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1. THE CHAIR: Before we come to the first petitioner, the NFU have written to the Committee. Looking at that letter, really it’s more queries for HS2, so I look forward to reading HS2’s response to the points raised in that letter, rather than addressing them myself.

2. Mr Parkin, welcome and thank you for returning to petition the Committee. I understand that you may be disappointed that the Committee have taken a different view about the siting of the infrastructure at maintenance base. However we have taken that view. I therefore ask you to use your time today not to stray into those areas that we’ve already heard about, but to use your time to introduce new considerations relating to the additional provision only; anything that doesn’t relate to the additional provision will be disorderly and I will not permit an exploration of that. Please, as we beseech all petitioners, let us know early on what you’d like, and if you can’t have it, then what you’d like us to do by way of mitigation and your suggestions. I hope that will help you.

3. Also, in terms of timing, I can see no reason why your submission should go on more than half an hour; I think that’s very generous for someone returning, very generous for an additional provision, so I will stop you at 4.39 and see if HS2 have anything to say. Over to you, sir.

   Stone and Chebsey Parish Council

   Submissions by Mr Parkin

4. MR PARKIN: Okay, well thank you very much, Chairman, and Committee for having us back. On behalf of Stone and Chebsey Parish Councils, we are going to be brief about what we want and why we wanted it, because you’ve actually covered it, you know what we wanted and why we wanted it. So we’re going to deal with new issues today in relation to the additional provision and supplementary environmental statement and our petition in relation to that.

5. So today’s evidence will just be given by myself and my colleague, Gordon Wilkinson, who you are familiar with. He was here before when we were here in April.
6. We are going to focus today on Yarnfield Lane and improvement measures that we would like to see on Yarnfield Lane in relation to the Stone railhead. This very much relates to the additional provisioning and I’ll give some details about why we think that’s the case.

7. As you’re probably aware, Yarnfield village as itself is a very busy village; it has not only 2,200 residents, but it has a conference centre with 400 bedrooms. It has the Stone Dominos Football Club, which is quite a regional centre for football.

8. THE CHAIR: Can I suggest we get up a map to remind ourselves of the area, so, as you’re discussing it, we are very clear?

9. MR PARKIN: Yes, certainly. Okay. So, I was going to refer to P44(2) which was the original operational layout for Stone, and then P44(1), which is the new operational layout, so you can see the differences. I’m not sure all the facilities will actually show up that I’ve just referred to on here, but I’ll do my best to draw attention to them.

10. So, you can see Yarnfield Lane here. You’ve got Stone Golf Course, the Wayfarer junction a bit further up. This is obviously the railhead location, a location which we’ll refer to in a minute, Moss Lane, and then as you come into Stone, Stone Dominos Football Club is here, just on the edge of the village.

11. You’ve got Yarnfield Park Conference Centre which has about 80,000 visitors a year, located here. The other parts of it, not quite on the map, I suspect, which is Springfield First School, which not only takes children from the village, but also children from Stone. We’ve got the Labour in Vain public house, the village post office, a Cloud Nine hair and beauty salon, and the village hall. So it’s a very busy community.

12. The reason for showing this plan is to show the current arrangements for the railhead as proposed originally. If you go to P44(1), you’ll see the new operational layout, and I’ll point out the differences. So, the main difference in terms of the railhead here that we’re interested in, as you’ll see, that there was a 449-metre-long viaduct which crossed the valley of the Filly Brook, and the railway here, the Norton Bridge to Stone railway. That has been replaced by an 80-metre-long viaduct, as part
of the new proposals, with the remainder being made up of embankments in the flood plain.

13. We also had a second bridge here – this used to be called the Filly Brook west underbridge because the Filly Brook used to go underneath it. It’s now been replaced by a culvert and embankments.

14. The other material changes which have been made that we have petitioned about are that the mainline railway has been raised by between 0.6 and 0.9 metres, as it goes past the Stone railhead, and the railway itself has been moved over by 15.5 metres at the point where it crosses the M6 motorway.

