hereby authorised to act as Roll B Agent on behalf of the Company;

5.2.3 any one director be authorised to sign the Letter of Authorisation on behalf of the Company.
the draft Petition be approved in the form in which it had been produced to the meeting (with such amendments, modifications, variations or alterations as the Roll B Agent may deem necessary); and

the Roll B Agent be and is hereby authorised to deposit the Petition in the House of Commons

6. CLOSE

There being no further business the Chairman declared the meeting closed.

Chairman
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF AMITA AND KIRAN SHRESTHA  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your petitioners are  

The Shrestha family, residents of 30-40 Grafton Way, a Camden Council block, on a street that runs between Gower St and Tottenham Court Rd, immediately south of and parallel to Euston Rd. There are 117 flats in the block, and we have brought up our two children here, now at university and secondary school. Like all residents in the block, we will suffer pollution and noise from the additional construction traffic from HS2 and displaced traffic from other routes restricted due to the construction of HS2 and diverted down Grafton Way which operates as a westbound one way system for Euston Road at the junction with Hampstead Road. We have suffered the impact for many years still ongoing, of the construction of UCL Hospital on both the north and south of our building. As well as the relentless construction noise, dust and pollution, demolition means that exceptional numbers of vermin seek new homes and come into neighbouring residential buildings. Our building is occupied by council tenants, and leaseholders who have exercised the right to buy, or bought from those who have.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns are  

3.1 Your petitioners ask for sound proof glazing and air filtration. The ventilation is to filter out the dust and pollution from the building sites and the increased traffic. There will be additional construction and diverted traffic on your petitioners’ street and your petitioners will be prisoners in their own homes with no fresh air. Spoil must be removed and materials brought in by rail not lorries.  

3.2 We have experienced construction and the inability of local enforcement to prevent for example dust and out of hours working from the hospital rebuild on the south side of Grafton Way and the Beaumont Place side which has unleashed an avalanche of rats. The dust from the building sites is appalling and we need ventilation, we cannot be expected to live like this for decades.
3.3 We need an independent adjudicator to ensure that all the processes are implemented fairly and enforcement officers to make sure that agreed measures are followed. Over and over it is agreed that construction will not start before 8am and rubble will be hosed down to prevent dust, but the difficulty is having officers on the ground to direct contractors to comply. We feel badly for our relatives on Regents Park Estate who now have to suffer this too, with the HS2 replacement housing; and for everyone who will have this massive impact for the next twenty years while HS2, the classic station and crossrail 2 are built in our area. Your petitioners ask for timely information from HS2 enabling genuine engagement, which has not taken place to date.

3.4 Your petitioners ask that there is no temporary or permanent loss of public green/open spaces and trees, to ensure the amenity of residents. Your petitioners ask that the promoter undertake there will be no worsening of air quality from HS2 pollution measured from baselines taken in advance of the commencement of UCH construction – and they will improve current levels. Your petitioners ask for fair urban compensation. Your petitioners ask for mitigation for 20 years construction such as noise insulation be assessed and agreed with each householder – and be adequately monitored. Your petitioners ask that the promoter undertake there will be minimal disruption & duration of every aspect of HS2 construction.

3.5 Your petitioners ask that independent costings & comparative technical assessment of HS2 & alternative railway schemes be provided, and Old Oak Common costings to be calculated as per Lords request. Your petitioners ask for undertakings that Euston Station, including HS2 and Crossrail 2 be rebuilt in the same footprint, and there be no additional scheme into Euston until local transport has capacity to take all those passengers further. This would save our community from the massive destruction the current proposals entail.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: Amita Shrestha Signature.

Name: Kiran Charan Shrestha Signature.
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16  

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill  

THE PETITION OF  CHALFONT ST GILES PARISH COUNCIL  
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 Chalfont St Giles, and so is the elected body responsible for local planning, open spaces and other issues affecting the residents of the Parish.  

3. Your petitioner’s concerns are as follows:  
   1. The River Misbourne  
The River Misbourne is a chalk stream which by its very nature sometimes flows, sometimes floods, and sometimes dries up. It is a focal point of the village, next to the duck pond, and is a habitat for abundant wildlife.  

   At Chalfont St Giles the river acts as a “Perched Stream”. This means that it will sometimes flow when the ground water level in the surrounding area is below that of the river itself. In very dry weather the natural fissures and cracks in the river bed, together with local sink holes, can swallow the flow from upstream and the river runs dry. However in recent years abstraction of water from the river by Affinity Water has been reduced, vegetation in the river has been managed by volunteers from Misbourne River Action, and as a result the river has been flowing well for some years. Para 13.4.39 of the HS2 Phase One Environmental Statement Volume 2 states that the River is frequently dry. This is not the case. The river flow is unpredictable. It can also flood. Most recently this occurred in 2014 when despite pumping operations the centre of the village and the surrounding fields were under water for some three months. Local residents and businesses were severely affected and BT had serious concerns about the safety of the telephone exchange with water levels within centimetres of the electrical connections.  

   The present intention of HS2 Ltd is that the line will run in a tunnel from Chalfont St Peter in the direction of Amersham and the tunnel will pass underneath the centre of Chalfont St Giles. The tunnel is planned to pass underneath the River Misbourne at the point where the river runs through a low bridge under Pheasant Hill which is the access road into the village from the A413. The planned depth of the tunnel at this point is 19 meters – less than half the height of Big Ben.
Paragraphs 13.4.38 to 13.4.42 of the HS2 Phase One Environmental Statement Volume 2 describe the permanent effects that tunnelling under the river could cause. The potential for ground settlement to occur during or soon after construction which could activate the fractures in the river bed is recognised. However it is predicted that this could occur over 260 metres of the river, which, is "a relatively small stretch of the total river length". The conclusion drawn is that “It is unlikely that additional loss of water will occur and consequently the predicted impact on the river and the lake (Shardeloes in Amersham) will be negligible and the effect neutral, and therefore not significant.” Unfortunately, the point at which this may occur is exactly at the point where the tunnel is proposed to go underneath the river in the centre of Chalfont St Giles and if it were to occur, the effect on our medieval village would be extremely significant, not only in terms of the loss of the amenity, but also in relation to the effects of the remedial work that would be involved.

To date HS2 Ltd have not provided any information or assurances to your petitioner about how they propose to ensure the safety of the river and its aquifer during the drilling of the tunnel, or when it is operational. Their position, repeated in the House of Commons, is that “if there is a problem, they will deal with it.” That is not sufficient.

Mitigation

a) Alteration of route.
Your petitioner objects to the route proposed for the new railway by HS2 Ltd. Your petitioner does not believe that alternative proposals have been adequately investigated and requests that proper consideration be given to adopting the route proposed by High Speed UK. This would avoid the Chilterns AONB altogether, and the River Misbourne would be unaffected.

b) Protect the River Misbourne.
Your petitioner is aware of the petition of Save St Giles, and of the view of the experts that they have consulted, namely Ian Cloke FGS, Dr Haydon Bailey, Geological & Environmental Adviser to the Chiltern Society, and Bob Older of Misbourne River Action. Your petitioner fully supports their petition, and their views on mitigation. If it is determined that the route proposed by HS2 Ltd is to be adopted, then we request that the depth of the tunnel be significantly increased, and that the bed of the River Misbourne be reinforced.

c) Compensation for communities in the event of damage.
Your petitioner is aware of the statement made to parliament by Robert Goodwill MP dated 22nd March 2016 describing plans to compensate Affinity Water in the event that the chalk aquifer is damaged as a result of the construction of the railway, and the Public Water Supply is adversely affected. Your petitioner requests that the Bill be altered to ensure that should such damage occur, the communities and businesses that are affected by such damage will also receive appropriate compensation.

II. Traffic on the A413
Your petitioner is grateful to the Promoter, HS2 Ltd, for giving assurances to Transport for Bucks that capacity and/or safety improvements will be carried out on the HS2 construction route at the A413 junction with Pheasant Hill in Chalfont St Giles. The A413 is the main road between Amersham and Uxbridge and is vital to commuter traffic. It has only one lane in each direction between Amersham and Chalfont St Peter although it has been described by HS2 Ltd as a “trunk road”.
Your petitioner is concerned, however, that if the tunnelling by HS2 results in damage to the River Misbourne that requires remedial action, this may require Pheasant Hill to be closed. The stretch of Pheasant Hill between the A413 and the river bridge has been shown on the plans submitted by HS2 Ltd as “Land potentially required during construction” (MB8 – Vol 2 CFA08 CT-05-025). Your petitioner understands that this is to allow HS2 emergency access in the event of an incident during tunnelling. The A413 cuts the village in half at the junction with Pheasant Hill, so the outcome would be that half the village could not access the other half without a significant diversion of several miles and access to the village centre would be severely disrupted, particularly for residents, businesses and delivery vehicles.

Mitigation
Alteration of route.
Your petitioner requests that proper consideration be given to adopting the route proposed by High Speed UK. This would avoid the Chilterns AONB altogether, and the River Misbourne would be unaffected.

II. Chalfont St Giles Vent Shaft
It is proposed that a Vent Shaft site be constructed at Bottom House Farm Lane in Chalfont St Giles (Scheduled Work 2/11). During the construction phase it is proposed that the junction of Bottom House Farm Lane with the A413 be widened and that the lane itself be widened and straightened to accommodate HGV’s. There are also proposals to create passing spaces along the lane.

