

PETITION AGAINST A PRIVATE BILL:

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SESSION 2013 –14

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Against – on merits – Praying to be heard [in Person] .

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in Parliament assembled.

THE HUMBLE PETITION of Mr Peter Lyons on behalf of the Harmood Street, Clarence Way and Hartland Road Residents Association . The above streets being off Chalk Farm Road.

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. Your Petitioners are the Members of the Harmood Street, Clarence Way and Hartland Road Residents Association. This association is a mixed ethnic group of people: some born here and now retired; some under care at home; working couples with young families at local schools; and some skilled and professional people commuting to other parts of London. The important factor vital to all of these on a daily basis is effective TRANSPORT. Our streets adjoin Chalk Farm Road, which has five bus services running along it. As a result of the Bill these bus services would be in daily competition for scarce road space with heavy HS2 road transport. For ten years London Buses would no longer be able to maintain their present reliable service to the local public. We estimate that the daily rush hour capacity of the buses on Chalk Farm Road is currently in the order of 3,000 travellers per hour. We have not seen any attempt by HS2 to quantify the number of hours that will be lost by commuters. This equates to one and half million hours of attributable delays each year for the duration of the project in just the Chalk Farm Road part of the area of HS2 operations. Delays to drivers of cars, a number of whom will be residents of the immediate neighbourhood attempting to get their children to school and themselves to work should also be considered. Furthermore even if taxis are prepared to consider picking up fares off Chalk Farm Road

the impact of fares will be considerable. So when the Environmental Statement anticipates "there will be some impacts on neighbouring streets" this in fact adds up to a combination of continuing and sometimes prolonged delays in getting to one's everyday destinations, increased risk of injury to the cyclists amongst us, and certainly increased exposure (not 'possible' but CERTAIN) to airborne pollution. In combination together these will inevitably lead to a high level of stress for almost a decade. We do not share the view taken by some that the ends justify the means, when this entails such unacceptable levels of risk and threat to our community.

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

9. Central London is now regarded as the most polluted city in Europe. The Bill, if passed, will make a chronically bad situation even worse. It is not possible to forecast the number of premature deaths that will arise from increased levels of air pollution due to ten years of construction work; though there is definitely a correlation between respiratory diseases / premature deaths and increased levels of air pollution. In HS2's Environmental Statement it is acknowledged that "there is a *possible* risk to health from air pollution," whereas we assert that it is not a 'possibility' but a **certainty**. The ageing population in Camden continues to increase. Resources available to the NHS and Camden's Adult Social Care Service to deal with these problems arising out of illness caused by respiratory problems are diminishing. Currently there are no proposals to mitigate the impact of this threat. We believe that Honourable Members will wish to look again at HS2's assumptions in this

respect and would like to ask them to request HS2 to produce a realistic impact study- based on current levels of pollution (already exceeding danger levels along Euston Road at the junction of Eversholt Street), and known correlations between airborne pollution and respiratory illness.

The Hawley Wharf Development, which will border on our street, will be the largest single construction site - after King's Cross - that Camden has seen in a decade. This will be taking place concurrently with HS2 operations. The HGV vehicles for HS2 in this area will be competing with both the Hawley Wharf Development lorries and the existing flow of traffic into and out of Central London. Due to the nature of the road network in the area any attempts to reroute traffic can but only produce delays and disruption elsewhere. Such a concentration of HGV's must inevitably pose a real threat to the number of regular cyclists in our community. Camden already has seen too many cyclist deaths in the past year. Most of these have been attributed to the kind of vehicles that HS2's current plans envisage deploying on a massive scale.

HS2's construction plans envisage 24 hour working which will serve to further exacerbate the damaging levels of stress and sleep deprivation due to noise, disruption to travel and airborne pollution. Whilst there has been some limited recognition by HS2 of the need to offer mitigation to those homes closest to the proposed workings, there is no mention of how those affected in a less direct way may be compensated. Residents in this area are only too well aware that commercial traffic inevitably makes use of our streets as a short

cut. Although HS2 have indicated in their Environmental Statement which streets will be designated lorry routes, they do not say how this will be monitored and reported on.

10. One possible solution for moving demolition and construction traffic off the roads would be to adopt the DD2 solution for Euston Station, which would enable the demolition and construction traffic to be taken off roads and transferred to rail. Additionally this would be a quicker construction process than the present proposals for Euston. As there is a possibility of change in the plans for Euston Station, would it be feasible to terminate temporarily HS2 services at Old Oak Common? Such a strategy was employed for HS1, with it coming into Waterloo until the St Pancras development had been completed. We the petitioners live in an area where we will have to endure the negative impacts described above, with no provision for any compensation for those so affected. We feel that this is an injustice, which we call upon your Honourable House to remedy. The HS2 scheme is promoted partly on the basis of a number of intangibles, such as 'improved access to Northern cities', which may well be true, but such claims should only be given credence if there is a proper recognition of the negative impacts the required construction work will have on us.
11. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.

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 Themselves [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
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 Petitioner in the
premises as your Honourable House
shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Signed


Peter Lyons

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF

COMMONS

SESSION 2013–14

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON to WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

PETITION OF **The Harmood Street, Clarence Way and Hartland Road Residents Association,**

AGAINST, By counsel &c