

IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2013-14

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL

Against – On Merits – Praying to be heard

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

THE HUMBLE PETITION of CORIN CAMPBELL-HILL

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 line 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 & 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 Mc Loughlin, supported by the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Chancellor of the Exchequer, Secretary Theresa May, Secretary Vincent Cable, Secretary Iain Duncan Smith, Secretary Eric Pickles, Secretary Owen Paterson, Secretary Edwin Davey and Mr Robert Goodwill.
3. Clauses 1-36 of the Bill set out the Bill’s objectives in relation to the construction and operation of the railway mentioned in para. 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 water, sewage, street works and the use of lorries.
4. Clauses 37-42 of the Bill deals with the regulatory regime for the railway.
5. Clauses 43-65 of the Bill set out a number of miscellaneous and general provisions, including provision for the appointment of a nominated undertaker to exercise the powers under the Bill, transfer schemes, provisions relating to statutory undertakers and the Crown, provisions about the compulsory acquisition of land for regeneration, reinstatement works and provision about other high speed railway works. Provision is also made about the application of the Environmental Impact

## Assessment Regulations

6. The works proposed to be authorised by The Bill are specified in clauses 1 and 2 and Schedules 1 and 2 of 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. The Bill designates \_\_\_\_\_ as a street where anticipated works will have an impact by way of traffic congestion and/or interference with pedestrian passage, said to be predominantly in Q2 2017, with alleged "moderate adverse effects" by HGV or other vehicles.
8. Your Petitioner is Corin Campbell-Hill which owns the long leasehold of \_\_\_\_\_ part of an early Victorian terrace. Your Petitioner resides at \_\_\_\_\_, where she has lived for many years. Your petitioner rents out \_\_\_\_\_ Each of the properties, \_\_\_\_\_ may be directly and specially affected by the works contemplated by the Bill. Your Petitioner has also long independently owned the freehold of \_\_\_\_\_ and it likewise may be directly and specially affected by such works. Paras. 18-23 below apply also to that property. The Petitioner petitions on behalf of each of the two properties,  
\_\_\_\_\_. At some point, it is possible that the Petitioner may move to \_\_\_\_\_ ) at which point she will rent out \_\_\_\_\_ She currently rents out \_\_\_\_\_ and will continue to do so.
9. Both properties, \_\_\_\_\_, lie within the \_\_\_\_\_ Conservation Area, and it is currently projected that, apart from the matter referred to in para. 7 above, numerous works are projected to take place within or close to the area, liable to affect such properties. Some of those works are referred to hereafter.
10. In addition to the matters referred to in para. 7 above, by a notice 271/007732 from Messrs Winckworth Sherwood and Eversheds sent 23 November 2013 some (but alas not all of those interested in or occupying \_\_\_\_\_ were informed that it was intended to seek authority for compulsory acquisition by way of temporary possession of land, identified by what appears to be a strip of garden running behind numbers \_\_\_\_\_ numbered 343- 360 on the deposited plans, (sheet 1-06) which accompanied the said notice. No further information was provided. In particular, nothing was said about the nature or duration of the proposed works, how access was to be gained or otherwise what disruption or inconvenience was liable to be caused. Research revealed that Sch. 15 to the Bill identified Nos. 350-360 as required for "diversion or installation of works to utilities apparatus", but this still left very substantial questions as to the nature or duration of the planned operation.
11. More generally, sheet No 1-06 indicates a number of planned operations in or in the

vicinity of

viz

itself,

Again, no information was provided by the said notice or otherwise as to what was intended, although your Petitioners have been led to understand that and possibly represent "land potentially required during reconstruction".

12. Your Petitioner and her rights, interests and property are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

13. The bill is unclear as to what is planned for the strip represented, 343 - 360 or for the other areas in the vicinity of and the extent to which life as a resident of it will be disrupted and for how long. This uncertainty will affect the quality of life of those residing in the two flats as well as their value and saleability.

14. Looking at matters overall, there are two aspects which render the position of your Petitioner unfair:

(a) The very fact that the details provided on sheet No 1.06 are so unclear, with no guide as to numbered references, make it virtually impossible to determine precisely what areas are required for what purposes and for how long.

(b) The unfortunate circumstance that the deadline imposed for lodging this Petition precedes whatever response may be forthcoming in consequence of Consultation Responses to HS2's Environmental Statement returned among many others by your Petitioners. All that has been forthcoming so far is a bare analysis of the responses, without any evaluation of their weight or validity.

15. Focussing in the first place on works planned re. 343 - 360 your Petitioner is confused as to why the said notice sent 23 November 2013 could not have contained a statement along the following lines: "We are likely to need temporary possession of in order to conduct the following works.....Those works are likely to take.....weeks/months/years. They will inconvenience you in the following respects." With regard to your Petitioner's property at , which forms part of an early Victorian terrace number 343 - 360 on the deposited plans (sheet 1 - 06) , it is indicated that sewer works 1/29 will be under taken in the gardens at the rear of this terrace. Several houses in the terrace have been extended into the back gardens and any work might therefore have to be done under the extensions which will be extremely disruptive and could involve occupants having to vacate the premises. In the particular case of , that in order to do any work, tenants have to be given notice to leave the premises which would cause the loss of rental income. In addition, should HS2 Limited cause any structural damage

your Petitioner requests that before, during, and after, surveys be done to the property. Should any damage be caused, it is requested that this be put right at the expense of HS2 Limited.