Your petitioner understands that if the scheme is adopted according to the plans of HS2 Ltd, the proposed tunnel will need Vent Shafts, and that one of them will need to be in the vicinity of Chalfont St Giles. However in evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee a representative of HS2 Ltd stated that the size and depth of the vent shaft site would be roughly equivalent to that of Westminster tube station. Your petitioner remains of the view that this is a desecration of the Chilterns AONB. Furthermore your petitioner believes that Bottom House Farm Lane is totally unsuitable for use for vehicular access to the site proposed. The lane is bordered by ancient hedgerows and is very twisty and narrow – at the location of the site it is possible to stand in the lane and reach out and touch the hedgerows on both sides – hence the need for widening and straightening. The lane is currently mostly used by horses and dog walkers. The effect of the construction will be to destroy much of the hedgerow, and the entire nature of the lane. The Grade 2 listed granary which stands on stone mushrooms, will for the duration of the works, be essentially on a traffic island.

Your petitioner is aware of and supports all the concerns raised in the petition of Mrs Rosamund Wall, a resident of Bottom House Farm Lane who will be directly and adversely affected by the plans of HS2 Ltd.

Mitigation
a) Alteration of route
Your petitioner requests that consideration be given to amending the proposed route for the railway as outlined in 1a above.

If this is not possible, your petitioner requests that the mitigation proposed by Mrs Rosamund Wall be implemented.
b) Haul road
A dedicated haul road to be constructed across fields to link the Chalfont St Giles Vent Shaft site with the A335 Beaconsfield Road. This would have the advantage of reducing the amount of construction traffic using the A413 which would instead take advantage of the new Beaconsfield relief road to Pyebush roundabout. This was a proposal made to the House of Commons Select Committee by your petitioner. It was dismissed by HS2 Ltd, on the grounds of additional cost.

c) Speed Limit
A strict and restrictive speed limit to be imposed on traffic using Bottom House Farm Lane.

d) Access only
Through traffic to be prohibited on Bottom House Farm Lane.

e) Assurances of restoration
The road to be reinstated as a single track lane with passing spaces as soon as possible.

f) Compensation
Fair compensation to be paid to those residents who will be seriously adversely affected by the construction of the Vent Shaft site.

g) Pollution of the River Misbourne
Your petitioner shares Mrs Walls's concerns about the possible pollution of the river from the construction of the vent shaft site, and the increased heavy goods movements over the river bridge on Bottom House Farm Lane. Your petitioner requests that a full environmental assessment be undertaken before work is allowed to commence.

4. The prayer
The petitioner therefore asks the House of Lords that the Council, 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.

Mary Phillips
Chalfont St Giles Parish Councillor
Agent

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

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF  
MRS VALERIE HOLLINSHEAD  
MRS WENDY HOLLINSHEAD  
MRS KAY WRIGHTON

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioners are landowners, farmers and occupiers of Curborough House Farm, Netherstowe Lane, Lichfield, Staffordshire, WS13 8EJ. The petitioners run a number of businesses from the farm in to which they have diversified. It is proposed by the Bill to authorise the compulsory acquisition of certain interests in land and property of the petitioners to which they object.

3. The Petitioners Concerns

3.1 It is proposed to authorise the compulsory acquisition of certain interests in land or property of your petitioner who has via their agents on many occasions made formal representations to HS2 on how best to mitigate their losses.

3.2 Fundamentally, most of the issues affecting the petitioners land stem from HSZs proposed realignment of Wood End Lane, running to the north and east of the railway line. As your petitioners land runs adjacent to Wood End Lane, the railway line effectively severs the petitioners land from its main access route to Wood End Lane. In short it severs their road frontage and access to the highway network.

3.3 Moreover there are concerns about the impact upon the development potential of the property due to HSZs proposed realignment of Wood End Lane. These can be explained as follows

a Your Petitioners have made HS2 Ltd aware on very many occasions that they and their neighbours, (the Greaves family), own a sizeable area of land in this location which together with some adjoining land is part of a limited area of land around Lichfield which does not have Green Belt designation. Indeed there are over 600 acres of land in this location which are under option to IM Properties who I believe are submitting their own petition. The current planning application covers 120 acres (planning reference 14/00057/OUT/MEI). Your Petitioners via their agents have made HS2 Ltd aware on numerous occasions that this land has been very robustly promoted through the Local Plan Process and that a planning application for 750 residential dwellings in the area is subject to appeal at present. This application is for dwellings, a primary school, neighbourhood facilities, shops community buildings and the suchlike. It also includes new access points to Watery Lane and Netherstowe Lane and improvements
thereto. Your Petitioners and their professional advisers from IM Properties, CBRE planning team and Counsel are firmly of the opinion that this appeal will ultimately be upheld and are very aware of the statement issued by the Secretary of State in October of 2014 stating that the demand for housing numbers alone is not of itself sufficient "excuse" to remove land from Green Belt. As there is a significant demand for housing in Lichfield, and as this is part of an area of land which is not Green Belt, development here is thought to be very likely.

b. Put into context, Lichfield itself has identified a requirement for around 10,000 new homes up to 2029. The application which was submitted by IM Properties on this non Green Belt land makes use of Wood End Lane and its junction with Netherstowe Lane in its current location as a means to connect the proposed development to the highways network and in particular the A38. By following their current proposals, HS2 Ltd will remove all of that vital road frontage to Wood End Lane and Netherstowe Lane that your Petitioners currently own resulting in a very long detour and the construction of road junctions upon third party land over which your Petitioners have no control and no doubt leading to ransom. Key to the success of any scheme is maintenance of connectivity to Wood End Lane and Netherstowe Lane. Your petitioners have, via their own highway consultants put forward viable alternatives to HS2’s proposal.

c. Not only is there a demonstrable need in Lichfield for further housing to meet its own needs, but there is also a massive under supply in housing requirements in the Birmingham conurbation. Indeed, the latest figures as agreed by Birmingham City Council’s Cabinet on 27 July 2015, confirm a shortfall of 38,000 houses in the area. Under the ‘Duty to Co-operate’ this shortfall will need to be distributed within neighbouring authorities within the greater Birmingham housing market area which includes Lichfield District Council. It is conceivable therefore that several thousand additional houses could be allocated to Lichfield in order to help meet Birmingham’s needs. In summary, there is a significant need and demand for housing in Lichfield and your Petitioners’ land is part of the only available deliverable and sustainable area of land being promoted on the edge of Lichfield urban area which is not in the Green Belt. This position supports the need not to fetter the ability to deliver housing on the Petitioners’ land and the prospects of achieving development here is thought very likely.

d. At the time of presenting this Petition, your Petitioners would respectfully like to make the Select Committee aware of IM Properties comments that the Inspector examining the Local Plan for the area has commented that the land in this location is, in his opinion, in a sustainable, deliverable and suitable location. In the absence of HS2 Ltd’s proposed scheme, it has excellent connectivity to the highways network, it is located on the north east side of Lichfield where the majority of the employment land is located at Fradley, and is in closer proximity to the railway station at Lichfield Trent Valley where car parking is currently being expanded. This affords a very swift journey time of approximately half an hour into Birmingham New Street.

e. The planning application which was submitted by IM Properties on this non Green Belt land makes use of Wood End Lane as a means to connect the proposed development to the highways network and in particular, the A38. By following their current proposals HS2 Ltd will remove all of that vital road frontage on Wood End Lane that your Petitioners currently own resulting in a very long detour and the construction of road junctions upon third party land over which your Petitioners have no control and no doubt leading to ransom.
4. The petitioner therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and the Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers the Bill.

And the petitioners remains, etc.

C R Bedson BSc MRICS FAAV
Agent for
Mrs Valerie Hollinshead
Ms Wendy Hollinshead
Mrs Kay Wrighton

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

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

THE PETITION OF MARLENE JANE EMILY HILLS

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the Bill in relation to the HS2 high speed line being within the 60-120 metres zone house from the centre of the proposed line to the end of her house. The petitioner’s property is known as 36 Hodgetts Lane, Burton Green, Kenilworth CV8 1P1, Warwickshire. In addition to the high speed line this property is also directly impacted by the proposed Auto Transformer Feeder Station (known as ATFS) being approximately 55 metres from her house.

2. Your Petitioner
The petitioner is Mrs Marlene Jane Emily Hills who has lived in the above property with her late husband and their son since August 1987. The petitioner is one of the co-founders of the Greenway Trust (Kenilworth to Berkswell), a charitable organisation formed in 2012 that exists to promote the Kenilworth to Berkswell Greenway and raise awareness of the wide variety of health, social and other benefits arising from the use of this multi-use corridor.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns
The petitioner would draw attention to the loss of value occasioned to her by two infrastructure sites in very close proximity to her house namely the high speed line and the Auto Transformer Feeder Station (ATFS) which will stand between two and three storeys high.

The petitioner feels that her rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your petitioner objects for the reasons noted in this petition.

The Promoter proposes to build HS2 high speed line 75m (measured from the middle of the proposed line) to the petitioner’s front gate and has offered her Voluntary Purchase (VPS) of her property. HS2 Ltd does not accept that this high speed railway line and the ATFS doubly blights her property and that as such it should therefore be compulsory purchased so that she is not financial disadvantaged.