15. The major change, as far as we’re concerned, and what impacts it has on HGV traffic, is the fact that we’ve got a lot more embankment as replacement for structures.

16. Now, if I can just turn to paragraph 5.1.22 of the SES and AP ES volume 2 community area report. You can see that this says that there will be an increase in HGV vehicles as a result of an extension to those embankments, and it just says the increased HGV traffic movements will be via the M6. There are no details of how many additional HGV movements this will result in or the quantities of material that will be required to go into the embankments.

17. Now, because HS2 – as you know, I’m an engineer – has had a cut and fill balance, so the amount of material it cuts and then has to fill was in balance in the previous proposals, it is our contention that, actually, removing a bridge structure and replacing it with embankments will mean more fill, which will mean more imports and that’s clearly what that paragraph is referring to. But we don’t have a quantity.

18. So we’ve done some calculations of our own, and we would be interested to know what HS2’s calculations are. We did actually ask them this question; we had a meeting with HS2 last week, and actually slide 18 is the agenda for that. We asked the question how much would go in there – if you could show slide 18, please; the reference will be A331(18). If you just scroll down to the bottom of the agenda, you can see that there are a number of point there, raising of the embankments, the replacement of the Filly Brook viaduct, HGV movements and transport logistics profiles.
19. So this was an HS2 agenda. We were hopeful that they were going to tell us what these quantities were; they have not. So it’s our contention, from my calculations, that there will be 160,000 cubic metres required to actually construct all those additional embankments.

20. Now, 160,000 cubic metres equals 16,000 additional imports of material; that’s actual deliveries, which is 32,000 truck movements. So that’s in addition to the HGVs that we’ve already got.

21. If I can move on to our slide 1 please, which will be A331(1). This is table 276 from the original environmental statement volume 5 and you can see the last three rows refer to the amount of HGV traffic that HS2 calculated, at that time, would be using Yarnfield Lane, and the biggest component of that is third from bottom, which is the transfer node, and you can see that there is an average of 935 HGVs and a peak of 1,185. That will be running over a busy period of 12 months. We’ve highlighted also the other two elements there, which are the Yarnfield North satellite compound, and also the M6 viaduct compound.

22. We then move on to our slide 2, please. This is a table that we put into our written statement based on those numbers and it is our contention – and I’ll show you maps to how we come to this conclusion at the moment. You can see that we’ve tabulated those numbers. If all three of those periods happen at the same time, you’d have 1,138 average HGVs on Yarnfield Lane, and it’s our position that 50% of this transport has to use the existing or proposed realigned Yarnfield Lane and the overbridge.

23. You can see that that is 569, if they all happen together; that’s one every 63 seconds. If we just consider the transfer node, that’s 468 in any 10-hour period, which is one every 76 seconds. So if we just move on to slide 3 please?

24. Slide 3 is actually a little graphic that we put together showing where the HGV traffic goes, at what time. This particular one, slide 3, shows the initial period, January 2021 to March 2022. This is the period when the M6 slip roads—this is HS2 slip roads—are not open, and you can see that there are –

26. MRS MURRAY: Thank you Chairman. Could we have P1101(19) please? Chairman, it says on here that this would increase traffic slightly on Yarnfield Lane M6 overbridge, but the vast majority of the traffic would use the M6 motorway, as opposed to the local road network.

27. MR PARKIN: Yes, I’m coming to that – my next slide will show that.

28. MRS MURRAY: So surely –

29. THE CHAIR: Let’s come on to it now.

30. MRS MURRAY: Yes, we’ve already got the answer.

31. MR PARKIN: So, the slide I’ve just shown is the situation for the first 15 months before the slip roads are open. So, if we can go back to slide 3, that’s what that shows. Those are the numbers which, in HS2’s histogram, will be using that section of road.

