

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2013-14

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – 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 Greatworth Parish Council

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.

Clauses of the Bill

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.

Your Petitioner

7. Your Petitioner, Greatworth Parish Council, is the parish council for the parish of Greatworth in the county of Northamptonshire, which has a population of 890 (according to the 2011 census data).
8. The proposed route of Phase One of HS2 passes through the parish of Greatworth. The route cuts across open fields between a green tunnel and a length of cutting. The route destroys an area of ancient woodland at Halse Copse and with 100m of a working Grade II listed farmhouse. The Parish Council is most concerned by portion of the route that is between the green tunnel and the cuttings.
9. The Bill would authorise the compulsory acquisition of land belonging to the

constituents of the Parish, to which they object. Furthermore, the provisions of the Bill will injuriously affect most of the area for which your Petitioners are the local parish, and your Petitioners accordingly object thereto for the reasons, amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

10. Your Petitioner has responsibilities for much of the land in its area that will be affected by the Bill, and represents many of whom will be affected by the works proposed under the bill. This includes land and properties subject to compulsory acquisition, highways that will be used as major construction routes, footpaths that will be removed, areas of green space that will be lost, areas which will be converted into construction sites, land to be used for ancillary plant buildings, land to be used for construction materials.
11. Your Petitioner has sought to work with HS2 Limited and the Government in the development of the proposals. However, as outlined in this petition, it has substantial outstanding concerns with the appraisal work, design and development of the project and the particular powers now proposed in the Bill. Your Petitioner requested an additional meeting with HS2 which has been refused, despite HS2 being in the area. They did not have time to meet with Greatworth Parish Council.
12. Your Petitioner and their rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

Your Petitioner's Concerns

13. Greatworth is a tranquil village, the centre of which is a conservation area with several grade two listed buildings, and an ancient church. When addressing parliament the then transport minister Justine Greening, MP specifically stated that Greatworth was one of the worst affected villages along the HS2 route.
14. In summary your petitioner is concerned that although the principle of HS2 has been established by the second reading of the hybrid bill, it feels like the cost of the project is being squarely placed at the feet of communities such as Greatworth. Being situated almost at the mid point of the line, residents will

never use the line, we have no local transport infrastructure that will see a benefit from the users of the line switching services. However we have seen property values drop, face the prospect of years of misery during construction and then the on-going nuisance when the line is in operation.

15. Each of your Petitioner's concerns is explained more fully below and solutions to its concerns identified. Your Petitioner recognises, however, that other solutions to these concerns may be brought forward and, insofar as those are to be preferred, it would wish to associate itself with them.
16. Your Petitioner's concerns relate to noise, construction traffic, height of line, compensation, woodland and wildlife, siting of compounds and public rights of way.

Concern at lack of information

17. Your petitioner wishes to express concern regarding the poor provision of information supplied by the promoter, both prior to the deposit of the Bill, and since the Bill has been deposited. HS2 Ltd has continually failed to provide necessary paperwork prior to meetings as requested, and information presented has often been inadequate and conflicting.
18. Plan and Profile maps and GIS layers were requested by your Petitioner and others early on in the process of the consultation on the environmental statement, as it was felt that these were necessary tools to inform their response. HS2 Ltd responded that the GIS layers were likely to be available in mid/late December. It was not until the 24th January that these were made available, the day that the consultation was due to end. The latest plan and profile maps remain unavailable, and furthermore, supplementary information such as the Code of Construction Practise has remained in draft form. Other important supplementary documents, like the local environment management plans ("LEMPs") have not been produced, even in draft.
19. The on-going lack of information has made it particularly difficult to understand the full impacts of HS2, and therefore commenting on the project has been particularly difficult. It also raises the question as to why this information is being withheld when it has been produced. Your petitioner expects to be able to consult on the final version of the CoCP and any other

relevant documents that are produced, prior to construction taking place, and asks your honourable House to require the Promoters to ensure that happens. Your Petitioner also requests that in future, all information is made available in a timely manner.

