

**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 EDWARD BRAGIEL and JULIA CLARK**

**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 Petitioners are **EDWARD BRAGIEL and JULIA CLARK** of 165 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8LA

Your Petitioners are resident householders in Gloucester Avenue and have lived there for many years. They both also cycle to work each day and again have done so for many years. The Promoter's plans severely threaten the health, wealth, amenity, pleasure and life of your Petitioners.

Your Petitioners fear that the Promoter's plans will cause traffic chaos and gridlock over a period of ten years as well as air serious noise and air pollution.

They ask your honourable House to ensure that the Promoter's plans do not cause traffic chaos, gridlock or noise or air pollution in Camden over this period.

Your Petitioners are further deeply concerned that the Promoter's tunnels will run near to his house and cause blight to its value. They consider that the exclusion of properties above the Promoter's tunnels from compensation is deeply unjust.

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

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

### **Traffic**

Your Petitioners fear that HS2's construction plans in Camden will lead to prolonged traffic chaos and to gridlock. The Promoter is seeking powers to make traffic orders, despite being neither a long-established nor an experienced highway authority. HS2 has no understanding of the reasons behind the current pattern of traffic flow in Camden; including the environmental reasons behind many local regulations. The successful management of traffic in Camden can only be assured by a considered and complementary system. The closures and diversions proposed by the Promoter, taken together with the very large number of additional lorry journeys, are an almost certain recipe for chaos.

Your Petitioners' specific fears are as follows:

- 1 Your Petitioners are deeply concerned that the powers contained in Clause 3 and Schedule 4 of the Bill concerning highways may seriously affect the ability of the highway authorities to manage their own network.
- 2 Your Petitioners are dismayed that the Environmental Statement contains no traffic management plan to demonstrate how traffic can be managed during construction without destroying the life of the community in Gloucester Avenue, in Primrose Hill Village and in Camden in general.

- 3 Your Petitioners are astonished at the Promoter's failure to give adequate attention to the need to prevent construction causing traffic chaos in Camden. They draw your honourable House's attention to the Promoter's lack of experience in traffic management and to the assumption in the Bill that the needs of construction should be allowed to override all other traffic priorities in Camden.
- 4 Your Petitioners draw to your attention the huge personal, social, business, economic, health, educational, cultural and other costs of prolonged traffic chaos and gridlock in Camden.
- 5 Your Petitioners fear that construction traffic and road closures in Camden will have a significant detrimental impact on Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village.
- 6 Your Petitioners fear that construction traffic and road closures will lead to congestion at the junction of Gloucester Avenue with Oval Road; and at the junction of Gloucester Avenue with Delancey Street and Parkway. The closure of Park Village East will aggravate these problems, with Albert Street and Arlington Road being turned into rat runs. Other major local roads, including Albany Street, Chalk Farm Road, Oval Road, Primrose Hill Road, Prince Albert Road and Regent's Park Road, will see an increase in construction traffic. Use of the Slips car park in Regent's Park for construction vehicles will intensify traffic pressure at Gloucester Gate.
- 7 Your Petitioners fear that the building of the vent shaft on Adelaide Road, with the closure of Adelaide Road and an increase in construction traffic, threatens major disruption not only to Adelaide Road itself but to England's Lane, Haverstock Hill and Primrose Hill Road.
- 8 Your Petitioners fear that construction traffic will cause congestion on Haverstock Hill, the principal road leading north from Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village.

- 9 Your Petitioners fear that, while the immediate impact on Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village will be severe, the threat posed to it by HS2's plans cannot be limited to their immediate area. HS2's plans for Camden as a whole threaten to cause traffic chaos throughout the borough of Camden and beyond. Gloucester Avenue, the area around it and Camden as a whole will all suffer.
- 10 Your Petitioners are concerned about the transportation of hazardous material near Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village, and in Camden as a whole.
- 11 Your Petitioners oppose, as a general principle, the use of cycle routes for construction traffic. Gloucester Avenue is a marked and much-used cycle route and together with other roads affected by HS2's construction plans is used daily by Your Petitioners and many other cyclists.
- 12 Your Petitioners are concerned about the risk to the vulnerable (cyclists and pedestrians) at junctions affected by construction works or where there are significant increases in traffic.
- 13 Your Petitioners fear that many bus routes, including the C2, 31, 168 and 274, on which residents in Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village, especially the elderly, are heavily dependent, will be diverted and delayed; that commutes and school runs will become much more difficult and time-consuming; that the emergency services will struggle to get through; and that traffic chaos, including gridlock, will cause significant loss of time and profitability to many thousands of people. They also fear that HS2's plans will bring huge inconvenience and massive economic loss not only to Camden but to surrounding boroughs, including Islington and Westminster.

To address these fears, your Petitioners pray your honourable House to ensure the following:

- 14 Your Petitioners request you to look very closely at the Promoter's plans under Clause 3 and Schedule 4 of the Bill to make traffic orders. They ask you to examine the experience, and therefore competence, of the Promoter in traffic

management. They ask you to place clear limits on the general powers of the Promoter to make traffic orders.

