

0735

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2013-14

HIGH SPEED RAIL [LONDON-WEST MIDLANDS]

PETITION

Against the Bill - praying to be heard by counsel, &c

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF: Councillor Raymond Puddifoot MBE
Councillor David Simmonds JP
Councillor John Hensley JP

SHEWETH as follows: -

1. A Bill [hereinafter called "the Bill"] has been introduced into and is now pending in your honourable House intituled "A Bill to Make provision for a railway between Euston in London and a junction with the West Coast Main Line at Handsacre in Staffordshire, with a spur from Old Oak Common in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham to a junction with the Channel Tunnel Rail Link at York Way in the London Borough of Islington and a spur from Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes".
2. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLoughlin, supported by the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, Secretary Theresa May, Secretary Vince Cable, Secretary Iain Duncan Smith, Secretary Eric Pickles, Secretary Owen Paterson, Secretary Edward Davey, and Mr Robert Goodwill.
3. Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bill's objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway mentioned in paragraph 1 above. They include provision for the construction of works, highways and road traffic matters, the compulsory acquisition of land and other provisions relating to the use of land, planning permission, heritage issues, trees and noise. They include clauses which would disapply and modify various enactments relating to special categories of land including burial grounds, consecrated land, commons and open spaces, and other matters, including overhead lines, water, building regulations and party walls, street works and the use of lorries.

4. Clauses 37 to 42 of the Bill deal with the regulatory regime for the railway.
5. Clauses 43 to 65 of the Bill set out a number of miscellaneous and general provisions, including provision for the appointment of a nominated undertaker ["the Nominated Undertaker"] to exercise the powers under the Bill, transfer schemes, provisions relating to statutory undertakers and the Crown, provision about the compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration, reinstatement works and provision about further high speed railway works. Provision is also made about the application of Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.
6. The works proposed to be authorised by the Bill ["Phase One of HS2"] are specified in clauses 1 and 2 of and Schedules 1 and 2 to the Bill. They consist of scheduled works, which are described in Schedule 1 to the Bill and other works, which are described in clause 2 of and Schedules 2 and 3 to the Bill.
7. Your petitioners are the Ward Councillors for the Ickenham ward in the London Borough of Hillingdon and have been elected to represent the interests of their constituents in this area.
8. Your petitioners allege that they and their property, rights and interests in their area and their constituents 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. Your petitioners are residents in the London Borough of Hillingdon and their respective addresses are 14 Tudor Way, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB10 9AB; 63 Old Farm Road, West Drayton, Middlesex UB7 7LE and 29 Court Drive, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB10 0BN.

Introductory

9. Your petitioners oppose the Bill in principle. Whilst your petitioners acknowledge that the principle of the Bill is established at second reading, your petitioners' views on the subject are so strong, they must be recorded in this petition.
10. Your petitioners allege that the Government should have carried out a Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment prior to its decision to proceed with the HS2 Scheme in January 2012. Furthermore, your petitioners consider that the Environmental Statement fails to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, the HS2 proposal will cause harm to the open countryside and Green Belt land, which is arguably contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. Insufficient time has been allowed for comprehensive consideration of the Environmental Statement consultation responses and that there has been a wholly inadequate summary of these responses which has overtly omitted vast amounts of very significant information which should have been included.
11. There are a number of matters which cause great concern to your petitioners, arising from the proposals in the Bill. Some of these points apply generally to the whole length of the line within the London Borough of Hillingdon and some of the points are specific to the Ickenham ward.

General Concerns

12. Your petitioners note that the proposed route for HS2 is in tunnel between the eastern boundary of the Borough until it emerges at Ickenham High Road, West Ruislip. It is then

proposed to go overland as it travels through Ickenham westwards towards the Colne Valley, where, on a Viaduct, it would cross the Grand Union Canal, Mid Colne Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest, the River Colne and a number of lakes in the valley. Your petitioners respectfully submit that the proposal to carry the railway overground through the area between Ruislip and the M25 will give rise to a number of serious adverse environmental impacts which are summarised in the following paragraph. In your petitioners' respectful submission, the cumulative effect of all these adverse impacts requires that a bored tunnel should be constructed instead of an overland route across Ickenham and the Colne Valley.