General position of council on HS2

20. Although your petitioner is aware that the Select Committee of your honourable House is unable to consider cases which object to the principle of the Bill, your petitioner wishes to express its objection to the principle. Your petitioner is seriously concerned over the business case of HS2, particularly the fact that it represents poor value for money to the taxpayer, in a country which cannot afford such expenses. Your petitioner instead supports the alternative solution to HS2 produced by 51m. This alternative represents a much better business case including lower initial costs and a much greater Benefit Cost Ratio, as reported by WS Atkins working for the Department of Transport.

Compulsory acquisition powers for regeneration

21. Your Petitioner is concerned about the powers to acquire land and rights in land compulsory set out in clauses 4 of the Bill, and believes that the powers sought go beyond what is required to achieve implementation of HS2. The powers under clause 47 to acquire land for regeneration and other purposes are unprecedented, unnecessary and only serve to create additional blight.

22. Your Petitioner seeks an assurance that the Secretary of State will acquire no greater amount of land than is reasonably required for the construction and operation of the works authorised by the Bill. Your Petitioner requests that the Bill and the deposited plans be amended to exclude land that is not required, or that the Secretary of State be required to enter into legally binding agreements with land owners saying that land that is not required will not be compulsorily acquired. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that clause 47 be removed from the Bill.

Noise

23. Your petitioner is gravely concerned about the impact of noise on the

tranquillity of the Parish of Greatworth, which as part of South Northamptonshire has recently been ranked as the third best place to live in the whole of the United Kingdom by the Halifax Building Society. South Northamptonshire Council has carried out local noise monitoring, and has evidence that the local dBA level is typically between 25 and 35, measured at six locations in the district within 200m of the proposed line, a mere fraction of what it will be once the proposed railway line is in operation. Noise is one of the most widespread concerns in this area, and many of the mitigation requests are related to a desire to reduce the intrusive noise of ultra high speed trains in this currently tranquil countryside. In addition to our complaint we are aware of the communities of Whitfield, Brackley, Radstone, Thorpe Mandeville and Boddington have also expressed significant concerns about noise.

24. The existing promoter guidance is that noise mitigation is not considered necessary where average decibel levels are predicted to be below 50dBA. In short, an urban area will receive mitigation where noise levels are anticipated to rise from, for example 45dBA to 51dBA, whereas a rural area, such as South Northamptonshire could see levels rise from 25dBA to 49dBA without any mitigation.
25. Your petitioner requests that the Promoter or Nominated Undertaker be required to provide mitigation to reduce the nuisance where ambient dBA noise levels are either predicted to be or turn out to be more than 40 dBA during the day or 35 dBA at night time.
26. Further, your petitioner requests that as the main driver for the proposed railway is apparently no longer speed, and as noise is directly related to speed, the night-time running speed of the railway in rural areas should be limited to no greater than 200kph during the last two hour of operation in the evening (anticipated to be from 10.00pm till midnight).
27. Your petitioner is extremely concerned about the noise profiles that will be experienced due to the trains exiting a tunnel and going into a cutting. We are concerned that this profile will cause an almost instant pop in noise, rather than a gradual build up. This is likely to be more prevalent from the trains travelling south.

28. Your petitioner requests that the Green tunnel be extended to alleviate this risk.

Construction Compounds

29. Your Petitioner is gravely concerned about the impact of the proposed Greatworth Satellite Compound adjacent to Greatworth Hall. Your Petitioner anticipates that the open space and public rights of way will be seriously affected by noise, vibration and dust. There will also be serious visual impacts for the residents and businesses at Greatworth Hall, the residents of Astral Row and Helmdon Road. All of this will significantly reduce the quality of life for your Petitioner, make the current businesses at both Greatworth Hall and Greatworth Park unviable, make learning difficult for the staff and pupils of both Greatworth Primary School and Greatworth Pre-School and reduce enjoyment for users of the open space and Public Rights of Way.

