

**IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2013-14**

**HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON-WEST MIDLANDS) BILL**

**PETITION**

Against the Bill - 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 THE CAMDEN CUTTING GROUP**

SHEWETH as follows:-

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as "the Bill") has been introduced and is now pending in your Honourable House entitled "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 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 are specified in clauses 1 and 2 of and Schedules 1 and 2 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 and Schedules 2 and 3 to the Bill.

### ***Your Petitioners***

7. This petition is from the Camden Cutting Group, a neighbourhood organisation with 192 supporters. The Camden Cutting Group speaks for those in the area bound in the south by Granby Terrace, in the north by Parkway, in the west by Park Village East & West (including the Peabody Estate), and in the east by Arlington Road. About 3000 people live in this area. The open railway cutting leading to Euston is in the centre of this neighbourhood.
8. The Camden Cutting is at the centre of a unique London community that coexists with the railway. The area is a real neighbourhood, surprisingly quiet, and a liveable mix of two Conservation Areas, historic buildings and social housing. The Cutting area is currently a uniquely tranquil area, with relatively little through-traffic, benefiting from the space and light and air that the railway cutting creates while accepting the limited intermittent noise the trains produce during the daytime.
9. Your Petitioners and their interests are injuriously affected by the Bill, to which your Petitioners object for reasons amongst others, hereinafter appearing.

### ***How the Camden Cutting Neighbourhood is Directly and Specially affected by HS2***

10. Our neighbourhood is threatened by ten years of heavy construction (much longer if David Higgins's recent proposals for a Canary Wharf style development between Euston and Parkway are adopted).
11. The HS2 proposals make little effort to recognise that this community exists and offer few proposals to mitigate against, or offer compensation for, the effects of noisy, disruptive and round-the-clock construction. The London-West Midlands Environmental Statement (ES) Section 5 'Community' 3.2.1.1 Vol 2 CFA1 does not even mention most of our neighbourhood, nor does the non-technical summary (ES 3.0.0).

12. We have met numerous times with the staff of HS2 Ltd to discuss specific local issues of concern and have attended open consultation events set up by HS2 and/or the LB of Camden. The quality of engagement and discussion offered by HS2 was poor; for HS2 it was clearly a PR and box-ticking exercise. The ES documents give no indication that HS2 have grasped the nature of the local community which has striven so hard to engage with it. Concerns that we have raised about the ES, Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and Compensation have been ignored.
13. The work that will be happening outside our doors, as described in the ES, includes:
  - Demolition of 12 metre high Park Village East (PVE) retaining walls
  - Reconstruction of PVE retaining walls at a height of 35 metres high above HS2 track level plus 15 metres below track level
  - Deep excavation and construction of retaining walls in the Cutting
  - Construction of the high speed dive under
  - Demolition and reconstruction of Mornington Street Bridge
  - Demolition and reconstruction of Granby Terrace Bridge
  - Phased demolition and reconstruction of Hampstead Road Bridge six metres higher and 220 metres long (twice the existing length)
  - Reception of tunnel boring machine
  - Works on the classic railway tracks, signalling and other systems
  - Installation of new tracks, gantries, signals etc
  - Construction compounds throughout the neighbourhood
  - Demolition of the central retaining wall at the Parkway portal
  - Utility works in Park Village East, Delancey Street and Mornington Terrace
  - Movement of construction traffic along residential streets
14. The ES Vol 5 Draft Code of Construction Practice CT-003-000 sections 5.2.6 to 5.2.10 allow much of the work in the neighbourhood will be exempt from normal working hour restrictions and will take place 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Most of the work will be noisy, need heavy machinery that is in itself noisy, and generate heavy lorry traffic on neighbourhood streets for ten years. Much of the construction work will take place within a few metres of our front doors yet there is no effective mitigation or compensation proposed.
15. Many people in the Camden Cutting neighbourhood live within a few metres of the proposed works and there is nothing shielding them from the construction works. The Cutting is a large open area with hard sound reflective surfaces; works anywhere in the Cutting will create impacts for a great distance.. Mornington Terrace, Clarkson Row, half of Mornington Crescent, Park Village East and part of Parkway are completely exposed across the open Cutting to the full brunt of the works. The adjoining cross streets of Mornington Street,

Mornington Place and Granby Terrace are almost as exposed and parts of Delancey Street are exposed. A wider area will be affected by construction traffic with heavy lorries on quiet residential streets and about 600 HGVs a day on the local High Street A400 (ES 3.2.1.1 Vol 2 CFA1 Table 20). These impacts will include air pollution as well as noise and vibration. The neighbourhood will be a construction site for ten years.

