

IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF  
COMMONS  
SESSION 2013-2014.

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

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 **Mr. Michael and Mrs. Gillian Hartley**

SHEWETH as follows:-

A bill (hereinafter referred to as "the Bill") has been introduced 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 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."

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 Iain Duncan Smith, Secretary Eric Pickles, Secretary Owen Paterson, Secretary Edward Davey, and Mr. Robert Goodwill.

Clauses 1 to 36 set out the Bills 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.

Your Petitioners are Mr. Michael and Mrs. Gillian Hartley (hereinafter referred to as "the Petitioner" the owner occupier of Wayside, Stockwell Heath, Staffordshire WS15 3LZ ("the Property") which is located 2.3 kilometres from works provided for in the Phase 1 bill and 214 metres from the preferred route for Phase 2 of the railway currently under consultation. Your Petitioner requires shortly to move to a more urban environment to facilitate late life needs and be less dependant on rural transport issues but finds that the blight created by this Bill have taken away the fundamentals to achieve a sale or provide any compensating provisions. Furthermore the particular area in which we are located is a likely to be virtually cut off by the construction processes with pursuant injurious affects on your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is directly affected as clauses 51 and 52 of the Bill before you, give right of entry to your Petitioner's property and furthermore the principles and decisions reached in respect of Phase 1 will set standards for the Hybrid Bill for Phase 2 where it will be substantially more difficult to challenge such arrangements. Your Petitioner's rights interests and property are therefore injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for the reasons set out below.

#### **Access to land for surveying**

- 1.1 Your Petitioner is concerned that rights of entry and authorisations to enter land for surveying purposes goes beyond the rights that are reasonably necessary. Your Petitioner notes that these clauses are primarily designed for preparatory work to be undertaken. Your Petitioner submits that the powers in the Hybrid Bill are too broad and should be subject to independent oversight.
- 1.2 Your Petitioner requests that Clauses 51 and 52 should be amended so that Land can only be accessed with the landowner's and occupiers consent and such consent deemed to not be unreasonably withheld.

#### **Compensation**

- 1.3 Your Petitioner is concerned that the compensation provisions in relation to property that is not compulsory acquired and other matters would not be sufficient to compensate your Petitioner adequately for the loss and damage they incur as a result of the plan for Phase 1 of the high speed railway and associated development as supported by the rights of entry for survey purposes and the increased possibility of the plan for Phase 2 being realised through the passing of this Bill.
- 1.4 Your Petitioner requests that the Bill should be amended to ensure your Petitioner and other persons who are injuriously and affected by loss of value should be entitled to claim compensation for the full amount of loss incurred due to HS2.

## Limits of Deviation

- 1.5 Your Petitioner is concerned that paragraph 1(2) of Schedule 1 of the Bill provides that in constructing or maintaining any of the scheduled works the Undertaker can deviate vertically upwards not exceeding three metres, vertically downwards to any extent within the limits of deviation shown on the deposited plans.
- 1.6 Your Petitioner is concerned that these deviations could potentially make significant differences to the impacts of the construction and operation of all Phases and operation of the high speed railway and associated development, for example by raising the height of track and overhead gantries to the detriment of the amenity of the landscape.  
These potential environmental impacts are not adequately addressed in the environmental statement which provides that the Undertaker only has to use reasonable endeavours to adopt measures to reduce adverse environmental effects provided it does not add unreasonable cost or delay to the construction and operation.
- 1.7 Your Petitioner requests that the provisions in the Hybrid Bill to allow deviation, should be deleted.

## Noise

- 1.8 Your Petitioner is concerned that HS2 Ltd have not set proper noise thresholds and ignored National policy and the views of the World Health Organisation in this area. Your Petitioner submits that overriding existing policies will determine design parameters for rolling stock and track design across the whole rail network.
- 1.9 Your Petitioner is concerned that the specific impacts of groundborne noise have not been properly considered or explained to impacted communities and the limit for groundborne noise does not reflect recent practice or experience and the methodology used for predicting the impact of groundborne noise is insufficiently robust and no amelioration measure have been suggested to deal with this problem.
- 1.10 Your Petitioner therefore requests
  - a) HS2 Ltd be instructed to issue revised noise thresholds covering noise exposure, in rural and urban areas both during the day and at night time reflecting World Health Organisation guidelines that provide for peak noise at 60db maximum pass-by outside, giving 45db inside.
  - b) HS2 Ltd be required to set noise limits for construction which are in line with World Health Organisation limits and local authorities be provided with enforcement powers to order the cessation of construction activities in the event such anticipated exposures are breached.
  - c) HS2 Ltd be obliged to commit to designing the high speed railway to operate in such a manner that the revised noise exposures are not breached.
  - d) A binding requirement included in the Bill for noise monitoring with obligations on HS2 Ltd to introduce additional mitigation measures, including reduction in train speeds, in the event forecast noise levels are exceeded.

