TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS

SESSION 2015-2016

PETITION against the

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON TO WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

THE PETITION OF MARY-JANE GIBSON

DECLARIES THAT:

1. Your Petitioner is Mary-Jane Gibson (hereinafter referred to as "the Petitioner", the joint owner/occupier of The Old Vicarage, Little Missenden, Amersham, Buckinghamshire HP7 0QX, which is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB). She is specifically and directly affected by the Bill.

THE CONCERNS

2.1 The full affect of the long-term loss of the AONB caused by using cut and cover tunnels, viaducts and other surface methods of construction has not been seriously considered.

2.2 The Commons select committee appeared not to bring HS2 to account on this issue and nor did it appear to give full consideration to the proposal of a bored tunnel through the WHOLE of the Chilterns AONB.

2.3 The loss of part of the AONB would represent a tragedy for the environment, for the residents of the area in question, the wider Buckinghamshire community and for the many thousands of visitors to the area annually. The reduction in visitors would inevitably have a severe effect on the local economy.

2.4 Existing communities will be divided by the use of surface methods of construction which will have a big social impact.

2.5 The Chilterns AONB was only designated as such in 1965. The designation was to protect the area from being despoiled by projects such as this. If this designation is to be willfully and unnecessarily ignored this can set a precedent for any future planning framework for the destruction of other national AONB sites.

2.6 There appears to be no independent analysis of the costs involved in having a bored tunnel the whole length of the AONB as opposed to the current plans of using different surface construction techniques for part of it. Or if there is, it has not been made available to the public.
2.7 Has the cost of translocating the ancient woodland to protect the ecosystem versus boring a tunnel has been considered, the public has no knowledge of it.

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Dated: 16th April

SIGNED
Mary Jane Gibson
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Park Score 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: including plots 152, 153, 164, 157, 161 and 162).

2. The petitioners are PARK SCORE LIMITED (hereinafter referred to as "Your Petitioners").

3. Your Petitioners are the freehold owners of land comprising title number AGL143943 known as land at Atlas House, Atlas Road, NW10 6DN. The Bill seeks authorisation for the compulsory acquisition 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 Units 1, 2 and 6 of Atlas House. 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 and a temporary bridge over Grand Union Canal.

7. The notice served on your Petitioners fails to schedule Centrewest London Buses Limited (company number 02328596)/ Tower Transit Limited (company number 04335658) as lessee of the property. Centrewest London Buses Limited converted the property into a bespoke bus garage together with recently upgraded offices and workshops.
8. It is not clear to your Petitioners from the published information whether the proposed compulsory acquisition of Units 1, 2 and 6 at Atlas House will be permanent or temporary and therefore future planning for the property 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. The Bill poses a blight to the future occupation of the Units which are unlikely to continue to be let until clarity is provided on the length of acquisition.

10. Discussions with the promoters of the Bill have not shed any light on this.

11. The current use of Units 1, 2 and 6 at Atlas House as a bus garage is complimentary to the future proposals for the railway, with the bus garage being perfectly located for the future railway terminal at Oakd Oak Common. If the bus garage is forced to relocate, it is unlikely that the relocated position would be as close to the future terminal.

12. Your Petitioners seek that the promoters of the Bill use an alternative location for the provision of the satellite construction compound in this location, for example at the 18 acre Northfields Site fronting the North Circular Road.

13. In the event that the promoters of the Bill must use this location for the railway works, your Petitioners seek a written undertaking from the promoters of the Bill that:

   a. land at Units 1, 2 & 6 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 1, 2 & 6 of Atlas House will be returned to your Petitioners in its former condition, complete with any structures previously located thereon.

14. 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.

15. Your Petitioners have proposed a lease on reasonable terms to the Promoter. Discussions on this are ongoing in the interests of protecting Your Petitioners' interests and saving public money spent by the Promoter.

Length of compulsory purchase powers

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. 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

 Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner(s) is/are

   A RESIDENT ALBERT STREET, LONDON NW1 7LU. WE ARE A FAMILY WITH YOUNG CHILDREN WHO LIVE IN A HOUSE IN ALBERT STREET WHICH WE HAVE OWNED FOR 15 YEARS.
3. Your petitioner’s concerns are

INCREASED TRAFFIC – The volume of traffic on and around Albert Street will increase enormously for many years. This will make it much more difficult / slower / more dangerous for us to drive to/from our house, cross these roads and cycle along these roads.

- The thousands of lorry trips along the designated routes around Albert Street (e.g. Arlington Road, Mornington Terrace, Mornington Place, Park Village East, Robert Street, Hampstead Road, and others) forcing other traffic to use non-designated routes (e.g. Albert Street).
- The demolition of the Mornington Street Bridge and the Granby Terrace Bridge for (unknown) periods during construction thereby cutting off the only two bridges over the exposed railway between Euston Station and Parkway and pushing traffic up to Parkway or down to Euston Road along parallel routes such as Albert Street.
- The closure of Park Village East and north Albert Street and other roads to the west of the railway pushing traffic out to Albert Street, Parkway, Camden High Street, Albany Street and others.

I am not aware of any mitigation proposed for this. We cannot be expected to have our lives disrupted so much for up to 20 years. Albert Street is a quiet community street with many families (e.g. Albert Street south can be closed to traffic by residents for one Sunday each month for children to play in the street; every year there is a very popular street party in Albert Street south for residents of Albert Street and neighbouring streets). This community and their lives will be destroyed by the enormous increase in traffic caused by HS2 works. I would ask that:

- instead of using lorries equipment should be delivered by rail and soil/rubble removed by rail;
- that costings of an alternate terminus be conducted;
- levels and safety in and around Albert Street be monitored professionally, independently and frequently to ensure they are kept to a level close to current traffic volumes;
- Albert Street and neighbouring residents have access to a dedicated adjudicator; and
- Albert Street residents receive fair compensation for the serious disruption caused.

INCREASED NOISE – It is proposed that the works in the Camden Cutting will be conducted 24 hours a day for up to 20 years including lorry deliveries, pile driving and that noise levels could reach 90 decibels. Despite the proximity of the railway this is a very quiet street. This relentless noise will destroy the peace of the neighbourhood and our lives. I would ask that:

- Proposed noise levels are reduced and no noise at night or at weekends;
- Levels of noise in and around Albert Street are monitored professionally, independently and frequently to ensure they are kept to a level close to current levels.
- Albert Street and neighbouring residents have access to a
dedicated adjudicator.

INCREASED DUST AND DIRT – The amount of dust and dirt produced by the HS2 works will represent a health hazard for us requiring us to keep our windows closed at all times for up to 20 years. This is unacceptable. I would ask that:

- Proposed dust levels are reduced to levels that are safe enough for windows in Albert Street to be kept open at all times;
- Levels of dust in and around Albert Street are monitored professionally, independently and frequently to ensure they are kept to a level close to current levels.
- Albert Street and neighbouring residents have access to a dedicated adjudicator.

I WOULD ASK THAT THE HS2 PROJECT BE ABANDONED TO AVOID THE EXTREME DAMAGE TO OUR LIVES FOR UP TO 20 YEARS.
4. The prayer

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

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

Name: [Signature]

Name: [Signature]

Name: [Signature]

Name: [Signature]

Name: [Signature]

Name: [Signature]

Name: [Signature]

Name: [Signature]

Name: [Signature]
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 MONIER REDLAND 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 Petitioner is Monier Redland Limited, a manufacturer of concrete products for construction purposes. Your Petitioner is the leaseholder and occupier of premises at Atlas Road, Park Royal. Your petitioner operates a business for the sale of roofing tiles and concrete products from these premises.

4. Your Petitioner is affected by the works authorised under the Bill to be carried out, to which Your Petitioner requires further information and confirmation regarding the works under the Bill, hereinafter appearing.

YOUR PETITIONER'S CONCERNS

5. Your Petitioner previously raised questions as to how the Bill will affect their operations, but has not received any information. In particular, Your Petitioner identified the following concerns:
(a) The demolition of your Petitioner's premises which will necessitate
the relocation of your Petitioner's business;

(b) The impact of the surrounding works, including impacts on your
Petitioner's existing access via Atlas Road;

(c) The need for advance notice of compulsory purchase of your
Petitioner's land due to the difficulty in finding another site in the
area; and

(d) the need for assistance in relocating early should suitable premises
become available.

6. Your Petitioner considers it essential that their concerns be addressed through an
agreement with the Promoter which provides for advance notice of acquisition of the
land required for the new railway. Such an agreement is required as a matter of
urgency to enable your Petitioners to plan and manage the relocation of their
undertaking and begin the search for suitable alternative premises. Your Petitioner
also considers it essential that undertakings should be given by the Promoter in
relation to assistance with relocation of the undertaking should suitable premises
become available.

7. While Your Petitioner sets out below more detail on certain of the above issues, in
many cases, those assurances make provision for further information that will deal
with Your Petitioner's concerns.

Surrounding works

8. The Bill proposes that the land currently occupied by your Petitioners will form part of
a Satellite Construction Compound at Atlas Road, through which spoil from the
construction of the tunnels for the railway will be transported away from the site.

9. The Bill also includes powers to acquire land to build a 920m long tunnel from the
Atlas Road Satellite Construction Compound, via a shaft, to the east end of the
proposed Old Oak Common Station Box. Conveyors will transport excavated material
generated during the construction of the Euston tunnel directly from the station box to
the Atlas Road Satellite Compound. It will also provide for the delivery of concrete
tunnel lining segments by construction train from Atlas Road Satellite Compound to
Old Oak Common Station box main compound to construct Euston Tunnel.

10. Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to provide further information
regarding the proposed works in the immediate vicinity of Your Petitioner's land,
including construction programme and in particular in relation to the proposed partial
closure of Atlas Road. Your Petitioner seeks this information as this will impact its ability to conduct its business operations.

11. The Bill provides alteration to the land requirements at Atlas Road in order to maintain the operation of bus depots. Approximately 380m² of additional land will be required approximately 100m to the south to allow for safe vehicular movement within the Atlas Road Satellite Compound. The changes to the land required for the bus depots will result in an additional 1.5ha of land outside the limits of the Bill being used temporarily at Atlas Road for construction activities. Your Petitioner seeks information regarding the timing of these alterations and how this will impact access to its site.

12. The Bill provides for alteration to the land required for the conveyor route running from Atlas Road to Victoria Road Crossover Box. The Bill provides for a network of enclosed conveyors that will be installed to link the proposed Atlas Road Satellite Compound and other compounds. Your Petitioner seeks further information regarding whether these conveyors will block access to the site and exact plans and timing of these alterations.

13. Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter provide confirmation regarding whether the land will be acquired under the compulsory purchase powers contained in the Bill or will be occupied under temporary possession powers.

14. Your Petitioners are also concerned that depending upon the phasing of construction activities, Your Petitioner's land may become surrounded by construction activity, which will have an adverse effect on Your Petitioner's business. Your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that appropriate additional site-specific mitigation will be provided to minimise the impacts during the construction period.

**Difficulty finding another site**

15. If the land is acquired under the compulsory purchase powers contained in the Bill, Your Petitioner raises concern regarding the ability to find another site in North London under short notice due to the fact that there are limited sites which would be suitable for the relocation of Your Petitioner's business.

16. If the land is to be acquired, Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter provides advance notice to Your Petitioner to allow adequate time to find an alternative site and to relocate Your Petitioner's business.

**Disruption from relocation**
17. Relocating will affect Your Petitioner's business and disrupt its operations. Your Petitioner seeks assistance with the relocation to ensure that there is minimal disruption.

CONCLUSION

18. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the undertakings or assurances described above are given in favour of your Petitioner, the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

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

Your Petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that your Petitioner, 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 MASONS LLP
Parliamentary Agents for Monier Redland Limited
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 THE MAYOR OF LONDON ON BEHALF OF THE GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

YOUR PETITIONER DECLARES that:

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as "the Bill") has been introduced and is now pending in your noble House intitled "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 PETITIONERS

3. Your Petitioner is the Mayor of London ("the Mayor") acting on behalf of the Greater London Authority (hereinafter called "the Authority") as established under the Greater London Authority Act 1999 ("the Act"). The Authority comprises the Mayor of London and the London Assembly. The Act conferred significant powers and duties upon Your Petitioner, and subsequent enactments have further increased the scope of these powers and duties, the majority of which are exercisable by the Mayor on his own behalf or by him on the Authority’s behalf. The Authority is a strategic authority, with a strategic role in London’s economy, housing and regeneration, policing, transport, planning, environment, culture and health improvement. Through the five functional bodies currently established under the Act, the Mayor has powers over the...
provision of transport, policing, economic development, and fire and emergency planning in Greater London generally.

4. The Mayor sets an overall vision for London and has a statutory duty to create strategies for the Capital covering planning and development, transport, housing, economic development and regeneration, culture, health inequalities and environmental issues including climate change, waste disposal and air quality.

5. In accordance with that duty, in July 2011 the Mayor published the replacement of the spatial development strategy for London – known as the London Plan. The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, and it sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the Capital to 2031. The London Plan forms part of the development plan of all local planning authorities (i.e. the London Boroughs, the Corporation of London and any Mayoral Development Corporations) in Greater London under the Capital’s two-tier planning system.

6. The local plans of London’s local planning authorities need to be in general conformity with the London Plan, and its policies guide decisions on planning applications by them and by the Mayor. The Mayor has a statutory strategic role in relation to planning applications of potential strategic importance (“PSI applications”) which local planning authorities within London must refer to him in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 (“the 2008 Order”). This is a two stage process whereby the Mayor is initially asked to express a view on whether he considers that the PSI application complies with the London Plan. Thereafter, the local planning authority must not determine the PSI application unless it has notified the Mayor of the decision that it proposes to make. At that stage the Mayor may decide that he is content for the local planning authority to determine the application itself. The Mayor also has powers, as provided for in the 2008 Order, to (i) direct a local planning authority to refuse a PSI application and (ii) to direct that he is to be the local planning authority for the PSI application. This latter power is not exercisable in respect of PSI applications relating to land within the area of a Mayoral development corporation.

7. On 11 October 2013, the Mayor published Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan (“REMA”). From that date, the REMA are operative as formal alterations to the London Plan and form part of local planning authorities’ development plans in Greater London.

8. On 15 January 2014, the Mayor published Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan (“FALP”) for a twelve week period of public consultation. The FALP have been prepared primarily to address key housing and employment issues emerging from an
analysis of census data released since the publication of the London Plan in July 2011, and which indicate a substantial increase in the Capital's population. FALP was published as the updated 2015 London Plan in March 2015. Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP) were published on 14 March 2016.

9. As part of the London Plan, the Mayor has identified Park Royal, including Old Oak Common and Euston, as Opportunity Areas to enable significant regeneration and growth. These designations are covered by Opportunity Area Frameworks and plans, including the Park Royal Opportunity Area Framework and the Euston Area Plan, which are non-statutory planning documents, which comprise of supplementary planning guidance used as a material consideration when assessing planning applications. The Framework also provides guidance in the preparation and assessment of Local Development Frameworks by Boroughs and the Mayor. The London Plan also designates a Euston Opportunity Area with a Euston Area Plan, more detail on this is set out in paragraph 27 below.

10. Under section 77 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 ("the Act"), the Authority has the power to oppose any local bill in Parliament which affects the inhabitants of, or any part of, Greater London. This Bill is such a bill.

11. The power of the Authority to oppose the Bill is exercisable by the Mayor acting on behalf of the Authority. Before opposing any such bill the Mayor must consult the London Assembly. Consultation with the London Assembly took place between 24 April 2014 and 8 May 2014, prior to Your Petitioner lodging its initial petition in the House of Commons.

12. Your Petitioner, its subsidiaries and their 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

13. 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.

14. Your Petitioner previously raised concerns as to whether the proposals for HS2 Phase 1:

(a) sufficiently maximised the regeneration and development proposals at Euston Station and its local environment, were
adequately integrated into their surroundings, and sufficiently safeguarded the future delivery of a Crossrail 2 railway line;

(b) delivered a station development at Old Oak that meets the Mayor's planning and regeneration objectives and is sufficiently integrated into its surrounding highway, public transport and pedestrian and cycle networks;

(c) provided the best integrated transport solution for London, particularly at Old Oak Common and Euston; and

(d) contained adequate proposals to mitigate adverse impacts likely to arise during the construction of HS2 Phase 1.

15. 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 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.

16. 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. Your Petitioner has seen the petition submitted to your noble House by Transport for London. Your Petitioner supports the points made by Transport for London in its petition in relation to the July 2015 Assurances.

17. On 23 October 2015, the Secretary of State gave an Undertaking to your Petitioners ("the October Undertaking") dealing with:

(a) the design of the proposed station at Old Oak Common;

(b) the provision of a pedestrian access through the station concourse area linking the HS2 area of the Old Oak Common station with the Great Western Mainline area of the Old Oak Common station and enabling provision for a future access to Wormwood Scrubs;

(c) overstation development at Old Oak Common station;
(d) a logistics tunnel to be constructed under Atlas Road pursuant to the Bill; and

(e) the planning functions of the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (one of the functional bodies of the Authority) and related matters.

18. To date, HS2 Limited has produced the studies required by the October Undertaking and matters are progressing between Your Petitioner and HS2 Limited. Your Petitioner raises no concerns in this petition in relation to matters covered by the October Undertaking.

19. Most recently on 7 December 2015, the Secretary of State provided the GLA with a further set of assurances (also provided to Transport for London) ("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 and 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.

20. Transport for London has set out in its petition detail on the above issues and your Petitioner agrees with and adopts the position set out in that petition, subject to the additional matters set out below. In summary, in many cases, the December 2015 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 obliged 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.

**Delivery of the vision for Euston Station and the surrounding area (December 2015 Assurances)**

21. The points made in this petition in relation to Euston are made by your Petitioner additionally to the points set out in Transport for London’s petition and in your Petitioner’s strategic role. Nothing in this petition should be taken to differ from the more detailed development of any of those points set out in Transport for London’s petition. Your Petitioner sets out further context in relation to the delivery of the vision for Euston Station and the surrounding area in the context of the your Petitioner’s role and duties set out above.

22. 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 Crossrail 2, overstation development and regeneration in the area.

23. 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, Transport for London, 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 reference for the Board that include a forward work programme have not yet been produced and agreed.

   (b) the Euston Integrated Programme Board ("EIPB"), comprising Your Petitioner, Transport for London 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.

24. 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.

25. 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 meaningful. 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.

26. 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 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 gives 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 opportunity now to future-proof for the NR Station redevelopment and mitigate or reduce future construction impacts and costs.

27. The Mayor’s wider ambitions for the area are reflected in the Euston Area Plan ("the EAP"), which has been jointly prepared by London Borough of Camden, the Authority and Transport for London (with input from the Department for Transport, HS2 Ltd and NR) to support that growth and redevelopment at Euston, taking account of the proposed Euston HS2 Terminus. The EAP was adopted in January 2015 and takes
forward the objectives and aspirations for delivering a comprehensive transport and development framework for the Euston area, building on the London Plan and other strategic policy documents which identify Euston as an Opportunity Area with the potential for over 14,000 jobs and 3,000 homes. The Mayor’s 2020 Vision also flags up the potential of Euston – King’s Cross – St. Pancras as the UK’s largest mega rail hub, creating an area with the potential to contribute significantly to London’s growth.

28. The EAP land use strategy proposes a grid of new east-west and north-south pedestrian and cycle routes across the station and station track approach. It also identifies opportunities for over-site development (“OSD”) above the entire station site and the approaching tracks (including both the NR Station and the HS2 Euston Terminus) including the provision of homes and open spaces. A key component of the EAP vision is the future rebuild of the NR Station as part of a commitment to deliver a world class station fully integrated with local development.

29. Your Petitioner is concerned that the Bill design does not support the EAP’s vision to unlock the full regeneration of the area. The HS2 project has significant potential to enable high levels of growth not just related to the station, but in the wider area, and in particular presents an opportunity to achieve both regeneration objectives in surrounding estates and wider environmental improvements. The delivery of this growth, and in particular OSD, will be significantly undermined if a comprehensive rebuild is not delivered and opportunities to provide works to support future development (such as enhanced utilities provision and access) and reduce later disruption are not taken. The Kings Cross St Pancras redevelopment, for example, included within its design parameters the additional utilities capacity needed to support the additional development expected around the new station site. Doing so reduced future disruption and costs and therefore expedited the delivery of the new development. Not forward planning for Euston in this way by delivering a coordinated redevelopment will mean opportunities are missed and redevelopment is stunted.

30. Opportunities to (1) combine construction worksites and coordinate works and (2) avoid or mitigate impacts on other transport infrastructure (including the London Underground network, bus station and strategic road network) must be maximised via the structures that the Secretary of State has agreed to put into place.

31. 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.

32. 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 in the hope that your Petitioner's aspirations for the Euston area set out in the EAP can be brought closer to realisation.