30. Furthermore your Petitioner requests that the Greatworth Satellite compound should be moved to an area to the North of the Sulgrave exit of the Greatworth Green Tunnel. This would remove many of the concerns about the visual impact of the Greatworth Tunnel satellite compound and the associated issues of traffic, light pollution and noise. There is a relatively flat area near the junction with the A4525, exit of the tunnel. This junction needs to be rebuilt as part of the construction phase and citing the compound near to this location would protect Greatworth.

31. Your Petitioner requests that the area is unsuitable for a worksite but that if it has to be there, then the best means available for minimising noise, dust and vibrations both during construction and operation are utilised. Your Petitioner requests that noise, dust and vibration monitoring equipment is installed at Greatworth Hall and Greatworth Primary School for the duration of construction, and a monitoring programme agreed with South Northamptonshire Council. If monitoring shows that the noise thresholds are exceeded, works should stop immediately until noise mitigation can be installed.

32. Additionally your Petitioner requests that tree planting is carried out prior to any construction to ensure that screening is effective to some extent prior to construction.

Working hours

33. Your Petitioner objects to the working hours set out in the draft Code of Construction Practice. Your Petitioner and the residents we represent view the Greatworth Satellite Compound, and they live along possible construction routes. Therefore will be directly affected by construction works and traffic for over 6 years.

34. Your Petitioner requests that working hours in the evening and weekend are curtailed to ensure that the site does not operate 24 hours a day. Work should cease no later than 10PM and not at all on weekends. No work should be undertaken on vent shafts outside construction core hours, and should any work be required outside core hours; this should be at the discretion of local authority. Justification as to why work must be carried out outside of core hours will be required.

Construction Traffic

35. Your Petitioner is gravely concerned about the impact of traffic accessing the Greatworth Satellite Compound site, and the impact this will have on the local road network, the B4525 is already a dangerous stretch of road with a number of fatalities in recent years. An additional 300 workers are expected to work from the site during 6 years of construction. Your Petitioner and the constituents we represent are regular users of roads in the area surrounding the proposed Compound, and are concerned that increased traffic will produce additional risk, create significant congestion and increase pollution in the surrounding area

36. Your Petitioner requests that additional public transport is provided to bring workers to the site, and that this provision be maintained after the construction phase for local use. Currently the village is poorly served by public transport and given the huge expense on a railway with no local stops

adding additional subsidies to the local transport provision would be welcome.

37. Your Petitioner is concerned about the effects that construction traffic will have on B4525 Welsh Road due to its already regular use by HGV traffic making the connection between the M1 and M40, and also the local bio-mass energy plants. Concerns are also raised about the suitability of Halse Road, Helmdon Road and Marston Hill for construction traffic.
38. Your Petitioner further requests that all traffic, HGV and workers vehicles associated with the construction of HS2 be barred from entering the villages of Greatworth and Halse.
39. Your Petitioner is also gravely concerned that temporary closure of Helmdon Road will result in considerable challenges for the users of Greatworth Schools and businesses. Your Petitioner's residents regularly use the Helmdon Road in order to get to the B4525, access the social club, drop children off at school and access footpaths in the area and therefore will be directly affected by this road closure. The Village Schools require easy access to the surrounding villages in order to maintain their viability. Your Petitioner also maintains that the closure of the Helmdon road will significantly; increase the traffic exiting the village along either Halse Road or The Dump Road.
40. Your Petitioner requests that work is undertaken to ensure that Helmdon Road remains open throughout the construction phase. This could be achieved by the construction of the new road prior to the closure of the old one.
41. Additionally your Petitioner requests that Helmdon Road, Halse Road and Marston Road are not used by HGVs at any time. And that construction traffic on the B4525 is restricted to the hours of 10:00 to 15:00 Monday to Friday and not at all at the weekends in order to minimise the negative impacts of construction routes. During construction, the nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the road, and after construction, the road must be returned to its original size and character, and all damage repaired by the nominated undertaker. A hotline should be set up allowing road users to report any damage to the road, and Northamptonshire County Council as

highway authority should have access to all reports, to ensure these are addressed in a reasonable length of time.