16. Additionally, Arlington Road and other neighbourhood streets will suffer a permanent increase in traffic and pollution as a result of HS2 (ES 3.2.1.1 Vol 2 CFA1 Table 29).
17. The human cost of the HS2 construction has not been considered seriously by HS2. If you are working at home, revising for A Levels or hoping to sleep at night between 2015 and 2025 (dates not times) your life will be seriously disturbed. It is unrealistic to think that life goes on as normal while a 12 metre high 3 metre thick retaining wall is being demolished outside your house and a 35 metre high one being built in its place (just one example). The basic human right to the peaceful enjoyment of property is being removed by ten years of disruptive construction in the Camden Cutting without proper mitigation or compensation.
18. HS2 do not recognise the immediacy which this neighbourhood has to the works and that ten years of construction is not a temporary disturbance. Many of the adverse effects of HS2 construction are documented in the ES, but their impact is not considered.
19. The Construction Programme in ES 3.2.1.1 Vol 2 CFA1 (Figure 8 after 2.4.143) and the Construction Phasing Maps in the Vol 2 Map books (CT-20-005 to 008) clearly show seven continuous years of construction 2015 to 2021 plus three continuous years of construction 2023 to 2025. Despite this evidence, sections 5.4.35-38 and 11.4.7 / Table 14 of the ES state that 'major adverse effects' for Camden Cutting residents will last for periods of between three months and two years. This is a patently untrue and misleading assessment: serious disruption will last for ten years.
20. ES Section 11.4 (ES 3.2.1.1 Vol 2 CFA1) describes some of the noise and vibration that Camden Cutting residents will experience and includes the unbelievable statement in 11.4.2 that 'The mitigation measures, including noise insulation where necessary, will reduce noise inside all dwellings to a level where it should not significantly affect residents.' The idea that a bit of secondary glazing is going to make everything okay given the scale and duration of the works is not credible.

### ***The Relief Sought by your Petitioners***

21. For the reasons given in this petition, your Petitioners respectfully ask that the proposed scheme be varied in the following respects and that appropriate amendments to the Bill be made accordingly:
- Fair compensation must be available to the residents of the Camden Cutting without the unreasonable requirement of proving hardship or 'Need to Sell' (para 22-31).
  - The design of the approach to Euston Station should address the needs of the local community and not just the requirements of HS2. The unique qualities of the Camden Cutting neighbourhood must be preserved (para 32-36).
  - A tunnelled approach from Parkway to Euston Station should be considered. This could significantly reduce impacts on the Camden Cutting (para 37).
  - The proposed HS2 track layout should be modified so as to substantially reduce the amount and scale of the civil engineering required in the Camden Cutting, particularly to eliminate the need for a high speed dive under, the demolition of the Park Village East retaining wall and the demolition of the central retaining wall at the proposed Parkway portal (para 38-43).
  - The proposed design of Hampstead Road Bridge should be rejected and replaced with one that is appropriate to its city centre location (para 44-47).
  - The new Mornington Street and Granby Terrace bridges should be designed appropriately for their location in a residential neighbourhood (para 48-49).
  - The proposals of the Higgins report ('HS2 Plus') must be developed appropriately for the needs of local communities including the Camden Cutting. We have no desire for our neighbourhood to be transformed into a new Canary Wharf; we want to preserve the unique qualities of our area (para 50-53).
  - Local Environment Management Plans should be developed with the involvement of local residents (para 54).
  - Working Hours should be more closely controlled than proposed by HS2 (para 55-60).
  - Noise, Vibration and Air Pollution thresholds should be more closely controlled than proposed by HS2 (para 61-75).
  - Effective and appropriate Acoustic and Visual screening should be provided (para 76-80).
  - Construction compounds should not be located on neighbourhood streets (para 81-83).

- Rail should be used instead of road for construction access and where construction traffic must use roads it should be more closely controlled than proposed by HS2 (para 84-94).
- Personal Mitigation Budgets (cash payment) should be available to all residents of the Camden Cutting as an alternative to secondary glazing or temporary accommodation (para 95-99).
- All construction impacts and issues that affect local residents should be managed by HS2 in a dedicated local office (para 100-101).
- The main London Terminus for HS2 should be at Old Oak Common, at least initially. This will save a very large sum of money, provide a better rail service, and minimise the negative impacts on Camden. It could make most of the concerns listed above irrelevant (para 102-109).