Traffic Impacts in Hillingdon

33. 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 were not pursued further.

34. Your Petitioner requests that the Promoter be required to carry out a comprehensive study to provide to the Select Committee, setting out options for extending the HS2 Phase 1 tunnel in Hillingdon and a consideration of the impacts that such options would have on reducing traffic, amenity and environmental impacts in Hillingdon. Should that study conclude that a tunnel would be beneficial, the Promoter should be required to construct such an extended tunnel and that the Bill be amended to include provision for an extended tunnel for HS2 Phase 1 in Hillingdon.

35. The points raised in this petition are without prejudice to the points made in relation to traffic impacts in Hillingdon in the petition of Transport for London.

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 the Mayor of London acting on behalf of the Greater London Authority

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

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

THE PETITION OF Annabel Rose Taswell-Fryer  
Declares that  

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

2. Your Petitioner  

The petitioner is Annabel Rose Taswell-Fryer, resident at 15 Coombe Avenue, HP226BX, who the Bill will specially and directly affect, both during construction and after completion of the proposed HS2 line. The petitioner lives in Wendover, adjacent to that part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Bill will specially and directly affect.  

The petitioner is detrimentally affected by the Bill, to which the petitioner objects for reasons, amongst others, detailed hereinafter.  

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns  

3.1 Tunnel through the Chilterns AONB  

The petitioner is a resident of Wendover and its vicinities in the Chiltern AONB and is deeply concerned about the effect that the intended proposals on this AONB and on the town of Wendover.  

Between South Heath and Wendover, Buckinghamshire, the route proposed is on the surface and includes sections in cuttings, on two (large and intrusive) viaducts, and on embankments. This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 82 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention.  

The designation of certain places as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty indicates how valued these places are not only to local residents but to the country as a whole. The petitioner believes that the section of the HS2 line proposed to be built on the surface of this area will permanently destroy the beauty and tranquillity of the area that contributes to its status as an AONB. The petitioner is firstly concerned that this will vastly reduce the tourism that this AONB attracts—over 50 million visits a year—and will thus have severe and damaging effects on local economies. Furthermore, the beautiful landscape remains a focal point of town life, and to damage this would result in decreased community cohesion. More personally, the petitioner has experienced first-hand the natural benefits of the AONB and their role in improving quality of life, the proposed HS2 line would permanently and gravely reduce the ability of local residents, and indeed visitors, to reap these benefits.  

The petitioner is also deeply concerned about the disruptions to her household and lifestyle during the long period of construction, including but not limited to: dust, noise, hours of work, vibration, traffic movements, congestion, and access problems. The petitioner supposes that the use of 6 metre sound barriers will immensely damage the landscape of Wendover, changing the character and atmosphere of the town, and ergo again have an adverse effect on both the local economy and the spirit of those living in the town.  

The petitioner requires use of the narrow lines and roads which will intersect and/or be affected by the construction of the proposed HS2 line; the use of these roads is essential for access to amenities in Wendover and its surrounding areas, in particular, medical services, schools, shops, recreation, and public transport. The petitioner would like to note that in 1998 the Wendover bypass was built as congestion through the town was such a severe problem, the traffic resulting from the construction of the HS2 line will surely revive this issue. The petitioner is extraordinarily concerned about that effect that this congestion will have on the emergency services, and their ability to respond to emergencies in a swift manner, at times
when lives are often at stake. Moreover, this network of narrow lanes is a characteristic feature of this AONB, and proposals to use some of these narrow country lanes for construction vehicles and access will not only impair ease of travel in the area, but also further degrade the AONB.

The petitioner requests that the Chilterns AONB be further protected by extending the proposed bored tunnel beyond Wendover 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. If this proposal is accepted, the aforementioned adverse effects of the proposed HS2 line will be significantly lessened. This proposal has been discussed at length with local councils, action groups, and with the local public, and is supported by them.

3.2

The petitioner requests that the following mitigation measures should be adopted and implemented, but would also like to note that if the Bill were amended to include the provision of a fully bored tunnel through the AONB to the North of Wendover, many of the measures set out below would become redundant.

Hierarchy of Mitigation

a. That possible further extensions of the tunnel from South Heath and at Wendover, by boring or mining, be adopted. This is of particular importance as it also has acknowledged environmental benefits.

b. That, if the proposed amendments are not accepted, the line along this section of the track by housed within deeper cuttings and, where appropriate, with improved mitigation and bunds, and that the power for the contractor to raise the line by up to 3 metres is removed for the AONB section of the line. This is to attempt to reduce noise, conceal the line and the gantries.

c. That the proposed green tunnel at Wendover be replaced by a bored or mined tunnel extended to the north and south of Wendover to remove the need for two viaducts and the linking embankment. This would also help to protect the Bacombe aquifer from huge damage and solve potential hydrogeological problems.

d. That provision is made for constructing bridges where there are established rights of way. That these bridges be made Green Bridges, bearing in mind both the need to retain trees and shrubs and the need to preserve wildlife access. This is especially important 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 to reduce the vast environmental impact. The reduction should be sufficient to ensure compliance of noise mitigation with the World Health Organisation standards.

f. That the Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and adjacent embankments be of the highest quality design and the infrastructure to be made as visually pleasing as possible. This includes enclosures where possible, and the minimum 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, to maintain as far as possible the appearance of the AONB - mature trees able to grow at least 40 feet high should be used 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.

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 continued monitoring should be undertaken regarding water quality and the effect of the construction works. That actions be undertaken, including termination of construction in this area, if any adverse effects are found.

k. That the pylons along this section of the line are removed and the power lines are reinstated underground.
I. That it is specified that for the AONB the line should have specially designed and constructed gantries, designed to be as unobtrusive and compatible as possible with the AONB environment. That designs shall first be subject to prior full consultation with local authorities and the local public.

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 HS2 line.

n. That there should be established a Chilterns AONB Review Group as set out in the amendments under the name of Cheryl Gillan and Keith Baker and others, proposed for consideration at the Report Stage of the Bill in the House of Commons.

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

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

3.3

The 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. The petitioner also requests that the Code should dictate that, in all cases, the required mitigation work, facilities and construction be undertaken to the highest standards employing the best available techniques, and to the highest standard of construction. That the Code or requirements in the Bill be amended to enforce the following measures.

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

b. Also 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 have access direct from the A413, including new haul roads, to avoid linking the same with the Link Road roundabout at Great Missenden and at Rocky Lane. 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 in a way that ensures that during construction and operation of the line noise, dust, and vibration is minimised, so as to meet the highest standards applicable, and so that air quality is maintained.

f. Constructing facilities that 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 avoid 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.

i. During construction, the nominated undertaker must be responsible for maintaining the quality of all roads used during and after construction, so that the roads must be returned to their original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker.

h. That the Promoter provides an air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response given the traffic congestion that will occur on the main emergency routes.

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

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

Annabel Rose Taswell-Fryer

17.04.2016
To The House of Lords
Session 2015-2016

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF A J Fish and J Fish

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners

The petitioners are Anthony James Fish and Julia Fish and are residents at and owners of property at 46 Ellesborough Road, Wendover, Bucks HP22 6EL. This property is situated within 90 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 are concerned that they are one of a small number of properties which will experience prolonged and extensive construction activities immediately adjacent to their property on all sides over a number of years. This will create an overall level of nuisance and disturbance at their property which is unacceptable to family life and take away their choice to continue to live in their property.

Your petitioner's property resides in the Rural Support Zone but are seeking enhanced compensation to cover the full costs of moving home, in addition to the market value which is available under the existing compensation scheme.
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 in that land both in front of and to the rear will be given over to construction activities, while the construction zone for the tunnel itself will be within 40 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. The property will suffer from noise, dust, light pollution and other nuisances whichever way the wind is blowing 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.

Unlike the owners of other adjacent properties already sold to the DfT, your petitioners have no wish nor reason to leave their property other than the exposure to the HS2 construction activities and therefore seek enhanced compensation to cover the full costs of moving.

3.2.1 Recognition of Location-Specific Issues

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 since original publication.

The Select Committee First Special Report (23 March), para 111, says:

- "That said, a number of property owners will face situations so adverse, despite their property not actually being required for the railway, that their degree of choice will be minimal. The Promoter recognised in the April 2014 decision document on consultation that special cases exist, and counsel for the Promoter confirmed that these are intended to be part of the overall scheme. Examples, we believe, include those whose properties will be particularly close to or surrounded by long-term construction activity."

In the Letter from the Chair of the HS2 Select Committee to MPs re: Need to Sell scheme, 27 October 2015, it says:

- But there are: "cases of particularly adverse effect (e.g. special proximity to construction works) .... deserving special compensation."

3.2.2 Your Petitioners' Circumstances

Your Petitioners have children of school age, who will be taking key exams and moving between primary and secondary schools during the construction 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.

3.2.3 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.

A J Fish

J Fish
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF David Wilson, Director of Renewell Limited

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

Your petitioner, David Wilson is a business owner and joint owner/occupier of a 3 bedroom semidetached house in Tilehouse Lane, Denham UB9 5DA, where your petitioner has lived for the last 27 years with his partner and 19 year old daughter. Your petitioner chose Tilehouse Lane to live in because of the semi-rural, quiet location which has become extremely important for the business. Since being made redundant 20 years ago, your petitioner retrained in order to run a small business from our home. Your petitioner practise Chinese Medicine/Acupuncture and the tranquility and ease of access are important to your petitioner’s patients. In addition your petitioner is approaching retirement age and would like to sell the business as a going concern towards his pension. Your petitioner is concerned that the house has been devalued and the business put in jeopardy both now and in the future because of the proposed works. The effects of this are devastating to your petitioner especially as he is nearing retirement. The business has already suffered because of the time taken out from running the business to review and understand the complexities of the HS2 proposition and mitigate the immediate and the future effects on the business, the property and the petitioners retirement plans

The business and home are located at the southern end of Tilehouse Lane. The northern end has been designated for a large construction site, a workers residential site, the entrance to the tunnel under the M25 from the Colne Valey viaduct and also the major focus for works in the area.

The following are areas of concern which will adversely and directly effect the business and therefore the future livelihood of your petitioner:

- Heavy Construction Traffic and Workers traffic
Possible road closures
- Noise, vibration, dust and light pollution
- Excessive Time Period of Disruption
- Health Issues
- Solutions

These points will be expanded in section 3 below:

3. Your petitioner's concerns

HEAVY CONSTRUCTION AND WORKERS TRAFFIC

Your petitioner is concerned about the effects of construction traffic will have on our business. Already there is often severe congestion in this area and the extra traffic load during the construction over many years could easily result in gridlock. Access to Tilehouse Lane should be unhindered at all times so that patients can make their appointments on time. If the construction traffic causes hold-ups on the A412 which makes access difficult and if the northern end of Tilehouse Lane is closed during the lengthy construction period then this may discourage patients from attending their appointments and also to continuing treatment. It would also disrupt appointment schedules with people arriving late causing undue stress and intolerable delays. This would have a direct effect on your petitioner's income and livelihood.

Your petitioners therefore request that no construction traffic is allowed to use Tilehouse Lane for access to the site. That Traffic is monitored at all times to ensure that as far as possible all construction traffic approaches from the northern end. That a special road is created from the M25 to the construction site so that all access, not just the HGVs, to the construction site comes from the M25 and does not use the Denham and surrounding area local roads at all.

Similarly the numbers of construction workers accessing the site will enormously add to the local traffic causing similar problems as noted in the above paragraph. Your petitioner respectfully asks for the amount of this traffic to be monitored and not allowed to use Tilehouse Lane for access to the construction site. Your petitioner also requests that all access to the construction site is from the M25 and not through Denham.

POSSIBLE ROAD CLOSURES
The possible road closures happening over the construction phase will severely increase an already congested area and make it virtually impossible to run a business which relies on patients arriving for their appointments on time. The stress of the extra traffic will also have a negative affect on patients choosing to come to our clinic.

**NOISE, VIBRATION, DUST AND LIGHT POLLUTION**

An important attraction of our clinic is the tranquility of its setting. Your petitioner is deeply concerned that the noise and vibrations coming from the construction site will directly effect this and disturb greatly our patients and the peace they expect during their appointment time. This would then discourage them from returning and so decrease income.

There will be dust pollution for several years from the construction site and vehicles.

Your petitioner requests 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.

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.

Your 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.

**EXCESSIVE TIME PERIOD OF DISRUPTION**

The enormous amount of time that the construction is expected to go on for will have a direct effect on our business and livelihood.

**HEALTH ISSUES**

Your Petitioners believe that the creation of dust, noise, poor air quality, traffic congestion, and 24-hour working will inevitably have a debilitating effect on the business leading to severe stress and possible health problems not only for your petitioner but also for his patients.
Your Petitioners request that health and stress clinics are established in Denham and local villages to monitor and treat those who suffer illness, physical or mental, during the construction period and beyond.

SOLUTIONS

Your petitioner respectfully requests that the tunnel be extended and HS2 does not resurface until Great Missenden or beyond, thus avoiding this severely congested area on the outskirts of London.

If this is not possible then your petitioner respectfully requests that they be compensated:

a) For a loss in business revenue

b) For a loss in property value.

Thank you.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

David John Wilson

Director, Renewell Limited

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 Ruislip Chamber of Commerce

Declares that

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1 – 36, and parts of others

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is The Ruislip Chamber of Commerce, founded in 1926 as a non-political organisation to represent the traders in Ruislip in the County of Middlesex. There are over 200 members, mostly independent traders.

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

Our main concern is the congestion caused by construction vehicles and delivery lorries. There are already 3 bus routes through the High Street, with 100 bus movements each way every day. With HGVs, delivery vehicles and all the cars on this through route there would be total congestion. This would deter shoppers, and the shopkeepers would suffer, and not be able to sustain a living for the 7 years of HS2 construction. The re-surfacing of the High Street for 6 weeks last year caused losses of over 30% The only answer, if HS2 is to go ahead, would be to extend the tunnel, which at present is planned to end in South Ruislip, through Ruislip, Ickenham and the Colne Valley. There is no compensation for businesses.
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.

Signed

Date
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Governors of Breakspear School

 Declares that

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by Clauses 1 – 36, and parts of others.

2. Your Petitioner
   The petitioner is a Governor of Breakspear School in Bushey Road, Ickenham. The school has just over 700 pupils and 100 staff.

3. Your petitioner's concerns
   Our three main concerns are the congestion caused by construction and delivery lorries in an area that is already heavily congested, the increased air pollution caused by extra lorries in an area already badly affected by air pollution from Heathrow, and the noise from the trains which go past the back of the houses on this road.

   Bushey Road is a horseshoe shaped road with access to and from Swakeleys Road, which already has long queues of traffic in the morning and afternoon. Pupils and staff, who already have problems getting to school on time, would have even greater difficulties. This would be for 7 years and would cause staff to leave, and pupils to seek other schools.

   HS2 have offered to build a haul road, but this would cause more problems, and would not alleviate the air pollution and noise problems.
I believe that the only solution to these problems, if HS2 is to go ahead, would be to extend the tunnel, which at present ends in South Ruislip, through Ruislip, Ickenham and the Colne Valley.

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 House, be given an opportunity to give evidence 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 GREATWORTH PARISH COUNCIL

Declares that:

1. The Petitioner represents constituents that are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.

2. The Petitioner

2.1 The Petitioner is Greatworth Parish Council. The parish council for the parish of Greatworth in the county of Northamptonshire, which has a population of 890 (according to the 2011 census data). The Parish includes Greatworth, Halse and Stutchbury.

2.2 The proposed route of Phase One of HS2 passes through the parish of Greatworth. The route cuts across open fields between a green tunnel and a length of cutting. The route destroys an area of ancient woodland at Halse Copse and with 100m of a working Grade II listed farmhouse. The Parish Council is most concerned by portion of the route that is between the green tunnel and the cuttings.

2.3 The Bill would authorise the compulsory acquisition of land belonging to the constituents of the Parish, to which they object. Furthermore, the provisions of the Bill will injuriously affect most of the area for which The Petitioner is the local parish council, and the Petitioner accordingly object thereto for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

2.4 The Petitioner has responsibilities for much of the land in its area that will be affected by the Bill, and represents many of whom will be affected by the works proposed under the bill. This includes land and properties subject to compulsory acquisition, highways that will be used as major construction routes, footpaths that will be removed, areas of green space that will be lost, areas which will be converted into construction sites, land to be used for ancillary plant buildings, land to be used for construction materials.

2.5 The Petitioner has sought to work with HS2 Limited, the Government, and The House of Commons Select Committee in the development of the proposals. However, as outlined in this petition, it has substantial outstanding concerns with the appraisal work, design and development of the project and the particular powers now proposed in the Bill. Following our appearance at the House of Commons Select Committee,
we were approached by HS2 in the halls where they promised to make contact to discuss a number of points, we still await this meeting.

2.6 The Petitioner and their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which the Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

3 The Petitioner’s concerns

3.1 The Petitioner’s concerns are set out below under the following headings, as follows:-

• Noise and visual intrusion (see paragraph 4)
• Temporary closure of Helmdon Road (see paragraph 5)
• Junction of Dump Road with Welsh Lane (see paragraph 6)
• Public rights of way in the Greatworth area (see paragraph 7)
• Construction (see paragraph 8)
• Compensation (see paragraph 9)

3.2 The Petitioner expect that a number of the concerns listed above will also be raised by other Petitioners, as a Parish council we wholeheartedly support their petitions.

4 Noise and visual intrusion

4.1 The Petitioner is gravely concerned about the impact of noise on the tranquillity of the Parish of Greatworth, which as part of South Northamptonshire has recently been ranked as the third best place to live in the whole of the United Kingdom by the Halifax Building Society. South Northamptonshire Council has carried out local noise monitoring, and has evidence that the local dBA level is typically between 25 and 35, measured at six locations in the district within 200m of the proposed line, a mere fraction of what it will be once the proposed railway line is in operation. Noise is one of the most widespread concerns in this area, and many of the mitigation requests are related to a desire to reduce the intrusive noise of ultra high speed trains in this currently tranquil countryside. In addition to our complaint we are aware of the communities of Whitfield, Brackley, Radstone, Thorpe Mandeville and Boddington have also expressed significant concerns about noise.

4.2 The petitioner is extremely concerned about the noise profiles that will be experienced due to the trains exiting a tunnel and going into a cutting. We are concerned that this profile will cause an almost instant pop in noise, rather than a gradual build up. This is likely to be more prevalent from the trains travelling south. The Petitioner requests that the Green tunnel be extended to alleviate this risk.
4.3 This proposal is technically feasible but has been refused by HS2 Ltd, who claim that it would not constitute value for money. The Petitioner believes that this argument is wrong in principle:

- At the petitioning stage, the judgement should be made on whether a particular petitioner’s proposal is technically feasible and is a sensible step towards doing everything possible to mitigate the effect of HS2 on the local residents and the landscape.

- The right time to judge whether HS2 represents taxpayer value for money is at the end, when all the mitigation measures have been decided and all the costs are known, and when Parliament can judge whether the project as a whole constitutes value for whatever taxpayer money is to be invested in it.

- In any event, it is by no means clear that the money required to fund a particular petitioner’s proposal will automatically come from the taxpayer. It may come from lenders or farepayers, or even from savings on other parts of the line.

4.3 Accordingly, the Petitioner asks that taxpayer value for money should not be used as a basis for assessing the proposal to extend the Greatworth green tunnel or any of the other proposals in this petition.

4.4 Further mention of noise is in paragraph 8.3.

5 Temporary closure of Helmdon Road

5.1 The Petitioner is concerned that temporary closure of Helmdon Road will result in considerable challenges for the users of Greatworth Schools and businesses. The Petitioner’s residents regularly use the Helmdon Road in order to get to the B4525, access the social club, drop children off at school and access footpaths in the area and therefore will be directly affected by this road closure. The Village Schools require easy access to the surrounding villages in order to maintain their viability. The Petitioner also maintains that the closure of the Helmdon road will significantly increase the traffic exiting the village along either Halse Road or The Dump Road.

5.2 The Petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd revisited the planned work and undertakes to ensure that Helmdon Road remains open throughout the construction phase. This could be achieved by the construction of the new road prior to the closure of the old one.

6 Junction of Dump Road with Welsh Lane

6.1 The Petitioner is concerned about the Junction to the north of the village
where the cross roads formed by the B4525, and roads to Culworth and Marston. This together with the old dump road exit from Greatworth when coupled with the increased traffic and ground works will become very dangerous. The Petitioner, residents and other petitioners all raised this issue with the House of Commons Select Committee. Everyone was calling for a new combined road layout at this location including a roundabout.