32. If we go to slide 4, this is the situation when the slip roads are open. And you can see the transfer node and the various compounds at the top of that picture by the roundabout, and you can see that that traffic travels along Yarnfield Lane, the existing Yarnfield Lane, and then makes a connection to the northbound M6. You cannot get to the northbound M6 without going on the existing Yarnfield Lane, or the new Yarnfield Lane.

33. So, if we go to slide 5, this shows the situation using the new Yarnfield Lane from July 2023. So the overbridge, the new overbridge over the M6 is not open until July 2023, and I can demonstrate that with HS2’s own drawings in a moment.

34. If we go to slide 6, what we actually show here is – we’re actually assuming that the worst-case scenario, with those numbers I showed in those tables earlier on, will happen once the new overbridge is ready. Actually, it seems from other evidence we’ve just seen that that’s potentially going to happen effectively slightly earlier. But you can see that we’ve got 467 going in the blue numbers to the Yarnfield North embankment transfer node, another 64 going to the satellite compound, and another 37 going – this is half of the total – going to the Meaford compound.
35. So, if we go back to slide 2, and look at those numbers again, you can see why I’m concluding that there is at least one every 76 seconds on Yarnfield Lane going to the transfer node, and if you add the other two at the same time, it’s one every 63 seconds. Now that’s the situation before HS2 made the changes. So they’re adding more traffic, and I’ll just to refer to another 16,000 trucks loads that have got to go on Yarnfield Lane.

36. If I can now go to HS2’s histogram. So, if we can refer to P41(10). This is the histogram which was put before us in evidence before and I think it’s been used a number of times in different guises, and you can see that this is the situation, and Mr Mould agreed with us when we gave evidence last time. This is the situation that HS2 believed was the slide 3 situation, i.e. going from its new roundabout, down to the A34.

37. If I may then move on to some new histograms which were not available to us until after Wednesday – well, we didn’t find them until after Wednesday, so I want to refer to P148(26) please. This is a slide which was produced as an exhibit for the situation when Stone Rural gave evidence on 15 May. We only spotted this this week, but you can see quite clearly what it shows.

38. It shows HS2 construction traffic using existing Yarnfield Lane and this is to the northbound slips from the transfer node. You can see that the numbers are between 400 and 500, on average. That actually spills over into the period beyond July 2023, which is the green area, which is when the new overbridge and new realigned Yarnfield Lane is.

39. So this is what we’ve been contending for a long time now, that we’ve got very high levels of HGVs on that central section of Yarnfield Lane.

40. MR WHITFIELD: Can I just ask you, Mr Parkin? Your understanding is those figures are not the increased flow either; those are the figures on HS2’s original methodology.

41. MR PARKIN: Well, we actually think those are incorrect and are an underestimate, because the maximum there is 436, and they go with some other slides which were presented to Stone Rural which actually did not change the number from 436; it stayed consistent. But I’ve just shown you the slide where it’s 468 to the
transfer node, plus another chunk to the other two nodes. So we believe those numbers should be much higher than that.

42. On top of that, you’re now going to add another –

43. MR WHITFIELD: 32,000 movements-

44. MR PARKIN: – 16,000 truck movements, in what timescale, we are not sure. So, moving on to the basis of HS2’s HGV calculations and, as you know, we have called for a transport logistics profile because these numbers must be based on some sort of thinking. For every other major project that I’ve been involved in, the applicants put in a transport logistic profile, which actually shows how they’ve calculated, and what types of HGVs you’re going to be getting to any development. What you’ll be getting here is HGVs which deliver steel for reinforced concrete; they’ll be delivering materials to make the concrete cement and other materials. You’ll have fuel oil to fuel the plant that’s going to operate on the site, and then there’s all the excavated material which either has to be exported or imported.

45. So, a full transport logistics profile is what we need to underpin the four numbers, especially now we’ve added more numbers associated with the SES.