The tunnel entrance/exit will be in front of her property with the ATFS to the front and side thus affecting her enjoyment of both her home and garden in perpetuity.

When HS2 commences the petitioner will be affected by noise and vibration as the cut and cover tunnel entrance/exit ceases 7 houses before her own. The blight caused by the location of the ATFS will be to create an electrical field which will be injurious to her health. The ATFS will cause noise and night time light pollution not currently occurring in the vicinity of her property. HS2’s Environmental Statement acknowledges the severe impact HS2 will have on properties on Hodgetts Lane.

The petitioner asserts that she is unreasonably and unnecessarily affected by the HS2 railway in its current design as described in the Bill and supporting documents including the
Environmental Statement. The Bill is unreasonable in that the proposed design is insufficient in mitigating the effects of the scheme both during the build and at completion, and significantly no account has been taken of the enormous impact of the scheme which runs directly through our village of Burton Green with the cut and cover tunnel ceasing half way on Hodgetts Lane, exposing the remaining properties on the northern portal to increased noise, visual impact and intrusion.

The petitioner's property is described in the documentation as being subject to significant impacts during construction stage from noise, dust and airborne pollutants causing health related medical conditions, construction traffic and loss of transport and electronic links. The petitioner's property is described in the documentation to suffer in perpetuity from noise and intrusion created by the operation of the proposed railway which will continue to prevent her peaceful enjoyment of her gardens and open spaces and will remain a constant visual intrusion. This will greatly reduce the future value of her property and her ability to provide for herself financially in the future with the repayment of her mortgage and other ongoing expenses.

The petitioner further comments that her property will be overlooked by the ATFS which will cause problems in perpetuity by constant intrusive light, constant maintenance traffic but more importantly an electronic field extending to over her property with the resultant health implications.

As the impact noted above by the two infrastructure projects which form part of HS2 high speed line is so great and the property is so close to both sites, adversely affecting in perpetuity the ability to live there unhindered, the petitioner requests that the property is subject to compulsory purchase so that she will not be adversely affected financially due to the high speed line.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner known as Mrs Marlene Jane Emily Hills as represented by herself be accepted.

Signed

Marlene Jane Emily Hills

Dated 18th 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 Lynette M Hollender

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner is a resident of Wells House Road directly affected by the HS2 Old Oak Common interchange construction and operation, and the works described in the HS2 Environmental Statement. My rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill and the Additional Provisions.

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

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

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

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Summary of required action via House of Lords Hearing

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

4.2. Compensation: Currently Wells House Road and other urban areas have no compensation beyond the inadequate ‘Need to Sell Scheme’. Property values are currently so low due to HS2 that owners would not be able to afford to move to other equivalent properties. One property received a £0 valuation due to HS2, rendering this scheme even more useless. We are seeking compensation schemes that will assist people who wish to stay throughout construction and operation and those who wish to move. In addition, schemes need to be developed to include
landlords and people renting spare rooms, shared ownership properties, people who purchased after 2010, and small businesses being operated from home/road based businesses. We also need the option of temporary or permanent rehousing if the disruption and pollution proves too much. People losing gardens or views, will also require compensation and/or reparation. There is a very real concern that we will be overtaken by aggressive developers who will destroy our community. We currently have no compensation for homes rented by one property landlords who inherited property and which to be able to return to the area when necessary. There is a very real concern that the prolonged construction works will impact on the ability to rent the property throughout it’s duration. The need to sell might be required and there is no compensation for the loss of value of the property due to the ongoing construction works for landlords.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.9. Conveyors to south of WHR: we are asking that the option to take waste below Old Oak Common Lane in the tunnel built for the new overground station is used. We strongly object to conveyors close to homes on the south side of WHR. If these are to be used, we would require that they are silent and are covered.
4.10. **Old Oak Common Station:** we ask that the platforms are moved east so that the impact of noise and disruption from the operation and the high-density overbuild of the station is moved away from WHR and other existing communities. This would also be a benefit to The Scrubs who believe an access point further east would not be so damaging to the environment. We also ask that HS2 Limited’s pledge for green space between WHR and the Old Oak Common HS2 Station be retained. In addition to the above it should be noted that throughout the ES document it constantly states that ‘no confirmed development is due to take place’.

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

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

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

4.14. **Loss of Green Space and Visual Impact:** In addition to the above it should be noted that throughout the ES document it constantly states that ‘no confirmed development is due to take place’. This is completely misleading as in the instances this is mentioned e.g. traffic plans, increase in job opportunities, impact on local green space –considered by locals a conservation areas – Wormwood Scrubs this is untrue as the Vision for Old Oak impacts hugely on this. This should be taken into
account as this forms part of the basis of the case for 'Regeneration Case 2.1.6 in the opening statements.

4.15. Order of hearings: Your petitioners requests that London presentations to the House of Lords are heard early in the proceedings. The HS2 Select Committee left ours to the last and by which time we felt there was a loss of interest. The petitions were referred to as ‘tedious’ by the HS2 team.
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.

Your signature:

Your name: Lynette M Hollender

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

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

THE PETITION OF Miss Clara Sita Curry

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner is a Wells House Road Resident and landlord who moved onto the road post 2010 and is directly affected by the HS2 Old Oak Common interchange construction and operation, and the works described in the HS2 Environmental Statement. Her rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill and the Additional Provisions.

   Wells House Road is a safe and peaceful triangular cul-de-sac with an ‘inner triangle’ of houses- in which your petitioner resides. It is a traditional family community with children playing in the street. It should also be noted that your petitioner chose to move to Wells House Road as it is an oasis of peace and quiet, close to excellent transport connections.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

   3.1. Wells House Road is in the centre of a major construction site for Old Oak Common Station. Much of this construction is to be carried out 24/7 and once the station is built, WHR will have High Speed trains, commuters and loud speakers from the station all disrupting this quiet street.

   3.2. WHR residents will be isolated by the closure of Old Oak Common Lane that will cut residents off from all major amenities. All properties will be hemmed in by the subsequent OPDC development, which will block light from homes and cause more noise and pollution during and after construction.

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

   3.4. Due to moving into the house post 2010, and as a live in landlord your petitioner is, at present, not entitled to any compensation. As the true impacts of HS2 and the OPDC construction were not available at the time of purchase in 2012, your petitioner is greatly frustrated by and fearful of this denial.

   3.5. Your petitioner does not live in direct view of the work that will be carried out around the outside ring of the WHR houses as she resides in the ‘inner triangle’. As the road is raised, sound travels very differently from that which is expected. Sounds that disturb residents in the inner triangle coming from Old Oak Common Lane (OOCL) are regularly not noticed by residents of the houses that back onto the road. Residents in the inner
triangle are awakened at weekends by noise from the Heathrow depot which lies on the other side of OOCL. Your petition fears that with 24/7 construction in both HS2 and OPDC development, the impacts of noise will be too much to live with and very difficult to find lodgers who will pay to live through it.

3.6. It should be noted that HS2 Ltd has not yet offered any assurances to individual residents. After objections to the lack of response and poor engagement by HS2, your petitioner wishes for there to be a conclusion with firm answers to residents questions with our needs to be met. It should be noted that many residents—some vulnerable—have been unable to express their concerns due to the poor variety of opportunities given.

4. Summary of required action via House of Lords Hearing

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

4.2. Old Oak Lane Closure: Although some assurances have been discussed between Ealing and HS2 Ltd, nothing has been confirmed to residents. We are seeking mobility & delivery services, 228 bus turning point; confirmation that at least part of the road will be kept open for pedestrians to access the scrubs and to reach transport links, shops and schools.

4.3. Compensation: Currently, your petitioner—a home owner who moved in after 2010 and is a landlord—is not eligible for any compensation. Property values are currently so low due to HS2 that she would not be able to afford to move to another equivalent property. Your petitioner seeks compensation schemes that will assist her if she wishes to stay throughout construction and operation and if she wishes to move as in the case of this petitioner, all schemes need to be developed to include landlords and people renting spare rooms; and people who purchased after 2010. We also need the option of temporary or permanent rehousing if the disruption and pollution proves too much.

4.4. Sound proofing every house: though some progress has been made regarding this, HS2 Ltd has only verbally offered this to houses which are in direct view of construction. Every house on the road needs to be assessed for sound pollution levels before and throughout construction and also during operation—as our sound quality will be impeded for ever more.

4.5. 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—perhaps this shields residents on the outer circle from the noises from across the road.

4.6. Baseline report on all properties: at present your petitioners’ house shakes once a day from a train on the far side on WHR. She requests that all properties are photographed and surveyed before construction commences in order to monitor and correct any structural damage.
4.7. Works entrance and conveyor belts: Your petitioner asks that a new location is found for this that is away from WHR properties. It is currently located directly behind properties on the east side of WHR. Your petitioner has two suggestions for its relocation—either the slip road used by Crossrail at the top on OOCL, or the road which the OPDC intend to create to link together new stations in the area—therefore bypassing WHR altogether. Moving both of these would greatly reduce sound and air pollution to WHR residents during construction and greatly reduce the need to relocate residents at any time, though sound insulation will still be needed during construction and for the transformation of the area—including a working commuter station.

