

**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 THE PARISH COUNCIL OF TWYFORD IN THE COUNTY OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

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 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 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.

## ***7.0 Who is your Petitioner***

7.1 Your Petitioner is the Parish Council of Twyford in the district of Aylesbury Vale in Buckinghamshire. Having published the requisite section 239 notice in the Buckingham and Winslow Advertiser your Petitioner did, in council assembled, on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2014, carry a motion to oppose the hybrid bill by petition by a majority of six votes to nil with one absentee.

7.2 Your Petitioner wishes to state that, at an Open Parish Council meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2014, attended by Councillors and members of the public, a draft petition was discussed and following amendments was approved as follows. The Chairman was authorised to sign the Petition and the Clerk to provide the appropriate letter of authority.

7.3 Your Petitioner represents a parish of some 450 adults, with dependent children, the vast majority of whom reside in the village of Twyford and will be affected by the works proposed under the bill. The age profile of the village is, for the record, significantly older than for the population at large.

7.4 These works include land and properties subject to compulsory acquisition, land and properties suffering changes to access, highways that will be used as major construction routes, footpaths and bridleways that will be moved or suffer temporary or permanent closure, areas of green space that will be lost or impacted, land to be used for ancillary plant buildings and a maintenance loop, land to be used for construction sites, noise during construction and operation of both the line and the accompanying IMD, visual impacts during construction and operation, temporary closure of roads, re-routing of roads and changes to junctions, damage to local businesses and property blight. The provisions of the Bill will injuriously affect most of the area for which your Petitioner is the local parish council, and your Petitioner accordingly objects thereto for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

7.5 The parish is traversed by the proposed route of HS2 over a distance of some 4 kilometers, partly on an embankment with a viaduct over water courses. It is bordered to the east by the proposed Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD), to the south by the proposed revived East-West railway line and is within 5 kilometers of an energy from waste facility being built by Buckinghamshire County Council. The currently proposed route now lies some 210 metres from the nearest dwelling in the village.

7.6 The village of Twyford is not financially rich but has a vibrant community spirit. There are few properties extending to more than half a hectare. Employment within the village is largely restricted to a significant dairy farm known as Portway Farm and Shepherd's Furze Farm. Otherwise residents are self employed or travel to surrounding towns such as Aylesbury, Bicester, Buckingham or Milton Keynes on a daily basis. The village supports a Church of England First School that will take children from age three to eleven; a considerable proportion of pupils travelling to Twyford from the neighbouring communities of Calvert Green and Charndon. Education after age eleven largely involves travel to Buckingham or Waddesdon and is sustained by county provided transport.

7.7 Since the announcement of HS2 in March 2010 and the indication that Twyford would lie on the preferred route your Petitioner has arranged some ten public meetings to inform its electorate. Your Petitioner's representatives have attended every Community Forum meeting for area 13, have been involved in at least five direct meetings with representatives of the Promoter and have arranged and sponsored a meeting with the then Secretary of State for Transport, the Rt Hon Philip Hammond MP, that included representatives from other affected parishes and was chaired by our constituency MP, the Rt Hon Speaker of the House of Commons, John Bercow MP. Residents of your Petitioner's parish have also been

vocal attendees at all Road Shows put on the by the Promoter in the Community Forum area.

7.8 In 2010 when announced the route of HS2 past Twyford was along the now defunct Great Central Railway track and at that time was no more than 50 metres from the nearest dwelling and a far lesser distance from the only public green open space in the village, the Recreation Ground held in trust for the village by your Petitioner. Following a meeting between representatives of your Petitioner and the Promoter the line was moved by the Promoter to its current location although, at that time, it was not clear to your Petitioner what level of noise could be anticipated within the village. The only indication of noise levels at that time being those demonstrated in the sound booths at the Road Shows organised by the Promoter.