42. Furthermore it has been stated that on average there will be 850-1430 daily combined two-way HGV trips from the A422 Brackley Road overbridge. (p228 table 21 of the CFA report Newton Purcell to Brackley). Your petitioner requests that a greater proportion of lorry journeys be made along the line of the rail route to reduce the number of journeys needed on public roads.
43. Your Petitioner is concerned about the Junction to the north of the village where the cross roads formed by the B4525, and roads to Culworth and Marston. This together with the old dump road exit from Greatworth when coupled with the increased traffic and ground works will become very dangerous.
44. Your Petitioner would like a new combined road layout at this location including a roundabout. This would also make an ideal location for the Great worth Satellite compound. Your petitioner requests that roads below a B classification are avoided where at all possible by HGVs in order to minimise the negative impacts of construction. Where routes other than A or B category roads are required, designated haul roads should be considered in discussion with the Local Highways Authority. During construction, the nominated undertaker must maintain the quality of the highways on which it is the predominant user, and after construction, roads and footpath, cycleway and bridleway disturbed by construction work must be returned to their original size, and character, and all damage sympathetically restored by the Nominated Undertaker.

Unnecessary loss of ancient woodland

45. Your petitioner objects to any loss of ancient woodland associated with this proposal. Ancient woodland represents, as stated by HS2 Ltd, an irreplaceable resource, and there is insufficient evidence suggesting that translocation of ancient woodland is successful. Ancient woodland, as identified by the Woodland Trust, will be lost at Halse Copse, which your Petitioner recognises as a key feature of the ancient landscape.

46. Your petitioner requests your honourable House to require that no ancient woodland will be lost in the Parish, and that the alignment of the railway will be modified to ensure this is the case, or green tunnels are used to prevent loss of ancient woodland. As ancient woodland is irreplaceable, there is no mitigation for the loss of this resource. The creation of a tunnel under Halse Copse which would then run through the current exit of the Greatworth Green Tunnel at the Sulgrave end would be an ideal solution.

Height of line

47. Your Petitioner is concerned about the varying height of the line through the area represented by the Petitioner. The original announcement of HS2 had the line on a 40m embankment, through initial consultation and agreement with the Promoter the January 2012 plans included the addition of a green tunnel and the line running along the base of the small valley to the south of Greatworth Hall. The Environmental Statement has the line now passing the village on a 8m embankment. Your petitioner is concerned about further increases and the provision in the bill for the height of the line to vary by as much as 4m as it passes the village.

48. Your Petitioner requests that the height of the line should revert to ground level as per the January 2012 maps. We request that the height of the line be capped at ground level between the green tunnel exit at Helmdon Road and the start of the cutting alongside Greatworth Hall. This will allow for the village to be shielded from majority of the noise. Extending the green tunnel between these points would solve this issue. Alternatively a new overlapping bund should be constructed from the exit of the green tunnel to the highest point of the next cutting to the south of the line and also additional sound proofing should be provided to the north of the line.

Greatworth autotransformer station

49. Your Petitioner is concerned about the landscape and visual impacts of Greatworth autotransformer station and the balancing ponds at Greatworth Hall, both of which introduce new infrastructure into the landscape. Your Petitioner and the residents that we represent will see the new infrastructure, and therefore will be directly affected by the works.

50. Your Petitioner requests that all National grid overhead lines serving the site are buried, and a sensitive design is used for the station building. The design of the autotransformer station should be produced in consultation with the local community, and it must be designed to fit in with the character of the area, taking into consideration the close proximity to both the Listed Farm House at Greatworth Hall and also the Greatworth Conservation area.
51. Your Petitioner request that the autotransformer should be moved to the Northern end of the Green Tunnel at Greatworth. This would save the need for additional planting to hide the building and infrastructure from the village.

Visual Blight

52. Your petitioners are concerned about the visual impact on the village of the railway and ancillary building on the village once the railway is operational. The Environmental statement makes many references to Greatworth and the adverse effect of the railway upon the houses and business in the area. Using words such as extreme, adverse and catastrophic. The attention to the select committee is drawn to the new footbridges, fences and support roads that will be required for the railway that will forever spoil the local landscape.
53. Your petitioner once again calls for effective measures to be put in place to remove this burden of the railway from the community of Greatworth. The most ideal option is a modest extension of the tunnel from Greatworth to the cutting along the line towards Radstone.

