

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 Jose Wiggins

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 moved to Harefield in 1970 and has lived at the current address of 10 Northwood Road, Harefield Middlesex UB9 6PW since 1981. Your petitioner has raised a family during this time and has enjoyed living and wishes to continue living in this currently unspoiled countryside village. Whilst your petitioner's home is not in close proximity to the proposed construction work your petitioner is nevertheless aware of the devastating effect these works will have on the village and particularly on those householders who do live in close proximity to the site. Your petitioner believes that the number of construction sites proposed for such a small area in Harvil Road and Moorhall Road will affect your petitioner's access to essential amenities.
- 8 Your Petitioner feels that the community as a whole will be injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioner objects for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.
- 9 Your petitioner opposes the Bill in principle. Whilst your petitioner acknowledges that the principle of the Bill is established at second reading, your petitioner's views on the subject are so strong, they must be recorded in this petition.

10. Your petitioner objects in principle because of the following reasons.

Your petitioner is seriously concerned over the business case of HS2, particularly the fact that it represents poor value for money to the tax payer the majority. Your petitioner supports the alternative solution to HS2 produced by 51m, this represents a far better business case including lower initial costs and a much greater Benefit Cost Ratio, as reported by WS Atkins for the Department of Transport. Your petitioner objects to the loss of local business and amenities that will be caused by HS2.

Construction Traffic and Sites

11. Your petitioner's property is situated close to the crossroads in Harefield between Rickmansworth Road to the North, Harvil Road to the South, Breakspear Road North to the East and Park Lane to the west. Your petitioner foresees problems with the amount of traffic that passes in and out of Harefield as construction work begins, particularly with the vehicles involved in the said construction work adding to the volume of traffic. Access in all directions will be adversely affected. Other roads in South Harefield will also experience delays if not complete blockages once work begins. Also pollution levels will rise. The knock on effect of these traffic delays could prove dangerous particularly as Harefield Hospital has ambulances that will not benefit from traffic jams. Access will also be made difficult for deliveries to shops, funeral processions to St Mary's Church in Harefield or to the Breakspear Crematorium in Ruislip, for buses, people travelling to work and for pupils attending both school sites. All essential services will be badly affected. Your petitioner is particularly concerned that difficulties associated with travel in and out of the village would have an adverse affect on the running of the hospital and could cause closure resulting in the loss of jobs along with other job losses if businesses are unable to operate and function efficiently. Your petitioner's rights of access in and out of the village would also suffer from the impact of this additional traffic. Should deliveries to shops be held up your petitioner would not be able to purchase essential supplies.

12. Two construction sites are proposed along Moorhall Road and the construction of the proposed viaduct across this road. Your petitioner uses Moorhall Road by car on a regular basis to access the M25 and M3 and Harvil Road to access the A40 as well as other journeys along these roads. Your petitioner also regularly uses the 331 bus along Moorhall Road as well as the U9 along Harvil Road. As work is scheduled to take years the inconvenience caused by delays or road closures will be intolerable.

13. Your petitioner is concerned that with the increase in traffic and heavy good vehicles the risk of road traffic accidents could increase. Older members of the community as well of those who regularly use the U9 and 331 London Buses to get to work, rely on

these buses and your petitioner , who frequently uses these buses is concerned that these modes of transport will no longer be able to operate as current routes would not be available.

14. Your petitioner submits that if a tunnel were constructed in this area, the construction sites would not be necessary and therefore construction traffic will be reduced, alleviating the above concerns and the related knock on affects to surrounding areas. If your Honourable House decides against a tunnel, your petitioner submits that only one of the roads be used for construction traffic at one time and this will monitored for compliance.

National Grid realignment

15. Your petitioner is concerned about the realignment of the National Grid bringing electricity pylons closer to those homes in South Harefield for the purpose of constructing the HS2 viaduct. HS2 Ltd has not consulted or made it clear when this work will start only that it will need to commence prior to the 2017 start date. HS2 Ltd has not indicated in any public document how close to houses the electric pylons will be placed or consulted with people living in close proximity to the pylons. . HS2 Ltd have not made any reference to how temporary this arrangement will be. Your petitioner is concerned about an increase in noise and dirt when this work starts and an increase in risk to health and noise pollution once in place which will affect the whole community. The impact on the countryside will be long term and will permanently spoil the areas around this construction work. Your petitioner believes that electricity pylons close to residential areas pose an extra health threat.

16. Your petitioner submits that a tunnel in place of a viaduct would prevent the need to realign the National Grid. If your Honourable House decides a tunnel should not be an option then consideration should be made to realign the National Grid away from those homes currently under threat and not in close proximity to a residential area. In order to minimise the impact of the proposal, your petitioner requests that prior to construction, your petitioner and other local residents in south Harefield, should be consulted meaningfully and have access to detailed plans outlining when the grid will be moved and the exact positioning of it and the reasons why this is the preferred position. It must be placed and screened as sympathetically as possible to cause minimum disruption to the residents and be sympathetic to the local environment.