### ***8.0 Your Petitioner's concerns:***

8.1 There are clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their parishioner's rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect persons and businesses concerned. Your Petitioner has sought at every opportunity to work with the Promoter in the development of their proposals for the HS2 railway but the Promoter has failed to adequately address most of the issues raised. As outlined in this petition your Petitioner still has substantial outstanding concerns relating to the issues following

### ***9.0 The Alignment of the Route and Specific Measures:***

9.1 Your Petitioner considers the Heathrow and West London rail developments can be designed to enable people to avoid travelling by road into Old Oak Common/Park Royal, Euston, St Pancras and King's Cross. One proposal from Intercity Connect ICC proposes a station at Iver to serve Heathrow and motorway road users and station near Banbury and Royal Leamington Spa near to the transport corridor Chiltern Line and M40 sections. There is a possible realignment of the Route 3 from Ruislip, via Tring and Buckingham to Lower Boddington for 94Km to enable connection to the WCML near Cheddington and Tring and intersection of the East West line near Winslow. This realignment would significantly reduce the amount of costly tunnelling required through the Chilterns.

9.2 Your Petitioner has considered the consultation reactions to HS2 and objects to the ways used to plan and promote this transport route and the early fixation on this Route 3 Phase 1 alignment through rural north Buckinghamshire, and the location of the Calvert Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD), without completing strategic environmental assessments of all feasible alternative locations that will minimise impacts on Twyford and its residents to avoid the loss of value of the property, the loss of productive farming land and damage to the ecologically sensitive landscape in neighbouring SSSIs. Specifically the Appraisal of Sustainability is not considered a feasible method of determining or choosing

between the route impacts sufficiently objectively as it was not possible to interpret comparatively in detail the Route compared to some of the other existing transport corridors.

9.3 The pathway of the route past the current land fill site at Calvert and the adjacent Energy from Waste Incinerator site at Greatmoor Farm is particularly narrow. This pathway is further diminished by the need to provide for rail access to the landfill and incinerator sites as well as the extension of the East-West rail link to Aylesbury and then London. Your Petitioner believes that fitting all the required tracks without any of these proposed lines encroaching on Sheephouse Wood, an ancient woodland and SSSI is not feasible and humbly suggests that this element of the route is so flawed as to require a complete rethink of the section between Aylesbury and the county border around Newton Purcell. This issue has been in the knowledge of the Promoter since 2010.

9.4 Your Petitioner objects to Route 3 Phase 1 and the situation that the Promoter and DfT have not explored sufficiently the selection and assessment of several shorter and longer route alternatives to realign the route further from Twyford.

9.5 Your Petitioner is further concerned that the changing rationale provided by the Promoter and the DfT to support the building of HS2 and the increasing costs associated with confirmed changes to the line since its initial announcement and with the known alternative proposals for tunnelling in the Chilterns further emphasises that the fixation on preferred route 3 at such an early stage demonstrates a lack of willingness to achieve the best value for money and to deliver the greatest possible benefits to the area affected by its construction.

9.6 Your Petitioner objects to the serious shortcomings by DfT and HS2 and its agents to fail to work from aerial photographs, LIDAR data and from other technologies in 2009 until 2012 when the determination to prefer Route 3 Phase 1 was being made with inadequate knowledge from the basic Appraisal of Sustainability (AOS) and little detailed understandings of the actual elevations, road and utilities situations and the impacts of Route 3 in detail. This is unlike CTRL (HS1), the last comparable project, where first British Rail and then Kent County Council with London and Continental Railways produced four fully detailed potential routes and assessed each and modified these to finally select the currently constructed HS1. Such diligent planning was possible for a specific defined scope. HS2 has changed the scope, its functions and its extent until the petitioning in 2014 without considering to the same level of detail of alternative potential routes and route sections and tunnelling. This should be reassessed for this two track railway providing no direct and significant contribution to the rail commuters and travellers within Aylesbury Vale. HS2 has been a one pass approach which has not been accepted by the public in consultations and

reassessments and changes will help many.

9.7 Your Petitioner suggests that the Promoter needs to re-examine how commuters can directly benefit from a one track each way rail route and how a dedicated passenger-only one track each way route can be reliable and available at a time when the WCML operates with less than optimum trains in train paths, when there are increasing volumes of road and rail freight and an increasing population projected, but with less people with the income to afford longer distance daily commuting. The specific measure is that HS2 can be realigned so that the WCML and HS2 can be interconnected near Tring with an improved realignment for Aylesbury adding to extra resilience and shorter tunnel sections from Ruislip to Tring to Winslow and Buckingham within the broad railway corridor. The broad corridor could provide the larger rail loading gauge for freight and for double decked commuter rail vehicles.

