

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2013-2014

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

PETITION

Against the Bill — 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 THE BERKSHIRE, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE
AND OXFORDSHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST

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 ("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.

7. Your Petitioners are the Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust, which was established in 1959, and their objects are to undertake and promote the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats including the restoration and creation of such habitats; to promote public understanding of, and support for, the natural world; and to campaign in support of sustainable principles and practices for the protection of the natural environment. Your Petitioners have 50,000 members and 1,350 volunteers, many of whom live and work in the area that will be affected by the construction and operation of the railway authorised by the Bill. Your Petitioners own or manage 85 nature reserves, totalling over 2,400 ha, including the Finemere Woods and Meadows and Calvert Jubilee nature reserves, which will be directly affected by the construction and operation of the railway authorised by the Bill. Your Petitioners work beyond their nature reserves to promote their objects throughout their region, and are recognised by local authorities across that region as a consultee on planning applications, highways works, and other matters affecting the area in which those whom it represents live. Your Petitioners have met with representatives of the promoters of the Bill on a number of occasions both in bilateral meetings and in community forums. Your Petitioners are a member of the HS2 Ecology Technical Group established to provide the means for engagement, consultation and information sharing in order to achieve the best possible outcome for ecology from the high speed rail proposals. The group has met occasionally with representatives of the promoters of the Bill. Your Petitioners are represented nationally by the Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts, who have been represented at the HS2 Ministerial NGO Roundtable which has met regularly during the preparation of the Bill.

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

Our own Nature Reserves

9. Your Petitioners' access to property at Finemere Woods and Meadows is within the limits of land to be acquired and used as shown on the plans deposited with the Bill. Sheet 5-22 of the Sections that accompany the Bill (Volume 5.1 Colne Valley – Quanton) show that the access would be restricted to 2.1m in both height and width, restricting the ability of your Petitioners to manage the nature reserve. Your Petitioners request that the plans are adjusted to provide a minimum height of 3m and a minimum width of 4m.

10. Your Petitioners support the provision of access for the management of Finemere Woods and Meadows nature reserve alongside the National Grid substation proposed adjacent to the nature reserve as shown on Sheet 2-47 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.1 Colne Valley – Quanton). This access is necessary to replace one lost to your Petitioners as a result of the proposals in the Bill. Your Petitioners request that this access provision remains part of the Bill.

11. Your Petitioners are concerned that the current parking provision for visitors accessing Finemere Woods and Meadows is within the limits of land to be acquired and used as shown on Sheet 2-47 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.1 Colne Valley – Quainton), and is shown in the Environmental Statement as being required for an alternative use. Your Petitioners' members' rights and those of the general public, to enjoy the nature reserve would be lost. Your Petitioners request that provision is made for alternative informal parking to allow enjoyment of the nature reserve by their members and the general public.

12. Your Petitioners are concerned that the current proposals affect their property at Finemere Woods and Meadows, within the limits of land to be acquired, and require the removal of two stock pens currently used to manage the nature reserve without new provision being required as shown on Sheet 2-47 and Sheet 2-54 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.1 Colne Valley - Quainton). Your Petitioners' property is directly affected, as are their interests as the proposals would affect the ability to manage the nature reserve appropriately for the benefit of the natural environment. Your Petitioners request that provision is made for facilities to allow the appropriate handling of stock to ensure adequate management of the nature reserve.

13. Your Petitioners consider that the approach taken to evaluating the ecological impact of the proposals fails to recognise the "ecological blight" that the developing scheme has had on their nature reserve at Finemere Woods and Meadows. Your Petitioners secured land to improve it for wildlife, but have not carried out works to create wildlife-rich habitat because of the uncertainties surrounding the scheme. Your Petitioners believe that it is not reasonable to evaluate the ecological value of the land on the basis of the existing habitats. Your Petitioners' property is directly affected, as are their interests. Your Petitioners request that evaluation of the ecological impacts of the scheme should account for the "blight" the scheme has had, and calculations of the impact, for example for the purposes of evaluating appropriate levels of mitigation or compensation, should be based on the ecological value the habitat would have reached had it been managed for improved wildlife value.