4.8. Supplementing the Code of Construction Practice: HS2 continues to dismiss noise, air, light and vibration pollution—including the vibrations from the tunnelling—as impacts that will be covered by the Code of Construction Practice. We challenge their current level predictions and also require clarifications and assurances that the construction will not impact on residents’ quality of life. Some residents have verbally been offered some sound proofing but your petitioner strongly believes this should be offered to all WHR properties on all sides of homes. We also need clarification as to what type of sound proofing would be offered and what measures will be taken for ventilation. Again, if it is not possible to retain a quality of life and health—such as a quality of life and health—to safely open windows—residents would require options for temporary rehousing—even more reason to move construction belts and traffic away from the road. In addition, your petitioner requests working hours—to limit work that creates noise—to weekday working hours, where possible.

4.9. Accountability: HS2 Limited has a shocking record of engagement with the community. Since their plans are continually changing, your petitioner needs confirmation of a means by which HS2 is forced to continue to provide written assurances and responses for new developments as and when they occur.
The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Clara Sita Curry

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Christine Harris

Declares that:

Your petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by:

Relevant Clauses of the Bill

1 Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway mentioned in paragraph 1 above. They include provision for the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, the compulsory acquisition of land and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. They include clauses which would disapply and modify various enactments relating to special categories of land including burial grounds, consecrated land, commons and open spaces, and other matters, including overhead lines, water, building regulations and party walls, street works and the use of lorries.

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

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

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

Your Petitioner

5 Your petitioner is the owner of The White House, Little Missenden, Amersham, Bucks, HP7 OQX. This property, your petitioner's home, is a Grade II listed house in the heart of a quiet Chilterns village. Little Missenden is a conservation area and within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Your petitioner's property is situated between the proposed Little Missenden ventilation shaft and the tunnel exit and is bypassed very closely by the A413, which is designated as an access route for works traffic during the construction of HS2. Your petitioner will therefore be affected by noise, dust, air pollution and construction traffic for some years, along with irrevocable damage to the AONB.

Your Petitioner's concerns

6 Your petitioner is particularly concerned about damage by the railway to the Chilterns AONB in which she lives and works. She believes that the route as proposed above ground will permanently destroy the nature of the AONB, both for residents and visitors to the area. Your petitioner's enjoyment of the AONB will thus be detrimentally affected and so will the enjoyment of her children, grandchildren and future generations. This is contrary to the purpose of the AONB designation which is to conserve the natural beauty of the landscape, meet the need for quiet enjoyment of the countryside and have regard for the interests of those who live and work there.

7 Your petitioner therefore supports proposals for an extended bored tunnel throughout the whole of the AONB, which in your Petitioner's opinion is the only way to alleviate the detrimental impact that the proposed railway will otherwise have on the AONB.
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.

Christine Harris

17th April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-2016

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mr Edward Hunt and Mrs Charlotte Hunt

Declare that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by clauses 1 – 3, 18, 51 - 52

2. Your petitioners

The petitioners live at 2 Chestnut Close, Handsacre, Rugeley, Staffordshire after moving in July 2008. The house is situated in a small residential estate at the ‘entrance’ to the rural village and lies 95m from the centre-line of the proposed development. Your petitioners live alone at the premises commuting on a daily basis by car as both work in the emergency services. The current proposals do not include plans to demolish the house, however construction traffic is planned to operate extensively in numerous locations in the locality, the route is planned to be raised by up to 10m above ground level in the immediate vicinity and a large set of points are to be installed approximately 100m from the house where the development merges with the West Coast Main Line.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

The current bill includes proposals for a new permanent access road to be built running from Hayes Meadow Primary School on Spade Avenue to an area approximately 100 metres from your Petitioners house. In this area it is stated that a “relocatable equipment building” will be constructed, access will be via Tuppenhurst Lane to the North which will cause an increase in construction traffic in this area. Twenty four hour lighting, noise and dust pollution will undoubtedly adversely affect your Petitioners house whilst construction takes place.

The main access route to the South of your Petitioners house (A515 then the B5014 Lichfield Road) will be overwhelmed with traffic as presently the current bill details construction compounds are to be based at “Harvey’s Rough” (Hanch), A515/Wood End Lane, Wood End Lane Roadhead and Curborough. Cumulatively these are expected to accommodate approximately 1500 two-way lorry movements per day over a 5 – 7 year period. HS2 Ltd term the traffic travelling to and from Harveys
Rough, the compound closest to your Petitioners property, to be minimal when in
reality due to the nature of the road infrastructure in the area the compound should
not be looked at in isolation. Traffic travelling to and from both the compound at
Curborough and Wood End Lane Roadhead must also be taken into consideration.
These vehicles will be travelling along the same roads. These are roads that are
already in a poor state of repair in places due to adverse weather conditions over
recent winters and this will only hasten their decline. In conjunction with the
undoubted diversions and possible closures between the Seedy Mill site and
Handsacre this will in effect mean that the route from your Petitioners house to
Lichfield, Birmingham and beyond will be closed off with the only alternative being
lengthy and costly diversionary routes – extra costs incurred both financially and in
time. The cumulative effects of the proposed construction compounds, associated
traffic, dirt, dust, noise and new buildings all in the immediate vicinity will have a
devastating effect on your Petitioners house and lifestyle. The Human Rights Act
(1988) preserves the right to peaceful enjoyment of your property and the current
bill proposals undoubtedly infringe upon that right.

Finally your Petitioners draw attention to their primary concern, the inconsistent
application of the Rural Support Zone (RSZ) and Home Owner Payment Zone (HOP)
in the vicinity of Handsacre and your Petitioners property.
It is known that a consequence of any property falling inside the RSZ is the automatic
triggering of compensation payments. As the proposed line runs through countryside
approaching Handsacre the RSZ and HOP zones are shown on both sides of the
proposed track and as such although there are few properties in this area these
would obviously therefore be eligible for payment. As the line then enters the village
of Handsacre the RSZ continues on the Eastern side of the proposed track (again
where there are no current buildings) however the RSZ on the Western side abruptly
ends exactly where the track enters the village – it is more than mere coincidence
that buildings, including your Petitioners property, are located in this area and that
the RSZ has undoubtedly been designed in this way to avoid having to pay relevant
compensation payments. HOP zone 1 also ends abruptly where the track enters the
village on the Eastern side of the proposed junction with the West Coast Mainline.
HOP zones 2 and 3 continue on the opposite side of the 85014 to the boundary of
the residential dwellings at the entrance to the village. This has the effect of
compensating a tiny number of landowners with assets further away from the line
than your Petitioners.

HS2 representatives have admitted that Handsacre is unique in that properties which
would ordinarily fall within the RSZ have in this instance been specifically excluded.
Your petitioners strongly disagree with the methodology provided in justifying this
erroneous decision which has undoubtedly been made on economic grounds. It is
unjust and unfair.

Your petitioners request that this anomaly be reviewed.
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.

EDWARD JAMES HUNT

CHARLOTTE MARY HUNT

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London–West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Gervais Williams & Miranda Glossop

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner Gervais Williams and Miranda Glossop of 3 King Henry’s Road, London NW3 3QP

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

The petitioners believe that The Planning Inspectorate would not have approved the construction of the Vent Shaft adjacent to Adelaide Road, London NW3 that links down to the rail tunnel between Euston and Royal Oak had it been subject to a normal planning assessment.

The key problem is that this Vent Shaft is to be located in a green corridor. Green corridors are strips of undeveloped access land that permit a full range of flora and fauna to populate the urban environment. Green corridors are naturally considered especially valuable in the largest urban contexts.

The Planning Inspectorate have established precedence for declining planning proposals that are located on green corridors specifically because they reduced their environmental effectiveness. A good example is their Appeal Decision dated 24 September 2014 ref Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/A/14/2220283 which includes the following statements.
Para 5 - ... The site also forms part of a wider area of land designated as an 'Urban Green Corridor' on the proposals map to the UDP.

Para 6 - ... Whilst the site is privately owned with no known public access and may never have been used for recreation or be large enough for the purpose, it formed part of a wider corridor area of land that played a positive role in visual terms. ... The proposal has compromised the integrity and visual amenity of the site, which is an important and strategic part of the designated Urban Green Corridor.

Para 7 - ... Whilst the appellant considers there was little or no wildlife to be found on the site, I note the site comprised of a mixture of grassland and trees and would therefore have provided an important habitat area. The proposal has not retained this corridor function of the land and moreover, it has compromised a link in the corridor which formed an important part of a wider ecological network.

Para 10 - I conclude that the proposed development has resulted in an unacceptable loss of open space and is contrary to Policies N1, N8 and N11 of the UDP and Paragraph 74 of the Framework, which look to provide open space and a network of spaces that link the urban areas with the Countryside.

The new Vent Shaft is to be located close to central London, and therefore is subject to planning guidance from the Mayor of London. This was updated in March 2012 with a new document entitled The All London Green Grid. This Supplementary Planning Guidance was specifically written to step up the environmental weighting of the green corridors within London. The Supplementary Planning Guidance indicates that all major projects within London, such as that of HS2, should be assessed with regard to their potential impact on the current network of green corridors.

The following statements are included within The All London Green Grid planning guidance.

In section 5.178 on page 124 the Planning Guidance states "The [central] area is the most urbanised part of London and this presents unique challenges in implementing green infrastructure interventions but it is also the place where new and improved green infrastructure could provide significant benefits in relation to surface water
flood management, mitigating the urban heat island effect and increasing access to open space.