9.8.0 The specific measure is to further examine and re-examine alternative route alignments and elevations for avoidance of community harm and for reducing impacts on the farm by the realignment.

9.8.1 This specific measure provides the opportunity to move the Route 3 alignment further away from the homes at Twyford to reduce the impacts on people living there and could reduce the costs of mitigation.

9.8.2 Diversion of the planned HS2 route will serve more local rail commuter requirements than the HS2 Route 3 Phase 1 achieves across Buckinghamshire currently.

9.8.3 An alternative route alignment will reduce impacts on homes and the farming operations.

### ***10.0 The impact of noise and specific measures***

10.1 Your Petitioner's parish is in a very quiet, tranquil area of countryside, much of which is situated at the end of no-through roads with no passing traffic. As a result the ambient noise is very low and the area is recognised by the CPRE as being an area of very low light pollution.

10.2 In September 2012, a baseline sound survey was carried out at St Mary's House, taken as an exemplar of the area of the parish most affected, and this has been allocated the "noise receptor" ID 288448.

10.3 Appendix SV002-013 Table 1, lists the results of this survey with the daytime noise level as 50.4dB and night as 39.9dB, with the highest level of 71.9dB.

10.4 Page 16, Table 3 of Volume 5, Technical appendix SV-004-013 CFA13, Calvert, Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Chetwode, Operational assessment Sound, noise and vibration, sets out the baseline noise levels as predicted at Opening Year and the expected impact on St Mary's House, a 15<sup>th</sup> Century residence, and the nearby Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a Grade 1 listed 11<sup>th</sup> Century building, as the increase in noise from the Opening Year baseline to the predicted noise at baseline plus 15 year traffic. This records a daytime increase of 4dB and a night time increase of 5dB. It is further recorded that this will have an adverse effect on the receptor.

10.5 The significant effect criteria recorded in Table 3 as OSV13-CO2 is defined in Table 5 as:-

"Approximately 10 dwellings in the vicinity of Grange Close and Church Street closest to the route and their associated shared community open areas (local playing fields with clubhouse). Forecast increases in sound from the railway are likely to cause a moderate adverse effect on the acoustic character of the area around the closest approximately five properties."

10.6 Your Petitioner notes that despite the sensitivity of the local playing field the Promoter did not take the opportunity to survey noise levels there. Your Petitioner believes that this omission has resulted in the mitigation being offered being inadequate to protect users of this facility from the impact of noise and other pollutants caused by the Promoter's plans to construct and operate this railway.

10.7 The World Health Organisation (WHO) regards 50dB day time noise level as the level that should not be exceeded to protect the majority of people from being moderately annoyed during the daytime. It also says that to protect the majority of people from being seriously annoyed, the day time level should not exceed 55dB. However, the WHO guidelines refer to a steady continuous noise which HS2 certainly is not.

10.8 The WHO says that most countries in Europe have adopted 40dB as the maximum allowable for new developments whenever feasible. The WHO states that for the primary prevention of subclinical adverse health effects related to night time noise in the population, it is recommended that the population should not be exposed to night noise greater than 40dB of L night outside the residential property during that part of the night when most people are in bed.

10.9 It is the opinion of your Petitioner from the evidence set out in the Environmental Statement that the mitigation proposals are insufficient to protect your Petitioner from the increase in noise levels that are predicted.

10.10.0 Your Petitioner respectfully suggests that the following measures taken as a package would improve the position of those residences within your Petitioner's parish

10.10.1 Move the line further away from the village of Twyford as described elsewhere in Your Petitioner's submission

10.10.2 Reduce the speed of the trains as they pass the village. Speed reduction will not only significantly reduce the noise but also allow greater route flexibility to avoid village blight.