14. Your Petitioners are concerned that the current proposals for ecological mitigation at Finemere Woods and Meadows, within the limits of land to be acquired as shown on Sheet 2-47 and Sheet 2-54 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.1 Colne Valley – Quainton) has in itself subsequent ecological impacts which are not recognised, and therefore not compensated for. Your Petitioners purchased that part of the nature reserve to restore species-rich grassland, whereas the mitigation and compensation proposals that accompany the scheme require the planting of significant areas with hedging to attempt to mitigate the impact of the scheme on Bechstein's bats. Your Petitioners' property is directly affected, as are their interests as the proposals would affect their ability to manage the nature reserve appropriately for the benefit of the natural environment and prevent access to other parts of the nature reserve restricting the ability to manage those appropriately as well. Your Petitioners request that suitable mitigation and compensation is provided for the loss of those parts of the nature reserve impacted through securing ecological improvements within the existing boundary of the limits of land to be acquired, or by incorporating additional land within the limits of land to be acquired.

15. Your Petitioners are concerned that the current proposals for access mitigation at Finemere Woods and Meadows, within the limits of land to be acquired as shown on Sheet 2-54 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.1 Colne Valley – Quainton), has ecological impacts which are not recognised, and therefore not compensated for. Your Petitioners purchased that part of the nature reserve to restore species-rich grassland, whereas the proposals require the creation of an embankment to elevate the access above the proposed railway and adjacent line and additional planting. Your Petitioners' property is directly affected, as are their interests as the proposals would affect their ability to manage the nature

reserve appropriately for the benefit of the natural environment. Your Petitioners request that suitable mitigation and compensation is provided for the loss of those parts of the nature reserve impacted through securing ecological improvements within the existing boundary of the limits of land to be acquired, or by incorporating additional land within the limits of land to be acquired.

16. Your Petitioners are concerned that the proposals within the Bill would prevent the use of the nature reserve at Calvert Jubilee as a nature reserve for the enjoyment of our members and the general public. Your Petitioners believe that the proposals, which result in the new railway running alongside the nature reserve, and the creation of the Calvert Railhead Main Compound to the North and East of the nature reserve, as shown on Sheet 2-57 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.2 Calvert - Burton Green), would result in such continuous and extensive disturbance to the area so as to prevent the quiet enjoyment of the nature reserve. Your Petitioners are unaware of any proposals to compensate for the loss of the nature reserve as a resource: Your Petitioners' property is directly affected by the proposals, as are their interests and those of their members. Your Petitioners request that suitable compensation for the loss of the nature reserve as a resource for the local community, your Petitioners' members and the general public is provided. This could be in the form of a Country Park which would ensure the community has access to the wider countryside. Your Petitioners support the proposals brought forward by the National Trust within their petition against the Hybrid Bill for the Calvert area to be subject to a masterplan that would take into account all of the cumulative effects of the various schemes in this area (including HS2, East-West railway and the Energy from Waste plant), utilising a landscape scale approach.

17. Your Petitioners are concerned that, in the absence of compensation for the loss of the nature reserve at Calvert Jubilee as a community resource, the proposals within the Bill would prevent the use of the current parking provision and access for management at Calvert Jubilee nature reserve as shown on Sheet 2-57 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.2 Calvert - Burton Green). Your Petitioners' property is directly affected by the proposals, as are their interests and those of their members. Your Petitioners request that reasonable provision is made for parking for visitors to the nature reserve, and that suitable access is maintained to allow appropriate management of the nature reserve.