6.2 The House of Commons Select Committee indicated that this was an area that should be looked at by the HS2 Ltd.

6.3 However, the scheme that has been adopted by HS2 Ltd falls short of what was requested. Instead of a roundabout, HS2 Ltd are proposing to widen the Welsh Lane at the junction by creating a new central lane for traffic coming from the west which wants to turn right onto the Dump Road. This proposal may well be satisfactory for Welsh Lane traffic from either direction wanting to turn onto the Dump Road, and for traffic turning left from the Dump Road westwards onto the Welsh Lane, but it does not cater adequately for Dump Road traffic which wants to turn right onto the Welsh Lane and then head eastwards. Under the current HS2 scheme, this manoeuvre will be even riskier than it is at present.

6.4 In normal circumstances, Greatworth traffic wanting to travel eastwards along the Welsh lane uses Helmdon Road and very little Greatworth traffic turns right from the Dump Road onto the Welsh Lane. However, HS2 Ltd currently plans to close Helmdon Road for a considerable period of time and, whilst Helmdon Road is closed, all traffic wanting to travel east along the Welsh Lane (a route often taken by the Petitioners) will have to use the Dump Road. Such traffic will be put at great risk by the inadequacy of the junction currently planned by HS2 Ltd.

6.5 Accordingly, the Petitioner asks that the present design for the Dump Road/Welsh Lane junction be replaced by a roundabout as originally requested.

6.6 The Petitioners point out that there are already two new roundabouts on the Welsh Lane where it passes Middleton Cheney, one of which is to access a new housing estate, and believe that this should be the solution adopted where the Welsh Lane passes Greatworth.

7 Public rights of way in the Greatworth area

7.1 The Petitioner believes that the network of footpaths and bridleways immediately to the north and east of Greatworth is extremely important to walkers and riders in Greatworth and the neighbouring villages. These important local assets that are available free-of-charge to the local
community are used almost daily by riders, dog walkers and the "Health Walk Group" who meet twice a month.

7.2 HS2 will have a serious adverse impact on value of this network. While the current plans do not cause any permanent loss of right of way, there will be considerable temporary and permanent diversions. The proposed new routes will all suffer the adverse impact of the noise from HS2 and the visual intrusion into the adjoining countryside.

7.3 For the last two years or more, the Petitioner and others have been trying to persuade HS2 Ltd to go further than they currently plan. The Petitioner believes that HS2 Ltd should be required not only to mitigate as much as possible the damage that the project will do to the network, but also to make improvements which would leave a lasting legacy to compensate the Greatworth community for the damage being done to it. Currently Greatworth and the wider community will receive no long term benefit from HS2 bisecting the local countryside.

7.4 The Petitioner believes that the advent of HS2 will make it even more dangerous for pedestrians and equestrians to use the Welsh Lane as a means of connecting the bridleways that cross the main road. This opportunity should be taken to rectify this problem in a way that can be done very easily and at little cost and, it is believed, entirely on land that HS2 Ltd will acquire for at least part of the works.

7.5 The Petitioner made proposals to this effect in their own petition to the House of Commons Select Committee, requests that were repeated by a number of other residents. The Petitioner appointed Nicholas Ward as HS2 Liaison Representative to pursue this matter with HS2 on its behalf - this was minuted on the 12th May 2015.

7.6 As these discussions have continued, the proposals have been modified to take account of information obtained, but even now they are not finalised because the Petitioner does not know precisely what land HS2 Ltd is taking on a permanent basis and what land it plans to take for the period of the works but then return to the current owners at the end of the works.

7.7 The latest proposals that have been put forward are as follows, moving west to east:-

- Linking footpath AN39 to the Dump Road. HS2 Ltd is acquiring land for the improvement of the junction between the Welsh Lane and the Dump Road and it is believed that this opportunity should be taken to link AN39 to the Dump Road, by designing in a path that could possibly run to the south of the Welsh Lane and the east of the Dump Road.

- Linking footpath AN39 to footpath AN40 on the north side of the Welsh Lane, on land that is being acquired in connection with the diversion of the Welsh Lane.
• Linking footpath AN40 to footpath AN4 on the south side of the Welsh Lane through the woodland at the northern end of Greatworth Park which it is understood will be owned by HS2 Ltd and which in due course will be sold rather than being returned to the present owners/occupiers. This would create a new circular route to the north of the village as well as improving connectivity to the network to the north of the Welsh Lane.

• Extending footpath AN13 along the full length of Helmdon Road north of the HS2 line and inside the field to the east of that road to a crossing point opposite where footpaths AN7 and AN9 meet the Welsh Lane. Provision was made in AP2 for AN13 to run all the way to the Welsh Lane crossing point but was subsequently withdrawn without any proper explanation.

• Linking bridleway AN14 to bridleway AN37 on land that HS2 Ltd will acquire to the north of the track and which it is understood will be retained on a long term basis with balancing ponds and an access track. It is understood that this area could be redesigned so that the proposed bridleway link could run through it along the access track.

7.8 It is important to emphasise that these proposals are open to discussions as to the best way to achieve the desired effect. For instance, the proposal in 8.9(b) could be achieved by having the new link path entirely to the north of the Welsh Lane or it could be entirely on the south side, or it could be partly on the north and partly on the south.

7.9 It is also important to emphasise that these five proposals each stand on their own and achievement of any one or two of them would be a good step forward. However, the Petitioners would argue that HS2 Ltd should be required to take forward all five proposals.

7.10 The Petitioner believes that all these desired outcomes could be achieved without the need to divert or otherwise alter any existing footpaths. This means that it would not be necessary for any of these proposals to go through the cumbersome process involved in diverting or otherwise changing an existing right of way.

7.11 The local Highway Authority (Northamptonshire County Council) have indicated in principle that they would support these proposals provided they have the consent of the landowners, this being the landowners at the time the new public right of way is dedicated. The Petitioners believe that this consent could be obtained easily and for little cost as part of the wider negotiations between HS2 Ltd and the relevant landowners in connection with land required for the project and mitigating damage done by the project.

7.12 The Petitioner through their appointed representative have also sought the support of the Northamptonshire Local Access Forum and hope to be in a position to report on this when they appear before the Select Committee.
7.13 There have been a number of communications with HS2 Ltd concerning the Petitioner’s proposals. At first, good progress was made but the discussions seem to have stalled since last December. The Petitioner hopes that HS2 Ltd will be persuaded to re-open these discussions and to pursue them in a constructive manner with a view to finding solutions that achieve the desired outcomes.

7.14 The suggestion has been made that these proposals should be taken forward by an application to the Community Fund but the Petitioners believe these ideas should be taken forward by HS2 Ltd as part of their mitigation of the damage their project is doing to the public rights of way in the Greatworth area. As one example, the proposal at (e) above to link bridleway AN14 to bridleway AN37 is to provide a link between those two bridleways which currently is only available on the Welsh Lane. Because of the traffic on the Welsh Lane, the existing link is already very dangerous for horses and it will be made infinitely more dangerous if there is a risk of high speed trains going past within sight and hearing of horses. It is therefore important that equestrian traffic should be taken off the Welsh Lane and it is HS2 Ltd that should do it.

8 Construction

8.1 The Petitioner objects to the working hours set out in the draft Code of Construction Practice. The Petitioner requests that working hours in the evening and weekend are curtailed to ensure that the site does not operate 24 hours a day. Work should cease no later than 10PM and on weekends. No work should be undertaken on vent shafts outside construction core hours, and should any work be required outside core hours; this should be at the discretion of local authority. Justification as to why work must be carried out outside of core hours will be required.

8.2 HS2 have stated in the past that the operating conditions and working roles will be decided when the contractors are appointed. The Petitioner seeks to have some controls on acceptable construction in the contract negotiations.

8.3 Residents within the Parish that live in the Northern End of the village should be given the option for soundproofing and other compensation for the noise and dust challenges they will face during the construction period. HS2 has said that compensation and noise mitigation measures can be applied for only after two years of operation. It is the view of the Petitioner that this should be brought forward to at the very least two years from the start of construction. It is wholly unacceptable that those who live closest to the route, but a small distance outside the automatic and voluntary purchase zones should have to endure 6 years of construction and two years of operation before they get compensated from the acknowledged increase in noise.
9 Compensation

9.1 The Petitioner submits that the compensation provisions in relation to property that is not compulsory acquired and other matters are not sufficient to compensate the constituents of the 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. There are many homeowners in our Parish whose houses have lost tens or hundreds of thousands of pounds. Some are unable to sell their properties. The Rt Hon Philip Hammond, when he was Transport Secretary, indicated that fair compensation would be provided for those affected by HS2. Your petitioner does not know of a homeowner in this Parish who thinks that the HS2 compensation arrangements are fair.

9.2 The petitioner is concerned by Clause 47 of the Bill which states that “The Secretary of State considers that the construction or operation of Phase One of High Speed 2 gives rise to the opportunity for regeneration or development of any land, the Secretary of State may acquire the land compulsorily”. Your petitioner considers this provides an opportunity for the state to profit while homeowners, landowners and businesses subsidise this project.

9.3 The Petitioner requests that the Bill should be amended to ensure persons outside the safeguarding area who are injuriously affected and adversely affected by loss of value should be entitled to claim compensation. Your petitioner also requests that Clause 47 in its entirety should be removed from the Bill.

9.4 The Petitioner submits that business owners close to the proposed route of HS2 will not be suitably compensated. There are many businesses which will be adversely affected in our Parish at both Greatworth Hall and Greatworth Park.

9.5 The Petitioner requests that the Bill should be amended to ensure business owners close to the proposed route of HS2 who are injuriously affected and adversely affected should be entitled to claim reasonable compensation.

9.6 The Petitioner requests that compensation for those in the voluntary purchase zone should be increased at a minimum to include the removal of stamp duty on the property they are effectively being forced to buy to regain their quality of life.

10 General

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

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

AND the Petitioners remain, etc.

Nicholas Peart
Chair, Greatworth Parish Council

18th April 2016
I hereby authorise Nicholas G. Peart to act as Agent on behalf of Greatworth Parish Council in all matters relating to the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill.

Peter Masser  
Councillor and Authorised Signatory  
Greatworth Parish Council  
Telephone: 01295 712621
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

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

THE PETITION OF Kevin Francis Sowden
Declares that:
1. The petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill.
2. Your petitioner is Kevin Francis Sowden, of Chesham Bois, AMERSHAM, Buckinghamshire.

Chesham Bois is located approximately 1 mile from Amersham Town Centre, within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

3. In particular objection is taken to the works to be undertaken within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and in particular to works 2.1 and 2.12 to 2.27 (listed in Schedule 1 of the bill) in the Parishes of Amersham, Little Missenden, Great Missenden, Chortridge and The Lee, and to the clauses of the Bill which would authorise these works.

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

This area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) and is further protected under the National Planning Policy Framework and the European Landscape Convention. Your Petitioner contends that building HS2 on the surface in this section will:

- permanently destroy the tranquillity of the area and the beauty of its landscapes, qualities that attract over 50 million visits a year - many from London residents,
- have severe adverse effects on the social, environmental and economic cohesion of the area during and for a period after its construction,
- permanently and seriously impair and prevent the Petitioner’s ability to enjoy the natural benefits of this AONB once HS2 becomes operational.

5. The petitioner understands that the Landscape value of this area is of the order of £500 million to £750 million. The value of the damage to this national asset as a result of the construction and operation of HS2 through it will be enormous.

6. Your Petitioner requests that the AONB be protected from the effects of this grave and destructive planning error by directing HS2 Ltd to ensure that the line passes through the whole of the AONB in a bored tunnel beyond that specified in Additional Provision 4 to the Bill, such as the proposal in the Crag 7a Tunnel, this having been accepted by HS2 Ltd in the Environmental Statement as both feasible and environmentally preferable, or the subsequent Bucks CC proposal; This would substantially mitigate the adverse effects complained of in this petition, and remove the need for all of the far less effective remedies proposed below.

This is especially the case because I believe that I (and all other residents of this region of The Chilterns AONB) have been unreasonably and unfairly disadvantaged by the proposal to build a High Speed Railway through The Chilterns for the following reasons:
i. Alternative routes were originally discarded in 2010 due to the Labour Government’s initial requirement of the (Ultra) High Speed of 400 kph / 250 mph to 320 kph / 225 mph.

ii. That following the change of rationale away from speed to focusing on capacity, that other more suitable routes were not independently and objectively re-considered.

iii. Even the Revised Design Speed of 320 kph / 225 mph is now seriously questioned by experts as being potentially unsafe due to the phenomenon of Rayleigh Waves. Research by David Connolly, a colleague of Prof Woodwards at Edinburgh’s Heriot-Watt University, has found that the safe maximum speed on the soft soil that occurs along much of HS2 may be as low as 157 mph.

iv. Thus, there is now a vitally important reason to completely re-assess the correct Design Speed and therefore to re-assess the optimum routes for the more suitable lower speeds.

To illustrate these points, the background to the development of HS2 over the last 7 years is as follows:

a. When the HS2 project was launched by the Labour Government in 2010 the government stated that it was vital to have a High Speed (HS) Railway in order to substantially reduce travel times between London and Birmingham, Leeds and Manchester.

b. Note that most HS Railways in Europe run at a maximum speed of 300 kph (186 mph).

c. Note that most countries in Europe are far larger countries than the UK.

d. The Government specified that the design speed of HS2 would be 250 mph (400 kph).

e. The Government stated that it was therefore necessary to build the new High Speed railway in an extremely straight line, avoiding curves to maximise the speed.

f. These related criteria of speed and straight lines were the two key criteria used in selecting the Phase One route between London and Birmingham and discarding the alternatives.

g. As a direct result alternative routes were discarded. E.g. HS2 Ltd modelling of an alternative M1-corridor route assumed a maximum design speed of 300 kph (186 mph).

h. However, HSUK (High Speed UK) demonstrated clearly that 396 mph (224 mph) is feasible on the M1 route, i.e. 20% higher than HS2 Ltd assumed.

i. Subsequently the Government announced that speed was no longer the key criteria. They stated instead that rail capacity was the key criteria.

j. In the small size of the UK, extreme speed (such as the 250 mph / 300 kph for which HS2 has been designed) has relatively little value. It offers only small time savings compared with lesser speeds (such as 300 - 320 kph).

k. Such extreme speed requires far greater energy use and generally heavier engineering.

l. Expert opinion regarding Rayleigh Waves concludes that the high speeds of 225 mph proposed for HS2 are simply too dangerous and thus impractical.

m. If concrete shafts are proposed as a solution to this problem this is both unproved at these ultra high speeds and will be far more expensive to build.

n. It seems therefore that both the route itself and most especially the ultra-high-speed design of HS2 have extremely serious questions that require thorough and independent investigation to provide answers to these questions.

If the design speed is too dangerous (Note that the safety case has yet to be set out and published) and if the engineers ultimately conclude that HS2 should run at only 200 mph / 320 kph or even less at 186 mph / 300 kph, (the standard maximum speed for high trains across Europe), then there is a very strong case to revise the proposed route from its original design of a very straight line to a more curving route that would avoid many of the destructive impacts on the countryside that the present route creates – or an alternative route.

Water Supply

7 Your Petitioner is greatly concerned that the Environmental Statement does not rule out the possibility of contamination to his water supply as a result of tunnelling in the Chilterns. Your Petitioner requests that an independent scientific investigation into the likely effects of such serious contamination be carried out immediately. Your Petitioner would also draw your attention to the possibility that a longer tunnel could be realigned to avoid the aquifer under the Lower Misbourne Valley, thus eliminating or substantially reducing the risk to the water supply which serves this area and much of NW London.
Construction Traffic

8. Your Petitioner is also gravely concerned about the inadequacy of measures proposed to mitigate the effects of construction traffic throughout the AONB, and in the Misbourne Valley in particular. Your Petitioner regularly drives through the AONB to access his community group locations, shops, healthcare facilities and recreational facilities, and so will be directly impacted by traffic congestion throughout the area (and on the A413 in particular) for the duration of the construction works over a 10 year period. Your Petitioner regularly uses the network of lanes in the AONB for recreation and regards these as a characteristic feature of the area which should be protected in accordance with the CROW Act (2000). Many of these cross the proposed route and will be diverted, in some cases permanently, or interrupted during construction.

9. As a resident of an area in the vicinity of the construction zone, your Petitioner is also concerned that traffic seeking to avoid congestion will place a further burden on the roads in his community, and so further aggravate the impact on his freedom of movement.

10. Your Petitioner notes that the projected traffic on the narrower sections of the A413 and the A355 will exceed 100% of road capacity during peak hours (calculated according to the DTI "Design Manual for Roads and Bridges" TA46/97). On this basis your petitioner so requests that the fully bored tunnel option be implemented.

11. Your Petitioner also requests that the nominated undertaker be required to mitigate the remaining nuisances, by amending the Draft Code of Construction Practice to strictly enforce the following measures –

i. Restricting HGV movements to the period 09:30 - 15:30 throughout the AONB, and prohibiting HGV Movements along school routes for 30 minutes before and after the start and end of the school day (during term time).

ii. Constructing new roads to access the trace directly from the A413, and prohibiting the use of all existing minor roads in the AONB for construction traffic.

iii. Operating a ‘Park and Ride’ scheme to transport construction workers along the trace, and enforcing this by not providing parking for contractors on or near the construction compounds.

Health and Welfare

12. Your Petitioner is gravely concerned that the emergency services will be unable to provide timely support to him and his family and property due to road congestion during the construction period, and would remind the committee that both the A413 and the A404 carry ambulances to the “local” (1.4 miles away) Accident & Emergency department at Stoke Mandeville Hospital, as well as all Hs2 traffic to within and from the AONB.

13. Your Petitioner requests that HS2 Ltd provide mitigation in respect of the above through provision of an HS2 designated air ambulance with crew on standby during working hours, to ensure that medical emergencies receive a prompt response. The committee might also consider that with 11 construction sites operating in the area, it would be criminally irresponsible not to be so prepared for any industrial or other accidents.

Operational Safety

14. Your Petitioner is especially concerned that the HS2 Safety Case has not yet been published (even though we are now in the 6th year of planning for HS2) and specifically that there are ongoing issues regarding the stability of High Speed trains operating on ballast tracks and particularly on viaducts constructed on soft soil. This raises the potential for derailments. (Report for HS2 Ltd by Professor Peter Woodward and Dr David Connelly. Heriot-Watt University Edinburgh). This may necessitate future highly expensive construction changes that could cause increased noise, with no consultation, after the Bill has been passed. Furthermore HS2 Ltd engineers have been unable to state how long, in time and distance it would take to stop a train in an emergency.
Your petitioner therefore requests that until these safety issues are resolved and any resulting consultation requirements are undertaken, work on HS2 construction should not start or if started, it should be stopped.

Environment

15 Your Petitioner makes extensive use of the recreational facilities afforded by the AONB, and strongly objects to the following impacts of the project:

i. Diversion of public rights of way, and reinstatement of some PROWs to run alongside the line. Can you imagine walking along a country footpath alongside a high speed train travelling at over 200 mph. Add to this the design capacity of HS2 is stated to be 18 trains per hour or approximately one train every three minutes, each train being 400 metres long.

ii. Destruction of woodland and in particular of Ancient Woodland represents an irreplaceable resource (as stated by HS2 Ltd); there is no evidence suggesting that translocation of Ancient Woodland has ever been attempted or has ever been successful.

iii. Adverse effects on the ecology of the AONB, in particular on the bird, bat and owl populations and rare plants.

iv. Continuing audible and visual intrusion of the railway in operation. No mitigation has been proposed to address the impact on walkers, cyclists or horse riders, and their needs are hardly mentioned in the ES (Vol 2) reports covering the AONB (parts 7 to 10). These AONB users are both AONB residents and/or part of the 50 million AONB visitors each year, and their absence will affect the shops and businesses which rely on this trade to survive. The closure of shops and businesses would also affect your petitioner’s ability to use these facilities and thus reduce availability of services currently enjoyed.

The only practical mitigation for all of these impacts is the full tunnel throughout the AONB as requested above. This tunnel would reach the surface well beyond the town of Wendover and outside the AONB.

16 Your Petitioner notes that HS2 have identified land (potentially required) for construction at the Amersham Vent shaft which will block the entrance to the Amersham Hospital. Furthermore, traffic to the materials store proposed nearby on the North side of the A404 will delay access to the adjacent Chilterns Crematorium. Your Petitioner therefore requests that the site plan is revised to remove these features.

17 Your Petitioner notes that access to Amersham Old Town will be curtailed as a result of the increase in traffic congestion on the main access routes (A413, A404, A355) and that this will deter the visitors on which this town depends for survival. This may lead to the closure of businesses patronised by your petitioner, who will then be forced to travel further to alternative suppliers.

18 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, it should not be allowed to pass into law.