10.10.3 Increase the height of the bund to above the pantograph level as this will inevitably reduce the overall noise levels,

10.10.4 Your Petitioner notes that the height of the bund is not stated in the Environment Statement but it is assumed to be the same level as the sound wall at 5 metres above track level. This is evidenced by the photomontage taken from the land adjacent to St Mary's House.

10.10.5 OR preferably, lower the track level. If the track level is lowered, and assuming that the bund is maintained at its proposed height, it will reach nearer to the pantograph level and hence be more effective at reducing noise. Lowering the track has, in your Petitioner's humble opinion a benefit to be carried over to the neighbouring parish of Chetwode.

10.10.6 Plant trees along the old Great Central Railway footprint in the first year of construction such trees to be primarily of native species to provide an additional sound barrier that will have time to grow before the operational phase is attained. Your Petitioner would welcome such a step as early planting could have a benefit in respect of the reduction of dust and air pollution during the construction phase. Your Petitioner further requests that its representatives are involved in the decision making process connected to the planting of this area and seeks an undertaking from the Promoter to this effect.

10.10.7 If further mitigation measures are not forthcoming, then your Petitioner would expect that an undertaking be given that the actual noise emissions do not exceed that which HS2 Ltd predict in SV-001.000.

10.11 Your Petitioner is further concerned at the lack of noise mitigation to the northern side of the line throughout its length through the Petitioner's parish. This will impact on both walkers using the reinstated footpaths to this side of the line as well as on the few properties within a few hundred metres of the line. Your Petitioner respectfully suggests that the omission of noise absorbing fencing is addressed

### ***11.0 The impact of traffic***

11.1 Your Petitioner objects to the lack of detail of the traffic associated with HS2 construction and surveys that will enter and operate within the land, plots and Work Numbers indicated in the Bill plans and sections. The road known as Perry Hill is unsuitable

for the passage of very large numbers of Heavy Goods Vehicles which will serve to put unwarranted pressure on the movement of vehicles from Twyford to points to the east such as Buckingham, Winslow and Milton Keynes as this traffic will be required to use or cross Perry Hill. Your Petitioner requests that representatives of your Petitioner are involved in all decisions regarding the flow of traffic on Perry Hill within the Petitioner's parish and asks that the Promoter be directed to give this undertaking. Where access routes are required and agreed by local farmers and amenity operators they should be able to sustain the weight and use of loaded farm vehicles and construction vehicles.

11.2 The HS2 construction and work site traffic and plant can use more of the safeguarded corridor strip to reduce conflicts with local traffic movements. Access to the sites at Calvert and the IMD for the work force should be enabled by the construction of a halt on the East-West railway which would allow the dispersal of workers' private vehicles to stations serving this line in the surrounding area.

11.3 Your Petitioner is particularly concerned that access from the village of Twyford to the village of Steeple Claydon is maintained for vehicular traffic at all times during the construction phase. Steeple Claydon is the nearest location for doctors and as such unfettered access is vital to the people of Twyford. Your Petitioner asks that the Promoter gives this undertaking. Should the Promoter be unable to give such an undertaking your Petitioner requests that the Promoter, at its expense, makes alternative arrangements with the practice in Steeple Claydon for the provision of General Practice medical services within Twyford. Your Petitioner is extremely concerned that patients registered with the GP practice at Steeple Claydon, be they from Twyford or any other village to the west of the proposed line, be required, without choice, to re-register with other practices should the Promoter fail to make the undertaking or take the requested action to provide service in Twyford. Your Petitioner would see this as a gross and unacceptable invasion of freedom of choice and considers that the loss of anecdotal medical history that would be lost coupled with the extended time and distance of travel to attend an other practice(s) to be intolerable and should not be countenanced.

11.4 Your Petitioner is similarly concerned that disruption of access to Twyford may cause difficulties for the emergency services to attend incidents and emergencies in Twyford within their allowed response times. Your Petitioner therefore requests that the Promoter, at its expense, undertakes to make available alternative services, possibly based at the IMD, to alleviate this risk.