Under section 5.191 on page 128 it is also noted under “Strategic green infrastructure opportunities” that urban planning should... “13) Promote additional pockets of nature in the central London by diversifying management, linking spaces to provide wildlife corridors and promote accessibility and interpretation of the natural environment in parks and on walking routes.”

The Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Mayor of London specifically identifies that there is a green corridor link between Regents Park/Primrose Hill and Hampstead Heath. It is sufficiently specific to be named individually as the Nash Ramblas Link. This green corridor runs north from Parliament Square and the Thames, through the Royal Parks and the Central Activities Zone to Regents Park and Primrose Hill. Thereafter it continues through the residential streets to Parliament Hill and Hampstead Heath. This link crossed the site the new Vent Shaft.

Camden Council have also carried out an assessment of the Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) within their borough. In this assessment they have specifically identified the Chalk Farm Embankment where the Vent Shaft is to be located to be on a Site of Borough Grade 1 Importance. Contiguous tree canopies tend to have a higher environmental value in green corridors, especially if they are undisturbed by walkers and dogs as in this case. This may explain the elevated designation of the Chalk Farm Embankment by Camden Council.

Overall the Petitioners question why the Proposers should select this location for a new Vent Shaft, given it is one of the only areas of natural undisturbed woodland in this area, and removing it will greatly degrade the wildlife corridor of its utility.

Unfortunately the petition on these matters to the House of Commons was not fully considered. For unknown reasons the presentation slides to be used were not available for the committee to consider. And the session was almost completed when we were asked to present so there was almost no time to cover these matters. We did write to the committee...
clerk afterwards to ask if we could supplement our truncated presentation with the presentation material for consideration, but received no reply.

The petitioners believe that had the House of Commons committee had all of these facts together they would have asked HS2 to explain why the Vent Shaft had to be located on the green corridor on the Railway Embankment at Chalk Farm. There is an alternative location at Juniper Crescent that is also a viable location and it has the advantage that it does not involve the removal of part of a green corridor link in Central London.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner* remains, etc.

GERVAIS WILLIAMS  
MIRANDA GLOSSOP  

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Mrs Susan Chatterton Rogers

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your Petitioner is the freehold owner of Cottage Farm, Aylesbury Road, Great Missenden HP16 9LS.

Cottage Farm, which is owned by your Petitioner, is located south west of the proposed High Speed Rail Link, accessed from Leather Lane. On map CT-06-034b the property is located in grid squares B9 and C9.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioner is 86 years old and has moved into a full time care facility as she is unable to live alone due to her health condition. As a result she has been unable to occupy Cottage Farm since December 2010.

Cottage Farm had been marketed for sale since April 2011, having not achieved a sale. As a result of petitioning in the House of Commons your petitioner’s application under the HS2 Need to Sell Scheme was finally accepted on 12th January 2016. HS2 subsequently offered a sum of £2,200,000 on 16th February 2016 which your petitioner accepted on 18th February 2016.

As a direct result of Cottage Farm’s lack of sale during the initial marketing period, and due to the length of time taken for HS2 to acknowledge and accept the Need to Sell Application resulting from the proposed High Speed Rail, your Petitioner has been advised that she is no longer eligible to receive Principal Private Residence Relief.

Your Petitioner believes that it is unacceptable that this relief will be unavailable to her. She is in a position where she will suffer a loss solely as a result of the promoters action, or lack of action. The petitioner considers that there should be a capital gains tax exemption in respect of compulsorily acquired property. A provision should be made for her and others in a similar situation to allow compensation to reflect this loss or alternatively compensation should be paid by HS2 to cover this potential loss. If the equivalence rule was always observed in compensation claims, no claimant should suffer uncompensatable losses due to taxation.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, clause 57, clause 58 and clause 63 so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Edward Henry Stephen Briggs

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF ALISON READ

Declares that:

1. The petitioner(s) is/are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

Your petitioner(s) is: ALISON READ

the Leaseholder for a ground floor flat on Mornington Crescent, the third building from the corner with Mornington Place which is a route for construction vehicles for HS2. The flats on the north side of Mornington Place are single story/ground floor only - we fought for this when planning permission was applied for in order to allow for light and air circulation and to stop over development in a Grade 11 listed Conservation area but this will result in noise and air pollution/penetration and have a severe impact on quality of life to the rear of the homes in this section of Mornington Crescent.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns are

- Traffic: the huge increase in heavy goods traffic in such a small, densely populated/built area will become intolerable. It is essential that a higher percentage of the spoil removed and the construction equipment necessary be conveyed by rail; if necessary commuter and other trains must be re-routed to other stations for the duration of construction in order to release more rail lines for this traffic. Surely it is only fair that the rail travellers who supposedly will benefit from the works are made to share the burden?

- Cycling: as a London cyclist for the past 50 years (45 of them in the Mornington Crescent area) I am very concerned for my safety on the road. The figures for deaths of cyclists from HGV vehicles in London are well known. The weight of traffic and the amount of HGV vehicles will cause a more rapid deterioration of the road surface - this adds to the danger. I petition the Lords to insist that ALL drivers of HGV vehicles working on this construction pass an extra licence qualification achieved
after training re bicycle-awareness in city traffic. Also that ALL vehicles be fitted with cycle-aware equipment, mirrors and warnings. I fear that I will give up cycling which I do not want to do.

- **Air Quality**: the figures for air pollution in Hampstead Road and Euston Road regularly exceed EU levels. I live here, I breathe this air these regulations must be adhered to at all times in order to not destroy the quality of life and health of residents. Adequate monitoring stations - staffed independently from HS2 must be set up from the start.

- **Noise**: I am concerned that noise levels for all night working will impact on my sleep and rest/relaxation - it is only at night that I hear the trains running in to Euston, with 24 hour construction work and traffic for twenty years we will all be frazzled to an early death. How can I live a healthy life style - which I enjoy doing when so much is taken out of my control and with no consideration for the lives of residents?

- **Disruption**: Most Camden residents have watched, suffered and endured with horror the Cross Rail works at Tottenham Court Road, I fear this will be repeated in a hugely increased manner and for a much longer time - all the way from Euston Station, Parkway and the rest of Camden Town. Maybe the Lords could visit the Tottenham Court Road site and have a look to get an idea of the disruption which we will be expected to live through?

- **Duration of Construction**: I beg that every effort is made to keep the construction of the shortest possible duration. We can not be expected to live in conditions like this for such a long time - it will be the death of me.

- **Cross Rail at Euston**: Please will the Lords look at the HS2 proposals in conjunction with the proposed plans for Cross Rail 2 at Euston - the works must be done in some kind of co-ordinated manner.

- **Arbitration**: I request that an independent adjudicator is appointed for the duration of the project in order to resolve issues that arise, it is never possible to set terms and conditions in advance, none of us is all seeing. Residents need an appeals process. This to include compensation for damage to life quality/noise/disruption.

- **Green Spaces**: to be maintained, mature trees protected as much as possible not just 'replaced later' at the swing of the axe.

- **HS2/Residents**: that HS2 change their 'performance' of concern for the local residents and turn it in to a real engagement and listening to concerns and then doing something about them. Their performance up to now has been apparent concern followed by nothing, no feedback and most important no changes made to the proposals for HS2 to take in to account the concerns of the residents.
4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name: ALISON READ Signature

Name: ................................................ Signature

Name: ................................................ Signature

Name: ................................................ Signature
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Name: ................................................ Signature

Name: ................................................ Signature

Name: ................................................ Signature

Name: ................................................ Signature

Name: ................................................ Signature

Name: ................................................ Signature
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Name: ................................................ Signature

Name: ................................................ Signature
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16  

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

THE PETITION OF Julian Williams  

Declares that:  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

Julian Williams is the freeholder and, with his family, occupier of Lowlands, Cheapside Lane, Denham UB9 5AB. Your petitioner’s property lies 1900m from the closest part of the line. However, it is the disruption and damage to the immediate area used by your petitioner and family for recreational and transport purposes which forms the basis of this petition.  

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

Your Petitioner believes the whole concept of the current HS2 project to be utterly wrong, that the planning, communication and delivery to date are hugely flawed and that the entire project should be abandoned. Your Petitioner is expressing his concerns about aspects of the scheme that will have a direct and devastating effect on him and his family.  

Your Petitioner and his family make great use of the outside environment for pleasure – walking, cycling, camping etc. Your petitioner leads Scouts in the area, makes use of the Colne Valley Country Park, The Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre, regularly cycles to work along the canal towpath and makes considerable use of the many beautiful and in some cases ancient Public Rights of Way.  

In winter time your petitioner usually commutes along the A412 from Denham to Watford and for a significant number of years has suffered massive delays during the M25 widening process and still experiences traffic congestion on an almost daily basis. Whenever there is an accident between the M25 and the M40 or M4, Denham, the North Orbital Road, the A40 dual carriageway and all surrounding areas are gridlocked.  

As it passes through the Colne Valley, the proposed route of HS2 will carry it over a 2.6km-long viaduct up to 15m high (from HS2 drawings), as well as a number of cuttings and embankments, which will have a massive adverse effect on the environment both during its construction and operation. It will require realignment of numerous roads and paths, draining of lakes, and construction of a number of power plants/feeder stations.  