Structural design – National Grid Feeder Station

17. Your petitioner is concerned about the proposal to construct a permanent National Grid Feeder Station and access road on land adjacent to properties. Your petitioner is concerned about the design and height of the National Grid Feeder Station which is outlined in London – West Midlands Environmental Statement Volume 2 / Map Books CFA7 / Colne Valley. The height or design of the construction has not been released by HS2 within the public domain. Your petitioner is concerned this structure will be clearly visible for everyone and that it will be unsympathetic to the natural beauty currently enjoyed. This will have a significant negative impact on the landscape, and ruin the natural beauty of the local environment. Your petitioner is concerned about the noise and dirt pollution during construction and noise pollution thereafter.

18. Your petitioner requests that this structure be constructed at a much further distance away from this residential area and sympathetic screening, mainly trees are planted around it to minimise the adverse visual impact and to be in keeping with the local surroundings. If your Honourable House decides this is not an option then can consideration be made that in order to minimise the impact of the proposal, your petitioner and other local residents, particularly in South Harefield, prior to construction must be consulted meaningfully on the detailed drawings and plans for the National Grid Feeder Station. It must be designed sympathetically 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, in order to minimise the noise and air pollution generated by it.

Viaduct

19. The proposal is that a viaduct will be erected in South Harefield. Your petitioner is concerned that such a construction will cause a high level of pollution and have an adverse effect on your petitioner's health. Your petitioner feels that a tunnel would eliminate the risk of pollution and minimise the health risk.

20. The journey of the proposed line will continue over the Grand Union Canal and Moorhall Road in the form of an arc. This arc is in close proximity to residential properties, with an estimated 36 trains every hour travelling up to speeds of 320km per hour over large bodies of water. Your petitioner is concerned about the level of noise which will be heightened due to the trains travelling over the water. Your petitioner believes that the promoters of the Bill have not properly considered this factor when estimating noise impacts.

It is proposed that there will be a 1.5 metre high sound barrier on each side of the viaduct where it crosses the Grand Union Canal. It is proposed that a 4 metre sound barrier will be placed on the far side as the viaduct crosses Moorhall Road. Your

petitioner is concerned that this will generate even more noise pollution.

21. Your petitioner understands that this viaduct will pass directly overhead at a height of 15 metres carrying up to 36 trains per hour. The promoters have not indicated the decibel level of the trains in this circumstance. The ES accompanying the Bill suggests 90 Db. at 25 metres. Your petitioner believes the noise level of passing overhead trains could be damaging to health and hearing, making Moorhall Road and the Grand Union Canal Towpath unusable on foot.

22. The proposed Colne Valley viaduct will be clearly visible. This will spoil the tranquil views and peaceful walks currently available.

23. Your petitioner submits that a tunnel in place of a viaduct would be sympathetic to the surrounding environment, remove the health implications associated with dangerous noise levels and would prevent closure of public rights of way and bridleways. If your Honourable House decides a tunnel is not an option the viaduct must be designed and constructed sympathetically and maintained visually to a very high standard i.e. by regular funding for the removal of graffiti .

The speed of the trains travelling across the viaduct should be reduced to a speed that does not generate a dangerous decibel. The frequency of the trains should be reduced to allow pedestrians to pass through between intervals when noise pollution is not at its worst.

24. The land adjacent to where the proposed Colne Valley viaduct is to be constructed along with a National Grid Feeder Station is a migratory path for thousands of Canada geese, landing here every year. Your petitioner fears the viaduct and National Grid Feeder Station will cause harm and distress to these birds along with local wildlife that will be affected by the clearing of land.

25. Your petitioners request a tunnel in place of a viaduct.

Sustainable Placement

26. Your petitioner notes that the land on Park Lodge Farm on Harvil Road and its surrounding countryside and woodland has been safe guarded for the sustainable placement of spoil from tunnelling. Your petitioner is concerned because the safeguarded area is as large as the area of Harefield. Your petitioner is concerned that the volume of HGV traffic will be further more increased when the disproportionate amount of spoil is transported to Harefield causing further traffic congestion and more air and noise pollution. The height they propose to dump the spoil, at 3 metres is a cause for concern as the risk of flooding is close to an area that is already considered a flood

plain. The petitioner is concerned this area will not recover from the dumping of spoil and that it may be contaminated with toxins.

27. Your petitioner requests that the promoters re consider and give more thought to their decision as to where to dump the spoil. The spoil could be transported by rail and placed in an area where it would have no adverse effect. This would also alleviate the heightened traffic, noise and dust pollution.

Air pollution

28. Your petitioner is concerned that the air pollution generated during the construction period of at least seven years, further aggravated by the disproportionate and large amount of construction proposed for such a small area, will increase the petitioner's risk of ill health and also many other residents in Harefield.

29. Your petitioner requests that your Honourable House consider a tunnel instead of a viaduct to reduce the risk of ill health and amount of air pollution caused during construction and then by the trains.