Operational Concerns

54. Your Petitioner requests that the Greatworth tunnel be extended along the line of the route towards Radstone, to remove the long term effects the Railway will have on the community and to attempt to restore the area to the current tranquil ideal.
55. Your petitioner requests extending the green tunnel and creating a new escarpment, the community represented by Your Petitioner can be shielded from much of the on-going operational effects of the railway. The independent

assessors report into the Environmental Statement Responses concluded that a “modest extension of the green tunnel at Greatworth would remove many of the local objections”

56. Your Petitioner is concerned about the design of the green tunnel portal to the North of the Village. This structure will be clearly visible from the homes of a number of residents and also those enjoying the Public rights of Way, and it will not fit in with the surrounding environment. This will have a significant negative impact on the landscape, and ruin the aesthetics of the local environment.

57. In order to minimise the impact of the proposal, your Petitioner requests that prior to construction, Greatworth Parish Council and other local residents should be consulted meaningfully on the detailed drawings and plans for the Portal building. It must be designed to fit in with the surrounding environment, and be maintained to a high standard. Visual screening must be put in place, and this must also be maintained to a high standard.

58. Your petitioner is concerned about the proposed new height of Helmdon Road as it crosses the Green Tunnel to the North of Greatworth. The alignment of the road will see both an increase in traffic noise and also light pollution from headlight for the residents of Astral Row.

59. Your petitioner once again requests that the height of the line reverts to the agreed January 2012 height. For the consultation we had with the chief engineer it was agreed that the line height would be dropped. At the January 2012 height the road would be reinstated at its current height.

Compensation

60. Your Petitioner submits that the compensation provisions in relation to property that is not compulsory acquired and other matters are not sufficient to compensate your Petitioner adequately for the loss and damage they may incur as a result of construction and operation of the high speed railway and associated development. There are many homeowners in our Parish whose houses have lost tens or hundreds of thousands of pounds. Some are unable to sell their properties. The Rt Hon Philip Hammond, when he was Transport

Secretary, indicated that fair compensation would be provided for those affected by HS2. Your petitioner does not know of a homeowner in this Parish who thinks that the HS2 compensation arrangements are fair.

61. Your petitioner is concerned by Clause 47 of the Bill which states that "If the Secretary of State considers that the construction or operation of Phase One of High Speed 2 gives rise to the opportunity for regeneration or development of any land, the Secretary of State may acquire the land compulsorily". Your petitioner considers this provides an opportunity for the state to profit while homeowners, landowners and businesses subsidise this project.
62. Your Petitioner requests that the Bill should be amended to ensure persons outside the safeguarding area who are injuriously affected and adversely affected by loss of value should be entitled to claim compensation. Your petitioner also requests that Clause 47 in its entirety should be removed from the Bill.
63. Your petitioner submits that business owners close to the proposed route of HS2 will not be suitably compensated. There are many businesses which will be adversely affected in our Parish at both Greatworth Hall and Greatworth Park.
64. Your Petitioner requests that the Bill should be amended to ensure business owners close to the proposed route of HS2 who are injuriously affected and adversely affected should be entitled to claim reasonable compensation.
65. Your Petitioner requests that compensation for those in the voluntary purchase zone should be increased at a minimum to include the removal of stamp duty on the property they are effectively being forced to buy to regain their quality of life.

Footpaths and *Rights of Way Issues*

66. Your Petitioner objects to the Bill because of the proposed closures/diversions of AN39, AN40, AN41, AN44, AN13, AN14, AN28, AN19, and AN37. The footpaths and bridleways represent an important community asset to your Petitioner and the community we represent, this includes

individuals and also those participating in the Northamptonshire County Council Health Walks scheme. The Public Right of Way is vital to your Petitioner for a number of reasons, including the health and wellbeing of the residents, as a safe vital recreational space for dog walking. The loss and/or diversions of these footpaths for years will have significant negative impacts on your Petitioner.