The HS2 scheme and particularly the overground section described above will have the following unacceptable impact:
1. Massive disruption during construction and equivalent impact upon completion of the scheme on footpaths, bridleways, towpaths and minor roads. Your petitioner is a keen walker and cyclist and uses at least one of the footpaths affected practically every weekend. Thousands of people use the canal towpaths, especially during the months between spring and autumn. The walks along the River Colne, through the Colne Valley Regional Park are very well used and will be negatively impacted upon during construction in respect of noise, access and airborne construction products and spoil.

2. The Grand Union Canal towpath would be crossed at a point adjoining lakes on both sides and adjacent to the Harefield Marina. It is understood that the towpath may have to be diverted for a construction period of up to four years. Your Petitioner regularly cycles this route, particularly in the summer, and encounters many other cyclists, walkers and canal residents in the process. At the point where the HS2 route crosses the canal exceptional, certainly industrially unacceptable, noise levels are envisaged.

Your Petitioner has asked for information in respect of noise levels at two “information events” organised by HS2 Ltd. On both occasions he was introduced to the 'noise specialist' and both times was told “we don’t really know”. When your Petitioner asked about the impact of noise from exceptionally high speed trains and their potential carriage across open flat lakes from viaduct walls (barriers) significantly lower than the tops of the trains – a similar answer - “It hasn’t been done yet” – was received. Your Petitioner estimates that noise levels could be prolonged and regular, significantly impacting upon him (or others) when walking, cycling or paddling/sailing underneath the viaduct. This would of course similarly impact upon other travellers or local residents. Your Petitioner suggests that the impact of noise upon passers-by (and their number) has been hugely underestimated.

3. Your Petitioner understands that the existing gravel processing plant at Moorhall Road, at the location where it crosses the canal (Widewater Lock) may be utilised to play an important part in the construction period. Should this be the case it is envisaged that the inevitable numerous lorry movements will cause further congestion on the already busy local roads together with nuisance to your Petitioner and family (who use the Moorhall Road daily and its junction with the A412 many times a day). The nuisance being congestion, airborne pollution (dust) and rapid deterioration of the tarmac.

4. Another place your Petitioner visits regularly is the Broadwater Lake Nature Reserve which, although originally a gravel pit, is the biggest expanse of water in the Colne Valley (about 20 hectares) and, indeed, one of the biggest in south-east England. The four lakes in the vicinity are within the Mid Colne Valley SSSI and this has national importance in respect of bird populations and overwintering birds. Your Petitioner visits the site, usually in the early morning, in order to see the birds on the lake or the islands/trees. At dusk, during the summer or autumn months, numerous bats can be seen (or occasionally felt) as they race and weave across the water above the banks.

The proposed route goes directly across one of the four lakes (Korda after the Denham-based film-maker Alexander Korda) and adjacent to the remaining
The construction works will undoubtedly have a devastating and lasting impact upon this environment, its inhabitants and feathered visitors.

The viaduct in operation would spoil a beautiful place and rare resource. It is doubted that the lake would ever recover any of its current population; your petitioner is concerned about the potential for impact meetings between the birds and the high speed trains.

Your petitioner is aware that HS2 Limited carried out an Environmental Impact Study on the Colne Valley Regional Park and that its findings indicated low impact on land and receptors or minor adverse effects on the park. This is completely incorrect, the impact on the visitors, the wildlife, the SSSI generally, your Petitioner and the wider environment would be massive and permanent.

5. Another resource enjoyed by your Petitioner and his family/friends is the recreational lake operated by the Denham Water Ski Club. Your Petitioner’s involvement here is primarily social/spectator rather than as a participant. The proximity of the railway during its construction and operation will be massive both in respect of nuisance, noise and views. It is doubtful if your Petitioner would want to re-attend during or following construction and ultimately this facility would be lost to your Petitioner and his community.

6. Probably the most important loss of amenity, which will have a special and direct effect on your Petitioner, is that of the project’s impact on the Old Shire Lane near the Buckinghamshire/Hertfordshire County boundary. The Old Shire Lane is an excellent Public Right of Way enjoyed by your Petitioner for walking and cycling and by many others for similar purposes and as a bridleway. Your Petitioner frequently walks or cycles this path with family members and enjoys the beauty of the path through the seasons. There are numerous fine old oaks, noisy and varied hedgerows, sunken paths (indicating hundreds/perhaps thousands of years of passage) and diverse wildlife along the route. Bluebell time is fragrant and spectacular as the bluebells and dogs mercury surround the lane. The lane would be hugely impacted by the proximity of the high-speed railway line, particularly at the northern end where the sunken paths and dips and hills exist.

In your Petitioner’s view, the impact of the construction works on the area and the Old Shire Lane have not been properly assessed.

The Old Shire Lane has been largely considered as simply a path to be temporarily diverted (without detail on the original route’s protection and maintenance during construction) and re-routed to suit the project without proper and due diligence in respect of the habitat, history and view. The construction works and modification of the land enclosed by the Old Shire Lane, Chalfont Lane and the A412 (Denham Way – North Orbital Road) will devastate the area providing massive impact on users during construction and post construction. Noise and light pollution, movement of dirt, dust, and tunnelling spoil will be massive. The site also includes the (potential if not now “on the cards”) passive provision for the possible Heathrow spur which further increases the extent of the earthworks and site.

HS2 Ltd’s limited Impact assessment of the Old Shire Lane presumed it to be simply part of a circular walk and assessed through survey at two separate August dates in 2012. This was during the summer holidays and one of the inspection dates coincided with the penultimate day of the London Olympics.
The dates chosen were minimal and not representative of normal usage. The survey was not deemed by your Petitioner to be either adequate or accurate.

7 To the south of the Old Shire Lane, between Little Halings Wood and Juniper Wood, your Petitioner has permission to access the land, rich in wildlife and of particular beauty, surrounded by ancient woodland. It is proposed by HS2 Ltd that this land between two patches of ancient woodland is converted ("created") into a woodland habitat as some sort of environmental measure designed to minimise overall environmental impact. Your Petitioner believes that this is a token measure of limited understanding and limited beneficial impact.

8 Your Petitioner has driven to work along the A412 North Orbital Road for a number of years. Due to motorists using the A412 as a "cut through" between the M40 and Maple Cross in both directions, passage along this road is often difficult at peak hours and congestion occurs at all places between the Denham roundabout as far back as Chalfont Lane, sometimes Maple Cross. When an accident or blockage occurs on the M25, Denham is gridlocked. Traffic queuing on the North Orbital Road adjacent to the Denham Ski Club site, U-turns on a fast, vision-restricted hill and turns back to use the narrow Tilehouse Lane as an alternative. Any further, heavy or slow traffic entering the A412 or M25 at peak hours will undoubtedly have significant additional impact upon your Petitioner and the traffic congestion.

It is suggested by your Petitioner that the Environmental Survey and its associated statement produced by HS2 Ltd is wholly inadequate, incomplete and misleading. Your Petitioner considers the mitigation measures proposed by HS2 Ltd in respect of disruption, noise, the aesthetic and the environment, as token appeasement measures of no real consequence.

The proposal to cross the Colne Valley by viaduct would have a serious direct effect upon your Petitioner.

Given the impact upon the Colne Valley described above, the damage to the environment, the views, the Public Rights of Way and the road system, your Petitioner requests that the following changes are made:

1. That the entire railway remains within a tunnel between the two planned portals and does not surface within the Colne Valley.

2. That necessary construction shaft provision is made similar to that used by Crossrail with limited visual impact minimising the effect on the environment.

3. That construction traffic is limited such that it will have minimal additional adverse impact on rush hour or peak times and avoid local roads altogether.
4. That any damage to the road surface caused by heavy traffic is dealt with immediately to prevent further damage, vehicle damage or additional congestion.

5. That noise and light pollution is minimised at construction shafts.

6. That a proper, in-depth and independently witnessed (paid for by but not directed by HS2 Ltd or Government) Environmental Study is carried out to ensure that real concerns and issues are properly considered and dealt with (and, for example, the monitoring and policing of environmental and traffic issues are dealt with during construction).

7. That all construction traffic is prohibited from travelling through Denham Green and Moorhall Road and that the Moorhall Road facility is not increased in size as a consequence of the project.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner* remains etc.

Julian Williams

Dated: 18 April 2016
To The House of Lords
Session 2015-2016

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Patrick Joseph Fell and Joy Francesca Fell

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners
The petitioners are Patrick Joseph Fell and Joy Francesca Fell and are residents at and owners of property at 48 Ellesborough Road, Wendover, Bucks HP22 6EL. This property is situated within 120 metres of the centre of the alignment of the proposed route and closer to other construction sites associated with the proposal. The HS2 line proposed in the Bill will specially and directly affect them, both during construction and after completion.
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 Overview
Your petitioners have two concerns: firstly, that the proposed construction of a short, 'green', tunnel, a viaduct and embankments, and a six-metre high wall as a sound barrier, will together constitute a grotesque disfigurement of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, as well as introducing unacceptable levels of noise to this area; and, secondly, that the prolonged and extensive construction activities proposed will create an overall level of nuisance and disturbance at their property which is unacceptable.
The alternative to the approach proposed by the promoter is to build a fully bored tunnel, as outlined in the T3i proposals. As well as providing proper protection for the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, this would eliminate all construction activities close to the petitioners' property and thus address their second concern.

