

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF
COMMONS
SESSION
2013 - 2014

HIGH SPEED RAIL (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 **MARTIN SHEPPARD**

SHEWETH as follows:-

1. 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 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 Petitioner is **Martin Sheppard** of 102 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8HX

Your Petitioner is a resident householder in Gloucester Avenue. The Promoter’s plans severely threaten the health, wealth, amenity, pleasure and life of your Petitioner.

Your Petitioner is deeply concerned that the Promoter’s tunnels will run near to his house and cause blight to its value. He considers that the exclusion of properties above the Promoter’s tunnels from compensation is deeply unjust.

Your Petitioner asks you to realign the Promoter’s tunnels between Parkway and Chalk Farm Bridge so that they run to a vent shaft on existing railway land not to one at the side of Adelaide Road.

Your Petitioner strongly endorses all the points made in the petition of the Gloucester Avenue Association and prays your honourable House to hear that petition favourable.

The Alignment of Tunnels

- 1 Your Petitioner points out the very great extent of existing railway land to the north and east of Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill. It is most desirable that the Promoter's tunnels should run beneath existing railway land rather than beneath your Petitioner's house.
- 2 While he was pleased by the minor realignment of the Promoter's tunnels away from Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village, agreed by the Gloucester Avenue Association and the Promoter in 2013, your Petitioner believes that an alignment running beneath the centre of existing railway land would be greatly preferable in protecting his interests.
- 3 Your Petitioner points out that the Promoter's decision to locate a vent shaft near the Nature Reserve on Adelaide Road was based on the need for it to service the now-abandoned HS1/HS2 Link tunnel, as well as the twin tunnels running towards Euston. Your Petitioner points out that this is no longer the case, following the abandonment of the HS1/HS2 Link.
- 4 Your Petitioner believes that it is possible to site the vent shaft for the Euston tunnels on existing railway land, rather than next to Adelaide Road. He respectfully observes that the removal of the provisions for the Link will release two areas of land previously required in connection with the Link: the first being the site which was proposed for a construction compound and the HS2/HS1 intervention shaft by the former Primrose Hill Station. The second is the site proposed for the eastern portal of the HS2/HS1 tunnel on land between Juniper Crescent and the Regent's Park Road Bridge. Both sites are within the "red lining" of the Bill, and both are fewer than 2000 metres from the site of the next vent shaft on the proposed railway at Alexandra Place. Your Petitioner understands that this is the principal engineering constraint affecting the spacing of vent shafts.

Your Petitioner therefore respectfully prays your honourable House as follows:

- 5 Your Petitioner requests you to ensure that the Promoter's tunnels run centrally under existing railway land between Parkway and the Chalk Farm Bridge.
- 6 Your Petitioner asks you to examine the opportunity provided by the abandonment of the HS1/HS2 Link to realign the Promoter's tunnels to run to a vent shaft situated in what was the intended HS1/HS2 Link construction compound; or on the site of the intended HS1/HS2 Link portal.
- 7 Your Petitioner prays that in considering the Promoter's plans for Euston, to replace the now-abandoned Option 8, the loss or saving of a few seconds during the operation of the line should not be allowed to outweigh the interests of the residents of Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill Village and Camden. He draws your honourable House's attention to the fact that capacity rather than speed is now the Promoter's argument for the necessity of building the line.
- 8 Your Petitioner prays that, in considering the Promoter's plans for Euston, your honourable House is mindful of his interests. Your Petitioner believes that any decision on plans for Euston Station to replace Option 8 will have implications for him. He therefore requests that you will ensure that, in making this decision, significant weight should be given to any solution which allows the Promoter's tunnels to run centrally under existing railway land in the sector between Parkway and Chalk Farm Bridge.
- 9 Your Petitioner prays your honourable House, when considering the option of a double-deck station at Euston, to add to its unenlarged or reduced footprint and other merits the advantage of allowing the alignment of the Promoter's tunnels to run centrally under existing railway land in the sector between Parkway and Chalk Farm Bridge.

Compensation

Your Petitioner believes that compensation proposals for the damage caused by construction are inadequate and unjust:

- 1 Your Petitioner believes that Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village have already been damaged by blight caused by HS2. The threat of tunnelling under or near to their houses has caused uncertainty amongst potential buyers.
- 2 Your Petitioners believes that the many compulsory purchase orders issued in Primrose Hill Village, for works whose nature is unspecified, have blighted property in Berkley Road, Chalcot Road, Chalcot Square, Gloucester Avenue, Princess Road and Regent's Park Road.
- 3 Your Petitioner believes that, although construction threatens to inflict huge damage on Camden, there is no recognition in the Bill of the principle that polluters must pay for the pollution they cause.
- 4 Your Petitioner fears that the Bill expects Camden and its residents to shoulder the heavy cost of the damage, offering compensation to no more than a handful of those affected. Your Petitioner draws your attention, in particular, to the disastrous effect the Bill will have on small businesses.
- 5 Your Petitioner believes that it is unjust that no compensation is available to holders of property above or near HS2's tunnels.
- 6 Your Petitioner fears that HS2's plans will cause traffic chaos and NO2 pollution in Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill Village and Camden as a whole, making them less attractive places in which to live. It is unjust that there should be no compensation for the loss of amenity, threat to health and property blight resulting from HS2's plans.

Your Petitioner prays your honourable House to ensure measures providing fair compensation:

- 7 Your Petitioner requests that there should be full compensation for all losses caused by the construction of HS2 in Camden, whether direct or indirect. This should include compensation for loss of housing, decline in housing values and business losses.
- 8 Your Petitioner requests that you should widen the compensation zone in Camden to match that outside London.
- 9 Your Petitioner requests compensation for loss of property values in areas above or near to HS2's tunnels. This compensation should be extended to leaseholders as well as freeholders. Your Petitioner draws to your attention in particular the case of the residents and leaseholders of Darwin Court.
- 10 Your Petitioner request the acceptance of proposals for a property bond scheme made by the HS2 Action Alliance.
- 11 Your Petitioner requests that you give favourable attention to the petition on compensation in Camden presented by Sir Keir Starmer QC.

YOUR PETITIONER THEREFORE HUMBL Y PRAYS 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 Petitioner will ever pray, &c

.....

SIGNED