46. So, if I can move on from the base situation, as I’d like to bring in – before I do so, I want to refer to A40(11). This is a photograph we showed before but it concentrates on what we’re now looking for in terms of improvements to Yarnfield Lane, and this is the existing overbridge. We made the point before that this is a school bus travelling across the bridge. You can see how much it occupies of the road, and I think you might remember that Gordon referred to kissing wing mirrors when we last appeared.

47. If I can now go to slide 11 from our submission. This is new slide 11; sorry, that’s confusing. This is an aerial photograph of the existing overbridge, and you can see the carriageway width is 5.4 metres. If I can go to slide 13. Now, we have smart motorway works taking place between junctions 13 and 15 at the moment and this is a 32-tonne truck, the sort of trucks that deliver quarry materials to any development. This was photographed last week crossing Yarnfield Lane bridge. What has actually happened here is they’ve delivered material on the northbound carriageway, come off
the existing emergency slip, gone across the bridge and are now heading down the other side.

48. What you can’t see from that photograph is that – well, you can see the brake lights are on. That HGV is travelling at 10 miles an hour and it’s hugging the side of the carriageway, and you can see an approaching vehicle coming the other way. It just emphasises the narrowness of this particular stretch of road – well, the whole road is this, but this is obviously the overbridge. If I can now go to slide 9.

49. Now, this is the eastern end of Yarnfield Lane, so this is the bit that’s going to be used for the first 15 months. The bit I want to emphasise here is the bendy bit through the woodland, which is obviously in the middle here. At the moment, HS2’s proposal is to extend the width of Yarnfield Lane to six metres and I think you might remember that Mr Wilkinson gave evidence to say that was insufficient.

50. This section, and particularly the section from the top of the hill here down to the bottom of the hill, is about 1:6. It’s 5.5 metres wide, not that we can measure it because it’s too dangerous to stand there, and this section of road, to do a little bit of widening on the southern side to six metres is not going to do anything for health and safety purposes.

51. If I can then go to slide 10. This shows the ground view, if you like, of that same piece of woodland. So, the top left that you’re looking at is actually looking uphill on that section of woodland, and you can see how narrow it is. The bottom photograph is looking at the approach from the top side and you can see a vehicle coming out. This was last week. You know what the weather was like last week; he’s got his lights on.

52. If you look at the drawing on the other side, it’s a 26-tonne HGV, so it’s not as big as the HGVs we’re going to have in terms of weight, but it’s certainly the same width, and it’s slowly trying to find its way up that hill. So, our contention is this gradient is far too steep and the road is too narrow at that point.

53. THE CHAIR: I’m conscious you’ve got nine minutes left. Do you want to call your witness? It’s your time to use.

54. MR PARKIN: Well, I’m just going to go for one more slide and then I will.
55. THE CHAIR: It’s your time but I will stop you abruptly, wherever you are.

56. MR PARKIN: Okay, slide 7. Actually, we can do without slide 7. It’s just showing where they’re going to do the widening. So, we’ll move on and if I can introduce Gordon to talk more about what we’re looking for in terms of mitigation measures.

**Submissions by Mr Wilkinson**

57. MR WILKINSON: Okay, very quickly, thank you, Chairman. You’ll recall, the last time that I spoke to you, I queried the HS2’s desire to widen the road to six metres and I argued that it should be 6.7 metres. If you could go to slide 15, please.

58. Unfortunately, the day after I gave my evidence, I found this on HS2’s own technical standards, and you’ll see C6.2 refers to rural roads and states the minimum width should be increased to six metres for lengths with occasional use of buses or heavy goods vehicles, and 6.8 metres for roads where buses or heavy goods vehicles are likely to pass each other on a regular basis. I was out by 0.1, so 6.8 would seem to be the required status for widening for the amount of HGVs we are about to experience.