67. Your Petitioner requests that these public rights of way are not closed for any length of time. If the right of way is to be diverted, then a replacement right of way of an equal or similar length must be provided between the same locations first. Any diversion either temporary or permanent must not include using the B4525. The B4525 is a very dangerous road already and subject to an impending 50MPH speed limit, with the identified increase in HGV traffic this will only get worse. The replacement/temporary diversions to public rights of way must be planned in consultation with the local community including Greatworth Parish council and the Health Walks Group, local knowledge is important in planning the new routes.

68. Although the temporary closure of footpaths will be a significant inconvenience the local community supports the prioritisation of better long-term provision over short term benefits. For example reduce the number of new pedestrian bridges during construction in favour of the green tunnel extension that will once again provide a more natural crossing point.

Wildlife and Ecology

69. Your Petitioner is concerned about the impacts of the loss of woodland, vegetation, specific habitat along the route through the Parish on the local wild life and specifically the Barn owl community. The loss of any wildlife habitat affects your Petitioner and the residents of Greatworth, who regularly go to the countryside to appreciate the variety of wildlife in this area. The established hunting routes of Barn owls and the flight paths of bats in the area are along the dis-used railway to the North East of the Village, HS2 will dissect this route and wipe out the wildlife.

70. Your Petitioner requests that habitat compensation should be like-for-like, with no net loss of habitat of comparable ecological value, and that a net gain

in biodiversity/habitat compensation is delivered. This must be delivered as close as possible to the site of loss, in locations that will not be further impacted. Planting mitigation should be carried out well in advance of vegetation removal, so that habitats reach their functional maturity before the original habitats are lost. Furthermore the increased Green Tunnel as requested by your Petitioner would also significantly mitigate the risks to the local diverse wildlife specific Barn Owls and Bats who according to the HS2 Environmental Statement risk being wiped out.

Water Courses

71. Your Petitioner objects to the use of balancing ponds in the local Area. Your Petitioner and the local residents use the walks and land in the surrounding area, and balancing ponds would alter the character of this area.
72. Your Petitioner requests that alternatives Sustainable Urban Drainage System techniques are considered in consultation with the local authority. If balancing ponds must be used, they should not be artificially lined, and they should be used to support imaginative ecological enhancements and maintained with some water and vegetation at all times.

Impact of liquifaction of boulder clay

73. Your petitioner is gravely concerned that no work has been carried out on the possible effects of vibration from the high speed trains on the local topography – more specifically the underlying Boulder Clay in the Northamptonshire Uplands which covers much of the area we represent. The proposed route will cut through ancient springs causing concerns for the long term safety of the oldest buildings in the village.
74. More specifically, your petitioner is concerned that where deep cuttings are in place, they should be designed in such a way as to completely avoid the risk of landslip due to this phenomenon of liquifaction. Furthermore, your petitioner is concerned that where liquifaction of ground may occur, works may be required to stabilise historic buildings within the village, which will almost certainly have an impact on their significance.

75. Your petitioner requests your honourable House that the Promoter be required to carry out a detailed study of all sections of the route passing through boulder clay in the District to ensure that where a risk of liquifaction is possible, measures are put in place to avoid such an occurrence.

76. Your petitioner also requests that the Promoters acknowledge that mitigation may be required for properties that lie outside the Limits within which protective works can be carried out under the Bill.

Greatworth Green Tunnel

77. Your Petitioner supports the construction of a green tunnel in between Helmdon Road and Sulgrave as proposed by the Bill, thereby avoiding further detrimental impacts on the parish of Greatworth. Your Petitioner requests that this green tunnel remain part of the Bill.

Conclusion

78. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, so far affecting your Petitioner, the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.

79. 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 Petitioner.

YOUR PETITIONER therefore humbly 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 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.

Nicholas G. Peart

Chair, Greatworth Parish Council

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2014-2015

HIGH SPEED RAIL
(LONDON-WEST MIDLANDS)
BILL

PETITION OF Greatworth Parish Council

AGAINST, By Counsel, &c.