11.5 Finally on the question of traffic disruption your Petitioner is concerned that access to the Twyford First School from Calvert Green and Charndon, particularly, is maintained at all times. Failure to so do would render the Twyford First School at risk of closure due to reducing rolls with the concomitant outcome that the village of Twyford would become a

significantly less attractive place for families to settle.

11.6 Your Petitioner is concerned that alternative arrangements for cyclists using National Route 51 when this is closed have not been mentioned and would look to the Promoter to rectify this omission.

11.7 Your Petitioner further notes that a Restricted Byway, known locally as Mill Lane and much used as a recreational route, has been identified by the Promoter as a possible access to work number 2/96. Your Petitioner is concerned that the route for construction vehicles to this access will be via roads through the village of Twyford known as Portway Road and Bicester Road. These roads which are unsuitable for passage by heavy goods vehicles are the only access and egress to the village and are used by young children to access the Church of England First School in Church Street. Your Petitioner notes that there is not a continuous footpath along either road to provide protection for pedestrians who are forced to cross each road to ensure safe visibility of oncoming traffic.

11.8 Your Petitioner respectfully suggests that the Promoter can gain easier access to work number 2/96 along the line of route or on the parallel line of the Great Central Railway and request that they give an undertaking to so do. Should there be occasions where it is not possible to use this alternative prior negotiation must take place with a representative of your Petitioner and the Promoter must avoid using the roads through the village during the hours of 0830 to 0915, 1145 to 1215 and 1445 to 1630.

11.9 Your Petitioner is finally concerned that no other side roads or restricted byways in the village including, but not limited to, Mill Lane, Main Street, Church Street, Grange Close and School Lane should be used by the Promoter or their contractors for construction purposes and looks to the Promoter to give this undertaking.

## ***12.0 The impact of construction***

12.1 Your Petitioner is concerned that, in the Code of Construction Practice, in all cases where the term "Local Authority (ies)" is used this must be taken to include the relevant Parish Council(s) for the area under consideration. Your Petitioner is looking for the Promoter to make a binding undertaking that in each case where a decision affecting a parish is taken a representative of that parish appointed by the Parish Council is involved in the decision making process. For its part this Parish Council will undertake to have a representative available for consultation at 24 hours notice.

12.2 Your Petitioner continues to be concerned that it is the intention of the Promoter to utilise a significant part of Shepherd's Furze Farm for the disposition of spoil from tunnelling elsewhere. The acquisition of this land will render the viability of the Portway

Farm/Shepherd's Furze farm enterprise unviable at its current level and remove a source of employment for people of Twyford. Your Petitioner believes that an appropriate alternative site for the disposition of this spoil may be found at the nearby Landfill site and site for the Energy from Waste plant and would ask that the Promoter undertakes to come to a sensible commercial arrangement with the operators of these sites rather than merely using arable land as a dumping ground.

12.3 Your Petitioner is concerned that poor construction practices or management do not jeopardise the quality of subterranean water used via boreholes by local farmers. Your Petitioner would look to the Promoter for the strongest possible safeguards put in place to protect these sources and for the Promoter to undertake to provide alternative sources, at its cost, should contamination occur.

12.4 Your Petitioner is further concerned about the number of workers permanently residing at work camps in or close to your Petitioner's parish and the effect that this may have on the sewage disposal, delivery of fresh potable water and electricity systems serving your Petitioner's parish.

12.5 Your Petitioner objects that the Bill includes powers for the Secretary of State and the Nominated Undertaker to do construction works which are estimated to take up to 10 years to complete with others and will include many construction operation and logistics lorry, van and car workers in movements creating local congestion across the Twyford and surrounding area, the creation of dust and noise, poor air quality, and in some location there may be 24 hour working on the earth works, viaduct or satellite work site. These will inevitably lead to direct disruption and delays for residents of the parish, including local residents, farmers and estate owners.

### ***13.0 The impact of local wild life on the proposed development***

13.1 Your Petitioner objects to HS2 failing to address by avoidance mitigations such as moving the route following the identification of the impacts on the farm land and general ecology of the area with the Petitioner's parish. Much of the land through which HS2 will travel is known as Home Farm. This is unique to the area in that it contains ancient ridge and furrow fields rich with wild flowers, grasses and rare trees and is a significant Biological Notification Site. For many years Home Farm has been farmed in such a way as to encourage wildlife.

