

**IN PARLIAMENT**

**HOUSE OF COMMONS**

**SESSION 2013–14**

**HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL**

**PETITION**

Against – on merits – 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 Philip Stephen Riley and Jean Margaret Riley

SHEWETH as follows:-

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced and is now pending in your honourable House entitled “A Bill to make provision for a railway between Euston in London and a junction with the West Coast Main Line at Handsacre in Staffordshire, with a spur from 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 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 parents in a household of five people, including our three children Alexandra (21), Jessica (19) and Matthew (16). We live at Snowford House, in the hamlet of Snowford Hill near the village of Long Itchington, some three quarters of a mile from the Fosse Way, close to the point where HS2 is proposed to cross this road. We have lived here as a family for 10 years.
8. Your Petitioners and their property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
9. Your petitioners principal concern as a family is the closure of our road, the Leamington Road/Long Itchington Road, as it crosses the Fosse Way. Our lives revolve around schools in Warwick, and the facilities available in Leamington Spa, and wider access to the Midlands via the M40 motorway. We therefore as a family will cross the Fosse Way dozens of times every week going to and from our daily activities. The closure of our principal route to our local towns and the proposed changes to the Fosse will entail us making a detour onto the Fosse Way and then back off the Fosse Way approximately a quarter of a mile later (and vice versa). The Fosse Way itself is a notoriously fast road, in particular as it cuts through the Leamington Road/Long Itchington Road, and we are concerned that having to make two manoeuvres every time we wish to cross, to join and exit, rather than, as now,

one manoeuvre, a simple crossing, will be significantly more dangerous. This is not only true for us – but also the 1,000s of people who live in Long Itchington and further beyond there, who travel into Leamington Spa/Warwick, or use the route to access the M40 motorway, every day.

10. In addition, the Leamington Road/Long Itchington Road on both sides of the Fosse Way is part of the national sustrans network, and its closure will force people riding bikes onto the Fosse Way – a very dangerous road for cyclists. Your petitioners are both cyclists of some 15 years standing, with much experience, and we would avoid cycling on the Fosse Way wherever possible. This closure will force us now onto that road for virtually every cycling trip we undertake, or our children undertake, when heading into Leamington Spa or beyond. We live in a family home, as do many others nearby, so children are regular cyclists along the Leamington Road/Long Itchington Road. This closure will affect all of them, and will seriously undermine the confidence of any parent who would normally encourage their children to cycle into Leamington and back from Long Itchington and surrounding villages.
11. Your petitioners object to this forced closure and respectfully submit that the bill be amended by the Committee by means of support for the proposal by the local parish councils that HS2 create a green tunnel for the line as it approaches and then passes the village of Offchurch. As well as all of the other benefits this would bring for the villagers in Offchurch, such a green tunnel would make the reinstatement of the Long Itchington road a simple, inexpensive matter, allowing drivers and cyclists to safely cross the Fosse Way in as quick and simple a manner as possible before continuing their journeys to/from Leamington/Warwick and the M40 etc.
12. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner(s) respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, so far affecting your Petitioner(s), should not be allowed to pass into law.
13. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner(s) and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner(s).

YOUR PETITIONER(S) 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 Petitioner(s) 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 Petitioner(s) in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioner(s) will ever pray, &c.

Signed

PHILIP STEPHEN RILEY

JEAN MARGARET RILEY

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2013-14

**HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL**

PETITION OF PHILIP STEPHEN RILEY & JEAN MARGARET RILEY

Against the Bill – On Merits – By Counsel &c

[Faint, illegible text, likely a signature or stamp]