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.,

Signed by Kevin J Sowden
Date 19th April 2016
To the House of Lords Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioners are the Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council representing a group of affected people who live in and around the Stoneleigh Estate in the County of Warwickshire and share the common cultural heritage of this important landscape. The Stoneleigh Abbey Landscape is included on the English Heritage register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic interest at Grade II* and is significant as it forms the setting for Stoneleigh Abbey, a Grade 1 listed building which has at its core the remains of the Cistercian Abbey founded in 1154. The historic Stoneleigh Estate contains 77 scheduled monuments and 80 listed buildings grouped around the Abbey and its Park and within the conservation areas of Stoneleigh and Ashow and the hamlet of Stareton.

The ecological character of the Estate is a mosaic of arable, woodland, river corridor and semi improved river pasture. Stoneleigh Deer Park is recognised as the best former wood pasture site in Warwickshire by virtue of the large assemblage of 300 year old oaks in a region that holds approximately 5% of England’s wood pasture and parkland resource.

3. Your petitioners concern:

Your Petitioners allege that they and their property, rights and interests in their area and the inhabitants thereof would be injuriously and prejudicially
affected by the provisions of the Bill if passed into law in their present form and they accordingly object to the Bill for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing. The plans as presented are unnecessarily damaging to the historic parkland.

4. Attention to the levels at the B4115 at the entrance to the Park together with the provision of a full sized green bridge would reduce the impact on the landscape.

5. We are concerned that the artificial earthworks through Stoneleigh Park, as currently shown in the Bill documents, will disconnect the designed landscape and that the noise will have a detrimental impact on the lives of residents.

6. Elevating the levels on the B4115 will be damaging to the parkland landscape generally and will specifically damage the ecology of the environment around an area of irreplaceable ancient woodland, which we note cannot be mitigated. This loss is of great concern to us.

7. The B4115 must be used as an access to the roadhead for HGVs under a gyratory system. The traffic implications for residents and the environment are highly damaging. We would wish to see the Promoter work with highway authorities to enable direct access on and off the A46.

8. The past actions of the Promoter have yet to demonstrate a commitment to fair and open communications or give reasonable indication that due consideration has been given to the value of this unique historic landscape; rather the Promoter has limited negotiations to the commercial and financial interests in the land, leaving the residents to feel excluded from any useful dialogue. It is incumbent on the Promoter to demonstrate a new way of working that assures us that they are committed to creating a quality iconic railway that protects and enhances the historic environment of this area.
9. The petitioner as the representative body for the Joint Parishes wishes to see a robust, transparent and honest dialogue in place before the end of these Committee proceedings. This could include both a strategy and an agreed framework for information and the appointment of a new independent arbitrator to ensure that the Promoter is held to account throughout the extended period of construction in the important historic landscape.

10. 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.

Hazel Fryer Parish Councillor Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council

Jane Mackenzie Parish Councillor Stoneleigh and Ashow Joint Parish Council

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

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION of COUNCILLOR CHRIS WILLIAMS

Declares that

1. The Petitioner is specially and directly adversely affected by the whole Bill, particularly Clauses 1 - 3 (Works), Clauses 20 - 24 (Planning), Clauses 25 - 36 (Deregulation), and Clauses 60 and 61 (Deposited plans and sections).

Your Petitioner

2. Your Petitioner is Councillor Christopher Williams. Councillor Williams has represented Chelmsley Wood since 2012.

3. The railway, whose construction and operation would be authorised by the Bill, would cross the M42 motorway and run northwards for some 1.6 kilometres across the open space on the eastern edge of Chelmsley Wood. This open space is split for administrative purposes between the Town of Chelmsley Wood and the neighbouring Parish of Bickenhill. When Chelmsley Wood was developed as an overspill of Birmingham, 50 years ago, its design adhered to the concept of a Garden City, with green spaces within the community and open countryside beyond. However, subsequent development has intruded on the internal communal areas, and the M42 and M6 motorways have created hard boundaries to the east and north. Housing is particularly dense. The surviving green space is therefore particularly valued by the community for formal and informal recreation, and for its landscape amenity. Chelmsley Wood consistently falls within the top 10% of most deprived wards in the country based on data from the indices of multiple deprivation. Many parts fall in the top 5% of the most deprived areas. As such, green space is important in reducing inequality in this location, part of the North Solihull Regeneration Zone. The National Exhibition Centre, Birmingham International Station, Birmingham Airport, and other commercial developments are just south of Chelmsley Wood, and the proposed "Birmingham Interchange" station on the new railway would be nearby on the east side of the M42 motorway. Your Petitioner regrets that the narrow strip of open landscape between Chelmsley Wood and the motorway has been selected for the proposed railway, and believe this route would not have been chosen had proper account been taken of the injurious affects on the rights, interests, and property of the residents of the area.
Your petitioner's concerns

4. Your Petitioner takes objection to the part of the works and the provisions of the Bill that are injurious to our residents, as set out below. Your Petitioner believes the wide range of measures detailed below would provide substantial relief.

Petitioner's proposal for adjustment of the scheme alignment

5. Your Petitioner asserts that many of the potential injuries from which they seek relief arise from an inadequate analysis of alternative alignments by the Promoter, and from the adoption by the Promoter of an unfavourable alignment developed during 2009 in confidential discussions with Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council. The scheme published in 2010 by the Promoter was faulty, and the proposed elevation of the line in Chelmsley Wood has been raised since by some 12 metres to make it practicable. At the same time, the route has been straightened, increasing the line speed from 315 kilometres per hour to 400 kilometres per hour, with a consequent increase in noise.

6. Your Petitioner is aware of many attempts to get a fundamental re-examination of the route, culminating in a meeting between Borough Councillors including petitioner Councillor Williams, the MP for Meriden, and the Secretary of State for Transport, on 27 November 2012. The key purposes of the meeting were said to be "to press for the maximum length of tunnelling and line realignment to the east". A shift of the line to the east was offered as a possibility by the Promoter in the Design Refinement Consultation in July 2013, but was rejected.

7. Your Petitioner regrets that neither the scheme Promoter nor our Borough Council has done an adequate engineering study for an objective assessment of a realignment to the east. The Promoter has admitted that realignment would be practicable and would alleviate many grievances, including impairment of property, loss of rights, loss of amenity, and permanent damage to the environment. However, it is understood the Promoter believes this to be uneconomic, as no monetary value is placed on the damage to the environment and communities that would arise during construction and operation of the proposed railway. The long sections of elevated railway in Chelmsley Wood would take up vital open space and bring continual noise disturbance. In addition, the widespread changes to the road network envisaged by the Promoter would cause congestion and pollution when in use, and major disruption during construction.

8. If the railway were shifted eastwards, it could cross the A45 and River Blythe either in tunnel or on viaduct, depending on the particular choice of alignment. This small shift of the proposed railway would simplify road access to the proposed Bickenhill station, reduce the changes to the main highways, and inflict less disruption on existing traffic. Your Petitioner asserts that this adjusted alignment would avoid or mitigate most of the matters for which undertakings are sought in this Petition, and would save substantial capital cost and disruption arising from the many major changes to the trunk road network. Your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the alignment of the railway, comprising Work Nos. 3/1 and 3/25, will be adjusted eastwards by up to 200 metres in Chelmsley Wood, that corresponding changes will be made to all the subsidiary Works, and that the relevant Plans and Sections will be amended accordingly.
9. Your Petitioner is concerned by the expected high noise levels at residential properties on Yorkminster Drive caused by the high speed of trains proposed to run on the Pool Wood Embankment. When first proposed in March 2010, the railway was to be in a cutting more than 3 m deep, and the speed of the trains was to be limited to 315 km/h by virtue of the curving of the line on a radius of 4.5 km. However, the Promoter has straightened the line to a curve radius of 7.9 km, and raised the proposed line speed to 400 km/h with an exponential increase in noise. Furthermore, the line has been elevated to 9 metres and more above ground. Your Petitioner notes that it is intended that two-thirds of the trains do not stop at the Bickenhill Station, so would be running at full speed a scant 200 metres from domestic properties. Your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that noise barriers will be provided along the whole extent of the Pool Wood Embankment to ensure that the maximum noise level from the passage of a train will not exceed 60 dBA at a distance of 200 metres from the line.

10. Your Petitioner is concerned by the disruptive effect of the expected high noise levels on recreational activities in Heath Park. Noting the high standard of noise attenuation that would be necessary at source, because of the closeness of residential properties, your Petitioner believes it is reasonable to seek an undertaking from the Promoter that the maximum noise level from the railway will be kept below 66 dBA at the centre of Heath Park, 100 metres from the railway.

11. Your Petitioner objects to the loss of recreational space and the visual intrusion that would be caused by the construction of Work No. 3/25 on an embankment more than 9 metres high and nearly 100 metres long across Heath Park. This element of the proposed scheme would link the Coleshill Heath Road Underbridge and the M6 Viaduct. Your Petitioner seeks the displacement of the alignment of Work No. 3/25 some 100 metres eastwards, as previously studied by the Promoter, or failing that, the construction of the Work on a viaduct so that the loss of recreational and visual amenity is reduced to a practicable minimum.

12. Notwithstanding any reduction the Promoter may offer in the loss of recreational space in Heath Park, your Petitioner welcomes the proposed provision of additional recreational space in Brickfield Farm. However, little detail is given, and your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that the proposed games field to the south of Coleshill Heath Road at Brickfield Farm will be provided fully fit for purpose, in advance of the loss of land in Heath Park for the construction works, and that noise barriers on the Pool Wood Embankment will ensure the maximum noise level from the passage of a train will not exceed 66 dBA at a distance of 100 metres from the line.

13. Your Petitioner notes the intention to provide a replacement Pelican pedestrian crossing across Coleshill Heath Road. However, there is reference to some related changes to a bus stop and footpath, with insufficient information to evaluate them. Your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that all changes to public access arrangements will take account of the needs of users with mobility difficulties and will only be implemented after the views of the public have been received and taken into proper account.
14. Your Petitioner is concerned by the impacts on the health, security, and amenity of residents by the proposed placement of the Coleshill Heath Road Underbridge Satellite Compound on Heath Park and the Coleshill Heath Road Westbound Roadhead spoil heaps on Brickfield Farm. It is anticipated that these facilities would cause considerable nuisance from dust, dirt, fumes, traffic, and noise for a number of years during the construction period, with adverse affects on the domestic and recreational activities of residents. Your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that these facilities will be relocated to the east side of Brickfield Farm and that construction traffic will not use Yorkminster Drive.

16. Your Petitioner objects to the loss of agricultural land, the potential severance of wildlife movement routes, and the visual intrusion that would be caused by the construction of Work No. 3/25 on an embankment 8 to 9 metres high and nearly 1.5 km long across Brickfield Farm. The embankment would also pose a threat to the hydrology, as the area is level and poorly drained, and a reduction of permeability will lead to water logging. Further, because small mammals would be able to access the line, barn owls would be attracted and made vulnerable to train strike.

Your Petitioner believes that these difficulties could be reduced by placing the line on a viaduct. As a minimum, a series of tunnels should be provided through the embankment for wildlife access and to promote drainage, although this would not address the loss of agricultural land or the visual intrusion. Your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that this part of Work 3/25 will be constructed as a viaduct north of the crossing of the M42, and that the visual mass of the viaduct and its noise barriers and overhead line equipment be managed by using a through-truss structural design with integral side walls above the tracks rather than a box structure beneath them, and that the architectural design of the viaduct and the integral noise barriers should be of a good standard, with variations in finish along the length to give visual interest and break up the linearity.

17. Your Petitioner objects to the damage to the landscape that would be caused by the Pool Wood Embankment, its noise barriers, security fencing, and overhead line equipment, and the consequent loss of amenity and reduction in property values in Chelmsley Wood, Coleshill Heath, the Birmingham Business Park, and surrounding areas. The embankment would also form a backdrop to the new public open space on Brickfield Farm. Although execution of this section of Work No. 3/25 as a viaduct would lessen the damage, your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that trees and shrubs of sufficient height will be planted in front of the Work, arranged irregularly and in depth to create a natural effect, that this planting will be done early in the construction phase following best practice guidance, and that the Promoter will make enduring agreements to provide on-going care and maintenance.

18. Your Petitioner notes the proposed balancing ponds adjacent to the Pool Wood Embankment, but are concerned that the ecology of the area will be damaged by the loss of the existing natural pools and shaded woodland environment of Pool Wood. Although this damage would be reduced by constructing this section of Work No. 3/25 as a viaduct, your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that substitute
aquatic environments will be provided in the Brickfield Farm area that are not part of the drainage system for Work No. 3/25.

19. Your Petitioner is concerned by the harm to the landscape that would be caused by the unnatural long narrow shape and location of the proposed balancing ponds at the foot of the Pool Wood Embankment of Work No. 3/25. It is believed they would be less obtrusive if sited on the east side of the railway line, nearer the M42 motorway, and your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that they will be relocated accordingly.

20. The southern end of the proposed Pool Wood Embankment would result in the destruction of nearly 5 hectares of natural woodland. It is intended to site a construction roadhead in the wood, construct the 70 metre wide 4-track embankment through it, and convert the surviving area to grassland. Your Petitioner would point out that apart from the ecological value of this wood, it is also used for informal recreational access by the residents of nearby Chelmsley Wood, and that there is a great scarcity of natural green space in the neighbourhood. Notwithstanding any relief provided by the realignment requested in paragraph 11 and the viaduct construction requested in paragraph 16, your Petitioner seeks an undertaking from the Promoter that an area of woodland of similar size and character will be created using the remnant area to the west of the proposed scheme and contiguous parts of Brickfield Farm.

21. The Prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Councillor Chris Williams, Chelmsley Wood ward, Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.

18 April 2016
THE HUMBLED PETITION of:


Your Petitioners and their estate

1 Your Petitioners are the Claydon Estate LLP, the Trustees of the Sir Ralph Verney No.1 Trust, the Trustees of the Sir Ralph Verney No.2 Trust and the Trustees of the Sir Ralph Verney No.6 Trust.

2 Your Petitioners together own the Claydon Estate near Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, which has been the ancestral home of the Verney family since 1620. Claydon House was built in the 1770s by the Second Earl Verney and given to The National Trust by Sir Ralph Verney in 1956. His son, Sir Edmund Verney, 6th Baronet, lives in the house today.

3 The total area of the Estate comprises 5000 acres (2023 hectares) and is spread across five parishes in Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire: Middle Claydon, East Claydon, Steeple Claydon, Calvert Green and Grendon Underwood.

4 Subject to the interest of The National Trust in Claydon House, the estate comprises:

(a) Claydon House gardens and courtyard;

(b) the Claydon Estate farm, comprising 2,200 acres of in-hand arable land,

(c) the parkland, originally designed by John Sanderson, a student of Capability Brown, and containing grazing land for cattle and sheep and three lakes which are used by fishing clubs;

(d) woodland, comprising 500 acres, including both ancient woodland and new plantations.

5 The Estate is predominantly a busy commercial farming operation with a number of other activities taking place, including tourism (the Claydon House gardens and
courtyard as well as other areas of the Estate are open to the public), property letting, forestry and sporting activities. Farming is the principal activity of the estate and the main source of income - generating over 50% of the Estate’s income.

6 Parts of the Estate are subject to compulsory acquisition or use under the Bill or lie adjacent to, but outside the limits of deviation or the limits of land to be acquired or used, specified on the deposited plans to the Bill.

7 The following areas of the Estate are identified in Schedule 5 of the Bill (Acquisition of land for particular purposes) as being subject to compulsory acquisition or use under the Bill for the purposes of (but not limited to) providing environmental mitigation:

*Parish of Middle Claydon, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire*

(a) A public bridleway shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-55 as plot number 1.

(b) Agricultural land, hedgerows and a public bridleway shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-55 as plot number 2.

*Parish of Calvert Green, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire*

(c) Woodland and track (Sheephouse Wood) shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-55 as plot number 9.

*Parish of Grendon Underwood, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire*

(d) Agricultural land shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-54 as plot number 28.

(e) Agricultural land and track carrying public bridleways (GUN/28/1, GUN/33/1 and GUN/33/2 - Three Points Lane) shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-55 as plot number 30.

*Parish of Steeple Claydon, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire*

(f) Agricultural land, hedgerow and public footpath (SCU13/2) shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 3.

(g) Agricultural land shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 4.

(h) Land and woodland (Decoypond Wood) shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 6.

(i) Agricultural land shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 8.
(l) Agricultural land, hedgerows, ponds, watercourse, drain, public footpath (SCL/12/1) and pylons and overhead electricity cables shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 9.

(k) Agricultural land shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot 12.

(l) Agricultural land shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot 78.

8 The following areas of the Estate are identified in Schedule 5 of the Bill as being subject to compulsory acquisition or use under the Bill for (but not limited to) the provision of diversion and installation of overhead electric lines:

Parish of East Claydon, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire

(a) Agricultural land, pylons and overhead electricity cables shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-52 as plot number 4.

(b) Agricultural land, pylons and overhead electricity cables shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-52 as plot number 4a.

(c) Agricultural land, track and pylon and overhead electricity cables shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-52 as plot number 5.

(d) Agricultural land and pylon and overhead electricity cables shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-52 as plot number 7.

9 The following areas of the Estate are identified in Schedule 8 of the Bill (Land in which only rights may be acquired) for the provision of access for construction and maintenance of utility diversions:

Parish of East Claydon, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire

(a) Agricultural land and hedgerow shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-52 as plot number 2.

(b) Agricultural land and hedgerow shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-52 as plot number 3.

(c) Agricultural land and track shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-52 as plot number 5a.

(d) Agricultural land, verge, hedgerow and track shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-52 as plot number 7a.

10 The following areas of the Estate are identified in Schedule 5 of the Bill as being subject to compulsory acquisition or use under the Bill for the purposes of (but not limited to) the diversion or installation of, or works to, utilities apparatus:

Parish of Steeple Claydon, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire
11 The following areas of the Estate are identified in Schedule 5 of the Bill as being subject to compulsory acquisition or use under the Bill for the purposes of (but not limited to) the provision of balancing pond and associated works and access for maintenance:

*Parish of Steeple Claydon, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire*

(a) Agricultural land, hedgerow, drain and public footpath (SCL/12/1) shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 9b.

12 The following areas of the Estate are identified in Schedule 5 of the Bill as being subject to compulsory acquisition or use under the Bill for the purposes of (but not limited to) the provision of worksite and access for construction:

*Parish of Steeple Claydon, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire*

(a) Agricultural land and pylons and overhead electricity cables shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 21.

(b) Agricultural land, hedgerows, ponds and buildings shown on the deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 26.

13 The following areas of the Estate are identified in Schedule 5 of the Bill as being subject to compulsory acquisition or use under the Bill for the purposes of (but not limited to) the provision of flood mitigation measures:

*Parish of Steeple Claydon, Aylesbury Vale, Buckinghamshire*

(a) Agricultural land, hedgerow, drains and public footpath (SCL/8/4) shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 109.

14 In addition, the following areas of the Estate have been identified in the documents accompanying the Bill as being affected by the HS2 project in the parish of Steeple Claydon:

(a) Agricultural land, woodland and public footpath (SCL/13/2) shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 2.

(b) Land and woodland (Decoypond Wood) shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 5.

(c) Agricultural land and hedgerow shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 7.
(d) Land and woodland shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 13.

(e) Access track shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 14.

(f) Agriculture land and hedgerow shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 17.

(g) Access track shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 18.

(h) Land and telecommunication mast (BUK0201) shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 22.

(i) Agriculture land and hedgerow shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 23.

(j) Access road carrying public footpath (SCL/12/1) shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 25.

(k) Agricultural land shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 50.

(l) Access road carrying public footpath (SCL/12/1) shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 53.

(m) Agricultural land shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-56 as plot number 54.

(n) Agricultural land and public footpath (SCL/8/1) shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-58 as plot number 77.

(o) Agricultural land, woodland, public footpaths (SCL/9/3 and SCL/7/2) shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-59 as plot number 89.

(p) Agricultural land, river, bed and banks thereof (unnamed river), hedgerows, drains, ponds, tracks and public footpaths (SCL/8/1, SCL/9/2, SCL/8/3, SCL/8/4, SCL/7/1 and SCL/9/1) shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-59 as plot number 92.

(q) Agricultural land, pond and woodland shown on deposited plan sheet number 2-59 as plot number 93.

The provisions of the Bill will therefore have a seriously adverse impact on parts of the Estate and thereby on the Estate as a whole. Accordingly, your Petitioners object to the Bill and its provisions referred to above and they allege, and are prepared to prove, that they and their property, rights and interests are injuriously and prejudicially affected by the Bill for the reasons (amongst others) hereinafter appearing.
Your Petitioners' concerns

The Calvert Infrastructure Maintenance Depot

16 The IMD will be a substantial and permanent intrusion upon this peaceful rural landscape. Its construction and subsequent operation will also have a substantial and detrimental impact on your Petitioners’ farming and other activities on their Estate.