Flooding

30. In early 2014 there was flooding in Moorhall Road. One proposed construction site will be on land that serves as flood water storage for Moorhall Road and surrounding properties when the River Colne and surrounding lakes flood. Early 2014 Moorhall Road was closed for approximately one week due to flooding. Your petitioner is concerned that there will be a further risk of flooding with the loss of this flood water storage area. Your petitioner is concerned that flooding will cause further traffic congestion as well as a risk of flooding to properties in that area.

31. Your petitioner suggests that a tunnel instead of the proposed viaduct would take away this risk. If your Honourable House decides a tunnel is not an option the promoters of the Bill should consider this risk and make a more informed decision with regards to how many construction sites should be in a relatively small area within a high risk flood area. The promoters could consider placing one larger construction site in an area where there are no such risks.

Crime and Cost of Policing

32. Your petitioner is concerned the construction of the viaduct from the start will result in the rise of crime in Harefield, and neighbouring Colne Valley area. Your petitioner is concerned about the impact of the proposed residential construction site based on the A412 along with six other non-residential construction sites proposed for the local area. The residential site will result in an increase of at least 200 workers, likely to be mostly

transient workers. The construction work is likely to attract hostility, increasing the risk of public order type offences committed by protestors venting their frustration. These crimes are likely to occur in the vicinity of the residential site and in and around Harefield Village. The workers themselves may become targets of hostility when they choose or need to use local amenities. HS2 Ltd only briefly mentioned when questioned at a community forum, that it would provide a security guard to ensure construction workers behaved reasonably and were law abiding. Your petitioner is concerned a security guard will not have the sufficient power or resilience to be effective and will be at risk. The non-residential sites housing expensive machinery will be vulnerable targets for theft and criminal damage type offences. Your petitioner is concerned because historically, major construction works particularly where areas of natural beauty are threatened, have seen protestors come from outside to support local opposition. Construction work in Harefield and the Colne Valley is likely to start earlier than 2017 and will experience the loss and destruction of beautiful natural habitat. Your petitioner is concerned this area will attract much media attention and draw in protestors. Your petitioner is concerned that locals will be directly affected by this potential threat of crime and violence .

33. Harefield Village has one designated Police officer and one Police Community Support Officer. These officers are based at Ruislip, approximately four miles away. The PCSO's current form of transport to Harefield is on public transport. Your petitioner is concerned that the very long delays caused by construction traffic on roads leading to Harefield from Ruislip and a rise in crime will result in totally inadequate policing in the area, placing residents, their property and construction workers at an unacceptable risk. Your petitioner is very concerned about the increase in cost that will be involved to provide necessary and acceptable law and order enforcement. Your petitioner is concerned that HS2 Ltd has failed to recognise or chosen to ignore the issue of policing and cost, evidenced by reports from previous major infra-structure projects. Your petitioner bases her concerns on the following information published regarding the M11. 'The road was eventually built as planned, and opened to traffic in 1999, but the increased costs involved in management and policing of protesters raised the profile of such campaigns in the United Kingdom, and contributed to several road schemes being cancelled or reviewed later on in the decade. Those involved in the protest moved on to oppose other schemes in the country, while opinions of the road as built have since been mixed. By 2014, the road had become the ninth most congested in the entire country.'¹¹

34. Your petitioner submits that the construction of a tunnel in place of the viaduct would reduce the risk of increase in crime in Harefield and the Colne Valley area as damage to the country side will be minimised, therefore attracting less media attention and less threat from protestors. Your petitioner requests that your Honourable House consider that tunnelling would be the cheaper and less disruptive option to the benefit of all involved or affected.

35. If your Honourable House decides this can not be option Harefield Village must be provided with sufficient policing based in the locality to protect all involved from the risk of crime. Your petitioner requests thought be given to funding for the provision of extra officers and to provide a local police station.

Rights of way

36. Your petitioner is concerned that restrictions will be placed on the towpath along the Grand Union Canal and also on other rights of way and will no longer be available to your petitioner to use these current rights of way for exercise and pleasure walks as these places are close to where work will take place.

37. Your petitioner asks that the number of local PRowS proposed to be stopped up or interfered with, and the duration of such interruption, be reduced significantly so that an adequate level of important local amenity is preserved.

Your petitioner asks that these concerns be considered and that residents be consulted about these revisions.

Compensation

38. On the 9th April 2014 the Government published an improved compensation and assistance package. Despite responding to and highlighting the mass disruption and pollutions your petitioner believes will affect South Harefield, your petitioner has been made aware that those living but affected by the construction work are not entitled to compensation.

39. A tunnel would reduce the negative impact. If your Honourable House decides a tunnel is not an option your petitioner asks that the compensation and assistance package is reviewed to ensure that those directly affected are adequately compensated for years of blight and stress that will be the consequence of HS2.

40. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect those in close proximity to the construction work and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect them.

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, &c.

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF
COMMONS
SESSION 2013-14

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL
PETITION OF Jose Wiggins

Against the Bill - On Merits - By Counsel &c

Jose Wiggins