Other Nature Conservation Impacts

18. Your Petitioners consider that the Bill as drafted will not achieve the stated aim of 'no net loss' of biodiversity. Your Petitioners consider that the impacts the proposals would have on biodiversity assets are insufficiently mitigated and compensated for, leading to a significant overall reduction in biodiversity value resulting from the proposals. Furthermore, your Petitioners are concerned that the stated aim should be to achieve a 'net gain' for biodiversity, in line with paragraph 10 of the recommendations of the Environmental Audit Select Committee of your honourable House in their recent report on HS2 and the Environment (7th April 2014), through the works undertaken to mitigate and compensate for the impacts of the proposals on wildlife and through inclusion of enhancements for biodiversity. Your Petitioners' aims relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats are directly affected by the impact, mitigation and compensation associated with the proposals. Your Petitioners request that a clause is added to the Bill requiring a net gain for biodiversity to be secured in perpetuity through the works, mitigation and compensation and appropriate funding is allocated. Your Petitioners request that suitable mitigation and compensation is provided through securing ecological improvements within the existing boundary of the limits of land to be acquired, or by incorporating additional land within the limits of land to be acquired.

19. Your Petitioners share the concerns raised by the Environmental Audit Select Committee of your honourable House in their recent report on HS2 and the Environment (7th April 2014) relating to

biodiversity offsetting as set out in paragraphs 13 to 17 in their recommendations. Your Petitioners' aims relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats are directly affected by the approach taken to biodiversity offsetting to secure mitigation and compensation for ecological impacts by the scheme proponents. In order to meet those concerns, your Petitioners request that provisions are made within the Bill for the Promoters to:

- (a) establish an adequately resourced, publically accountable and independent Biodiversity Group to measure and monitor local and HS2 line-wide biodiversity impacts, mitigation and compensation in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy described in the National Planning Policy Framework, in order to ensure a biodiversity net gain through the adherence to relevant British Standards, Government Standing Guidance, current CIEEM EcIA Guidelines and an independently set and government approved HS2 Biodiversity Offsetting Metric;
- (b) ensure that suitable independent experts are appointed to the Biodiversity Group to advise and approve any ecological impact assessment, the selection of mitigation and compensation measures and subsequent monitoring;
- (c) establish a ring fenced Biodiversity Compensation and Offsetting fund to ensure a biodiversity net gain (as defined within an independently and government approved HS2 Biodiversity Offsetting Metric that is grounded in Defra researched habitat creation and restoration cost analyses) is implemented through the Biodiversity Group.

20. Your Petitioners are concerned that the proposals do not make sufficient provision to ensure that mitigation and compensation measures for ecological impacts (see Table 1) are fully secured as currently such measures are subject to considerations including those of cost. Your Petitioners' aims relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats are directly affected by the inadequacies of such measures. Your Petitioners request that the Bill adequately secures mitigation and compensation measures both financially and in perpetuity.

Table 1. Known sites directly impacted by Hybrid Bill proposals.

Site Designation	Site Name	Plan reference
Sites with direct impacts within the limits of land required		
BBOWT Reserve (inc. Finemere Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI))	Finemere Wood and Meadows	Sheets 2-50, 2-54, 2-47
BBOWT Reserve and Local Wildlife Site (LWS)	Calvert Jubilee	Sheet 2-57
SSSI	Mid Colne Valley	Sheets 2-06, 2-07, 2-08
LWS	Shardeloes Lake	Sheets 2-20, 2-21
LWS/Ancient Woodland (AW)	Sibley's Coppice	Sheets 2-24, 2-25
LWS	Grendon and Doddershall Meadows	Sheets 2-47
LWS	Calvert Railway Station	Sheets 2-56, 2-57
LWS	Turweston Manor Grassland	Sheets 2-74, 2-75, 2-76
LWS/AW	Decoypond Wood	Sheet 2-56
LWS	Barton Hartshorn Railway Wood	Sheet 2-66
LWS	Calvert Brick Pits, Great Moor Sailing Club	Sheets 2-57
LWS/AW	Hedgemoor and Farthing Woods	Sheets 2-22, 2-24
LWS/AW	Mantle's Wood	Sheets 2-22, 2-24
Local Nature Reserve (LNR)	Denham Quarry Park	Sheet 2-03