Each of these issues is addressed separately below.

### ***Compensation***

22. We understand from consultation meetings with HS2 that our neighbourhood has been excluded from the compensation proposals offered to rural areas on the basis that we are accustomed to train noise and that the Draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) will protect us from the effects of construction. The first of these arguments is irrelevant: we are not petitioning about the effects of HS2 when it is in operation; it is the ten year construction period that is our concern. The second arguments is false: we are not protected by the Draft Code of Construction Practice as most of the construction activities in the Camden Cutting are specifically exempted from the prescribed working hours, and few mitigation proposals are guaranteed by the CoCP.
23. The Government's April 2014 'Decision Document' did not respond to the issues that the Camden Cutting Group raised in its substantial responses to the Compensation Consultation and the Environmental Statement Consultation. The compensation measures offer nothing to those in the Camden Cutting neighbourhood whose homes and community will be seriously affected.
24. The Compensation proposals do not respect the statement made in the House of Commons on 20 December 2010 by Philip Hammond, Secretary of State for Transport: "I have indicated that we will seek to go further than has happened with previous such infrastructure schemes in the UK, because it is right and proper that individuals who suffer serious financial loss in the national interest should be compensated. She also asked whether we will be setting a precedent in that regard. She should be aware that developing European jurisprudence in the area of property rights and the need for Governments to compensate is pointing towards more generous compensation becoming the norm, and I suspect that that will be the case for future projects."

25. The proposals impose an unfair burden on residents in the Camden Cutting area: they, along with other Camden residents, are being asked to suffer severe disruption for ten years without effective mitigation or fair compensation. Urban areas should at least be offered the same compensation proposals that are available in rural areas.
26. The only compensation available to all but one Camden Cutting property (117 Parkway is in the Safeguarded Zone) is the Need to Sell Scheme (NTSS). The rules for the NTSS are so restrictive so as to make it of little value.
27. The NTSS is inadequate and unreasonable because:
- Applicants need to prove a hardship case that is acceptable to a panel; you can't just move for your own reasons like everyone else. Why should someone need to prove hardship? What do personal circumstances have to do with blight or HS2? Why should a person living near HS2 have to prove hardship to be able to move house when no one else in the UK has to? Hardship rules have nothing to do with blight but concern a person's circumstances.
  - Although the latest version of this scheme has changed the word 'hardship' to 'need to sell' there is absolutely no change in substance to the working of the scheme.
  - In rural areas people living within 120 metres of HS2 have no need to prove 'hardship' or 'need to sell' yet in Camden people living 10 metres from incredibly disruptive works must do so.
  - Applicants need to convince a panel that HS2 has affected the value of their property. This will be difficult to prove to a panel whose independent members are selected by HS2 and which makes recommendations to a civil servant employed by government; such a panel cannot operate independently.
  - The long time scale of HS2 demands more flexibility: a couple in their early seventies might well, through a complex but normal web of human circumstance, want to move house during the next 12 years but not qualify under the scheme and suffer considerable loss to their assets and to their enjoyment of a home. People must be free to move home and re-mortgage over the next 12 years and not be trapped, unable to get on with their lives as they normally would.
  - If you have received an offer 14.99% less than 'a realistic unblighted asking price' (Decision Document 2014) you are not eligible to even apply for the NTSS and will suffer a 14.99% financial loss because of HS2.
  - Even if an applicant is ultimately successful, it will likely be at least six months in total for the property to be purchased by the Government. In central London

properties often sell quicker than this, and if you want or need to move, waiting six months with no certainty that you will qualify in the end is no help at all.

- People who live near HS2 in London will be paying for the consequences of HS2. If HS2 is a worthwhile project, the burden should be fairly shared, not dumped on those who happen to live nearby.
  - Non-residential landlords are unfairly excluded from the scheme: disruption caused by construction works could severely undermine the rental value of properties and indeed make lettings impossible. No compensation is offered by the NCTS scheme.
28. There is no justification for restricting the Voluntary Purchase Offer to owner occupiers in rural areas. This scheme discriminates against both those who do not own their homes and those who live in urban areas. In a rural area, you are automatically compensated if you live up to 120 metres from the line. In Camden, you are denied compensation even when your property is adjacent to the new line.
29. We request that the Camden Cutting neighbourhood be made eligible for the same compensation as offered to rural areas in the Voluntary Purchase Zone.
30. A Camden Support Zone should be introduced in recognition of the Construction impacts of the Scheme and the prolonged blight this introduces to the area.
31. The Camden Support Zone should include all properties either side of the railway cutting that have an exposure to the works in the Cutting or are on a construction route.