In the event that a bored tunnel is not approved, your petitioners seek enhanced compensation to cover the full costs of moving home, in addition to the market value which is available under existing compensation schemes. This property is one of a small number which will have construction activities on all sides of them over a period of years and your petitioners do not regard this as an acceptable environment either for themselves or for their children.
3.2 Tunnel throughout the Chilterns AONB

3.2.1 Impacts of the Current Proposals

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.

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 - attributes that lead to the AONB being visited over 50 million times a year by visitors 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. It will permanently and seriously reduce the ability of both residents and visitors to enjoy the natural benefits of the area.

Your petitioners contend that 6 metre sound barriers will be irredeemably ugly, will seriously degrade the environment of Wendover, and will radically alter the character of the town, with a consequential negative commercial impact. The use of such barriers is in any case both unprecedented and unproven.

Your 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 a 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.

3.2.2 Request for a Bored Tunnel

Your petitioners request that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the presently proposed bored tunnel out to beyond Wendover, based on the T3i proposals and 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 this petition and the need for most of the proposed remedies otherwise required.

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.

3.2.3 Request for Independent Review of Costs

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

HS2 Ltd's construction costings need independent review in the light of information that is available on tunnelling and the cost of the alternative mitigation that would be required to address the impact of HS2 Ltd's proposal for this area. There is a need for an independent review of the net incremental cost of a longer tunnel. The value of landscape has been inadequately assessed by the Promoter, and the government approved methodologies for assessing the value of landscape have been ignored by the DfT. The value of the other benefits to be derived from further tunnelling has so far been inadequately considered by the Promoter, and these include the real economic impacts of property blight, traffic congestion, and the impact on tourism and other local businesses. Once a proper account is taken of the costs and benefits of an extended tunnel, the Chilterns tunnel proposal will not be materially more expensive to the nation and will truly protect the AONB instead of permanently disfiguring it.
3.3 Compensation for Construction of the Green Tunnel

Your petitioners submit that, in the event that the current proposals for a green tunnel are approved, the compensation provisions in relation to property that is not compulsorily acquired are not sufficient to compensate your petitioners adequately for the loss and damage they will incur as a result of its construction and associated development.

3.3.1 General Construction Issues

Your 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, light pollution and Public Right of Way disruption that will be generated by the works.

3.3.2 Location-specific Issues

Your petitioners submit that during the construction process there will be the following effects specific to the location of their property, in addition to the general impact on the area as a whole.

The property will be isolated by construction activities taking place on all sides of it. Land both in front of and to the rear will be given over to construction activities, while the construction of the tunnel itself will be within 60 metres on a third side. The construction of the new access road to Bacombe Lane and the works for the western end of the diversion of Ellesborough Road complete the remaining side. Nos. 42-50 Ellesborough Road will in fact be an island surrounded by construction activities. Whichever way the wind is blowing, the property will suffer from noise, dust, light pollution and other nuisances, and this will result in an inability to concentrate during the day, and potentially an inability to sleep at night.

Of the five other properties in this block, three have already been acquired by the DfT, one has been vacant for a lengthy period following the deaths of the owners, and the owners of the last are also petitioning this Committee for additional compensation. In all three cases of purchase by the DfT the owners had reasons for moving other than the impact of HS2.
3.3.3 The Environmental Statement and Timescales

The Environmental Statement acknowledges more than once the extent of impacts on these properties. At Vol. 2 CFA10, 2.6.38 it states that “these properties will... be significantly affected by the construction of the green tunnel”; at Vol. 2 CFA10, 5.1.2 it recognises “impacts on amenity for residential properties on Ellesborough Road”; at Vol. 2 CFA10, 5.1.2 it states: “...residential properties on Ellesborough Road ...are predicted to experience in-combination effects...associated with the construction of the Wendover green tunnel”. It goes on to identify visual effects including additional lighting and “significant daytime noise effects”.

At Vol. 2 CFA10, 2.6.38, cited above, the impact of the construction of the green tunnel is actually called in mitigation of the decision to locate the diversion of Ellesborough Road to the rear of the properties. The additional effects of the road diversion will be “minor” in comparison.

The Environmental Statement indicates that a period of about two years is required for construction of the Wendover green tunnel. This timescale may however need to be modified to allow for the consequences of any findings from hydrogeological investigations undertaken after original publication.

3.3.4 Your Petitioners’ Circumstances

Your Petitioners have children of school age, who will be taking key exams including A-levels and who will be applying for university places during this period. Your petitioners submit that it is not acceptable that they should be required to address the challenges of this critical period in their lives with the gratuitous handicap imposed by the proposed works.

Your petitioners use their property not only for residential purposes but also in part as a location for business activity.

Unlike the owners of other adjacent properties already sold to the DfT, your petitioners have no need or desire to move from their present location. However they do not regard the impacts of the proposed construction on their property as in any way acceptable and do not believe it will be possible to continue normal family life in such circumstances.

3.3.5 Request for Enhanced Compensation

Your petitioners therefore request that their property be offered the same compensation as is available to properties in the Safeguarded Area and, in particular, that the full costs of moving, as well as the market value of the property, be available in compensation.
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.

Joy Francesca Fell

Patrick Joseph Fell

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 GREENWAY TRUST

Declares that:

1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the Bill in relation to the additional provisions AP2-018 (Revision to gradient and construction phasing eastern approach to Bridleway W164 overbridge) and AP2-018-004 (Burton Green area amendment)

2. Your Petitioner

The petitioner is the Greenway Trust (Kenilworth to Berkswell), a charitable organisation formed in 2012 that exists to promote the Kenilworth to Berkswell Greenway and raise awareness of the wide variety of health, social and other benefits arising from the use of this multi-use corridor. The Greenway Trust works in partnership with landowners along the route, including Warwickshire County Council, Warwick District Council, the University of Warwick and others, together with Sustrans and other interested parties, to maintain and improve the route and its local environment. Greenway Trust members carry out maintenance and improvement activities on a voluntary basis, and raise funds to support the activities of the Trust.

Your Petitioner would draw attention to the great value of the Kenilworth Greenway to local people and those from further afield. It is a major recreational resource for walkers, cyclists, horse riders, joggers, naturalists and other outdoor enthusiasts.

The Greenway is furthermore of significant ecological importance. It is a major migration route between local wildlife habitats for many vertebrate and invertebrate species, providing important interlinking wildlife corridors for both. We aspire that the biodiversity of the Greenway should be preserved and enhanced showcasing the many unusual flora and fauna found here.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

The Promoter proposes to use the Greenway for heavy vehicles during construction of the proposed railway, and then attempt to reinstate it to its original condition. However, your Petitioner fears that there will be irreparable damage to the structure, drainage system, culverts, embankments, flora, and fauna. The community would experience major inconvenience and loss of amenity. Your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the Kenilworth Greenway will not be used for construction traffic other than in exceptional circumstances, and that a clear specification for restoration works and replanting will be agreed with the Greenway Trust and local councils and amenity groups.

The Petitioner reiterates concerns that the planned railway could be a major barrier to migration of species between local wildlife habitats, thereby reducing ecological value. Your Petitioners request that the best available measures to enhance ecological activity along the Greenway be investigated and implemented.
The Petitioner would draw attention to the close proximity between the Greenway and the proposed HS2 line, where the two routes converge and run parallel to each other. We are particularly concerned about noise and vibration impacts, particularly on sensitive users of the Greenway, including vulnerable people, horses. We would ask that greater detail acoustic design is undertaken at this stage to better quantify noise and vibration impact. We further request that consideration be given to extended and/or enhanced noise barriers on both sides of the railway in the vicinity of the under and overbridges to mitigate the noise impact as much as reasonably possible for all users of the bridleway/cycleway along its route.

In order to preserve the characteristic environment of the Greenway, we would seek that the Promoters include additional measures to reduce noise impact to a daytime level of below 50dB over as much of the length of the Greenway route as possible.

Work No. 2/182 and Work No 2/183 (Cromwell Lane, Burton Green) (AP2-018-004)

At this point HS2 would enter a cutting and pass beneath the reconstructed Cromwell Lane with a view that the proposed route of the realigned Greenway would then climb up onto the top of the cut-and-cover Burton Green Tunnel. There are a number of concerns at this point, notably the acoustic treatment of the south portal entrance and the Cromwell Lane Underpass to prevent resonance and noise transmission that might startle horses being ridden or led through. Your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the underpass will be suitable in height and width and acoustic attenuation (noise and vibration) for horse-riders, cyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair and other vulnerable users and that it will be certified as such by the Promoter.

Your Petitioner also seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that there will be proper screening both noise and visual to ensure horses will not be startled by sudden-onset noise or visual effect of high speed trains.

At this Cromwell Lane section, the Promoter proposes that the new Greenway should climb with a gradient of 5% over a considerable distance, despite the preferred maximum gradient for mixed use being 3% in the Highways Design Manual. Your Petitioner asks that the Promoter re-examine this in order to make the gradient safe and suitable for all users on this multi-user bridleway, keeping the gradient no greater 3%.

At the top of the cut and cover tunnel we would ask that the Promoters seek to increase the physical distance between the Greenway and the high speed line along a length north of the North Portal of the Burton Green tunnel as far as the Footpath M186 Accommodation Overbridge at Waste Lane.

In the overall design of the realigned Kenilworth Greenway as it passes through the Burton Green area, we request that an extension path be created to link directly to the site of the relocated Burton Green Village Hall, and that its use as an attractive and safe walking route between Cromwell Lane and the Village Hall by day and by night be facilitated.