LNR	Denham Country Park	Sheet 2-02
AW	Battlesford Wood	Sheets 2-06, 2-08
AW	Jones' Hill wood	Sheets 2-28, 2-29
AW	Pinnocks Wood	Sheets 1-49, 1,50
AW	Jenkins Wood	Sheet 2-25
AW	Sheephouse Wood (non SSSI section)	Sheets 2-55, 2-56
AW	No Man's Wood	Sheets 2-22, 2-23
Outside of limits of land required, but with conservation interests directly affected		
LWS	Aylesbury Sewage Works LWS	Sheet 2-41
SSSI	Sheephouse Wood	Sheets 2-55, 2-56

This table lists only designated sites known to be affected. Habitats of principal importance occur on undesignated sites and may occur on areas currently un-surveyed. Biodiversity interests will be affected on other sites beyond the limits of land required. Other sites may lie outside the limits of land required but within the limits of deviation. Such sites have not been included within this table.

21. Your Petitioners are concerned that the information provided in the Environmental Statement (ES) which was subject to public consultation, a summary of which was presented to Parliament, was inaccurate and insufficient to allow a detailed consideration of impacts including cumulative and temporary impacts. Your Petitioners consider that the ecological baseline information provided within the ES is incomplete, that the approach taken is not 'precautionary nor consistent with the approaches set out in the *Scope and Methodology Report (SMR) Addendum Report: Ecological Field Survey Methods and Standards*, that the ES confuses the terms mitigation and compensation throughout, which on occasions are double-counted, and that the ES selectively reports from other available information. Your Petitioners agree with the paragraphs 11 and 12 in the recommendations of the Environmental Audit Select Committee of your honourable House in their recent report on HS2 and the Environment (7th April 2014) as they relate to these concerns. Your Petitioners are of the view that these deficiencies render the ES unfit for the purpose for which it is intended. Your Petitioners' aims relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats are directly affected as a result of decisions made on the basis of that information. Your Petitioners believe that further survey work in relation to habitats and species of principal importance and species protected by legislation along the route should be undertaken, with further public consultation. Your Petitioners furthermore believe that the information arising from additional surveys should be considered by Parliament, or the select committee, and appropriate modifications to the proposals required.

22. Your Petitioners are concerned that the current proposals could be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of Bechstein's bats (*Myotis bechsteinii*) at a favourable conservation status in an area within the Bernwood Forest, part of their natural range. Your Petitioners believe that failure to ensure that suitable and sufficient work is undertaken to protect the population of Bechstein's bats in Bernwood Forest would conflict with the requirements of the European Habitats Directive, making works non-compliant with that Directive, and preventing Natural England from licensing works ostensibly permitted by the Bill. Your Petitioners' interests regarding biodiversity are directly affected by impacts on such protected species. Your Petitioners request that provision is made either to avoid such impacts, or to mitigate such impacts to an acceptable level. Your Petitioners request that sufficient survey work is undertaken to adequately inform such avoidance and mitigation work, which could take a variety of forms, that monitoring is required during construction works and operation of the proposals to ensure the population is not adversely affected, and that provision is made for remedial works should they be required.

23. Your Petitioners are concerned that the current proposals would be detrimental to the maintenance of populations of barn owls within the vicinity of the land potentially required. Your Petitioners are particularly concerned that mitigation proposals for such impacts whilst acknowledged within the ES are not secured and currently rely on the agreement of landowners beyond the limits of the land potentially required without any mechanism having been secured to ensure such agreement. Your Petitioners also believe that mitigation proposals designed to reduce the impacts on barn owls should include habitat provision in suitable locations beyond the limits of land to be acquired in addition to the provision of nest boxes. Your Petitioners' interests regarding biodiversity are directly affected by impacts on such protected species. Your Petitioners request that the Bill includes provision to ensure the proposed mitigation and compensation is secured and that additional habitat is provided sufficiently distant from the proposals to be effective.