17 During construction of the IMD and HS2 works, the intrusion will be exacerbated when additional land is occupied as a worksite. Vehicles and workforce needing to access the site will place an unacceptable strain on the local road network.

18 Once constructed, the IMD will be a continuing intrusion. Your Petitioners are particularly concerned about night time working at the IMD and about noise and light pollution to the whole of 'the Claydon bowl' area, which is one of the most tranquil areas of this part of England.

19 The IMD will require lighting for all of its external working areas, including general circulation areas and walkways, with enhanced lighting to loading areas. Your Petitioners are concerned to ensure the external lighting at the IMD satisfies the environmental guidance for a 'dark sky' lighting installation. Your Petitioners seek a commitment from the Promoter that it will comply with current guidance and best practice measures for the reduction of light pollution.

20 Given the special nature of the landscape in this area, the IMD needs to be designed with particular sensitivity to its surroundings. At this stage only the outline design of the IMD is available with detailed design to be approved later by the local planning authority.

21 In respect of any land that may still need to be taken for tree planting and landscaping the promoter and Estate have yet to come to a final agreement on the layout as well as the management going forward for these areas, in particular the areas around the IMD, Sheep House Wood and Decoy Pond Wood. This is even more relevant following the relocation of the FCC sidings to the south of Sheephouse wood.

22 The CFA acknowledges the possibility of the spread of noxious weeds as a consequence of the IMD and the HS2 railway line. Your Petitioners require a commitment from the Promoter that your Petitioners will be consulted upon and agree an appropriate management regime for the control of weed growth which could threaten your Petitioners agricultural interests.

23 A rail station proposed for the East West line has been discounted by the promoter. Your Petitioner strongly supports the station proposal and requests that the committee revisits this option.
Other land take

24 In addition to your Petitioners land being acquired for the IMD, a significant number of small parcels of your Petitioners' Estate are proposed to be acquired either for specific purposes such the provision of environmental mitigation. It is yet to be agreed with the promoter how these areas will be managed going forward and justification for the proposed layout of planting. Your Petitioners submit the Promoter has not adequately and satisfactorily made out a case for the use of these plots of land either in the Bill or the accompanying documents.

25 Much of the Estate is farmed in hand. To do so, your Petitioners have structured their business accordingly and have incurred considerable fixed costs in the form of plant and machinery and the employment of a full time manager and full time assistant. These costs cannot readily be reduced in response to a reduction in the land available to be farmed. Therefore any reduction in the Estate by compulsory purchase weakens the financial viability of the Estate and should be kept to a minimum. Where it is unavoidable, your Petitioners seek compensation for this form of loss.

26 Your Petitioners seek to ensure that any interest in its land 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 Petitioners' estate) should be strictly limited only to that which is absolutely necessary for the construction, safe operation and maintenance of the HS2 works.

27 In the case of any land not needed for the permanent railway works, the land should not be compulsorily acquired. The petitioner has received a general assurance from the Promoter that they will not be compulsory acquiring areas of the Petitioners property but they have failed to give reference to the specific areas. Unnecessary compulsory purchase will cause unnecessary and avoidable difficulties and uncertainty for your Petitioners. There are likely to be adverse tax consequences and your Petitioners will suffer from the uncertainty of not knowing whether the land will be conveyed back to them and, if it is, at what cost to them.

28 Where land is to be taken temporarily, it should be subject to a lease or licence from your Petitioners. This will provide an income from the land rather than your Petitioners having to wait for compensation later. It will also enable a mechanism for agreeing how land will be reinstated, including the drainage arrangements for the land.

29 At the western side of the Estate, the works include the provision of a waste transfer railway siding and road works to enable waste to be transported across the high speed railway to a waste disposal facility at Calvert. The relocation of these sidings has now been agreed with the promoter however the Estate is anticipating that further mitigation will be required to accommodate these works. Your petitioner requests details of the location and design of this as soon as possible with a view to incorporating it into the wider discussions on mitigation works.
30 In the same area, the Promoter is proposing to acquire compulsorily a substantial belt of valuable agricultural land for tree planting in order to provide new habitat for the Bechstein bat. Whilst a number of meetings have been held in regards to this your petitioner have yet to agree with the Promoter a sensible outcome. Your Petitioners seek a commitment from the Promoter to reconsider this aspect of the proposals in discussion with your Petitioners.

31 Your Petitioners also seek a commitment from the Promoter that the future ownership and management of any such land will be agreed with them.

32 There are other areas in respect of which your Petitioners wish to engage actively with the Promoter in order to agree alternative, more suitable areas for the proposed works or mitigation than are currently identified.

Footpaths

33 The Bill contains provisions for the diversion of footpaths across your Petitioners’ land. Your Petitioners seek a commitment from the Promoter that due regard will be had to your Petitioners farming requirements when it is being decided when and how footpaths are to be diverted and that unnecessary disruption to your Petitioners farming operation will be avoided.

34 Your Petitioners expect the nominated undertaker to be appointed to carry out the works to be bound by the terms of a code of construction practice to regulate these and other matters. Nevertheless, your Petitioners submit that the Promoter and the nominated undertaker who is to carry out the works should be required to consult with your Petitioners about proposed working methods and in relation to all aspects of likely environmental impact on your Petitioners’ Estate.

35 It is also unclear what remedy, if any, will be available to your Petitioners in the event of any failure to observe the terms of the code of practice or other environmental obligations. Where the Promoter has not agreed terms on such issues directly with your Petitioners, your Petitioners should have some other clear form of recourse in the event of a non-compliance by the nominated undertaker that affects them.

36 The Promoter should also be responsible for any expense incurred or loss suffered as a consequence of such matters.

Compensation

37 Your Petitioners further submit 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 Petitioners for the loss, damage and inconvenience which they may suffer as a result of the construction and subsequent use of the proposed works.
Conclusion

38 For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, so far affecting your Petitioners, the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

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

YOUR PETITIONERS therefore humbly pray your Honourable House that the Bill may not be allowed to pass into law as it now stands and that they may be heard by their Counsel, Agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against so much of the Bill as affects the property, rights and interests of your Petitioners and in support of such other clauses and provisions as may be necessary or expedient for their protection, or that such other relief may be given to your Petitioners in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Signed on the Petitioners behalf by the duly authorised Agent (Henry Gurney – Roll B Agent)

15th April 2016

Date
To the House of Lords
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Dr Sheila Rankin

Declares that:

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

2. The petitioner is the owner of and lives at Coombe Cottage, 38, Ellesborough Road, Wendover, Aylesbury, HP22 6EL. She has lived in this property for 6 years.

   The Bill would authorize the construction and operation of the railway through and near Wendover. The proposed line would run through your Petitioner’s property, which would be destroyed to create a cut and cover tunnel shown on maps CT-10-020.

3. Your petitioner retired to Wendover because it is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and would allow walking and photography in a peaceful and beautiful environment. Your Petitioner will derive no benefit of any kind whatsoever from HS2, and accordingly will suffer twice, firstly as a taxpayer having to fund it, and secondly by being subject to the disruption caused by construction and the permanent blight to the AONB caused by operation.

Objection is taken to substantial damage to this part of the Chilterns AONB with its exceptional natural beauty and legally protected status with

- the visual impact of construction
- alteration of the landscape following dumping of 800,000 cubic metres of spoil at Hunt’s Green
- Damage to aquifers
- Disruption of footpaths including the Aylesbury Ring, South Bucks way and Icknield way
- Light over the construction area causing light pollution with effects on both the local population and wildlife.

Your Petitioner avers that the operation of HS2 following the completion of the proposed scheduled works would have the following permanent effects:

- Your Petitioner’s view of the Chiltern Hills in the AONB would be permanently scarred by the obtrusive viaduct and embankment 13 metres above ground level with gantries a further 5 metres high. The line would be visible from numerous viewpoints within the AONB. It would be overbearing and dominant in the landscape.

- Your Petitioner’s view of the Chiltern Hills would also be permanently damaged by trains up to 400 metres long passing every two minutes, as would the peace
of the AONB. The proposed sound barriers would be visually intrusive and another blight on the AONB

Your Petitioner’s main objective is to persuade your Honourable House to lower the line into a fully-bored tunnel as it passes through the whole of the Chilterns AONB, ending at the AONB boundary to the north of Wendover and preserving the AONB for future generations to enjoy. I earnestly request that your Lordships require The Promotor to commission a fully independent review of the costs of 2 alternatives: The Promotors existing scheme and the cost of a fully bored tunnel to the end of the AONB.

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Signed

Sheila Campbell Rankin
[17/04/2016]
To the House of Lords

Session 2015-16

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

THE PETITION OF NORTH UXBRIDGE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Declares that

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

2 Your Petitioner is the North Uxbridge Residents Association representing 1700 households in the Uxbridge ward of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Your petitioner and its members submitted responses to the HS2 Phase One Environmental Statement Consultation — together with Ickenham and Harefield (our neighbouring areas), which demonstrates the great concerns as to the injurious and prejudicial affect if the provisions of the Bill are passed into law in their present form.

3 Your petitioner considers that the Environmental Statement did not adequately assess the impacts on roads of North Uxbridge and Ickenham, schools, employment, ecology, air quality, local services, emergency services, drainage and flooding. It was prepared with great haste and the most adverse effects were never discussed at HS2 LTD Community Forums.

General Concerns

4 Your petitioner has identified several specific significant concerns which are set out below. This list is by no means exhaustive, and due to the inadequacy and inaccuracies of the Environmental Statement prepared by HS2, it is inevitable that the construction of HS2 will disrupt the lives of your petitioner and its members in ways which are not yet known. However sufficient has been alluded to, so as to give rise to major cause of concern as to the ability of this suburban area to function satisfactorily.

Specific Concerns

Construction Works

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 the sitting of three construction sites in the area of Ickenham, heavy volumes of construction traffic, the dumping of spoil on green belt land, a construction compound on ancient farmland with a concrete factory, de-contamination plant, lorry parks and storage of fuel.
Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require that the nominated undertaker is subject to binding measures to mitigate the impacts of these works. These binding mitigation measures should include but not be limited to restrictions on noise, dust and vibration, restricting HGV movements and prohibiting HGV movements near school routes for 30 minutes before and after the start and end of the school day.

Construction Traffic

Your petitioner is gravely concerned about the inadequacy of measures proposed to mitigate the effects of construction traffic in the immediate area. The siting of three construction sites in Ickenham for up to 10 years with other construction sites in nearby Harefield and site signalisation will cause significant disruption and congestion to Ickenham suburban roads by HGV traffic which are already heavily congested by north-south local traffic and entry/exit slip road traffic using the Swakeleys Roundabout on the A40. Breakspear Road South, Harvil Road, Swakeleys Road, and Park Road Uxbridge are already heavily congested during morning and evening peak times. Your petitioner and its constituents are concerned that they will be adversely affected in travelling to work, taking children to schools and the safety of their children walking to school.

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

(a) Devise and implement a plan whereby 1-152 HGV traffic should only use haul roads and not have access to our local roads,

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

(c) Constructing such rail head facilities and be operational as soon as possible and well in advance of any tunnelling works to remove spoil and bring construction materials by rail, thereby minimising the creation of the dumps and factory/plant premises between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South.

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.

R V Parsons
On behalf of the North Uxbridge Residents Association
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Andrew Parford and Marianne Parford

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

   The petitioners are residents of 96 Hoylake Crescent, Ickenham, UB10 8JG

3. Your petitioner’s concerns

   Disruptive noise will affect us during construction which we understand will continue for 7 years, 24 hours a day immediately behind our house. (300 – 400 metres).

   There will be heavy traffic congestion that will affect us directly and our village caused by heavy HS2 plant. This will create gridlock in an already congested area which will make it almost impossible for us to travel by car, especially during peak rush hour periods.

   We are concerned about the noise of the new trains travelling every 3 mins on the line within 300 metres of our house after construction. (14 trains an hour in each direction). This will disturb our quality of life and an area of woodland and fields that are currently almost silent during the day.

   The tunnel portal emerging almost immediately behind our property could be avoided by the construction of a tunnel extension. This proposal is supported by our MP Nick Hurd.

   We are concerned that our property is already blighted and this will become worse during construction. We are both pensioners and would at some time like to move nearer to our family. We are not convinced that HS2 Ltd. will fully compensate us if we wish to move and the conditions for compensation look both complex and unsatisfactory.

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.

Andrew Parford

Marianne Parford
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015-16

PETITION against the  

High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF CRAIG DOUGLAS

 Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

The petitioner owns the lease of and lives above the property, The Bree Louise public house 69, Cobourg Street, with his family and pets. The lease is under the Landlords and Tenants Act, is renewable for the term of 30 years as the existing lease expires in 2029.

3. The Bill would authorise the compulsory purchase of the property and in the current footprint would raise it to the ground, which your petitioner objects to. Your petitioner purchased the lease in early 2004, then a public house named the Jolly Gardeners and renamed it the Bree Louise shortly after, named for his daughter a twin, who died in September 2003. Her living twin brother, nearly 13, has schooled locally since nursery and now walks to school to the Outstanding Regent High School, a 10 minute walk away through Euston Station.

4. Your petitioner has spent the last 12 years growing the pub into a renowned award winning local and destination pub. It took 4 years to break even but by sticking to the real ale, cider and pie themes the Bree Louise became its London Camra (Campaign for Real Ale) pub of The Year in 2009 and again for 2016, cider pub of the year Runner Up in 2014 and Winner of the same in 2015. Employing over 20 staff, many of them students from the local UCL, always paying a living wage not a minimum wage. We source as much of our produce locally supporting London Breweries and grocery stores alike. Our customers come from far and wide, locally UCH, UCL and companies small and large, from passing foot traffic for Euston Sq and Euston tube stations and further afield from Euston mainline and overground station and now from all over the world. Indeed the BBC Travel Show did an article for the show in the Bree Louise last Friday, 15th April to be aired globally. The Bree Louise is your petitioners only form of employment, as is it his wives, and the business now turns over close to a million pounds a year.

5. Your petitioner asks your right honourable House to ask HS2 Ltd to seriously consider the option of using Old Oak Common as its terminus linking to Euston, Kings Cross St Pancras and the rest of London. Failing this to use The Double Deep Down option keeping within the existing footprint of Euston Station. Failing this as your petitioner would lose his house, home and livelihood which he considers to be grossly unfair and therefore asks your right honourable House to amend the Bill to ensure proper compensation will be payable not only to himself but to all others similarly affected.
6. The Petitioner

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

CRAIG DOUGLAS

18th April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF: Sheila Ansell

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

1. Your Petitioner lives in London Road, Wendover, Buckinghamshire, HP22 6PN, in a group of 25 properties, six of which have been/or are being purchased by HS2 Ltd under the Need to Sell Scheme. The properties are shown on map CT-10-020. Your petitioner has been the recipient of letters and information in the post from HS2 Ltd which indicate that it considers that they are affected by the Bill.

2. The ages of those who live in London Road range from early 40s to late 80s and there are four children who attend local schools. The newest residents moved here five years ago and the longest has been here for over 60 years. All the properties are detached and are a mixture of bungalows and houses.

3. Your Petitioner lives in a valley within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the proposed route of HS2 runs across the front of her property. Map PC-01-021 shows that one property is in Home Owner Payment Zone 2, 13 are in Zone 3 and the others are between 300m and 400m from the centre of the proposed line.

4. Three of the properties were used to take sound measurements for later comparison purposes.

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

5. Your Petitioner’s main objective is to persuade your Honourable House to lower the line into a fully-bored or mined tunnel as it passes through the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

6. Objection is taken to both the construction and operation of certain of the scheduled works proposed to be undertaken in and near Wendover between Great Missenden and Stoke Mandeville. These works consist mainly of an embankment between Hartley Farm and Road Barn Farm; Small Dean Viaduct; and an embankment between the northern end of the Small Dean Viaduct and the southern end of the Wendover green tunnel. They include ancillary works such as satellite compounds, auto-transformer stations – Rocky Lane Underbridge Satellite Compound and Wendover Auto-transformer Station Satellite Compound (400m away), the Small Dean Viaduct Launch Satellite Compound (250m) and the Small Dean
Viaduct Main Compound (650m) (see map CT-05-037), balancing ponds (see map CT-06-037) and portal buildings.

Problems caused by the construction process of the scheduled works

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

8. The A413 (London Road) on which your Petitioner’s property is located and which is her sole means of access, is a single lane in each direction and the normal volumes of traffic will be hugely disrupted by the large number of traffic movements of heavy vehicles and plant serving the construction sites. Several hundred HGVs per day will cause long delays along this and all local roads, especially the B4009 and A41, which they use on a regular basis.

9. Air quality will deteriorate to the level of discomfort and hazard to health through exhaust fumes from plant and large number of heavy vehicles using the A413 to transport the many thousands of tonnes of chalk, and the dust arising from the excavations for the viaduct and embankment.

10. Your Petitioner is also concerned that asphyxiative and explosive gases are to be stored at the Small Dean compound with the consequent risk to health from build-up and lateral migration.

11. Construction work, particularly pile driving in connection with the construction of the Small Dean Viaduct, plant and arisings movements will produce substantial noise and vibration, leading to difficulties in concentration during the day. The construction areas and compounds will be brightly lit for extended periods which in this area of little artificial light will make sleep at night difficult.

12. Your Petitioner is concerned that although the Code of Construction Practice might be written to the highest standard, enforcement will not be total without independent monitoring and fast track arrangements for the raising and resolution of breaches.

Problems caused by the operation of HS2

13. Your Petitioner avers that the operation of HS2 following the completion of the proposed scheduled works would have the following permanent effects:

14. The balancing ponds in Rocky Lane and London Road represent a risk to health as they will be substantial bodies of dead and stagnant water, contaminated with toxic substances from the railway. There is a risk of contamination seeping into the groundwater and aquifers.

15. Your Petitioner is also concerned that the balancing ponds will be at or above the level of the houses in London Road (A413) with the consequent risk of overflow and flooding in the periods of heavy and sustained rainfall as has been experienced in recent months and which is expected to become less exceptional in the future. The edge of one of the balancing ponds
is approximately 30m from four of the properties.

16. Noise from the trains will continue to place an intolerable strain on your Petitioner’s peaceful enjoyment of her home as trains will be running along the top of an embankment and on viaducts. This whole section of the line, and your Petitioner’s property, are in a valley so noise from the train will bounce off and be amplified by the hillsides.

17. The embankment and viaduct will be some 15 metres high with gantries adding some further five metres, some 20 metres in total. The line will be clearly visible from your Petitioner’s property, as well as numerous viewpoints in the locality. Both structures will be permanent scars in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

18. Your Petitioner’s house has been been blighted since the announcement of HS2 in 2010 and its value will be adversely affected on a permanent basis.

**Mitigation for construction of the present proposal**

19. That construction traffic on the A413 and B4009 be permitted only during the agreed working hours, excluding rush hour (7-9am and 5-7pm) on weekdays.

20. That the number of construction vehicles using local roads be limited, and always in a manner so as to cause as little inconvenience to other road users as possible.

21. That all arisings be removed by rail, not road, to a suitable location and not be permitted to be dumped in the Chilterns AONB.

22. That before construction starts, a traffic management plan be agreed with the local county, district and parish councils, with arbitration being sought if agreement cannot be reached.

23. That for all matters relating to construction, permitted working hours be strictly limited to weekdays between 8am and 6pm, on Saturdays between 8am to 1pm, and no work at all on Sundays, with an hour before and after for start-ups and close down.

24. Your Petitioner supports The Wendover Society and others in the specific limitation of noise levels, and that an independent organisation be appointed to monitor noise levels on a frequent and regular basis, with the results of such monitoring being immediately made public.

25. That artificial lighting at construction areas be limited to working hours.

26. That before construction starts, the Proposer should agree maximum level of toxic traffic emissions from construction traffic with local county, district and parish councils, with arbitration being sought if agreement cannot be reached.

27. That funding be made available to Wendover Health Centre and local hospitals for the provision of any necessary additional facilities to cope with increased 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.

28. That the Proposer ensures that full compensation for damage or loss to property or loss in property caused by construction of the scheduled works will be available to all those who suffer such loss.

29. That the Code of Construction Practice and all regulations and agreements dealing with all the above matters in paragraphs 19-28 be legally enforceable both at criminal and civil law, with civil law breaches being first dealt with by an Ombudsman, and the local county council having the right to bring both criminal and civil proceedings.

Tunnel Options

30. Your Petitioner supports the proposal that part of the scheduled works be replaced by a tunnel under the whole of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This would overcome most of the disadvantages set out in paragraphs 6-18 above and all the disadvantages set out in paragraphs 19-29 above.

31. The Proposer has failed to take into account the value of the benefits that a tunnel would bring. For example, there would be no need to construct two exceptionally large viaducts, an overbridge, embankments and a cut and-cover tunnel as well as the purchase of land and properties and the moving of electricity pylons, and damage to the environment would be avoided.