The temporary diversion route for the Kenilworth Greenway through the Burton Green area during the construction phase is directly affected by the relocation of the Replacement of Burton Green Village Hall (SES-018-001).

The petitioner welcomes the relocation of the Burton Green tunnel South Portal Satellite Compound to the north side of the railway line. However, the exact routing and detailed
design of the temporary route between where it leaves the Kenilworth Greenway existing route and the crossing at Hob Lane remains unresolved. We request that the Promoters be required to provide a temporary safe diversion route which meets all of the concerns raised in our previous Petition, and in particular safe crossing points of both Red Lane and Hob Lane, and a separate shared use path and bridleway alongside the Red Lane carriageway.

W164 overbridge (AP2-018-003) (Waste Lane)

The Petitioner is concerned that the realigned route at those points contains three sharp 90 degree bends on the southern side of the overbridge. This would prove difficult for cyclists, horse riders and wheel chair users to negotiate, and has implications for safety on this multi-user path. We would respectfully suggest that the Promoter redesign this section to reduce the severity of these bends and ensure good forward visibility of the bends from each direction on safety grounds. Noise and vibration impact at this point in the form of additional screening would also be needed.

Kenilworth Greenway route between the Footpath M186 Accommodation Overbridge and Berkswell Station AP2-023-001

This section of the route is unchanged by the Additional Provisions, with the Kenilworth Greenway path running close to the line of the railway. The Petitioner reiterates previous concerns about this close proximity between the Greenway and the high speed line, and request that the Promoters be required to take all reasonable measures to mitigate noise and visual impacts on all users of the route. In particular, the Promoters should follow the precautionary principle in terms of mitigating noise and visual impacts to avoid horses being startled in confined spaces where they are co-mingling in close proximity with other users. The Petitioner welcomes the extension of the Kenilworth Greenway route to link with Station Road, Berkswell. As with the Burton Green underpass and the Waste Lane overpass, we request that the gradients on this new section of the route be made as gentle as possible and certainly less than a maximum of 3%.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner known as The Greenway Trust a Society established in the promotion and protection of the Greenway as represented by Mr Ian Cox and Mrs Marlene Hills be accepted.

Signed

Ian Donald George Cox

Marlene-Han Emily Hills

Dated 18th 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 & MRS DJ ROTHWELL

 Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioners are residents of Two Oaks, Red Lane, Burton Green Kenilworth and also business owners of Two Oaks Day Nursery of the same address.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

4. The petitioners considers that the provisions in the Bill relating to compensation is completely inadequate, consideration should be given to age, circumstances and business activity.

5. The petitioners have already suffered significant impact from the scheme, deterioration of health and financial loss.

6. The petitioners have continued concerns that the noise and dust generated during the construction phase will not only effect the well-being of the petitioners but also the children attending the Day Nursery.

7. The petitioners remain sceptical over the noise/visual mitigation in place, in order to safeguard the environment where children traditionally sleep outdoors.

8. The petitioners acknowledge that the extension to the Burton Green Tunnel has been largely welcomed and will benefit many residents, it does however move fifty meters closer to the petitioners. A preferred solution would be to extend the tunnel further towards Kenilworth.
9. The prayer

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

AND the petitioners remains, etc.

MRS FDE ROTHWELL

18th April 2016
TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS
SESSION 2015-16
PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF DAISY AYLIFFE AND BEN WICKS

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners are Ben Wicks and Daisy Ayliffe, residents of Princess Road, Camden.

3. Your Petitioners and their interests are injuriously affected by the Bill for reasons outlined below. If the Bill were to be passed in its present form, our properties and our enjoyment of life would be significantly blighted for many years to come. It is not just the quantity of impacts that concern us; equally important is the length of time over which we are likely to be impacted (up to nine years). We desire to stay living on Princess Road and plan to use the local primary school, but there is no doubt once construction starts and perhaps earlier, the price of our properties, our ability to sell and the quality of our family life will be adversely impacted for many years to come. We therefore ASK that Princess Road be removed from the scope of the Bill.

Our concerns

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

5. We ASK that the Compulsory Purchase Notice Orders on our cellar is withdrawn. If, however, it can be demonstrated that the sewer has to re-routed along Princess Road and that for this purpose for legal reasons there have to be Compulsory Purchase Notice Orders, we ASK - so as to remove any ambiguity - for a legally binding undertaking from HS2 Ltd that our cellar will not be acquired for these or any other works. Our cellar forms part of the bedroom of our young daughter, Violet Wicks. If there is no reason to compulsory purchase the room that our daughter sleeps in, as we were assured when the HS2 team visited, then we ASK that the compulsory purchase order is dropped.
6. Princess Road is within the Primrose Hill conservation area and almost all houses on Princess Road are early 19th century, of special historical interest or Grade 2 listed. It should be noted that 32 Princess Road, the building of which the cellar in question is a part is mentioned in Camden Council Conservation Area Statement (2000) Primrose Hill Conservation Area being notable as a particularly good example of the local building tradition. Such buildings, whilst not statutorily listed are nevertheless important local buildings in their own right and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

7. Princess Road is now designated as a Construction Traffic Route (CTR). In spite of several requests, HS2 Ltd have failed to explain why our street has been so designated. We have merely been told that their traffic modelling now predicts more than 24 HGV movements per day, and that therefore our beautiful street, home to a large primary school and filled with small children almost every day, now falls within the CTR category. A lollipop lady helps children cross Princess Road morning and afternoon, performing this task amid HGVs and additional pollution could be untenable. We note that HGV traffic predictions on our adjoining streets. The extra traffic is predicted to last during construction scenarios 2 and 3 (i.e. 2017 through 2022). More traffic means more noise, pollution and other negative effects for us as residents.

8. HS2 Ltd have not said how many HGV movements they expect for our street. Any increase in HGV traffic will be injurious to all who reside and use this street - extra noise, vibration, air pollution and risk to pedestrians and children. Our concern is greatly heightened by the undoubted risk that the HGV traffic prediction will be seriously underestimated, and that the injury and blight will be far greater. We have seen nothing that would give any confidence that, in the event of contractors wishing to use Princess Road to a greater extent than the traffic modelling predicts, we as residents would have any way of preventing this from happening.

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

10. In the event of Princess Road remaining within the scope of the Bill and remaining a designated CTR, there should be:
   • an enforceable limit on the number of HGVs allowed to transit our street each day;
   • a limit to the size and weight of HGVs transiting our street
   • subject to further consultation amongst Princess Road residents, taking into account that there is a trade-off between extra vibration and speed prevention.

1 Map CT - 05 - 001 in SES 2 Volume 5
• there should be no HGV traffic at night between 18.00 and 09.00 and no HGV traffic on Saturdays and Sundays.

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

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

13. If construction traffic is to be reduced in Camden Town, this would require that the total volume of equipment and materials to and from the construction site now planned to be carried by road be very significantly reduced. We support TfL’s view that a large proportion could be carried by rail. HS2 Ltd has been resistant to this on the grounds it would disrupt normal rail service.

14. We **ASK** that in the light of AP3, the compensation measures relating to Princess Road are reviewed to include the increased disturbance to be faced by residents. It is increasingly clear that if the Bill is passed in its present intended form, we, residents of Princess Road, will be severely damaged, and the mitigation measures so far proposed for our neighbourhood and for us in particular go nowhere far enough in offsetting or compensating us for the amenity damage and blight to our homes that construction is likely to cause.

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

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 your petitioners remain, etc.

Ben Wicks

Daisy Ayliffe

12th April 2016

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

THE PETITION OF CHRISTOBEL WENDY SMITH
Declares that:
1. The petitioner* is* specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is an owner/occupier of a freehold residential property and agricultural and at Oldfields House, Mill Road, Stratton Audley, Bicester, Oxfordshire OX27 9AN.

3. Your petitioner's concerns

The petitioner's residential property is located within a peaceful and tranquil area about a third of a mile from the nearest road. The proposed HS2 line will run in close proximity to this property and will make it an unpleasant place to live due to the significant and persistent increase in noise. The ES conclusions in this respect are misleading and based upon a limited and unsatisfactory assessment of the likely impact upon the living conditions of people living nearby. The property lies south of that part of the line which runs past Chetwode. I fully support the residents of Chetwode in seeking a tunnel to accommodate this part of the line. This is necessary both for Chetwode residents and for those of us who live nearby to the south. There is also a need for greater noise mitigation by way of bunding and acoustic fencing where the route passes close to Godington just to the east.

My access route passes through Chetwode. If this is cut off during construction or operation then it will result in my having to undertake a very large detour. These roads are not wide enough to be accessed by HGV construction lorries and a limit on the size and numbers of construction vehicles should be imposed. During the operational phase the route over the railway near Chetwode must be made safe for horse riders. The proposed construction hours, and noise limits during this time are also unacceptable and would make living in my property intolerable whilst construction is in progress.

In conclusion, I would like the Bill altered to make provision for the route to pass through a tunnel in the Chetwode location; more restricted construction days/hours; a reduction in noise levels permitted during construction to be achieved by providing greater noise mitigation; the route through Chetwode from the south to be kept open during the construction and operational periods and made safe for use by horses; the numbers and size of construction lorries should be limited.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

CHRISTOBEL WENDY SMITH
16 APRIL 2016