- e) HS2 Ltd be required to commit to the same threshold for groundborne noise as The Northern Line Extension- meaning groundborne noise levels no greater than 25db LpAsmax for rural areas and 30db LpAsmax for urban areas.
- 1.11 Your Petitioner is concerned that Clause 35 of the bill and Schedule 25 provides that appeals against notices or against failure to give consent or the giving of qualified consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, section 60 (control of noise) and section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) may be referred to the Secretary of State or arbitration. Your Petitioner is also concerned that Schedule 25 would provide a defence to statutory nuisance for the Nominated Undertaker.
- 1.12 Your Petitioner requests that Clause 35 and Schedule 25 are deleted from the Bill.

### **Code of Construction Practice**

- 1.13 Your Petitioner is concerned that the Nominated Undertakers ongoing accountability to is unspecified and that this principle, if adopted would be highly detrimental to communities located along the route. The Code of Construction Practice does not identify how any lead contractors will be made to comply and the redress and appropriate action that might be taken in the event of non-compliance. Assessment in the environmental statement is made on the assumption that the Code of Construction Practice and the strategies will be fully effective, however the Code of Construction practice has no legal status.
- 1.14 Your Petitioner submits that the Code of Construction Practice should be incorporated into the Bill. Parliament and not the Nominated Undertaker should be accountable for the project. Any monitoring required under the Code of Construction Practice should involve the relevant local authority as well as independent experts with effective oversight and redress arrangements in the event of non-compliance with the Code of Construction Practice.
- 1.15 The standards set out in the environmental statement and the Code of Construction Practice is of "reasonableness" and "reasonable endeavours". Your Petitioner submits that this should be replaced by a higher standard, i.e. "best practical means" and the measures should be agreed with the relevant local authority. Measures should be subject to independent assessment, verifiable and challengeable. This applies to noise as well as other effects that are to be addressed in the Code of Construction Practice.

### **Carbon**

- 1.16 Your Petitioner is concerned about the impact of the high speed railway on the UK's carbon reduction commitments.
- 1.17 Your Petitioner requests that in accordance with the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee Report dated the 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2014 there should be an emissions monitoring system to bring transparency to the likely effect of the high speed railway on overall transport emissions and a reduced maximum speed until electricity generation has been sufficiently decarbonised to make it a marginal issue.

## **Power to acquire land, rights in land, airspace and subsoil**

- 1.18 Your Petitioner is concerned that the powers sought in the Bill go beyond the Scale of powers of what is reasonably required to achieve the construction and operation of the high-speed railway and its associated development particularly in relation to the acquisition of land and rights in land, air space and subsoil. Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by such proposals for Phase 1 and the establishing of principle for Phase 2.
- 1.19 Your Petitioner is also concerned by Clause 47 of the Bill (compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration and relocation) which is too broad in scope and is not limited by time or distance. Your Petitioner believes that this power should be removed.

## **Ecology**

- 1.20 Your Petitioner is also concerned by the adverse impacts of the construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development on fauna and flora. Your Petitioner is particularly concerned by the failure of the Environmental Statement for Phase 1 of HS2 to include any assessment of the in combination effects arising from the plans for High Speed trains running on the West Coast Mainline or later on Phase 2. Your Petitioner is further concerned by the absence in the Hybrid Bill of any requirements for HS2 Ltd to ensure their activities result in No Net Loss of Biodiversity. Your Petitioner highlights the number of sensitive sites (including Sites of Special Scientific Interest, County Wildlife Sites and Local Wildlife Sites) which would be impacted
- 1.21 Your Petitioner requests that in accordance with the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee Report dated 2 April 2014, a process should be established to monitor all aspects of environmental protection needed for 60 years following the start of construction and operation of the railway, including biodiversity mitigations, compensation off-set. This process must be managed by an independent body, which monitors and publicly reports progress against the "no net biodiversity loss" objective. A detailed costing should also be established for monitoring and reporting and for the environmental being overseen, and ring-fence these environmental protections with a separate budget for these purposes.
- 1.22 Your Petitioner requests that other recommendations in the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee Report dated 2 April 2014 are also followed including, but not limited to, the revising of the environmental statement to distinguish clearly between mitigation and compensation measures in respect of biodiversity, carry out outstanding environmental surveying as soon as possible, weighting metrics for biodiversity offsetting towards production of biodiversity gains and taking explicit account of community well being, adjusting metrics to encompass the precautionary principle, treatment of ancient woodland should be separate from the overall biodiversity net loss calculation, re-examining scope for off-site biodiversity compensation, research on alternative discount factors for the off-setting metric.

