

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 GRAEME PHILLIPS

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 Graeme Phillips (hereinafter referred to as 'the Petitioner'), the owner of Flat 11, South Lawns, High Street, Northfleet, Gravesend, Kent DA11 9HY ('the Property').

HS1-HS2 LINK RAILWAY

8. Your Petitioner is concerned about the decision to withdraw plans for a link railway between HS1 and HS2 and that there are no apparent signs that options for an HS1-HS2 link railway are under consideration.
9. Your Petitioner believes the original plans for an HS1-HS2 link railway were not optimal in the form they existed, but did not wish to see all ideas for an HS1-HS2 link railway discarded entirely. Your Petitioner wishes to see a full in-depth analysis of the options carried out before full dismissal of all possibilities of an HS1-HS2 link railway.
10. Your Petitioner favoured the "Euston Cross" and believes it was rejected by HS2 (the company) with very little consideration and using a very narrow focus. HS2 believed there was no sound case for a high-capacity high-speed HS1-HS2 link railway on account of low expected international Eurostar traffic from the Midlands to Manchester. Your Petitioner agrees that there is no apparent business case for a high-capacity high-speed link when Eurostar traffic alone is considered. However, your Petitioner believes several additional connectivity opportunities have been overlooked.
11. Your Petitioner notes that the Euston Cross option could also enable direct rail connectivity between the Midlands and Kent without the need for London interchange. It would also enable connectivity to a future Thames estuary airport if it were built, easy connectivity with Gatwick and Luton airports via the Thameslink route (interchange at St. Pancras International station), easy connections between Kent and the Great Western Main Line via the future Old Oak interchange station and many more options.
12. Your Petitioner believes that the Euston Cross proposal, with its intended entrances at Euston and St. Pancras International stations would be the best choice to ensure maximum connectivity, but would like to see an in-depth investigation of all options.

Your Petitioner notes that no options for passive provision for an HS1-HS2 link appear to have been seriously considered. Your Petitioner would like to see options for passive provision considered in full before a decision is made to completely discard all possibilities of an HS1-HS2 link. Your Petitioner believes that the cost of passive provision would not be a significant addition to the cost of the project and that later rectification would be very expensive if no passive provision has been made.

EXISTING HS1 STATION CONNECTIVITY

13. Your Petitioner notes that though St. Pancras International and Ashford International stations were good examples of systems integration regarding HS1, the other two HS1 stations, Stratford International and Ebbsfleet International, were poorly designed from a connectivity perspective.

14. Stratford International station is poorly connected to Stratford Regional station on account of being situated the other side of Stratford Westfield shopping centre, with only a Docklands Light Railway connection. Ebbsfleet International is poorly connected to the nearby Northfleet station, resulting in a long walk between the two stations, even though they are only 200-300m apart, making it impractical as an interchange station.
15. A bridge link between Ebbsfleet International and Northfleet stations was considered, but this idea was raised at a very late stage (at which point the idea was significantly more expensive) and so the utility of Ebbsfleet International station has been limited. Similarly, your Petitioner believes a moving walkway (along the lines of those seen in airports) is one way of providing connectivity between Stratford Regional station, Stratford City bus station and Stratford International station.
16. Your Petitioner does not have the evidence to definitively verify that the options listed in paragraph 16 are the most sound ones. However your Petitioner would like to see options considered for improving connectivity at Stratford International and Ebbsfleet International as part of the HS2 project, so as to enable them to be effectively used as part of an integrated HS1-HS2 system.
17. Your Petitioner would like to see an in-depth investigation of how lessons can be learned for HS2 to avoid the mistakes made with HS1 in terms of lack of foresight regarding poor integration of different railways.
18. It is possible that a timely in-depth analysis may still reveal that a well-connected station would have been disproportionately expensive (as was the case with Germany's Limburg Süd station), but your Petitioner does not believe options to connect HS1's stations to nearby railways were considered in a sufficiently timely matter.
19. Your Petitioner is aware of the government's plans for a future Ebbsfleet garden city and believes that options to improve the transport connectivity of the area should be considered as part of the HS2 project, so as to ensure the future city's success. Your Petitioner is also a resident of Northfleet, the nearest town to Ebbsfleet International station and is therefore keen to see transport interchange options considered as part of the HS2 project so that the redevelopment of Northfleet can be assisted where practical.

CONCLUSION

20. In light of the above, the Petitioner reserves the right to raise the above matters and any further matters of concern relating to the substance of the Bill and this Petition that may arise from continuing discussions, the preparation and publication of reports, any possible revisions that may be made to current work site proposals or any other matters relevant to our expressed concerns that may occur in due course and prior to our representation before the Select Committee.
21. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioner respectfully submits that, unless clauses of the Bill are removed or amended, then the Bill should not be allowed to pass into law.
22. There are other clauses and provisions in the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioner and their rights, (including their human rights) interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect

your Petitioner and other clauses and provisions necessary for their protection and benefit are omitted therefrom.

YOUR PETITIONER THEREFORE HUMBLY PRAY your Honourable House that the Bill may not be allowed to pass into law as it now stands and that they may be heard by their Counsel, Agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against such of the clauses and provisions of the Bill as affect the property, rights and interests of your Petitioner and in support of such other clauses and provisions as may be necessary or expedient for their protection, or that such other relief may be given to your Petitioner in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioners will ever pray, &c

.....
SIGNED



IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF
COMMONS
SESSION
2013- 2014

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON TO WEST MIDLANDS BILL)

PETITION OF GRAEME PHILLIPS

AGAINST, By counsel, &c