13. The reasons behind your petitioners' submissions that the high speed railway should be constructed in a tunnel through Ickenham and the Colne Valley include the following:

[a] impact on landscape

[b] impact of noise

[c] impact on highways

[d] impact on public rights of way

[e] heathrow spur

[f] proposed Railhead at Ickenham

[g] impact on Uxbridge Golf Course

[h] closure of Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre [HOAC]

14. Your petitioners believe that the decision not to proceed with a tunnel under the Colne Valley was taken at the outset of the project and has not been reconsidered, despite the environmental impacts in Hillingdon being far greater than envisaged at the outset. HS2 Ltd. have acknowledged that a thorough assessment of a tunnel extension has not been carried out and to your petitioners' knowledge, no costing or detailed engineering works have been done in order to assess the viability of a tunnel extension properly.

15. Given all the concerns and issues arising from the overland route in Hillingdon, your petitioners believe that the additional costs of an extension of the London tunnelling from Ickenham High Road, through Ickenham, and under the Colne Valley lakes would be justified. The following paragraphs set out in more detail your petitioners' justification for a tunnel and they also explain the remedies that your petitioners seek as a minimum in respect of the matters that are covered, should your honourable House not find in favour of a tunnel.

Specific Concerns

Landscape

16. Your petitioners and their constituents are very concerned about the vast quantity of spoil that will be deposited in Ickenham as a direct consequence of the construction works. The areas that have been selected for the "Sustainable Placement" of material have not been properly assessed.

Your petitioners would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker to re-evaluate the areas identified for the deposit of spoil in terms of their suitability and to prepare and agree alternative proposals.

Noise

17. There will be significant adverse noise impacts on your petitioners and their constituents' residential properties as a direct result of the overground high speed railway in Ickenham. Your petitioners wish to ensure that the Nominated Undertaker should provide a detailed site specific noise mitigation plan during the operational phase of the construction works and measures which would provide a workable solution to your petitioners and their constituents.

Highways

18. Your petitioners are very concerned about the impact of high volumes of HGV traffic which will pass through Swakeleys Road between Long Lane and the service road by Ivy House Road which form part of Ickenham Village. This section of the village is a thriving local parade and the impact of significant lorry movements will not only severely disrupt parking but will also negatively impact upon local businesses.

19. There will be very significant increases of traffic levels on the already congested junction of Swakeleys Road and Ickenham Road/Long Lane. This junction which is adjacent to the listed Ickenham Pump is already exposed to constant high volumes of traffic between West Ruislip and Uxbridge via the A40 road. The proposed construction of a railhead at West Ruislip over a seven year period will only serve to make the traffic on the Swakeleys Road/Long Lane junction even more congested than it currently is.

20. Your petitioners are concerned that although the recommended route for HGV traffic may be through Swakeleys Road, there is a risk that this traffic may pass through Long Lane instead. This would have the unwelcome effect of heightening safety concerns in the vicinity of Douay Martyrs School in addition to potential traffic impacts on Hillingdon Circus and side roads such as Swakeleys Drive and Milton Road.

21. A number of other side roads in Ickenham such as Breakspear Road South, Copthall Road West, Greenacres avenue, Thornhill Road, Woodstock Drive and Ivy House Road are already affected by "rat-running" from Northwood, Eastcote and West Ruislip towards Ickenham. Your petitioners' constituents who reside in these side roads will suffer intolerably from the knock-on effects on the existing highly congested main routes such as Long Lane and Swakeleys Road.

22. High volumes of commuter traffic passes along both Breakspear Road South and Harvil Road to and from the A40 via Swakeleys Road. Traffic volumes originating at the rail head at Long Lane, Breakspear Road South and Harvil Road viaduct compound and landfill sites will have a highly significant compound impact on traffic congestion at the Breakspear Road/Swakeleys Road and Harvil Road/Swakeleys Road roundabouts.