32. Your Petitioner supports the Long Tunnel as proposed by Buckinghamshire County Council and others. If this proposal is not accepted, your Petitioner supports the Short Tunnel option as proposed by The Wendover Society and others.

33. Your Petitioner recognises that the Extended Cut & Cover Tunnel proposal would give protection to the parish church of St Mary's and Manor School, but the associated 6m high noise barriers are ugly and unproven and the risk of disruptive noise is very real. This option would be very damaging to your Petitioner as it would bring the tunnel portal within metres of her property and additional mitigation measures would have to be sought.

34. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that unless the Bill is amended by the inclusion of a Long Tunnel under the whole of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or a Short Tunnel from Wendover to Great Missenden it should not be allowed to pass into law.

Financial Compensation

35. The value of your Petitioner's house is already blighted to the extent as to be unsaleable and she is outside the present compensation zones. The compensation proposals by the Proposer are inadequate and your Petitioner seeks a modification of the scheme to include her property so that she may seek Express Purchase by the Proposer.
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 remain, etc.

Signed:

SHIELA ANSELL
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF THE COLNE VALLEY PARK COMMUNITY INTEREST COMPANY

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioner

The petitioner is the custodian of the Colne Valley Regional Park through which HS2 is proposed to pass and owns two ancient woodlands immediately adjacent to the route of HS2. The concept of the Park was originally created back in 1965, and for over fifty years its 43 square miles have provided opportunities for recreation for millions of visitors each year. The Colne Valley contains distinct communities and a significant, if increasingly threatened, rural economy. The Regional Park also represents an integral part of London’s Metropolitan Green Belt to the west of the capital and its strategic role has been recognised by the Planning Inspectorate in the determination of major applications impacting on the Colne Valley.

The Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company (the CIC) was incorporated in 2012 to succeed the Colne Valley Partnership that promoted and managed the Regional Park from its inception. The CIC has an active membership of over sixty organisations from community groups, residents associations & charities to local authorities, private companies & landowners, together representing tens of thousands of individuals. Its remit and business is to:

- Maintain and enhance the landscape, historic environment and waterscape of the Park in terms of their scenic and conservation value and their overall amenity
- Safeguard the countryside of the Park from inappropriate development. Where development is permissible it will encourage the highest possible standards of design.
- Conserve and enhance biodiversity within the Park through the protection and management of its species, habitats and geological features.
- Provide opportunities for countryside recreation and ensure that facilities are accessible to all.
- Achieve a vibrant and sustainable rural economy, including farming and forestry, underpinning the value of the countryside.
- Encourage community participation including volunteering and environmental education. To promote the health and social well-being benefits that access to high quality green space brings.
3. Your petitioner’s concerns

3.1 The proposed route and design of High Speed 2 will have a significant impact on the integrity and perception of the Park as a place to visit and invest in, which in turn threatens the viability of the CIC. The locality between Ickenham, Harefield, Denham and Maple Cross comprises some of the most attractive landscapes in the whole Park, will be completely unusable for informal countryside recreation during the anticipated 10 years of construction and considerably less attractive after construction. Indeed, falling as it currently does between two proposed long tunnels, beneath west London and the Chilterns respectively, the physical (e.g. noise, visual intrusion, ecological, recreational, amenity, loss of productive farmland, further reduction in tranquillity), economic (e.g. direct loss of trade and as the consequence of reputational damage – i.e. a perception that with construction activity extending for at least 10 years and further permanent fragmentation of the landscape the Park as a whole will not be worth visiting or investing in), and social (e.g. influx of transient construction worker population) impacts in this locality will be amongst the most intense on the line as a whole.

3.2 Your petitioner is seeking a mitigation and compensation package for the Colne Valley commensurate with the severity of impacts described, and additional investment to help the Regional Park become more resilient to change at the mobilisation stage of the project.

3.3 Given the scale of the impacts that will be experienced if construction proceeds as currently proposed, your petitioner believes that the promoter should complete a proper assessment of the feasibility of tunnelling under the Colne Valley. Should this ultimately prove to be technically unfeasible, then the following represent the specific issues and remedies that the Colne Valley CIC would expect to be addressed by HS2 Ltd.

Addressing impact on Colne Valley Park and building capacity of the Park to adapt to change

3.4 Your petitioner is seriously concerned about the impact on local landscapes and communities that will inevitably discourage or displace users from facilities within the Colne Valley Park. It believes that some of the most attractive landscapes and views in the Park will be lost and many recreational facilities including angling clubs, Denham water ski club and designated nature reserves will be heavily impacted or lost.

3.5 HS2 threatens the viability of the Colne Valley Park CIC because of the ten year construction period that will result in significant landscape changes in one of the most attractive parts of the Regional Park. Your petitioner contends that this will result in reputational damage and loss of direct funding from members and corporate supporters.

3.6 Whilst it would be impossible to properly mitigate all the physical impacts, your petitioner seeks support from the promoter to help build the capacity of CIC to adapt to change.

Retaining land quality/function adjacent to the route and more creative use of construction spoil

3.7 Your petitioner believes that sites within the Park will lose their function as a consequence of HS2. Such sites include productive farmland, the Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre lake and the
Savay Lake fishery. These effects are compounded by the unique impacts of linear development in this rural/urban fringe. Dividing land and/or loss of use may well lead to abandonment, dereliction, undesirable uses and potential unwelcome development with further loss/subdivision of the landscape.

3.8 Your petitioner expects the promoter to work with CIC to develop a strategy for positive use of fragmented land in line with the Colne Valley Park’s remit. This strategy may require capital investment in land improvement and endowments for future management and maintenance such as the HOAC lake being converted into nature reserve (after HOAC has been relocated).

3.9 The promoter currently proposes that surplus spoil from tunnelling operations over and above that re-usable in line construction elsewhere is deposited within the Colne Valley in ‘sustainable placement sites’. Your petitioner is concerned that these would be totally incongruous and a further source of damage to the landscape.

3.10 Your petitioner proposes an alternative approach – at no additional cost to HS2 – involving its more creative re-use to restore damaged sites elsewhere in the Colne Valley (and possibly beyond), with the Colne Valley Park CIC receiving the value of the proceeds generated using the material in this way, for investment back into improving the Park environment as a whole.

**Impact on biodiversity and loss of ancient woodland**

3.11 Your petitioner is concerned about the impact of the construction and operation of the railway on the ecological connectivity and ecosystem functioning and resilience of the Colne Valley including Broadwater Lake nature reserve, Mid Colne Valley SSSI, Denham Country Park LNR and Frays Valley LNR. Your petitioner considers that the ecological mitigation and compensation that has been proposed for the Colne Valley Community Forum Area within the Environmental Statement accompanying the Bill is insufficient. Your petitioner contends that there will be a net loss of biodiversity in the area of the Colne Valley affected by the proposals as a result.

3.12 Your petitioner requests that provision be made for a robust, deliverable, effective and adequately funded programme of mitigation, compensation and enhancement to maintain and enhance ecological systems of the Colne Valley.

3.13 Your petitioner objects to any loss of ancient woodland associated with this proposal. Ancient woodland represents, as stated by HS2 Ltd, an irreplaceable resource, and there is insufficient evidence to suggest that translocation of ancient woodland is successful. The loss of ancient woodland, an irreplaceable resource in the Park, will affect your petitioner. The presence of HS2 severely compromises the ability of Northmoor Hill Wood and Wyatts Covert to function for the benefit of local residents.

3.14 As mitigation for the loss of ancient woodland is impossible to achieve and to ensure that adjacent ancient woodlands operate effectively as a community resource your petitioner expects the promoter to provide an endowment to cover management of existing ancient woodland adjacent to the route (including Northmoor Hill Wood and Wyatts Covert) throughout the lifetime of the construction and operation of the railway.
Reduce and address the impact on recreational routes

3.15 Your petitioner considers that many paths including circular walks within the Colne Valley Park will be rendered unusable during the construction period and will be significantly less attractive once the railway is operational. There will also be cumulative impact on all routes across the valley from Maple Cross to Harefield, Denham to Ickenham.

3.16 Your petitioner does not believe the proposed diversions are practical and would prefer to see permanent diversions of footpaths to reduce their length and to maintain an agreed distance from the route. Your petitioner also expects alternative routes and viewpoints to be provided, accompanied by investment in upgrades of circular walks, signage and views elsewhere in the north of the Park.

Addressing the impact on agriculture and viability of the rural economy

3.17 Your petitioner is concerned about the temporary and permanent loss of farmland from the Colne Valley Park and on the edge of London, which will lead to a further loss of farming infrastructure and increase isolation for those farms that remain.

Heathrow Express

3.18 The Additional Provisions relating to the relocation of the Heathrow Express depot as proposed are unacceptable to your Petitioner. There will be serious adverse impacts for residents on the canal. The impact of construction and the development in operation will be detrimental, making this unattractive to users.

3.19 The Promoter should provide screening of the construction site for users of the Slough Arm (towpath and boaters and residents of the Boatyard) and extensive planting to screen the development when operational (this screening should be provided away from the towpath to ensure that users are not ‘enclosed’). Resources should be allocated for enhancement of nearby paths eg improved access and signage to the Slough Arm from Langley Park Road and Market Lane, improvements to the Colne Valley Trail at Langley No.1 pit/Southend Farm, reinstatement of the link across the railway at footpath IVF/15A/L (in the vicinity of the former Dog Kennel Bridge which was unnecessarily demolished for Crossrail).

3.20 Your Petitioner is concerned about viable afteruse in line with the Colne Valley Park’s objectives for land post construction. Whilst we welcome habitat creation to the west of Hollow Hill Lane (in Slough) we are unclear on how this will be managed and maintained in future. Land without a clear plan for afteruse will lead to abandonment, dereliction, undesirable uses and further unwelcome development.

3.21 The Promoter should work with the Colne Valley Park CIC, South Bucks District Council, Slough Borough Council and Iver Parish Council to develop a strategy for positive use of land in line with the objectives of the Colne Valley Park. Resources should be provided to ensure this land can be effectively managed and maintained in perpetuity.
3.22 The current proposal and a number of other major committed infrastructure projects including Pinewood Studios development, Crossrail, Western Rail Access to Heathrow and M4 widening will have a serious adverse cumulative impact on local residents and businesses in the Colne Valley Park.

3.33 The Promoter should make financial provision to support the Colne Valley Park to enable these cumulative impacts to be addressed through enhancements and maintenance of the remaining unaffected areas of the Colne Valley Park in line with the Park’s objectives for the benefit of local residents and visitors.

Haul Road and Turbidity Treatment (AP4)

3.34 Construction of the Haul road at Uxbridge Golf Course will have an adverse effect on the attractiveness and desirability to use footpath USO and visit Frays Valley LNR, Harefield Place Nature Reserve as part of the suite of attractive wildlife sites within a short walk of the Colne Valley Park Visitor Centre. There must be additional mitigation and compensation for local landscapes and local communities in the Colne Valley Park. The same principles should apply to the new materials stockpiles which will border with Bayhurst Wood and the additional land take for re-routing construction access through Denham Country Park.

3.35 Confirmation is required that the turbidity treatment at Springwell Lake will not cause the permissive route around Springwell Lake to be blocked or blighted in any way or cause any impacts to biodiversity and the fishery in this areas. If impacts do occur then mitigation and compensation must be provided by Hs2.

4. The prayer

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

AND the petitioner remains, etc.

Michael Nye

15th April 2014
15th April 2016

To whom it may concern

This letter authorises a petition to be presented and confirms that Michael Nye, as a director of the Colne Valley Park CIC, has authority to submit the petition of the Colne Valley Park CIC against the HS2 Hybrid Bill.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Skehens
Chairman
To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the 

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Katie Nelson and Jon Beddoes

Declares that:

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

2. Your petitioners are Katie Nelson & Jon Beddoes of 46 Delaney Street, Camden, London NW1 7RY (hereinafter referred to as 'Your Petitioners').

Your Petitioners have lived on the Street for 3-4 years. They are a housewife and tech entrepreneur. They own their town house as free holders. The property is grade 2 listed and therefore does not have double glazed windows. The Victorian properties were built on very shallow foundations.

The Street is a pleasantly curved road of early and late Victorian 4/5 storey terraced houses which abut the pavements. It is situated at the centre of a unique Camden community that coexists with the existing railway cutting, which is located at the top end of Delancey Street/Parkway/Mornington Terrace (hereinafter referred to as the 'Cutting'), and the areas where the HS2 construction works will be taking place and where 5 compounds are going to be erected.

The Street also has a number of small businesses, such as a Portuguese delicatessen (No 40) and a specialist coffee shop (No 11) which have been there for decades and are very much part of the local community.

The Street is a one way route, running East to West and acts as a main thoroughfare. In additions, it has two bus routes, the C2 and 274 and has two bus stops.

Generally the traffic running freely in the Street, however, a two-way contra flow cycle route is planned for the Street and is due to be built at the end of 2016. This will narrow the road to a single lane and mean that buses will have to stop at the bus stop in the middle of the road thus creating tail-backs of traffic. The air pollution in the road is over the legal limit.
3. Your Petitioner residents’ property will not be demolished as a result of the Bill but Your Petitioner residents will be directly and specially affected. Your Petitioners’ properties are located within a very close range from the proposed construction works within the Cutting and Portal.

We feel dismayed that even at this stage of the petitioning process, we on Delancey Street will still be left with a significant negative impact from 10 years or more of construction and it’s associated issues. Any assurances given to Camden Council and mitigation on such issues as noise insulation do not take away the overall significant Adverse Effects of the scheme on the lives of all residents’ on Delancey Street.

Listed below are our concerns:

**DURATION AND EXTENT OF THE HS2 PROJECT**

At present the Euston Station is planned to be constructed in two stages meaning that HS2 works will not be completed at Euston until 2033 as compared to 2026 in the original ES. SES2 AP3 Non–technical summary Table 2. Your Petitioners are opposed to the duration and extent of works because of the decades of disruption and blight it will bring to Delancey Street and our surrounding area. 18 years of construction constitutes a ‘long time’. According to the Health Impact Assessment SES2. This cannot be considered a temporary scheme but a permanent one. A scheme that will outlive many of the elderly residents of Delancey Street.

The construction work to be carried out in the Cutting at the top of Delancey Street will be 10 years worth of heavy, noisy and disruptive work. It will include extensive excavation, demolition, piling work and structural work. (According to Construction Phasing Maps CT.20.005/6/7/8.) Although we have been told that within this time frame, there will be busier peak periods of 24 months, 30 months for example. According to the Construction Phasing Maps, shows that this work will be continuous between 2016 and 2026.

**CONSTRUCTION COMPOUNDS**

To accommodate the extra work (reintroducing Line X) in the Cutting, an additional construction satellite compound, Park Village East (North), will be required (SES2 and AP3 Vol 2 – S.2.43). This new compound will be meters away from Delancey Street and the Street will be used as one of the main HGV routes to this compound. There will be 4 satellite compounds built within close proximity of Your Petitioner Residents’ Street.

**TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE TRAFFIC EFFECTS**

SES and AP3 5.3.79 vol 2 states Delancey Street will be effected with temporary and permanent significant major/moderate adverse traffic effects. (TR-03-001.) Table 28 predicts a 30% increase in daily traffic flows in the Street for both vehicles and HGVs. There appear to be various reasons for this:

**Construction route.** Within the revised SES and AP3, Delancey Street has been designated a major construction route, to service the Park Village East (North) compound (7 years with a busy period of 14 months), Park Village East (11 years and 24
months busy period) as well as the Mornington Terrace Sidings (12 years and 14 months busy period) and Mornington Street Bridge Compound (5 years and 14 months busy period). According to the SES, the vehicle trips generated between all 4 compounds will be between 30-36 vehicles and 270-426 HGVs (Table 26). It is unclear whether these busy peak periods will overlap or which years they will be.

AP3 assumes the worst case that all excavated material will be transported by road. CFA 1 Table 7 estimated a total of 3,444,929 (tonnes) of construction, demolition and excavated material CFA 1 Table as opposed to 2,815,319 tonnes in the Bill scheme. It is estimated that there will be over 800 HGV movements per day during the busiest months.

**Diversion route.** The Street will be used as a diversion route and permanent closure and reconfiguration of roads during Construction Stage A and B1 and after the Operation of the new Station in 2041. This includes the Street being used as a diversion route for Mornington Terrace during various periods during Construction (5.3.79) As stated in Table 44 SES Vol 2 there will be a significant major adverse increase of more than 10% in traffic from 2041.

**Traffic Flows and queuing.** Traffic flows and queuing in Delancey Street will be further compounded by the following junctions: Delancey/Parkway (major significant adverse impact 2 years). This means traffic flows at the junction will be beyond or very close to capacity with the revised scheme and the increases in traffic due to the revised scheme will be such as to substantially increase queues and delays on a routine basis at peak times (15.4.50). Oval Road/Gloucester Avenue (major significant adverse impacts); Parkway/Prince Albert Road (minor significant adverse impacts). All these junctions are closely linked and all traffic joining these junctions from the north/east heading south/west come from Delancey Street. Currently, any minor change to signalling at any of these junctions has a profound impact on the queuing on the Street so much so that the traffic can become gridlocked and tail back beyond Bayham Street. There is no Mitigation for this because as SES Vol 2 states 15.4.80 adaptive control of the signalised highway junctions is less effective where there is a substantial overall net increase in traffic through the junction.

Albert Street North, Albany Street, Parkway, Camden High Street, Arlington Road are destined to be major construction routes with moderate/major adverse traffic effects. Delancey Street is hemmed in by these roads – traffic all around will be at a standstill.

**Permanent Traffic**

An increase of 10% traffic is forecast for the Street after 2041 due to the operation of Euston Station and the new reconfiguration of roads, including the permanent closure of some roads. Table 44 SES Vol 2. The expanded Station will require more taxis and station servicing vehicles which will impact traffic volumes on the Street.

The road network around Delancey Street is very fragile, any alterations, however small has a huge impact on all neighbouring roads, causing havoc for traffic, pedestrians, cyclists and residents.
UTILITY WORKS

During the construction phase Delancey Street will have utility works for possibly 6 months of more. This will create extra traffic flow problems on the Street. The utility works will be taking place in very close proximity to the properties, which abut the pavements – leading to disruption from noise vibration within the houses and limited access to pavements. In addition, car parking will be suspended – restricting the places available. This will be compounded by suspension of residents’ parking bays in neighbouring streets.

CONSTRUCTION NOISE

14.3.19 Table 19 indicates that day and night time noise during Stage A of construction will have a significant adverse effect for up to 12 months on up to 25 properties. Currently your petitioners block of terraced houses on the north side of Delancey Street are predicted to be eligible for noise insulation, but they feel that the noise assessments have not been carried out thoroughly enough in the Street.

We do not believe that the noise assessments carried out to date are reliable. Although noise insulation packages are being considered in one of the assurances to the Council, we have concerns about the quality of insulation, who gets it, and how it can be fitted to homes in a way that leaves them habitable, unimposing and the noise insulation effective.

TRAFFIC NOISE

There is no mention of traffic noise in the ES or SES. The 30% increase in heavy traffic will create more noise. There is no barrier or protection from noise penetrating the interior of the properties especially as the listed properties do not have sound insulation. Living with constant noise is very disturbing and impacts on a sense of wellbeing. The current level of noise from traffic is usually tolerable but the petitioners are worried that increased noise levels will become unbearable. As stated in Notley et al’s report from the UK National Noise Attitude Survey, 2012, around 30% of those who hear road traffic noise report being moderately, very or extremely bothered, annoyed or disturbed whereas about 2% of those who hear noise from trains report this same level of disturbance. (4.1. HIA)

CONSTRUCTION WORKING HOURS

The E5 Vol 5 Draft Code of construction Practice CT-003-000 sections 5.2.6 to 5.2.10 allows much of the work in the neighbourhood will be exempt from normal working hour restrictions and to take place 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This is unacceptable.
Residents need to have some time during the weeks that is exempt from work, noise and traffic.

**AIR POLLUTION**

The Street is a new location assessed for impacts on air quality as a result of SES 2 traffic changes and the results indicate there will be significant temporary adverse effects due to increases in NO2 concentrations during some peak periods of construction activity during Stage A of construction. (Non-technical summary pages 27). This is a significant concern for Your Petitioner Residents because the Air quality in the Street already exceeds the EU threshold and recommended safe limit of 40mg/m3. We do not believe that the increases would only be during some peak periods, because as we have demonstrated above, the Street is destined to become a major construction and diversion route for the duration of the Scheme and beyond. Any increase in air pollution, however minor it is, will not be acceptable.

**New Evidence.** During the month of August 2014 Air monitoring was carried out in Delancey Street, funded and analysed by Mapping for Change. The results were very alarming - 100-120 mg/m3. Although this is just a snap shot at a given point in time, the results are considered to be +/- 20% accurate. The month during which monitoring took place also represents a period during which less vehicles were on the road due to the summer holiday period. In addition, pollution is lower during summer months than in winter months.