16. Having regard to the fact that nothing was said about what is intended to be done, there are two scenarios:

(a) The work will be carried out entirely beneath the surface, tunnelling from . In that event, direct disruption to may well be limited. Foreseeable risks would be of contamination and subsidence.

(b) The work will call for surface excavation. If so, how will access be gained? The only access to the back garden at is via the front garden, and then down the steps into the garden flat. The front garden is shared by all flats in the building and is directly overlooked by looks directly over the back garden. How deep will the excavation reach? How much disruption will there be to the use and enjoyment of and for how long? Will the changes be permanent? Will the occupants of preserve their rights to peaceful enjoyment of their properties?

17. Thus your Petitioner humbly asks that, in order to remove the uncertainty imposed on the property and the leaseholders' and the occupiers' peaceful enjoyment thereof, the wording of the Bill be amended so as to identify the nature and extent of the work to be done as well as its duration.

18. Turning now to the wider position, that is to say to works generally as designated on Sheet No.1-06 and otherwise within North London, your Petitioners submit that serious consideration should be given to altering the route of the proposed line – either by having the line terminate at Old Oak Common or by more tunnelling. The current choice of route is one which has grossly weighted matters in favour of construction at the expense of those living, working or travelling in North London, and in particular supported by no plausible cost/benefit analysis. Apart from the roads that skirt and the southern part of the area has no through traffic. It is aptly known as and is indeed quieter than many rural villages and those who live here value it for that quality. It is a close-knit community, as evidenced by its thriving Community Centre and the fact that through residents own efforts, its library has been saved as a community enterprise. All this is under threat from the widespread works planned by HS2.

19. Against that background, your Petitioners would wish to draw attention to the following facts and matters which are liable prejudicially to affect Your Petitioners and the property:

- (a) Dust, noise, vibration and pollution. Unless modified, the contemplated works and associated lorry traffic will cause years of such nuisance and any 24 hour working will cause sleep deprivation. Pollution levels in the area are already excessive.
- (b) Closure of \_\_\_\_\_ and other streets. Your Petitioners would ask that serious consideration be given to relocating the ventilation shaft from \_\_\_\_\_, a critical east/ west route, which it is envisaged will be subject to long closures. Closures plus the significant extra HGV traffic running through existing streets, will inevitably cause congestion and an unacceptable diversion of vehicles being routed through the \_\_\_\_\_ area. (This might be mitigated were the current Central London congestion zone extended northwards so as to deter vehicles from entering the works zone, and in the event of the House being otherwise adverse to your Petitioners, they would urge that measures be taken to this end).
- (c) 24 hour working. Your Petitioners appreciate that on occasions this may be necessary. They would however ask that the parameters for such occasions be narrowly defined. HS2 should not have liberty routinely to engage in 24 hour working, with all the nuisance which this entails, simply to reduce costs.
- (d) The huge amount of HGV traffic will inevitably lead to an increase in accidents involving, in particular cyclists. HS2 appear to have given no thought to their predicament. Furthermore, certain cycle routes or proposed cycle routes will be blocked or lost.
- (e) Parking for residents and businesses. Your Petitioners are anxious lest the area returns to the chaos which obtained some 15 years ago, before it became a CPZ. At the moment parking is barely held in balance. Deprivation of spaces – eg because of temporary acquisition of roads for depots or works – Nos. 290, 361 and 392 -- would have a catastrophic effect.
- (f) Access to public transport. Closure of \_\_\_\_\_ would mean diversion half a mile northwards of the \_\_\_\_\_, the only east/west route serving the area. Should works on Nos. 381 and 382, 388 or 390 be extensive, access to \_\_\_\_\_ Underground Station would be blocked, as would access to the \_\_\_\_\_ bus. A two would be converted into a fifteen minute walk.

These facts and matters should, of course, be seen cumulatively – something notably absent from the approach taken in HS2's Environmental Statement.

20. Your Petitioner therefore asks that the methodology of the proposed works be revisited, so as so far as possible to avoid the problems referred to above. They

humbly request that HS2 should be required to consider alternative schemes to achieve the object of the Bill – including tunnelling and/or the use of the existing railway line rather than lorries for soil removal. Insofar as Rail track objects to use of the existing railway line for soil removal, its objections should be overridden.

21. In the event that the works proceed substantially in their present form, peaceful enjoyment of the two flats, and of will be substantially compromised.
22. One of the fundamental errors underlying the Bill and HS2's Environmental Statement is the assumption that urban dwellers are much more ready to absorb problems arising from major construction works. This is patronising and, worse, discriminatory. And in its assessment of the impact of noise and vibration, HS2 have the effrontery to suggest that this is to be ignored because allegedly in the ordinary course of events other construction work would be taking place. Your Petitioners therefore humbly submit that the House should address the issue of compensation and in particular the imbalance between levels of compensation proposed for urban as opposed to rural areas.
23. Your Petitioner humbly asks that the House recommends that funds be set aside which provide realistic compensation and/or if funds are limited, that any formula for their distribution should not favour rural over urban dwellers.

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 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 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.

.....  
As owner of

---

22 May 2014