23. The U1 U9 and U10 bus routes are vital links for many of your petitioners' older constituents and these services will be greatly impacted by the increased traffic congestion levels.

24. Your petitioners would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker to at all times during the construction works maintain adequate access through Ickenham for your petitioners and their constituents and will prepare and implement HGV traffic management plans

which will be strictly adhered to. Your petitioners also require that the Nominated Undertaker will take all practicable steps to minimise disruption to your petitioners and their constituents during the course of the construction works.

Public rights of way

25. The proposed diversions of public rights of way are so lengthy that they are unacceptable and certain footpaths, U45 U46 U47 U49 U51 U84, are to be diverted on to busy roads with no footways thereby representing a potential danger to life and limb. Your petitioners would request your honourable House to require that the Nominated Undertaker re-evaluates the proposed diversions of the footpaths so as to eradicate any risk to public safety and also to ensure that the extent of the proposed diversions are reasonable.

Heathrow Spur

26. The Bill contains "passive provision" for a Heathrow spur carrying the high speed railway to Heathrow Airport, consisting of significant works underground primarily under the Colne Valley north embankment.

27. Your petitioners are of the view that there is no business case for a Heathrow spur and there is no positive cost benefit case for the disruption it would cause during construction or operation as part of Phase Two of the project. Your petitioners ask that the Bill is amended so that the passive provision for the spur is removed.

Proposed Railhead at Ickenham

28. Your petitioners would request your honourable House to require that the proposed railhead at Ickenham be operational as soon as possible and well in advance of any tunnelling works, in order to minimise the transportation of spoil by road. Your petitioners are also concerned about the adverse impacts arising from the building of, and the operation of the railhead, and would request your honourable House to require that the Nominated Undertaker design a scheme to fully mitigate these.

Uxbridge Golf Course

29. Your petitioners are aware that the proposals include a construction route through Uxbridge golf course. Your petitioners request your honourable House to require that the Nominated Undertaker re-evaluates the need for this proposed new route and work with your petitioners to assess the feasibility of using existing nearby construction routes to the east to alleviate further damage. Your petitioners believe that the Bill as it stands makes no provision to allow Uxbridge Golf Course to operate satisfactorily on the site during the construction works.

30. The proposals for construction of new pylons will significantly affect at least three of the eighteen holes of the golf course which means that it will no longer be possible for it to be used as an eighteen hole competition course.

31. The proposals as a whole seriously call into question the future viability of the golf course and the provisions necessary for its protection have been omitted from the Bill. If the course is forced to close permanently, your petitioners consider that it would be reasonable for the Nominated

Undertaker to be required to compensate the landowners and Uxbridge Golf Club fully for any losses incurred and to make a further substantial contribution to the Community Fund.

Loss of facilities at Hillingdon Outdoor Activities Centre [HOAC]

32. Your petitioners and their constituents enjoy the community based HOAC facilities which are located in Harefield. HOAC is a unique facility and will inevitably close if the Bill is enacted in its current form. Your petitioners therefore reiterate their request that a bored tunnel should be constructed instead of an overland route across Ickenham and the Colne Valley. Alternatively, if HOAC is forced to close, your petitioners would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker to identify and implement an equivalent site for HOAC within an area of five miles of its existing location in Harefield.

33. 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, & cc.

Councillor Raymond Puddifoot MBE *COUNCILLOR*

Councillor David Simmonds JP *COUNCILLOR*

Councillor John Hensley JP *COUNCILLOR*

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2013 - 14

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST-MIDLANDS)
PETITION OF COUNCILLOR RAYMOND PUDDIFOOT MBE
COUNCILLOR DAVID SIMMONDS JP
COUNCILLOR JOHN HENSLEY JP

Against the Bill - By Counsel, & c

Councillor Raymond Puddifoot MBE

Councillor David Simmonds

Councillor John Hensley