### ***Consideration of the Local Community in the Design of the Approach to Euston***

32. The proposed track layout in the Camden Cutting requires the demolition of the Hampstead Road Bridge, the Granby Terrace Bridge, the Mornington Street Bridge, the Park Village East Retaining Wall and the Central Retaining Wall at Parkway. It also requires the construction of a rail dive-under in a large excavated cut and cover concrete structure with new deep retaining walls.
33. The design of this infrastructure has been carried out with regard only to the needs of HS2 and not with regard to the needs of the local community. HS2 is being built in a densely populated neighbourhood and the design needs to take account of this.
34. Consideration needs to be given to the setting of the Conservation Areas and Listed buildings (Grade II and II\*) on both sides of the Cutting. The Bill removes the protection that heritage assets normally have and we request that the Local Authority retains this control.



35. We request that HS2 design infrastructure in the Cutting to enhance the urban environment and minimise the impact on the residents of Camden. Specific items of infrastructure to be considered are in the following paragraphs (36 - 53).

***Euston Station Redesign***

36. We request that the new work on the design of Euston Station take into account the impact of the station design on the Camden Cutting, particularly with a view to establishing a track layout that minimises impacts on the Camden Cutting.

***Tunnelled approach to Euston Station***

37. We request that HS2 investigate an alternative design of the Euston throat. We understand from a meeting between HS2 engineers and Park Village East residents on 16 1 2014 that it is technically feasible for HS2 to remain in a tunnel from the proposed portal at Parkway to Euston Station, a distance of about half a mile. This would significantly reduce the construction impacts to the Camden Cutting, much as tunnels in rural areas reduce the impact on the countryside. We request that HS2 prepare a feasibility study and cost estimate of this possibility and that it is independently verified.

***Track layout without a high speed dive-under in the Euston approach***

38. An alternative track layout without a high speed dive under would reduce the amount of construction and construction impact significantly. We request that HS2 prepare a feasibility study and cost estimate of this possibility and that it is independently verified.

***Track layout without the necessity of demolishing the Park Village East Retaining Wall***

39. HS2 propose to demolish and rebuild the 12 metre high, 3 metre thick brick retaining wall along Park Village East that forms the western side of the Camden Cutting. The scale and elegance of this wall contribute positively to the character of the neighbourhood unlike much of the recent civil engineering work on new rail lines in and around London. Demolition of this wall and construction of its replacement will cause severe noise and disruption.
40. We understand from meetings with HS2 that it is feasible to leave this wall in place if slightly lower speeds are accepted on the approach to and exit from Euston Station so that the track curvature can be realigned. HS2 have told us that such a realignment will increase travel times in the approach by only four to six seconds.
41. We request that the track layout is revised to allow the Park Village East retaining wall to remain in place. It is not acceptable to cause severe disruption and destroy an historic wall to save six seconds on a journey.

***Track layout without the necessity of demolishing the Central Retaining Wall at Parkway***

42. HS2 propose the demolition of the Grade II listed 1830s Central Retaining Wall at the Parkway portal and describe the demolition as 'high impact and high adverse effect' in the ES. Demolition will cause severe noise and disruption, mostly at night, for residents facing the Cutting. This could be avoided if the alignment of the track was changed slightly. We understand from HS2 that this realignment is feasible and are unclear why it has not been adopted.
43. We request that the track layout is revised to allow the Central Retaining Wall to remain in place.

***Track layout without the necessity of raising the Hampstead Road Bridge by six metres and doubling its length to 220 metres***

44. HS2 proposes to raise Hampstead Road Bridge by six metres and double its length to 220 metres. The effect on the urban environment is severe.
45. Eye level views between Camden and central London along Hampstead road will be blocked and the unfriendly industrial nature of the proposed design, along with its great length, will create an isolated and inhuman streetscape. It will cut off Camden visually from central London, discourage pedestrian use and create an inhospitable and unsafe environment in the centre of London.
46. We request that the track layout beneath the the bridges be modified so that the bridge is lower and shorter. The bridge is not just for HS2; it is part of London and must be designed for the people of the city and not just for the engineering convenience of HS2.
47. We request that if for good reason the bridge can not be lowered and shortened, the design be modified so that it is a high quality piece of infrastructure that provides a high quality streetscape.