### **Nominated Undertaker**

- 1.23 Your Petitioner is concerned by the absence of any specific provision to the appointment of a Nominated Undertaker and the associated risk of them failing to fulfil their obligations, and the fettering of the Secretary of State's discretion by agreement with the Nominated Undertaker.
- 1.24 Your Petitioner requests that there should be a provision inserted in to Clause 43, enabling enforcement against the Secretary of State, in the event of the Nominated Undertaker failing to fulfil their obligations.

### **Power to apply Act to further high speed rail works**

- 1.25 Your Petitioner is concerned that a number of ministerial announcements have been made in recent weeks indicating a possible extension and new station at Crewe, provisions for which have not been made in the current and ongoing Phase 2 route consultation. Given that the wording of Clause 50 would allow HS2 to extend Phase 1, without further referral to Parliament, your Petitioner submits that Point 50 in the Bill be amended to clearly state that this Bill only permits the building of HS2 Phase 1 as proposed and publically consulted on.
- 1.26 Your Petitioner has noted Point 62, Part C which states "( c ) otherwise for the Purposes of or in connection with Phase 1 of High Speed 2 or any high speed railway transport system of which Phase 1 of High Speed 2 forms or is to form part"
- 1.27 Your Petitioner requests that Part C of Point 62 be deleted, due to the clear sanction it would provide to HS2 Ltd to make decisions regarding the commencement of work on Phase 2 without further reference to Parliament or other statutory processes.

### **Environmental Statement**

- 1.28 Your Petitioner is concerned by the absence of any specific provision to compel the Nominated Undertaker to implement mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Statement accompanying the Bill. Failure to include such provision would your Petitioner submits, be contrary to the purposes of the EIA Directive and be highly damaging to communities located on the railway's route.
- 1.29 Your Petitioner submits that the Environmental Statement accompanying the Bill is deficient for the reasons set out in HS2AA's Environmental Statement Consultation response.

In light of the above, the Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to our expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to representation before the Select Committee.

For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless clauses of the Bill are removed or amended then the Bill should not be allowed to pass in to law.

There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their rights, (including their Human Rights) interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

YOUR PETITIONER 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 Petitioner 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 in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioners will ever pray, &c

MICHAEL HARTLEY

GILLIAN HARTLEY \

IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2013-14

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

PETITION OF Mr. Michael and Mrs. Gillian Hartley

Against, By Counsel, &c.

1. The Bill  
2. The Bill  
3. The Bill  
4. The Bill  
5. The Bill  
6. The Bill  
7. The Bill  
8. The Bill  
9. The Bill  
10. The Bill  
11. The Bill  
12. The Bill  
13. The Bill  
14. The Bill  
15. The Bill  
16. The Bill  
17. The Bill  
18. The Bill  
19. The Bill  
20. The Bill  
21. The Bill  
22. The Bill  
23. The Bill  
24. The Bill  
25. The Bill  
26. The Bill  
27. The Bill  
28. The Bill  
29. The Bill  
30. The Bill  
31. The Bill  
32. The Bill  
33. The Bill  
34. The Bill  
35. The Bill  
36. The Bill  
37. The Bill  
38. The Bill  
39. The Bill  
40. The Bill  
41. The Bill  
42. The Bill  
43. The Bill  
44. The Bill  
45. The Bill  
46. The Bill  
47. The Bill  
48. The Bill  
49. The Bill  
50. The Bill  
51. The Bill  
52. The Bill  
53. The Bill  
54. The Bill  
55. The Bill  
56. The Bill  
57. The Bill  
58. The Bill  
59. The Bill  
60. The Bill  
61. The Bill  
62. The Bill  
63. The Bill  
64. The Bill  
65. The Bill  
66. The Bill  
67. The Bill  
68. The Bill  
69. The Bill  
70. The Bill  
71. The Bill  
72. The Bill  
73. The Bill  
74. The Bill  
75. The Bill  
76. The Bill  
77. The Bill  
78. The Bill  
79. The Bill  
80. The Bill  
81. The Bill  
82. The Bill  
83. The Bill  
84. The Bill  
85. The Bill  
86. The Bill  
87. The Bill  
88. The Bill  
89. The Bill  
90. The Bill  
91. The Bill  
92. The Bill  
93. The Bill  
94. The Bill  
95. The Bill  
96. The Bill  
97. The Bill  
98. The Bill  
99. The Bill  
100. The Bill