

0737

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 Philip Corthorne MCIPD  
Councillor John Riley  
Councillor Brian Crowe

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 West Ruislip 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 and those of 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 76 Seaton Gardens, Ruislip Manor, Middlesex, HA4 0AY, 114 Bury Street, Ruislip, Middlesex, HA4 7TG and 9 Brook Drive, Ruislip, Middlesex, HA4 8AE.

### **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 and 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 West Ruislip 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 amenity

[b] impact on highways

[c] impact of noise and dust

[d] impact on Ruislip High Street

[e] impact on Ruislip Golf Course and Ruislip Rifle Club

[f] 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**

#### **Loss of amenity**

16. Your petitioners and their constituents enjoy the green belt and the open land, both from a visual and recreational perspective, which is located in the vicinity of Breakspear Road. This area will not only be disrupted by the construction traffic but your petitioners and their constituents are also concerned that this road and its borders will cease to have any amenity value as a consequence of very significant amounts of spoil being deposited upon them. Your petitioners would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker to minimise the amount of spoil deposited.

## **Highways**

17. Your petitioners are very concerned about the length of time proposed for construction works of the tunnel portal and the railhead at West Ruislip with the consequent disruption that this will cause to your petitioners and their constituents from the lorry movements and other related construction activities. This will result in traffic delays and congestion in West Ruislip including High Road Ickenham, Ladygate Lane and Breakspear Road. Bus journeys and other forms of road transport will also be adversely affected.

18. There are already very limited routes through which your petitioners and their constituents can move from, to and within West Ruislip. These routes are already subjected to great pressure and will be unable to withstand the additional volumes of movements generated by the HGV traffic.

19. There are specific additional concerns arising from the congestion and lack of safety relating to the road access to the proposed tunnel portal and railhead. The proposed use of Hill Lane and another disused minor opening to provide access to Ickenham Road in close proximity to West Ruislip station is fundamentally flawed in light of the congestion, difficulty of access and limited visibility which will inevitably arise.

20. Your petitioners would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker to at all times during the construction works maintain adequate access through West Ruislip for your petitioners and their constituents and will also take all practicable steps to minimise disruption to your petitioners and their constituents during the course of the construction works.

## **Noise and dust**

21. There will be significant adverse noise impacts on your petitioners and their constituents' residential properties as a result of the construction of the tunnel portal and the overground railway in West Ruislip. Your petitioner's constituents who reside in The Greenway are particularly vulnerable to both noise and dust arising from the construction works. Your petitioners would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker to provide a detailed site specific noise and dust mitigation plan during the operational phase of the construction works and measures which would provide a workable solution for your petitioners and their constituents.

## **Ruislip High Street**

22. The High Street is a thriving local shopping centre which exists for the benefit of your petitioners and their constituents. Construction traffic will need to be routed to West End Road in Ruislip through the High Street which will have very damaging consequences for your petitioners and their constituents. The Nominated Undertaker should therefore be required to ensure that alternative routes for construction traffic are both considered and provided.

## **Ruislip Golf Course and Ruislip Rifle Club**

23. Your petitioners are concerned that the construction of a tunnel portal at West Ruislip will permanently require part of the land currently used at Ruislip golf course which will result in the loss of two of the eighteen holes. This means that it will no longer be possible for it to be used as an eighteen hole competition course.

24. Your petitioners are also concerned that the construction of a tunnel portal at West Ruislip will also permanently require the use of the land currently occupied by Ruislip Rifle Club. This Club currently has 100 members, more than half of whom have been members for a period in excess of 10 years. There are no local alternative facilities of a similar nature for the use of your petitioners and their constituents.

25. Your petitioners are concerned that the Rifle Club will have no option but to permanently close during the construction of HS2 and it will not reopen. With regard to the Golf Club, this may also have no option other than to close during the construction of HS2 due to the loss of part of its facility and this may in turn lead to the Club being closed permanently. If your honourable House does not require the railway to be in a tunnel, your petitioners and their constituents would request your honourable House to require the Nominated Undertaker to provide suitable solutions, to the satisfaction of the landowners and the Rifle and Golf Clubs, to enable the Clubs to continue as viable businesses.

26. In the unfortunate event that the facilities at the Clubs have to be closed, your petitioners consider that it would be reasonable for the nominated undertaker to compensate the landowners and the Clubs 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]**

27. 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.

28. 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.

Councillor Philip Corthorne

Councillor John Riley

Councillor Brian Crowe

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2013-14

HIGH SPEED RAIL [LONDON-WEST MIDLANDS]

PETITION OF

COUNCILLOR PHILIP CORTHORNE

COUNCILLOR JOHN RILEY

COUNCILLOR BRIAN CROWE

Against the Bill - By Counsel & c

Councillor Philip Corthorne

Councillor John Riley

Councillor Brian Crowe