59. Following that information, Stone and Chebsey technical team had a meeting with the Staffordshire County Council members and some of the highway team. As a consequence of that, if I could see slide 16 please, this came from Philip Atkins, leader of the council. You can see quite clearly that they support the idea of 6.8 metres, and, therefore, widening the whole section of Yarnfield Lane that will be used by HS2 construction traffic, HGVs, to 6.8 metres therefore represents the minimum mitigation that we are seeking, required for the four-year long construction period, although this, in itself, does not address all the safety issues faced by road users, especially vulnerable road users, such as pedestrians and cyclists.

60. So that really states the case of how the highways authority see they should be catered for, HGV movements on the whole of Yarnfield Lane, although as my colleague intimated, when we come to the existing Yarnfield Lane bridge, that will be quite difficult, given the fact it’s 5.5 on the ramps and 5.45 running lanes.

61. In addition, talking of vulnerable road users, at our meeting last week with HS2,
Mr Taylor stated that HS2 was in discussions with Cycling UK regarding mitigation for the central section of Yarnfield Lane. This included possibly the provision of cycleways through the cutting, undertunnels and overbridge sections. Slide 14 please.

62. So, on this section here, you’ve got the underpass under the mainline, and again, under the main IMB-R, it comes out of the cutting there, past the actual new HS2 entrance, and then you’ve got the overbridge itself there.

63. So, HS2 stated the width of the new bridge, from parapet to parapet, would be a total of nine metres, which would contain the six-metre previously mentioned road width for the carriageway and then two 1.5-metre footways. However, HS2 indicated the total footway width of three metres could be varied to, say, one metre and two metre to facilitate cyclists on one side. I think that was a fair interpretation.

64. It was assumed that the facility would be continued under the IMB-R, under the mainline railway. HS2 seem to suggest that cyclists only needed to be protected on the six-metre stretches of the IMB-R and no longer in any other parts of Yarnfield Lane. This is only once the new bridge is completed and we’ve got two and a half years before that happens.

65. So, whilst we concur with the idea of providing for vulnerable road users and the safer movement of cyclists, we also think that should include for pedestrians as well, both through the underbridge and along the whole of Yarnfield Lane.

66. As stated previously, because of the pedestrians, limited bus services, no flows in the evenings, there’s a lot of desire, a suppressed demand, to go down Yarnfield Lane. We would therefore request that Yarnfield Lane is initially widened to 6.8 and provided with a 1.2 metre pedestrian facility footway alongside it.

67. However, on completion of the construction operations in December 2024, the carriageway could then be reduced back to 5.5, because then we hope it will revert back to being a country lane, and the 1.2 plus the other original, say, 1.3 would create a 2.5-metre cycle/pedestrian shared access that will run the entire length of Yarnfield Lane.

68. That would then cater for future use of pedestrians and vulnerable road users
once everything’s settled down. It would also revert the lane back to being very popular with cyclists, club tourers and encourage more cycling than currently available.

69. Now, I gather Cycling UK is going to be here tomorrow. There’s clearly a problem when you start talking about cyclists on the actual bridge. I’m not going to spend too much on it, but you need rather quite a lot – three metres would be the minimum, for a shared surface with barriers and walls.

70. THE CHAIR: Can’t you stick traffic lights either end for the period of construction?

71. MR WILKINSON: Well, that’s a good point. So what we’re asking for is 6.8 up the actual embankments, and then when you come over to the original Yarnfield Lane bridge, you’ve got the 5.5 ramps, and the 5.4 running lane. We suggest there that you put shuttle lane lights across the bridge and maybe provide within that four-metre running lane a metre and a half, say, for pedestrians to walk alongside the traffic, or cyclists even. But, certainly, you’re going to need to do something very quickly to facilitate HGVs moving across that bridge where there clearly isn’t a lot of room available and they’re going to have to shuttle run.