Yours Petitioners cannot accept any higher levels of pollution. Knowingly, exposing residents, some very vulnerable, to increased pollution in an already overly polluted Street, cannot be ethically, morally or legally acceptable. No mitigation has been proposed despite the fact that air pollution levels in the Street already exceed the European guidelines. The assurances given to Camden regarding Air Quality monitoring and producing evidence annually is not sufficient – as that would allow air quality to worsen at least one year before any mitigation is put into place.

**DUST EMISSIONS**

No significant effects relating to dust emissions were predicted in the SES2 and AP3 ES, and the probable short term nature, the intensity and extent of exposure to the adverse effects of construction dust are considered to be low. However, Your Petitioners would like to raise the issue of dust emissions from the utility works and also from the HGV’s carrying concrete and other materials.
VIBRATION

Given that Delancey Street is now a designated lorry construction route, Your Petitioners are concerned that the vibrations experienced will be even greater than first feared. With 30% increase in HGV’s – this is likely to have a profound impact on the fabric of the houses, most of which are built with shallow foundations, and on the peace and quiet felt within the houses. There is also concern that the construction works will cause vibration to the nearest properties.

Residents have already suffered from vibration from heavy vehicles and from uneven road surfaces. Airborne vibration and groundborne vibration have been ongoing issues for us. Some residents have had to move to the back bedrooms of their houses to sleep.

RESIDENTS CAR PARKING

No mention has been made in the original ES or revised SES regarding residents' car parking. We know that Mornington Terrace and Park Village East are to lose their parking bays due to construction works, and yet HS2 have not allocated additional parking. This may mean added pressure on neighbouring residential parking bays including Delancey Street. In addition, the Street will lose parking bays temporarily due to the utility works.

ZOO CAR PARK

HS2 are planning to take over part of the Zoo Car Park, in Regents Park as a holding bay for their HGVs. This location is in close proximity to the complex junctions at the top of Parkway and this will cause extra untold congestion to this road network. This will impact the traffic congestion in Delancey Street as the majority of traffic from Delancey Street heads left into the top of Parkway and the junctions there.

LOSS OF AMENITY

As stated in the SES Vol 2 8.4.43 and the Non-Technical, Delancey Street will experience MAJOR ADVERSE TEMPORARY ISOLATION due to access restrictions, major adverse amenity effects, due to noise and visual effects, HGV movements, and air quality. This is unacceptable for Your Petitioners given the duration of the works. It will make living in the Street unbearable. It will make moving around the area, either by foot, bike, public transport or by car very hazardous and/or restricted.
**BLIGHTED PROPERTY VALUES**

The duration and intensity of the construction works at the cutting and the use of Delancey Street as a construction route will devalue the Properties on the Street. Who would want to buy a property on this Street which will be hemmed in by 10 years or more of traffic jams, construction works and increased levels of traffic? The new development, Solstice House, at the top end of Delancey Street which overlooks the cutting, has only sold two apartments since it was first marketed last year. Talking to Knight Frank Estate Agents, who are marketing this building; say that once the construction begins, values may very well be affected.

**ADVERSE IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS**

Residents on Parkway and Delancey Street are predicted to ‘experience in-combination effects from a significant increase in HGV movements, significant noise effects and significant air quality effects. The combination of these effects, which are expected to combine for up to 18 months, will have a major adverse effect on the amenity of residents which is significant’ (8.4.43 SES Vol 2). Your Petitioners are concerned that the estimate of 25 properties over 18 months is not a good indication of the impact on the whole of the Street. It is the full length of the Street which is designated a major construction route. It is over half the Street which will have utility works. The traffic queuing and gridlock will tail back to the start of the Street (based on previous experience of road works within the Street and at the top junctions). The air pollution is over the legal limit in the whole of the Street. The noise and vibration from the increased traffic and HGVs will impact the whole of the Street. The loss of amenities will be felt by all residents on the Street. Your Petitioners do not feel the ES or the revised SES takes into account the commensurate and cumulative effects of the Scheme.

**LIKELY RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

Your Petitioners’ Street is classified in the SES2 and AP3 ES Vol 2 –CFA1 Euston Station and Approach as having LIKELY RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS FROM TRAFFIC, NOISE, AND LOSS OF AMENITY. This means that after any mitigation has been put into place, there remains a ‘significant effect’ on Delancey Street.

**COMPENSATION**

There is no extension or new compensation funds available for Urban householders other than the Need to Sell Scheme which requires a householder to have a ‘need’ i.e. ill health, loss of job, in order for HS2 to buy the property. But this is only after a certain length of time of the house being on the open market. It is very limited and restrictive.
This scheme does not look after residents who simply want to move and who cannot afford the luxury of selling their main asset at a knock down price. This, in effect, would be taking investment and capital worth away from Your Petitioners. Given the duration of the Scheme, Your Petitioners will not necessarily reap any benefits from the operation of HS2 and the new Euston Station.

This scheme is not a temporary scheme – it constitutes a life time for some of our more elderly residents who will face construction for the rest of their lives.

**HEALTH**

The health of Your Petitioners is of a major concern given the duration and extent of the scheme together with the traffic increases both temporary and permanent. We believe that the physical and mental welfare of residents will be compromised.

Air Quality is already dangerously high in the Street, this as we all know leads to life threatening diseases.

The problems of anxiety, stress, annoyance, sleep disturbance, social isolation due to the duration and extent of the Scheme are of great concern to Your petitioner. The Scheme to date has already caused anxiety and stress and sleeplessness. Long term anxiety can have devastating effects such as depression, high blood pressure, strokes, and other serious physical symptoms such as chronic back pain, migraines, and irritable bowel syndrome.

**CAMDEN CUTTING GROUP PETITION**

Your Petitioners supports the petition of Camden Cutting Group and all the details and requests within it. However, we have some particular requests pertaining to our concerns.

**MITIGATION REQUEST**

**DEVELOPMENT OF EUSTON STATION AND THE ROUTE INTO LONDON**

Given the exceptionally high costs of the current proposal, the immense damage and disruption to Camden residents and the failure to achieve the much needed comprehensive redevelopment of Euston, we request:
- Government should commission a detailed technical, economic and social analysis of HS2 Ltd.'s current proposals and of the alternative options for the route into Euston.

- Any option chosen should provide for a new Euston Station that is built within the existing footprint, thus avoiding the need to expand to the west of the station by a third.

Traffic and Transport

This is our biggest problem and we cannot see how any mitigation such as traffic calming, traffic light phasing will elevate the congestion problems therefore we request that:

- Ideally that Delancey Street not to be used as a construction route and instead the major strategic roads such as Euston Road are used especially if Delancey Street becomes a cycle route.

- That the maximum possible removal or spoil and delivery of concrete and other materials are transported by rail and/or canal.

- We understand that concrete will be delivered from the Kings Cross plant to Park Village East using Delancey Street as the main route – and we ask that specific investigation is carried into the use of the canal for this.

- The London Zoo car park should not be used as a holding area for construction Lorries. It would bring years of HGV traffic through Camden and will add intolerable pressure to the junctions at the top of Parkway.

- 44. Your Petitioners asks that an assessment and mitigation of accident black-spots is done by HS2 on the dangerous junction of Delancey Street/Arlington road.

Permanent Traffic

- The road system should be designed to minimise traffic increases on any residential roads including Delancey Street due to HS2.

Noise and Vibration

In a variety of instances we believe the noise modelling fails to take account of the specific local environment and is insufficiently precise. In other cases the modelling is based on inaccurate or inadequate baseline noise data. Your Petitioners believe that
the whole of the street should be thoroughly monitored and assessed for both construction and traffic noise and vibration – given the close proximity to the Cutting and that an extra 30% increase in traffic is forecast to use the Street.

Therefore Your Petitioners request that:

- HS2 commit to reassessing their noise assessment methodology, modelling and mitigation further so that the effects of both construction works and traffic noise are mitigated for properties on Delancey Street.

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

- Noise thresholds for rehousing and/or secondary glazing should be lowered in order to take into account construction utility and traffic noise, so that more than 25 residences are included. This is too narrow a margin, where, in areas of the street lower down from the junction of Albert Street and Delancey Street, there will be excess, invidious and continuous noise of the ilk that will impact on the lifestyle of Your Petitioners’ quality of life all the time, day and night for a significant period of time.

- Noise insulation should be considered for the backs of the properties due to the ‘open spaces’ between the road and the backs of properties.

- Vibration from construction traffic be assessed in the Street because of the shallow foundations of the properties and due to their very close proximity to the road (1 or 2 metres away from the road).

- Pre and post surveys should be provided by HS2 Ltd to all properties on Delancey Street that are situated directly next to the road or are in close proximity to the Construction works in the Cutting.

- There is a need for speed controls on HGVs and other traffic on construction routes, but there is also a need to reduce vibration which could be exacerbated by road tables (due to be built as part of the cycle lane design). We ask that HS2 bring forward an appropriate solution that meets both these requirements and for this solution to be in place before use by any construction traffic.

**Air quality**

In addition to the assurances on Air quality given to Camden we request that:

- All HS2 and related vehicles are powered by Euro VI within Camden – rather than just HGVs.
- That this applies to vehicles working on associated works such as the building of the new school and residential properties.

- The SES2 and AP3 outline adverse effects of NO2 on Delancey Street, therefore Your Petitioners ask that a full and scientifically rigorous system of air-quality measurement along the whole of the Street prior to and during the construction is implemented. Air pollution levels must not be increased.

- Annual and bi-annual reviews are too little too late – for immediate impacts to be mitigated we therefore ask for monthly reviews that are made public.

- Action packages for Delancey Street should include – reducing or stopping the street being used as a construction route –

- Weekly washing down of the pavements in the whole of the street due to dust from concrete deliveries and associated construction traffic and works.

- That the Cutting area including Delancey Street and Parkway are included in the Central Activity Zone so that all Non-road Mobile machinery used in the cutting is powered by the latest best practice standards of IV rather than IIIB (or IIIA with approved DPF).

- Delancey Street will suffer from permanent increase in traffic once Euston Station is operational. We ask for all new taxi’s to be powered electrically and that there is an assurance from the Black Cab’s association that engines are switched off when waiting in the taxi queue around the station.

**Enforcement**

There is concern that already HS2 works and subcontractors working in and around the Cutting are not abiding to agreements and are causing nuisance to local residents such as leaving engines running outside homes. There seems very little ability to sort out problems as they happen – so our fear is that this will be exacerbated once the full scale works begin. Therefore we request:

- That an local enforcement officer is available 24 hours a day 7 days a week for residents to contact if and when they have concerns or problems. An officer with enforceable powers to stop the work whilst the problems are sorted out to the satisfaction of the local community.

- That penalties charges are placed on HS2 or their subcontractors for breaching any assurance or code of construction practice agreement.

- That an independent Statutory Adjudicator be appointed with the power to ensure any legal commitments entered into by HS2 are met in practice, including assurances,
undertakings, and policies in HS2 information papers.

COMPENSATION

Your Petitioners believe that even after any mitigation measures, Delancey Street residents will face ‘residual significant adverse effects’ from traffic congestion, poorer air quality and noise. This scheme is not a short term one, but a long-term one which will not benefit any of us in the foreseeable future – unless we are still alive to travel up North on the HS2 line.

It is unfair to expect residents to live in a blighted area – where selling their homes will become very difficult, especially at the market value. It will restrict a freedom of choice and could mean a loss of money.

Therefore we request:

- For a fair compensation in order to ensure that we have a sense of security in the knowledge that our rights, properties and ability to see our houses at the market value, whenever we choose to, are protected. There should be equivalent schemes available in urban areas as are offered in rural areas.

- We favour a Property bond scheme whereby market values are secured.

- The Need to Sell Scheme should be modified so it isn’t so restrictive in the requirements to show a compelling reason to sell. Also, we ask that the rule that requires homeowners to accept a 15% loss on the value of their property to be dropped.

4. The prayer – And 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.

Name: Katie Nelson Signed:

Additional signatures:

Name: Jon Beddoes Signed:

On behalf of The Delancey Street Residents’ Association.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF Paul and Anna Burke trading as All Clear

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner runs their business from, and jointly owns property at 32, Lappetts Lane, South Heath. Your Petitioner has responsibilities over the whole of the Great Missenden area and so will be directly and specially affected by the Bill.

This property currently enjoys a tranquil and safe location but is located 500 metres from the portal cutting and 750 metres from the train exit/entrance at the portal as outlined under deposited plans Volume 2.1 Replacement sheet 2.25.

Your Petitioner lives in part of the Chilteens Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) which the Bill may specially and directly affect.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s concerns

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

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

3. In the alternative to the extension of the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel throughout the AONB, which is the primary alteration to the Bill your Petitioner seeks, your Petitioner requests that the fully bored Chiltern Tunnel is extended to Leather Lane, as it will address, most but not all, of your Petitioner’s concerns.
4. The fall back alternative to these solutions is numerous individual mitigations of the adverse impacts, all of which will cost time and money (over and above the mitigation presently proposed by the Promoter). Your Petitioner expands on the individual adverse impacts that concern it and to which it objects, and the (additional) mitigation that would be required for each, if its fully bored tunnel proposals are rejected, below.

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

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

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

Remedies:
1. The construction haul road should be relocated further north, distant from the larger settlements of Great Missenden and Prestwood, and beyond the Mobwell junction hence reducing traffic congestion at the Link Road (A4128) and the B485 roundabouts. It would also lessen the impact and visual blight of the haul road on residents, visitors and businesses in Great Missenden. Traffic signals can be implemented on the junction with the A413 to control the flow of construction traffic.
2. The amount of spoil requiring transport by road can be reduced by moving more spoil down the trace.

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

Remedies:

---

1. HS2 Ltd had given Bucks CC in January 2016 an assurance that it would relocate this haul road but the conditions placed upon the County Council to achieve this were unrealistic.
1. Construction traffic should not use the maintenance access road off Frith Hill during construction.
2. Any temporary construction contractors should not park their white vans at the South Heath portal but at the main construction compound at Wendover and be bussed onto the site.
3. If the construction haul road is relocated as mentioned above, it could be retained so that access to Frith Hill (SHL) will no longer be required.

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

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

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

Remedies:
1. A further Chiltern tunnel extension throughout the Chilterns to the edge of the AONB or at least as far as Leather Lane would largely stabilize the dysfunctional market.
2. A compensation scheme that provides full current un-blighted house value to all residents when they wish to sell... A Right to Sell Scheme. The scheme is to be administered by a body independent of HS2 Ltd, with a right to appeal. The NTS scheme needs to be made less complex, faster, more accessible, less onerous to prove qualification, friendly to the elderly and with more stringent rules to ensure reasonable un-blighted valuations.

10. Pension/Property: Your Petitioner is particularly concerned as his property is the main part of his pension and if his house price is affected by this dysfunctional housing market then his pension is affected too. The petitioner raised this question several times to the House of Commons Select committee and to HS2 Ltd and has never been given a straight answer.

Remedy
Your Petitioner is looking for a straightforward reassurance that the Need To Sell scheme will take into account the fact that his property is his pension and so he will know where he stands.

11. Operational Noise: Your Petitioners are close enough to the surface line to suffer operational noise at night close to the peak WHO target LOAEL of 60dBA (23.00 – 24.00 and 06.30 to 07.30)
Remedies:
1. Your Petitioner feels that not exceeding the peak LOAEL level of 60dBmax should be a mandatory requirement and not just an aim as outlined in Information Paper E20. Anticipated noise levels should be independently verified and based on evidence of the efficacy of alternative noise reduction methods.
2. Reasonably practicable measures to dissipate the noise should include having retained sides, or steeper slopes to the portal cutting and beyond; deeper cuttings; reducing the train speed; lengthening the porous portal; higher more absorbent noise barriers adjacent to the line to protect Potter Row; noise barriers both sides of the line and to the south of the portal to protect South Heath and Frith Hill properties and those using footpaths GMI/12 & 13.

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

Remedies:
1. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern over high levels of dust and pollution, with independent monitoring and powers to halt construction until preventative measures are implemented and verified.
2. The provision of an air ambulance service is requested to complement emergency medical services which are already struggling.

13. Business impact: Your petitioner is very concerned about the effect on access to/from South Heath to the surrounding area and the negative impact upon the ability to get to/from client sites in a timely and consistent manner given the major adverse effect that will occur at the Link Road and Frith Hill roundabouts that will exceed their capacity.

Businesses in the area will be specifically affected by a reduction in tourists and in customers footfall, including 12 small businesses in the hilltop villages and approximately 70 businesses in Great Missenden. In addition, delivery vehicles will be delayed by the congestions caused by construction traffic, for example deliveries, often by articulated lorry with a trailer from Europe, to the South Heath Garden Centre.

Tourism plays a significant part in local business, with visitors to the Roald Dahl Museum, local cycling groups using this area as a centre for the Chiltern Cycle way and the Chiltern Hundreds Cycle routes. There are 55 million visits a year to the AONB bringing in £471.6 million of expenditure associated with leisure visits to the Chilterns and sustaining an estimated 12,000 FTE jobs.

Remedy:
1. For businesses which are indirectly or only temporarily affected; compensation for loss of profit, loss of trade and the fees of any professional advisor appointed by the business.
2. A substantial reduction in business rates where applicable.

14. Chilterns AONB: The proposed line is above ground from the South Heath portal of the Chiltern tunnel for 9 kms to the edge of the Chilterns AONB just north of Wendover. It is in a cutting for approximately 3 kms and will be visible at the highest point of the line in the vicinity of Liberty Lane, notwithstanding the sight of the security fences and catenary masts above the cuttings which will be a major permanent eyesore along the length of Potter Row.
The proposed line from Liberty Lane descends to Wendover and crosses two large unsightly viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean in the Chilterns AONB before reaching a green tunnel running alongside Wendover.

Construction will last up to 8 years with a peak period of more than 3.5 years. HGV traffic, noise and dust will render the rural lanes and footpaths less attractive to all visitors to this area of the AONB whether they are ardent walkers/hikers, currently popular with those groups taking the Duke of Edinburgh Award, or cyclists as it is Route 57 on the National Cycle Network or just families coming for a day-out from London to enjoy the countryside.

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

1. The AONB review body must ensure that the viaducts and embankments with enclosures to reduced noise are made as visually pleasing as possible. The design of the new permanent buildings erected by HS2 Ltd to be in-keeping with the surrounding area.
2. The vertical alignment of the track between the South Heath portal and Wendover should be lowered further, if it is not to be placed in a tunnel, to reduce the intrusion of the viaducts; to conceal catenary masts and gantries and reduce the height above the general ground surface of accommodation footbridges. The contractor should not be empowered to raise the line at all on the AONB section
3. The need for spoil dumps should be minimised either by tunnelling or moving the spoil down the trace or by rail. This particularly applies to the spoil dump planned for Hunts Green farm and those by the construction compounds
4. The Rights of Way are not to be closed for any length of time and any diversion not to be parallel to the track; furthermore diversions should be over green bridges and not accommodation bridges.
5. All overhead power lines adjacent to the route be buried
6. Alternatives to Balancing Ponds be considered, and they should be made ecologically and visually attractive, in-keeping with AONB.

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

Remedies:

1. Daily movements of HGVs to be restricted to between 09.30 and 15.30 hrs and prohibited from using rural lanes.
2. Construction activities should be subject to strict noise limits and light emission limits from night security lighting (there is no street lighting near the construction compounds) and activities restricted to times that are unlikely to affect the sleep patterns of children and the elderly. Furthermore, the Local Authority should be funded to enforce monitoring and policing of the noise and light emission limits and activities, and work should stop if the limits are exceeded.
3. During the construction phase a hotline should be established for residents to raise any issues of concern and for road users to report damage, also for an independent HS2 adjudicator to review issues, monitor progress with enforcement orders and facilitate claims.

16. Primary Mitigation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

Signed

Paul Burke                           Anna Burke

Date: 15.4.16.
Agent Authorisation

We the undersigned hereby authorise

Thomas Michael Johnstone of, Woodleigh, 12 Lappetts Lane, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire

to act as Agent on behalf of

Part and Anna Burke trading as 'All Clear',
32, Lappetts Lane, South Heath,
Great Missenden.

in all matters relating to the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill.

Signature:

Print name: Paul Burke.

Signature:

Print name: Anna Burke.
To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF BICKERTON’S AERODROMES LTD

Declares that:

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

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 ("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.

2 Your petitioner

Your Petitioner is Bickerton’s Aerodromes Ltd, the owner and operator of Denham Airport in Denham, Buckinghamshire and a statutory undertaker by virtue of The Civil Aviation Act 1982.