13.2 Your Petitioner suggests that should HS2 continue in its current alignment the proposed land take will cause the destruction of many trees, including 18 large black poplar trees – one of the rarest trees in Britain. In addition a considerable number of Black Poplar saplings will also be lost. Your Petitioner asserts that in view of the rarity of the species this will be an act of ecological vandalism and should be forbidden.

13.3 Your Petitioner also asserts that surveys have confirmed the presence in these fields and water courses of otters, water voles, brown hares, badgers, deer, bats and many other species of animals, insects and birds. Your Petitioner respectfully suggests that the Promoter seems to have paid insufficient attention to the results of these surveys and your Petitioner requests that the impact of the line on these important wildlife species is re-examined.

13.4 Your Petitioner questions the effectiveness of the methodology used by the Promoter's staff and agents when conducting surveys of wild birds in the Petitioner's parish. As most of these surveys were conducted during hours in the middle of the day your Petitioner respectfully suggests that these provided the Promoter with incomplete information as to the scope and numbers of bird species present in your Petitioner's parish. Independent research suggests that, in the past two years, a total of 87 separate species have been identified in, or immediately adjacent to, the area of land take in your petitioner's parish on the land known as Home Farm. Of these species eleven are rated red by the RSPB. Your Petitioner therefore respectfully suggests that further examination of the available evidence be carried out before the final alignment is decided upon as your Petitioner would suggest that destruction of the habitat of so many bird species, plus the impact on animal, insect and plant species, is a justification for the Promoter to decide to adopt an alternative alignment away from Twyford.

#### ***14.0 The impact of failure to define compensation***

14.1 Your Petitioner objects to the compensation currently omitting local betterment provisions that will replace and avoid loss of the parish's only public green open space should inadequate mitigation lead to the cessation of sport, conducted by successful local cricket and football teams and by local children and parishioners generally, on this site due to excessive noise. Your Petitioner expects that the Promoter undertakes to deliver, at its expense, an alternative site of a similar, or larger area and dimensions prepared to the same standard within a reasonable distance in the parish within a timeframe that would enable activities to continue in an uninterrupted manner should this situation seem likely to manifest itself.

14.2 Your Petitioner objects to no provision for recovery of the extra costs to reimburse for additional journey times during construction for the Petitioner's residents and/or others when visits to and from the HS2 impacted areas are required and congestion and diversions are experienced.

14.3 Your Petitioner remains concerned that no appropriate scheme of compensation has been made available to raise the blight rendered on the village of Twyford by the proposed presence of this railway. Your Petitioner notes that an Exceptional Hardship Scheme has

been in place which has enabled at least seven residents to sell their properties to the Promoter and continue their lives elsewhere. This in itself is a graphic demonstration of the blight that fell on the village as soon as the announcement that Route 3 was preferred in March 2010.

14.4 This scheme has not, however, due to its onerous conditions, been available to all owner occupiers in the village who have wished to move. Your Petitioner suggests that the proposed successor scheme will also not be readily available to all residents of Twyford for similar reasons. Your Petitioner therefore urges the Promoter to undertake to acquire any offered property within the village at the current unblighted value to restore the freedom of movement to all residents.

14.5 Your Petitioner suggests that this gesture will go a long way towards re-instating goodwill towards the project and could remove a significant number of petitions with the benefit to the Promoter of reducing the time the Hybrid Bill is before the Select Committee.

### ***15.0 The impact of excessive land take***

15.1 Your Petitioner objects to the disclosures in the draft and environmental statements and in the Bill plans and sections to the increasing extent of land take particularly for Portway and Shepherds Furze Farms, which, as they operate in partnership under the same holding reference, are considered as a single entity. The excessive land take will curtail the area for productive farming and render future expansion of the farm impossible. It is likely that the same issue applies to other linked holdings, such as Home Farm in Twyford, and Oak Tree Farm in Diddershall and to Churchview Farm in Twyford and Charndon Grounds, where one of the two farms lies with your Petitioner's parish and the other outwith.