72. But you’ll speak to HS2. But certainly, you don’t just need the cycle lane; you’ve got to get a higher barrier. You then need to provide the Armco barrier as well, which takes about another metre off your footway, so you’re going to need quite a wide bridge, and ultimately, you’re going to want a 6.8-metre bridge, plus maybe three metres’ footway on one side, plus Armco. This is going to be quite a new structure design. Moving on quickly. How am I doing?

73. Trevor mentioned the steep gradient; we would like to see it widened on the north side. If we could have slide 9 please.


75. MR WILKINSON: Okay, so Trevor mentioned this is going to be done here, but the county council would be concerned about the steep gradient and the kinks still, and we think that if it was actually extended across here, we could ease the grade and make it far safer for all road users, including vulnerable road users, and would encourage
more cycling as well.

76. THE CHAIR: Thank you, thank you for your evidence. HS2?

Response by Mr Mould

77. MR MOULD QC (DfT): A great deal of what you’ve heard is not new to you. I’m in your hands really as to how much more I can add. Perhaps I can just add two points.

78. The first is that, if I may say so, Mrs Murray alighted on the most significant slide, so far as the AP is concerned; that is to say, the slide that tells you what the predicted additional volume of material that has to be moved is, and also the very limited amount of additional traffic that would result from the AP works; that’s slide 1101(19). So that’s that point.

79. The second point is, so far as the permanent design of the highway, including the bridge, is concerned, the plans and specifications have to be approved by the local highway authority under schedule 4 to the Bill, and the design issues that have been raised by the petitioners are matters that will need to be considered by HS2 and the local highway authority under the aegis of that schedule.

80. THE CHAIR: Sheryll Murray’s got a quick question.

81. MRS MURRAY: Mr Mould, I appreciate that. If the local highway authority said that they wanted to widen that overbridge, who would meet the increased costs of the widening? Would that be HS2?

82. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes.

83. MRS MURRAY: Thank you.

84. MR MARTIN: Yes, thank you. Mr Mould, I’m now on the same issue. If additional land is needed for the widening of the road, will it not be necessary to have an additional – that as part of an additional provision? I mean, presumably, that is why the petitioners have brought this here, rather than –

85. MR MOULD QC (DfT): There is no question of any need for an additional
provision here. The land that is provided under the Bill is ample to enable a properly sized bridge and a permanent highway arrangement.

86. You will have in mind that the key concern of these petitioners is with the impacts of HS2 construction traffic, by definition. Once the railway has been built, and the bridge has been constructed, HS2 lorries will cease to be a component of the local traffic.

87. The vehicular access to the depot itself, that is to say, heavy vehicular access, will be via the southbound slip road, as you know, which is a permanent feature of the scheme. So, any vehicular traffic associated with the operation of the depot, once the railway has started to run, will be confined almost entirely to light vehicles, which is a common use of traffic on Yarnfield Road.

88. So, the specification for the bridge will have regard to the permanent position rather than the temporary position. There will be some temporary construction use of the bridge, as you know; that was something that we made clear to you before, and clearly some consideration will be need to be given to the sizing of the bridge in that respect, but as you yourself just said, there are other mechanisms that can be brought to bear, such as signalisation and so forth, in order to ensure that that temporary use is maintained.

89. Slide P1101(18) gives you a sense of the volume of traffic, of HS2 construction traffic that we’re dealing with, and it’s the traffic which is to the right of the divide, so it’s within the green box. HS2 construction traffic using replacement Yarnfield Lane. As you can see, after an initial period when the volume of traffic will be, as we’ve said, up to 400 movements two way, it then falls away largely from thereafter.