24. Your Petitioners object to the level of loss of ancient woodland associated with this proposal. Ancient woodland can support ecological communities of the highest wildlife value and represents, as stated by HS2 Ltd, an irreplaceable resource. There is insufficient evidence suggesting that translocation of ancient woodland is successful. As ancient woodland is irreplaceable, losses cannot be fully mitigated. Compensation is the only option, and as proposed is insufficient. The loss of ancient woodlands such as those listed below will affect your Petitioners' interests relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats. Your Petitioners request that the route is modified or tunnels are used to minimise the loss of ancient woodland and other ecological interests. Your Petitioners request that the Bill be amended to increase the tunnelling in the Chilterns, preferably to include a continuous tunnel under the Chilterns and specifically to ensure:

- a) The Northern (or any other) tunnel portal would not be situated within ancient woodland
- b) No structures or boreholes are situated within ancient woodland
- c) 10.2ha of irreplaceable ancient woodland within the Chilterns AONB are retained.

Furthermore, your Petitioners request that more compensation for the losses and impacts on ancient woodland be provided and secured in perpetuity.

Table 2. Ancient Woodlands affected by the scheme as proposed

Ancient Woodland Name	Plan Reference
Sites with direct impacts within the limits of land required	
Battlesford Wood	Sheets 2-06, 2-08
Decoypond Wood	Sheet 2-56
Farthings Wood	Sheets 2-22, 2-24
Jones' Hill Wood	Sheets 2-28, 2-29
Mantle's Wood	Sheets 2-22, 2-23, 2-24
Pinnocks Wood	Sheets 1-49, 1,50
Sheephouse Wood	Sheets 2-55, 2-56
Sibley's Coppice	Sheets 2-24, 2-25
Sites adjacent to land required with potential impacts	
Bow Wood	Sheets 2-15, 2-17
Finemere Wood	Sheets 2-50, 2-54
Greatsea Wood	Sheet 2-55

Northmoor Hill Wood	Sheets 2-06, 2-08
Romer Wood	Sheet 2-55
Rushmore Wood	Sheet 2-28
Sites potentially impacted	
Great Halings Wood	Sheets 2-08, 2-09
Juniper Wood	Sheet 2-09
Little Halings Wood	Sheets 2-08, 2-09
Havenfield Wood	Sheet 2-27
Jenkins Wood	Sheet 2-25
No Man's Wood	Sheets 2-22, 2-23
Weedon Hill Wood	Sheet 2-21

This table lists only designated sites known to be affected. Ancient Woodlands may occur on undesignated sites and may occur on areas currently un-surveyed. Biodiversity interests may be affected on other Ancient Woodlands beyond the limits of land required. Other Ancient Woodlands may lie outside the limits of land required but within the limits of deviation. Such sites have not been included within this table.

25. Your Petitioners are concerned about the impact of the proposals outlined by the Bill on the ecological connectivity of the landscape caused by physical barriers and the impact of this on the ability of species of principal importance and species protected by legislation to move effectively through the landscape. Ecological connectivity and “the establishing of coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures” is a key objective of the National Planning Policy Framework. It is essential that connectivity is maintained as much as possible during and after construction of the railway and that in particular satisfactory substitutions for existing animal crossing points are constructed as part of the works. Your Petitioners’ interests relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats are affected by the loss of connectivity caused by the proposals outlined in the Bill. Your Petitioners request that species modelling work is carried out as part of a scientifically led scheme using up-to-date accurate data to determine the locations of existing and potential future connected ecological networks. Your Petitioners further request that this modelling is used to guide the locations of green bridges, bored tunnels and underpasses instead of, or in addition to, those currently proposed in the Bill.