***Mornington Street Bridge***

48. HS2 propose to demolish and rebuild the Mornington Street Bridge. The design of the new bridge shown in the ES is industrial in nature and unsuitable for a residential neighbourhood. We request that the new bridge is rebuilt to the design of the existing bridge and that the adjoining brick walls along Mornington Terrace and Park Village East are also rebuilt as existing.

***Granby Terrace Bridge***

49. We request that the new Granby Terrace bridge is of a high quality design suitable to its residential neighbourhood.

***The Higgins Report***

50. The recent Higgins report ('HS2 Plus') set the course for a complete re-design of the Euston Station terminus, recognising the failings of the current plan in the

ES. While we welcome any improvements to the design, this further extends the period of uncertainty for the local community and may lead to even greater damage to the neighbourhood. The re-design of Euston will require a new ES and CoCP consultation so that the local community can understand the impact sufficiently, and respond to this with their concerns. We request that this time around HS2 engage in meaningful dialogue with the Camden Cutting community instead of box ticking and stonewalling.

51. The Higgin's report and the Compensation Decision Document show that neither the Department for Transport nor HS2 Ltd have any understanding of, nor interest in, the impact of HS2 on the communities in the Camden Cutting. We fear that with the focus on providing new residential, retail and business opportunities, the needs of the existing local community will be lost. Sir David Higgins' plans for the new station at Euston and connected developments in the Cutting to the north of the station will extend serious disruption to circa 2034.
52. The railway cutting currently provides the local area with a unique sense of quiet, light and air – unusual in densely-populated central London. This uniqueness is a huge asset to the local residents and one we do not want to give up. Some of the new options being considered for the station design include decking over the Cutting all the way from Euston to Parkway, to allow oversite development for new mid and high-rise buildings. These buildings would be out of scale with and overshadow the existing three to four storey listed buildings. For local residents in the Cutting area this proposal is even worse than the current HS2 plans: it would introduce a permanent negative change to the area as well as a further extended construction impact possibly by eight years to 2034. Local residents will not accept such a permanent loss of amenity in the local area from the reduction of light and space and the introduction of such dense and overshadowing development. Local people have no desire to turn the area into a new Canary Wharf. We request that any new plans for the area take into account the existing qualities of the neighbourhood and the needs and desires of its residents.
53. Clause 47 of the Bill allows ministers to compulsorily purchase land if they think HS2 creates "an opportunity for regeneration or development" on it. This clause states that if the Government "considers that the construction or operation of phase one of High Speed 2 gives rise to the opportunity for regeneration or development of any land" it may acquire the land compulsorily. This clause, which has no spatial or time limits, represents a new general power that seems to be unprecedented in the history of infrastructure projects. We are concerned that this power will be used to the benefit of large scale development and to the detriment of local communities and request that the powers are removed from the Bill. HS2 should be for improving transport not for providing money making opportunities for large scale developers at the cost of the existing community.

Development should be regulated by Local Authorities using the Planning system; there is no case for HS2 being above the laws that apply elsewhere in the country.

### ***Engagement of Local Community in the Local Environment Management Plans***

54. The ES and CoCP set out the proposed approach for how Local Environment Management Plans will be agreed. These effectively are the rules by which construction of the work will be governed. It is proposed that the contractors for the project, as well as local council, will be involved in agreeing these plans. We believe that representatives of the local community should also be involved. These representatives should not be restricted to elected councillors; residents of the streets most closely involved should be invited to elect individual representatives for their neighbourhood. This would ensure that impact on the local community and environment would be sufficiently considered in LEMPs, rather than simply project considerations (by the contractors) and impact on local services and traffic disruption (by local council). This tripartite engagement would give a voice to those most impacted by the construction, as well as improve upon the legitimacy of the LEMP process.

### ***Working Hours***

55. As described in the ES Vol 5 Draft Code of Construction Practice CT-003-000, most of the construction activities taking place in the Camden Cutting will be allowed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The work will be noisy, disruptive and go on for 10 years without respite. This is unacceptable in a densely populated neighbourhood.
56. A significant period of night-time working is being imposed on the Cutting area; while some of this is technically required (once concrete is being poured it cannot be stopped until complete), there is also a proportion that is driven by the desire to minimise disruption to the continuing operation of the national rail services into Euston Station. Indeed, it is our understanding that disruption to National Rail services would lead to fines being imposed on HS2.
57. We request that HS2 justify as part of the LEMP process, on a case by case basis, all work outside of the normal working hours. Where a justification cannot be made to the satisfaction of all parties engaged in the LEMP process, the work must take place during normal working hours.
58. We request that fines should be imposed on HS2 for any non-essential working outside of normal working hours, i.e. work undertaken outside of normal hours to avoid disruption to rail services. This would result in serious consideration being given to the local community when construction programmes were being drawn up. This money should then be used to fund additional mitigation for the local community.