15.2 Your Petitioner suggests that a two track railway route does not require the extent of land take for the corridor and the safeguarding of all that land when this is a currently used as a farm with natural habitats is perverse. The Environmental Statement and the Bill also exhibit extensive land take, well over and above requirements for the diversion and replacement of the utilities and for access and for construction of the HS2 route.

15.3 Your Petitioner notes that the Hybrid Bill does not deal in any meaningful way with the return of land acquired temporarily or permanently and then found to be surplus to requirements during or after construction. Your Petitioner is concerned that land may then be sold to developers who wish to use the land for purposes that are inappropriate for the location. Your Petitioner therefore urges that an undertaking be given that a strict hierarchy be created relating to the return of land under these circumstances and suggests that the original owner, their heirs and successors, should have first call, that the Parish Council should follow and that an open market sale should be the inferior outcome.

15.4 Your Petitioner is further concerned that clauses in the proposed Bill appear to allow the use of land acquired, but not subsequently returned, for purposes that are inappropriate for the location. Your Petitioner, therefore, seeks an undertaking that acquired land is used solely for the purposes of railway construction and operation or for environmental mitigation.

#### ***16.0 The need for separate SEAs***

16.1 Your Petitioner is concerned that an undertaking the size and style of the IMD at Twyford/Steeple Claydon is not subject to a separate SEA as it clearly meets the conditions set out in Planning Practice Guidelines at the reference Paragraph: 057 Reference ID: 4-057-20140306

16.2 Your Petitioner is also concerned that no due attention has been placed on the cumulative effects of the development of HS2, the building of the IMD, the development of the East-West railway and the development of an Energy from Waste facility has had on the parishes of Calvert Green, Charndon, Middle Claydon, Steeple Claydon and Twyford. Your Petitioner cites the following reference "The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, which was adopted on the 27th of June 2001, provides an opportunity to address cumulative effects at strategic levels. The SEA Directive requires the consideration of: 'the likely significant effects...including cumulative and synergistic effects on the environment...'"

16.3 Your Petitioner therefore requests that such SEAs are conducted, reported upon and determined before this Hybrid Bill has its third reading.

#### ***17.0 Your Petitioner's Conclusions***

17.1 Your Petitioner asserts that the current alignment of the route has brought and will continue to bring blight, together with other developments herein mentioned, to your Petitioner's parish for a significant period into the future.

17.2 Your Petitioner further asserts that had this project been more clearly defined and more rigorously tested before the premature announcement of a preferred route your Petitioner and those other similarly affected parishes would have worked with the Promoter to devise and develop a scheme that would have been acceptable to your Petitioner.

17.3 Your Petitioner suggests that the manner in which the Promoter has sought to impose the Promoter's views and conditions upon your Petitioner and other similarly affected parishes has clearly demonstrated an unwillingness on the part of the Promoter to work with your Petitioner.

17.4 Your Petitioner humbly suggests that the number, scope and quality of petitions presented is a direct outcome of the attitude of the Promoter and urges the Promoter and Her Majesty's Government to stop now and reassess both the benefits of the proposed scheme defined by this Hybrid Bill and how significant amendments can be introduced to make the proposed scheme acceptable to your Petitioner and other affected parishes.

17.5 Your Petitioner is concerned about the sheer volume of paper developed by the Promoter that your Petitioner has been required to read, understand and comment upon over the past four years. Your Petitioner humbly suggests that to impose such a burden upon any group which will, inevitably, be unsophisticated in the management and processing of such a volume of information is both unreasonable and unfair especially as such tight timetables have been imposed for such responses as are required.

17.6 There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioner.

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 so much of the Bill as affects 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, Roger Kirby Land  
Council

on behalf of Twyford Parish

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2013-14

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

PETITION OF THE PARISH COUNCIL OF TWYFORD IN THE COUNTY OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

Against the Bill – On Merits – By Counsel &c

Roger Kirby Landells

Chairman of Twyford Parish Council

[Redacted signature block containing several lines of illegible text]