26. Your Petitioners are concerned about the impacts of balancing ponds in Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs). LWSs are important wildlife areas, and the protection of these areas is vital to help maintain our valuable wildlife heritage. Your Petitioners’ interests relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats are affected by the siting of a balancing pond within the grassland and Grendon and Doddershall Grassland LWS as shown on Sheet 2-47 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.1 Colne Valley – Quainton) and also by the siting of a balancing pond within Turweston Manor Grassland LWS as shown on Sheet 2-74 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.2 Calvert – Burton Green). The introduction of balancing ponds will change the character and alter the ecology of these areas. Your Petitioners request that balancing ponds should be sited outside of LWSs due to the important wildlife in these areas. The remaining balancing ponds should only be constructed once other Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SuDS) options have been considered in consultation with the local authority. If balancing ponds are required, they should not be artificially lined, and they should be used to support ecological enhancement and maintained with some water and vegetation at all times.

27. Your Petitioners are concerned that proposals to address impacts arising from the Bill for rail sidings at Calvert as shown on Sheet 2-56 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.2 Calvert – Burton Green) may be requested through the petitioning process and that it may be proposed that the rail sidings are relocated further south between Sheepphouse Wood and Finemere Woods and Meadows as shown on Sheet 2-54 of the Plans that accompany the Bill (Volume 2.1 Colne Valley – Quainton). Your Petitioners are concerned that these proposals could compromise ecological mitigation and compensation to be secured under the Bill in this same area. Of particular concern to your Petitioners is the population of Bechstein's bats in the Bernwood Forest area, which are susceptible to both noise and light disturbance. Your Petitioners' interests relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats would be affected by any decision to relocate the rail sidings at Calvert. Your Petitioners request, should it be decided to relocate the rail sidings within this area, that they are located so that they do not interfere with ecological mitigation and compensation proposals in that same area, particularly those in relation to protecting the population of Bechstein's bats. Your Petitioners further request that any work required under the Bill within the area between Sheepphouse Wood and Finemere Woods and Meadows contributes to improved ecological connectivity and does not compromise ecological mitigation and compensation proposals.

28. Your Petitioners are concerned about the impact of construction works on chalk streams, specifically those associated with the River Misbourne and Shardeloes Lake LWS. Chalk streams are globally rare habitats and therefore special measures should be put into place to protect them. Your Petitioners' interests relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats are affected by any such impacts. Your Petitioners request that surveys are carried out to inform the current ecological value in these habitats, and surveys must continue during construction and operation. If surveying demonstrates any adverse impacts during construction, construction in this area must stop until the cause is identified and negative impacts rectified. Any adverse impacts during operation must be addressed immediately. Surveys should be undertaken independently and at the expense of the nominated undertaker, and the survey method should be agreed with relevant stakeholders.

29. Your Petitioners consider that inadequate provision is made for monitoring of ecological mitigation and compensation during and post construction of the proposals within the Bill. Your Petitioners' interests relating to the conservation of wildlife species and their habitats are affected. Your Petitioners request that the Environmental Minimum Requirements that accompany the Bill are altered to ensure that monitoring of ecological mitigation and compensation during and post construction of the proposals is carried out, and actions are taken to remedy any deficiencies that are identified.

30. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed variously above, and a clause added to the Bill requiring a net gain for biodiversity to be secured, and that the Bill is revised as a result of further ecological investigations, the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

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 such of the clauses and provisions of the Bill as affect 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.

Matthew Iain Jackson

Agent for:

The Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2013-14

HIGH SPEED RAIL
(LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS)
BILL

PETITION OF THE BERKSHIRE, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE
AND OXFORDSHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST

AGAINST, By Counsel, &c.

Mr Matthew Iain Jackson
c/o BBOWT
1, Armstrong Road
Littlemore
Oxon
OX4 4XT