90. So, the question would be whether it would be proportionate to use public money to provide a bridge that is designed to accommodate heavy permanent volumes of HGVs when the actual use that is required by HS2 is as limited as that, and signalisation, traffic management looks like a much more sensible – it doesn’t detract from my point about the function of schedule 4, because the highway authority still are the body that are responsible for approving plans, but it does set into context the risk of over-designing this feature.
91. My only other point was this: during the construction phase, the point about the stretch of Yarnfield Lane from the A34, the Fillybrooks, down to the access to the site, which as you know, is a point of concern for the petitioners, before the slip roads come into operation. There is clearly unfinished work in relation to precisely what detailed temporary widening works need to be carried out there. We’ve made provision for passing places and so forth, but there is land within the highway boundary along that stretch of road that is, in principle, available to provide temporary widening of the kind that was just canvassed by the petitioner, and I am not seeking to resist that, as a matter of principle. That’s a matter to be considered between the highway authority and HS2 as part of the detailed transport planning.

92. MR WIGGIN: It is in your interest that the lorries can pass each other?

93. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Absolutely.

94. MR WIGGIN: Did you also rather like the idea that it would be a cycle lane afterwards?

95. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Yes. I mean, if there can be a cycleway incorporated, I’m sure that’s something that would be of particular interest also to the highway authority, who will want to guide us on the restoration of any temporary works that are carried out.

96. As to logistics planning, we are, as you know, unfortunately for many petitioners, at too early a stage in the process to be in a position to provide details on that, but HS2’s transport management plan, which is prepared in close cooperation with the local authorities, will be the vehicle through which the detailed planning and the contractual arrangements for handling construction traffic is dealt with, and that will embrace matters of that kind.

97. MR WHITFIELD: Can I just ask, Mr Mould? You express confidence that the Bill covered enough for the bridge, which clearly it does, because the whole of that site – do you extend the same confidence to the approach to the bridge on that road if the road would need to be widened to 6.8 metres?

98. MR MOULD QC (DfT): Well, I don’t have a particular instruction on that but
the standard that you were shown is a standard for permanent construction, and so it brings you back to my point. Let’s not confuse the position during the construction phase.

99. When that road reverts, as it will after construction of the railway, to being a country lane, with relatively little heavy goods vehicles on it, then the standard that you were shown, I suggest to you that the appropriate standard is likely to be the standard that applies to country roads with relatively little heavy traffic rather than the standard that applies to one where there’s regular passage between HGVs. That won’t be the permanent position here.

100. MR WHITFIELD: Right. Going to the slide that we have on the screen, do you accept that that slide is not showing the full construction traffic potential, given the additional changes with regard to the added movements, and what is your view of Mr Parkin’s view that that’s 30,000 additional truck movements?

101. MR MOULD QC (DfT): P1101(19) provides you with our answer to that, which is the slide that Mrs Murray referred to. The HS2’s estimate of the additional volume of material that would need to be handled is shown there, 6,250 cubic metres approximately, about 1,470 lorry movements in total. That translates into about three per day on average over a two-year period. Our programme is, at the moment, that those civil works will be going on between 2023 and 2025, by which time the slip roads will be partially in operation and they would come into full operation during the early part of that period. So, that’s our estimate of the position; it’s nothing like as significant a change as the petitioners themselves have said.

102. THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Mould. You don’t have to take it, but you’re more than welcome to take two minutes by way of summation or comments on what HS2 have said.

103. MR PARKIN: Yes, can I just comment on a couple of things? First of all, if we go back to our slide 15, A331(15), there’s no reference at all on there to that being just for a permanent road. It says, ‘Realigned or diverted rural roads should generally match the existing, subject to minimum of 5.5 metres’.

104. THE CHAIR: It says, ‘On a regular basis’.
105. MR PARKIN: But it would be on a regular basis for a period of four years. So that’s that point I want to make, and I also want to make a point about the quantities which HS2 have just put in front of you. We’re talking about 385 metres of embankments standing 15 metres high, with a 20-metre-wide railway corridor on them. The idea that 6,000 cubic metres is required to build that is, quite frankly, ridiculous. And we would need – and I think the Committee should be asking for – some evidence of how HS2 has calculated its numbers, which brings me back to the transport logistics profile.

106. THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you very much for coming back and giving evidence on AP1. The Committee will now sit in private.