- 15 Your Petitioners request you to ensure that the Promoter provides a full traffic management plan for the period of construction. This needs to show that the legitimate entitlement of your Petitioners, in Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill Village and Camden as a whole, to a functioning traffic management system can be reconciled with the wholesale interference with the current system set out in the Bill.
- 16 Your Petitioners request your honourable House to give the question of traffic management in Camden during construction your closest attention. They ask you to ensure that a full traffic management plan, which protects the rights of your Petitioners and of Camden as a whole, as well as the allowing the Promoter to carry out construction, is in place before the beginning of any construction.
- 17 Your Petitioners request you to limit the scale of development at Euston and the area around it, reducing the construction traffic associated with it. A double-deck station provides the obvious benefit of maintaining or even reducing the footprint of Euston Station rather than enlarging it.
- 18 Your Petitioners request that you remove spoil from demolition and bring in construction materials by rail rather than by road. A platform at Euston dedicated to spoil removal would mean many fewer lorries on the streets of Camden. They also ask you to examine the possible removal of spoil and import of construction materials by canal.
- 19 Your Petitioners request that you examine closely any scheme which does not require surface rail construction through Camden and also proposes to remove spoil by rail.
- 20 Your Petitioners asks you to provide a full assessment of the Promoter's plans to transport hazardous waste through Camden prior to any work starting.

- 21 Your Petitioners request that you prohibit construction traffic from using Gloucester Avenue, a marked cycle route. They also request that you prohibit construction traffic from using marked cycle routes anywhere in Camden. If the Promoter wishes to use any marked cycle route, it must provide an alternative, temporary cycle route.
- 22 Your Petitioners request that you instruct the Promoter to put in place measures to assure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians at junctions affected by construction works or where there are significant increases in traffic.
- 23 Your Petitioners request that you use the now redundant HS1/HS2 Link main compound, or the land intended for the HS1/HS2 Link portal, for the vent shaft currently planned for Adelaide Road, removing the need to close Adelaide Road during the construction of the vent shaft.

### **The Alignment of Tunnels**

- 1 Your Petitioners point out the very great extent of existing railway land to the north and east of Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill. It is most desirable that the Promoter's tunnels should run beneath existing railway land rather than beneath your Petitioners' house.
- 2 While they were pleased by the minor realignment of the Promoter's tunnels away from Gloucester Avenue and Primrose Hill Village, agreed by the Gloucester Avenue Association and the Promoter in 2013, your Petitioners believe that an alignment running beneath the centre of existing railway land would be greatly preferable in protecting his interests.
- 3 Your Petitioners point out that the Promoter's decision to locate a vent shaft near the Nature Reserve on Adelaide Road was based on the need for it to service the now-abandoned HS1/HS2 Link tunnel, as well as the twin tunnels running towards Euston. Your Petitioners points out that this is no longer the case, following the abandonment of the HS1/HS2 Link.

4 Your Petitioners believe that it is possible to site the vent shaft for the Euston tunnels on existing railway land, rather than next to Adelaide Road. They respectfully observe that the removal of the provisions for the Link will release two areas of land previously required in connection with the Link: the first being the site which was proposed for a construction compound and the HS2/HS1 intervention shaft by the former Primrose Hill Station. The second is the site proposed for the eastern portal of the HS2/HS1 tunnel on land between Juniper Crescent and the Regent's Park Road Bridge. Both sites are within the "red lining" of the Bill, and both are fewer than 2000 metres from the site of the next vent shaft on the proposed railway at Alexandra Place. Your Petitioners understands that this is the principal engineering constraint affecting the spacing of vent shafts.

Your Petitioners therefore respectfully pray your honourable House as follows:

- 5 Your Petitioners request you to ensure that the Promoter's tunnels run centrally under existing railway land between Parkway and the Chalk Farm Bridge.
- 6 Your Petitioners ask you to examine the opportunity provided by the abandonment of the HS1/HS2 Link to realign the Promoter's tunnels to run to a vent shaft situated in what was the intended HS1/HS2 Link construction compound; or on the site of the intended HS1/HS2 Link portal.
- 7 Your Petitioners pray that in considering the Promoter's plans for Euston, to replace the now-abandoned Option 8, the loss or saving of a few seconds during the operation of the line should not be allowed to outweigh the interests of the residents of Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill Village and Camden. They draw your honourable House's attention to the fact that capacity rather than speed is now the Promoter's argument for the necessity of building the line.
- 8 Your Petitioners pray that, in considering the Promoter's plans for Euston, your honourable House is mindful of his interests. Your Petitioners believe that any decision on plans for Euston Station to replace Option 8 will have implications for him. They therefore request that you will ensure that, in making this decision, significant weight should be given to any solution which allows the Promoter's

tunnels to run centrally under existing railway land in the sector between Parkway and Chalk Farm Bridge.

- 9 Your Petitioners pray your honourable House, when considering the option of a double-deck station at Euston, to add to its unenlarged or reduced footprint and other merits the advantage of allowing the alignment of the Promoter's tunnels to run centrally under existing railway land in the sector between Parkway and Chalk Farm Bridge.

### **Compensation**

Your Petitioners believe that compensation proposals for the damage caused by construction are inadequate and unjust:

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

- 6 Your Petitioners fear that HS2's plans will cause traffic chaos and NO2 pollution in Gloucester Avenue, Primrose Hill Village and Camden as a whole, making them less attractive places in which to live. It is unjust that there should be no compensation for the loss of amenity, threat to health and property blight resulting from HS2's plans.

Your Petitioners pray your honourable House to ensure measures providing fair compensation:

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

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 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 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 Petitioners in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioners will ever pray, &c

**SIGNED**

**EDWARD BRAGIEL**

**JULIA CLARK**