3 Your petitioner’s concerns

Your Petitioner is concerned that the construction and operation of the high-speed railway and associated development at Denham poses a risk to the commercial and employment activities undertaken by Bickerton’s Aerodromes Ltd. The current plans for HS2 mean activities will be significantly disrupted due to the hazard introduced by the Colne Valley Viaduct proposed as part of the Authorised Works.

Safety of flights at Denham Airport

Your Petitioner is concerned about the adverse impacts on the amenity of Denham Airport that would arise due to the construction and preparation of the high-speed railway and associated development. In particular the proposed Colne Valley Viaduct.
Your Petitioner is concerned that the proposed Colne Valley Viaduct would introduce a hazard to the safety of flights at Denham Airport due to its design, including its proximity to the runway, its proposed elevation and overhead gear.

Your Petitioner is Concerned that adequate consideration has not been given in the design of the Colne Valley Viaduct to avoid foreseeable risks to the safety of flights at Denham Airport and that the proposed viaduct has not been adequately risk assessed.

In order to minimise the impact of the proposal, the Petitioner requests that prior to construction the Petitioner should be consulted meaningfully on the detailed drawings and plans for the Colne Valley Viaduct.

Your Petitioner submits that those responsible for the design of the Colne Valley Viaduct are best placed to address the risks to flight safety introduced by the Colne Valley Viaduct and the Petitioner submits that the nominated undertaker should be required to follow good practice and design out risk. The Petitioner requests that the nominated undertaker should be subject to binding mitigation measures to mitigate the risks.

HS2 Ltd proposes to create a wetland and plant trees on land that is currently open agricultural land to the north of Denham Airport. This land is at present available as a forced landing area to aircraft which suffer mechanical malfunction, which has happened on multiple occasions. The Petitioner requests that the Petitioner should be consulted meaningfully on the detailed plans for the reinstatement of land to the north of Denham Airport within the Denham ATZ (Aerodrome Traffic Zone).

Should ground equipment become necessary or desirable at Denham Airport (such as approach slope indicators, approach lighting, glide slope indicators) or should runway realignment become necessary or desirable as a result of the Authorised Works, the Petitioner requires an indemnity from the nominated undertaker against any such costs.

The proposed Colne Valley Viaduct is within 1000m of the runway at Denham Airport. However, HS2 Ltd has put forward no proposals for the rescue of pilots and passengers from aircraft (or indeed the rescue of train passengers) from the proposed Colne Valley Viaduct in the event of an aircraft accident involving the proposed viaduct. Also, HS2 Ltd has put forward no proposals for stopping trains in the event of an aircraft accident. The Petitioner submits that the nominated undertaker should be required to publish a rescue and evacuation plan prior to construction.

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

Amy Paul
Airport Manager
Bickerton’s Aerodromes Ltd 14 April 2016
To the House of Lords

Session 2015–16

PETITION against

The High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF: RONALD JOHN RYALL

Declares that:

1. The petitioner and his property and business would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the whole Bill.

The petitioner

2. The petitioner is the freehold owner of Dews Farm House, Dews Lane, Harefield, Middlesex UB9 6JN ("the Property"). He purchased it from the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon in 2005 under the Right to Buy Scheme.

3. The petitioner and his family have lived at the Property since the 1960's and his grandparents before them.

4. The petitioner is also the freehold owner of 2 Dews Cottage which is attached to a RMC garage in which his daughter lives. The RMC garage serves as the petitioner's business and provides a livelihood for himself and his family.

5. The Property is of historical interest, with Queen Elizabeth I having visited it in 1601 and it also has a blue plaque for Cecil Kincross who was born in it in 1894. He received a Victoria Cross.

The petitioner’s concerns

6. The petitioner faces the prospect of losing both his Property and business as a 4k long Colne Valley viaduct is to be built which will require the compulsory acquisition of the Property and the possible acquisition of the business.

7. The petitioner has spent a very significant sum of money and time in restoring the Property and he will lose a very valuable asset which he was hoping would continue to serve as a family home for future generations.

8. The petitioner’s business has been established for 50 years. It is the sole source of his income and it has an established clientele which will be lost for good.

9. The petitioner and his family have had to live with the constant uncertainty of the potential effects of Phase One of the HS2 project on their Property and business since its announcement in 2010. Save for one e-mail dated 15 March 2013 from HS2 Ltd, the petitioner has received little or no communication from this organisation apart from being told that it thinks that some of the petitioner's
Property may need to be demolished for the purpose of facilitating the construction of the scheme. This uncertainty has had a very significant adverse impact on both the physical and mental well-being of the petitioner and his family.

**The petitioner's requests**

10. The petitioner respectfully requests your right Honourable House to amend the Bill so that provision is made for an extension to the West Ruislip tunnel to the west of the Colne Valley so that the railway is carried through this Valley.

11. The petitioner fully supports the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon's request for such an extension and would seek to rely upon the evidence which it will present to your right Honourable House.

12. The petitioner alternatively respectfully requests that your right Honourable House require the Promoter to examine all possible options to reroute the proposed railway line and or the construction of the Colne Valley viaduct so as to avoid the acquisition and demolition of the petitioner's Property and business.

13. In the event that there is no option other than to acquire and demolish the petitioner's Property and business, the petitioner respectfully requests your right Honourable House to require the Promoter to fully compensate the petitioner for the loss of his Property and business.

**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 some or all of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the Petitioner remains, etc.

Ronald John Ryali

April 2016
To the House of Lords
SESSION 2015 – 16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midland) Bill

THE PETITION of:

(1) AMBROSETTI (UK) LIMITED

Declares that:

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

2. Your Petitioner

Your Petitioner is Ambrosetti (UK) Limited (hereinafter referred to as “AL”).

Ramac Holdings Limited (hereinafter referred to as “RHL”) owns the freehold of the industrial estate situated at Appletree Industrial Estate, Appletree Road, Chipping Warden OX17 1LL and registered at the Land Registry under title number NN184714.

Ramac Holdings (Trading) Limited (hereinafter referred to as “RHTL”) acquired, and continues to own, the freehold of the airfield site situated adjacent to the industrial estate owned by RHL. RHTL’s title to the airfield site is registered at the Land Registry under title numbers NN173059 and NN178087.

AL is the tenant of RHTL and has exclusive use of the airfield site for business purposes as well as occupying Units 1A, 1B, 2, 5 and 7 of the Industrial Estate.

When referred to together hereinafter, the Appletree Industrial Estate and the airfield site are referred to as “the Properties”.

AL’s business is centred on vehicle preparation and refurbishment, primarily “de-fleeting” vehicles at the end of their fleet lives. AL has a wide variety of clients ranging from major multinational car manufacturers, car hire companies and driving schools amongst many other fleet sector companies and agencies.

AL operates the following sites:
a. Kings North, Rochester, Kent – an approximately 25 acre site;
b. Sandwich, Kent – an approximately 20 acre site; and
c. Chipping Warden, Northamptonshire – a site in excess of 50 acres.

As regards the Chipping Warden site, AL started operations there based upon a strategic business decision on account of the Site’s central United Kingdom location and easy access to the Midlands fleet vehicle market, including via the M40 and M1. It was due to one of the key contracts won since opening the site that the further space at Units 1A, 1B and 5 were taken.

As a consequence, in the space of 12 months, the number of AL’s employees at the site has increased from approximately 20 to approximately 220 (including agency staff) as well as the units and storage areas on the industrial estate being used.

In general terms, a description of AL’s business is as follows. Vehicles are generally collected from the client by AL and brought to the site. Once there, the wear and tear of the vehicle is assessed and repaired (this usually amounts to repairing scratches and damaged paintwork, and other work of a similar nature). The vehicle is then also inspected for damage over and above the usual wear and tear before being refurbished, serviced, having the tyres changed and then having a final inspection prior to having marketing photographs taken.

Having taken all of these steps, the vehicles are then stored either in the warehouse facility or on the airfield site (depending on capacity and the type of vehicle/client) and the clients then notified of the vehicle’s availability for sale. Vehicles are then delivered to the client for onward sale.

In addition to storage, the airfield site is also used for road testing and the entire site sees a turnover of approximately 3,000 vehicles per calendar month (although, due to new vehicle registrations, peaks are seen in the months of March and September). Further, approximately 6,000 to 8,000 vehicles are held on site at any time.

The airfield site and its proximity immediately adjacent to the Appletree Industrial Estate is of fundamental importance and critical to the business of AL. There are numerous vehicle movements each day from/to the airfield site and the units on the Industrial Estate as vehicles are moving through the “defleeting” process.

There is no scope (nor is it feasible) to relocate AL’s business to the Rochester or Sandwich sites in Kent.
As is made clear by the foregoing, your Petitioner owns or has an interest in properties and/or businesses within the Chipping Warden area, some of which or part of which are subject to compulsory acquisition under the Bill (whether permanent or temporary) and some of which, whilst not subject to the compulsory purchase proposals of the Bill, are in the immediate vicinity of the proposed works including the tunnelling access shaft, spoil storage sites and spoil removal routes and they and their employees' and contractors' health, safety and wellbeing and their employment, businesses and livelihoods are liable to be injuriously affected by them.

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

3. Your Petitioner’s Concerns

Your Petitioner had thought that an agreement had been negotiated with HS2 Ltd covering these various issues (which generate savings in the cost of the railway amounting to many millions of pounds), as reported to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on 16 March 2015. However, whilst the agreed assurances have been provided, that agreement has not been finalised which has led your Petitioner to submit this further Petition to the House of Lords.

Your Petitioner has many substantial concerns respecting the provisions of the Bill as affecting the Chipping Warden area, the Properties and the business and livelihoods of your Petitioner, their employees and contractors.

Save for concerns of more general application as contained within this Petition, your Petitioner’s principal concerns as regards the current proposals for the HS2 rail link are (at least subject to approval of the Additional Provisions of the Bill):

a. The construction of the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel which will see the northern tip of the airfield site both crossed by the proposed Green Tunnel and rendered redundant as against its current use; and

b. The use of more than 90% of the airfield site for the purposes of a temporary material stockpile but with an associated main compound and satellite compound in the local vicinity.

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

Your Petitioner submits that the scale of the excavation and construction is unprecedented for an area such as Chipping Warden, being in a rural setting in the UK greenbelt. Your Petitioner is greatly concerned by the overall impact with the construction of HS2 as proposed will have upon the neighbourhood, people, the environment and amenity of the Chipping Warden area and upon the fabric, general amenity and value of the Properties, and upon the ongoing viability of the businesses operated by your Petitioner. They contend that these works are unacceptable in this area and should not be permitted. In the alternative, and without prejudice to the previous, the works should be designed, operated and controlled with nothing less than the highest standards of design, constructions practice and mitigation. It remains unclear to your 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 Chipping Warden area and the Properties therein are either unjustified and/or unclear. Your Petitioner is also concerned that no adequate provision has been made to compensate the property owners, traders and businesses of the area according to the actual loss they would suffer. Furthermore, no adequate provision has been made to secure that damage and disruption are kept to a minimum or to secure that in other respects their interests are reasonably safeguarded. No mention has been made of penalties for the Promoters or losses to your Petitioner should any breaches of agreement or policy occur so as to result in injurious affection or harm to buildings, to owners, lessees or to occupiers.

In the ordinary course, your Petitioner understands that a project of this sort would now be subject to much more detailed design work that it appears has been undertaken. Significant detail is missing – as such the current scheme and its impact has not been properly analysed and the most appropriate tunnelling methodology, worksites and route alignment have not been chosen taking all criteria including risk assessment, noise, pollution, vibration, environmental harm, traffic levels, health and safety into account. In consequence, the impacts upon the Chipping Warden area and the Properties and your Petitioner’s business and interests more generally are still ill-defined and your Petitioner is handicapped in it’s ability to engage with the Promoters in a positive fashion to safeguard both the interests of the area, the Properties 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 right to expect the large quantity of information that has been omitted from the Environmental Statement. Your Petitioner is currently awaiting proofs of evidence on a number of issues. Your Petitioner respectfully reserves the right to raise again these issues at such time as your Honourable House comes to consider this Petition.

Your Petitioner is concerned that the powers proposed in the Bill as affecting the Properties and the Chipping Warden area more generally are either unjustified and/or unclear.

Your 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’s and the businesses operated by your Petitioner for whom no adequate provision is made in the Bill.

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

a. Access to environmental information;
b. Public participation in the decision making process; and
c. Access to environmental justice.

Your Petitioner respectfully submits that the Bill deprives your Petitioner of its rights under this Convention, either in whole or in part.

The HS2 base case as regards its plans in the vicinity of the Properties is that there be a Green Tunnel running across and/or beneath the airfield site in particular. The result of this is that extensive surface works are required to support the tunnelling operations (and indeed to allow for the construction and installation of the cover of the Green Tunnel), supplying materials, removing excavated soil and storing the excavated soil. Your Petitioner submits that there will be a significant environmental impact as a consequence of these works which, inter alia, will involve significant disruption and congestion to the local rural road network.

Your Petitioner objects very strongly to the current plans (at least subject to approval of the relevant Additional Provisions) which include the siting of the Green Tunnel on
and/or under the airfield site, and the siting of a temporary spoil storage site on the surface of the airfield site with all the associated construction work, spoil removal and likely site regeneration works which will last many years.

Further, your Petitioner respectfully submits that there is fundamental uncertainty as to the proposals for the path of the Green Tunnel. As is demonstrated by the limits of deviation shown on drawing no. C222-ATK-HY-DPL-020-215300, although the intended path of HS2 (and the associated tunnel) is shown as the centre line cutting across the northern tip of the airfield site, the said limits of deviation show that the actual path of the line could pass outside the northern tip of the airfield site or, more fundamentally, could cross the airfield site much closer to the southern edge, effectively resulting in the loss of approximately 30% of the airfield site as it currently stands.

Indeed, your Petitioner understands that, should the line follow the northern limit of deviation, the line would pass through open green land rather than disrupt land put to commercial use of significant financial worth. Your Petitioner therefore respectfully submits that the route of the line should be altered so that the line follows the northern limit of deviation and by way of Green Tunnel, to the greatest extent possible, the impact of the line upon your Petitioner.

Further, there is the issue of the proposed temporary stockpile. As is made clear at paragraph 2.2.24 of Environmental Statement Community Forum Area report 15 (hereinafter referred to as “CFA15”), under the current proposals, construction of the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel will be managed from the Chipping Warden main compound, the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel south portal satellite compound and the Chipping Warden Tunnel north portal satellite compound.

In effecting this construction, the airfield site has seemingly been set aside in the proposals as being one of the areas referred to in paragraph 2.3.15 of CFA 15 to be used for the storage of topsoil stripped as part of the works prior to it being used when the land is reinstated to its former use. It is not, however, clear as to whether this is the case or whether it will also be used to hold excavated material from other areas.

Paragraph 2.3.43 of CFA15 makes it clear that the main compound will be operational for approximately 5 years and 3 months from 2017 onwards and that, in line with paragraph 2.3.45 of CFA 15, the compound will be used to manage the construction of the Chipping Warden Green Tunnel which itself will take approximately 4 years and 3 months to complete.
Although paragraph 2.3.3 of CFA 15 states that "wherever appropriate" land taken temporarily will be returned to its pre-construction use, by that point the current plans will render at least part of the airfield site redundant in respect of its current use. This is therefore of no assistance to your Petitioner and does not address in any way it's objections.

Your Petitioner therefore objects to the proposals in their current form and respectfully submit that:

a. The line should run as a green tunnel at the northern limit of deviation so as to avoid the northern tip of the airfield site; and

b. The temporary stockpile site should be altered so as to avoid the airfield site and the Properties in their entirety.

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

Your Petitioner is concerned about the definition of "Phase One purposes" set out in Clause 62 to the Bill and, in particular, to the inclusion of the words "otherwise for the purposes of or in connection with Phase One of High Speed 2 or any high speed railway transport system of which Phase One of High Speed 2 forms or is to form part". This could permit the Promoter to use powers for the purposes of development in addition to those needed for constructing a railway. Your Petitioner would therefore seek sufficient safeguards to protect it’s 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 and proposed temporary stockpile sites taking all criteria into account and it can be demonstrated to be necessary for the purposes of the Bill and to be in the public interest. Your Petitioner has not been provided with full justification for the
proposals in the Bill affecting the Properties and they are not satisfied that it is necessary or expedient for the other powers of the Bill to apply at all or in the manner or to the extent proposed.

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

Your Petitioner has significant concerns with regards to the noise, pollution and vibration arising from the 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 constructions and operation of the railway and its associated works and structures to ensure that no noise or vibration can be felt or otherwise experienced in or on the Properties (beyond those generated by your Petitioner’s current uses) 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 measure and penalties
should be in place to safeguard the interests of all those affected by noise, pollution, vibration and health and safety breaches.

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

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

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

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

Having regard to the rural nature of the Chipping Warden area and the businesses being carried out at the Properties, your 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 seek the imposition of more appropriate working hours. Enabling works and construction of the works during the hours currently proposed would cause considerable disruption to the occupiers of the Properties and the businesses and your Petitioner.

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

Your Petitioner is concerned about pollution, dust and dirt produced during the construction of the proposed works. Without prejudice to it’s contention that the Properties, and more specifically the airfield site, should not be used as a construction and spoil removal site, your Petitioner requests that special provision be made to take account of the particular sensitivity of the Properties, the businesses
operated by your Petitioner, the use to which the airfield site in particular is put and the rural setting. Your Petitioner would wish to see binding limits of pollution and airborne dust particulates imposed on the Promoter and the Promoter should monitor pollution levels and dust emissions, at their own cost both before and after enabling works and construction of the works at suitably agreed points at the Properties and in the immediate vicinity. Strict adherence to maximum pollution and particulate levels should be required and where maximum pollution and airborne particulate levels are exceeded the Promoter should be required to cease work and mitigate the excess levels. Your Petitioner requests that provision be made to ensure that the Promoter takes responsibility for the reimbursement of your Petitioner for additional expense caused by dust and dirt such as, for example only, more frequent cleaning of the vehicles situated on the airfield site. Your Petitioner requests the adoption of best practice in dust suppression at all times.

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

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

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

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

Your Petitioner also objects that the compensation provisions of the Bill are inadequate to compensate your Petitioner or its members or others in circumstances
where no land (or interests in land) is acquired by the Promoter under the Bill, but where the value of such land and the properties erected on it is reduced or where such land and the properties erected on it and/or the business interests operated from it is otherwise adversely or injuriously affected by the construction or use of the proposed works. Your 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 they have 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, that prospective lessees of properties will feel that the proposals may so blight some or all of the Properties that they would not be interested in acquiring any part or parts of the Properties, or that prospective or existing lessees will demand a considerably reduced rent, due to the prospect of the works. Further provisions should, they submit, be included in the Bill including provisions respecting the making and assessment of claims for compensation, in indemnifying your Petitioner for any losses it might suffer as the result of unfavourable rent reviews respecting leases insofar as the reduced rent payable (as it may differ from open market rent) is attributable to the proposed works and their effect on the Properties. Furthermore, compensation should be available for any loss (so attributable) which your Petitioner might suffer in the event of them not being able to let or re-let their properties (in whole or in part) to existing or new tenants or in the event of them only being able to do so at a reduced premium or rent.

Your Petitioner further submits that the Promoter should be required to indemnify them from all losses, claims and demands which may be made or suffered in consequence of enabling works and the construction, use or maintenance of the works or the operation of the trains and the maintenance of the tunnels at any time under the Bill, or their failure or want of repair, or in consequence of any act or omission of the Promoter, his contractors or agents in carrying out the operation of the trains and maintenance of the tunnels at any time under the Bill.

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

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

CONCLUSION

Accordingly your Petitioner respectfully submits that:

a. the line should run as a green tunnel, at the northern limit of deviation so as to avoid the northern tip of the airfield site;
b. the temporary stockpile site should be altered so as to avoid the airfield site and the Properties in their entirety;
c. the Promoter should provide satisfactory and complete evidence and justification as to why it is necessary and required to designate the airfield site as a temporary material stockpile;
d. if the Bill is to proceed in its present form the Promoter should amend its proposals so that the line of HS2 passes outside the northern tip of the airfield site and so that the temporary material stockpile site is redrawn so as to exclude the aircraft site in its entirety; and
e. the Bill should not proceed in its present form until provision is made for the Promoter to have proved that all outstanding matters of concern and the
environmental impact on the Properties and the Chipping Warden area more generally that are set out above have been address and resolved to the satisfaction of your 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 they, or someone representing them, in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the Petitioner remain, etc.

Timothy Dean Willis
Solicitor of the Senior Courts of England and Wales
Shoomsmiths LLP
Agent for the Petitioner
To the House of Lords
SESSION 2015 – 16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midland) Bill

THE PETITION of:

(1) AMBROSETTI (UK) LIMITED

Timothy Dean Willis
Agent for and on behalf of the Petitioner
Shoosmiths LLP
2 Colmore Square
38 Colmore Circus
Queensway
Birmingham
B4 6SH

T 03700 884000

19 July 2016