59. We request that some rail services are diverted to Marylebone or other stations during the construction of HS2 in order to allow more construction during normal working hours in the approach to Euston.
60. We request that for one full 24 hour period every week, there will be no work. No noise, just respite from the noise and disruption. There must be some opportunity for the local community to have a normal family life at least one day a week. This will give the local community the stamina to withstand the intrusion into their lives of the HS2 construction. Normally the respite day will be Sunday.

### ***Noise limits for rehousing***

61. We request that the noise thresholds for rehousing should be lower than the limits in the CoCP. These limits are based on BS5228 and are used for typical construction projects where disturbance is temporary, not ten years. Normal life can not go on during ten years of excessive noise. Normal life includes sleeping, doing homework or revision, socialising, working or just being at home.
62. Right now the streets in the Camden Cutting are quiet with only local traffic and limited intermittent train noise during the daytime only; ten years of round the clock heavy civil engineering will alter the environment radically for the worse.
63. World Health Organisation guidelines state that night-time noise should not exceed 40 db and where it exceeds 55 db "the situation is considered increasingly dangerous to public health" [World Health Organisation Europe, Night Noise Guidelines for Europe]. HS2 propose that residents of the Camden Cutting neighbourhood should live with this noise, night and day, for long periods of time over a period of 10 years.
64. We request that given the exceptional nature and duration of the HS2 construction project, the limits for rehousing are lower in each category listed in Table 1 of the ES Vol 5 Draft Code of Construction Practice CT-003-000 and Information Paper E23. We request that the limits for temporary rehousing are:
  - 70 dB during the day 0800-1800 on weekdays (instead of 85 dB)
  - 65 dB during the day 0700-2200 Sunday (instead of 75 dB)
  - 55 dB at night 2200-0700 (instead of 65) dB
  - 70 dB at other times (instead of 75-80 dB)
65. For reference: HS2 propose that the daytime limit for rehousing is 85 dB; this is like a very busy road with heavy lorries one metre from your house. The Health and Safety Executive requires ear defenders to be worn in a place of work which has this level of noise.
66. The ES Vol 5 Draft Code of Construction Practice CT-003-000 requires that the trigger levels are applied when the noise levels predicted or measured by the

contractor exceeds the limit in for ten days in any fifteen consecutive days or for 40 days in any six month period.

67. We request that these trigger levels are applied when the noise level predicted by the contractors exceeds the limit for five days in any fifteen consecutive days or 20 days in any six month period.
68. We request that temporary rehousing is within the locality and is agreed with individual households.

### ***Noise Thresholds for Insulation***

69. For the same reasons as described for rehousing thresholds above, we request that the noise thresholds for noise insulation should be lower than the limits in the CoCP and Information Paper E23. We request that the limits should be:
  - 65 dB during the day 0800-1800 on weekdays (instead of 75 dB)
  - 60 dB during the day 0700-2200 Sunday (instead of 65 dB)
  - 55 dB at night 2200 -0700 dB (same as proposed by HS2)
  - 65 dB at other times (instead of 65-70 dB)
70. Most of the buildings in the Camden Cutting neighbourhood are listed and/or have very large sash windows with splayed reveals and internal shutters. This will make suitable secondary glazing, blinds and mechanical ventilation difficult to install without destroying the internal qualities of the properties. Living with sealed windows, blinds and mechanical ventilation for ten years is a serious infringement to the quality of life in a house. Secondary glazing and mechanical ventilation is not a realistic or reasonable mitigation measure for most local properties and we request that HS2 recognise this.

### ***Vibration***

71. The CoCP refers to British Standards for acceptable vibration thresholds, but offers no commitment to survey or protect all properties in the Camden Cutting from vibration.
72. Most of the properties adjacent to the Cutting do not have proper foundations and are of uncertain robustness. We request that all properties within 50m of the existing retaining walls that enclose all sides of the Camden Cutting between Parkway and Granby Terrace are given structural surveys before construction commences to assess their vulnerability for damage from the proposed works and that they are actively monitored during the construction works.

### ***Air pollution thresholds***

73. Air pollution (NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>), predominantly generated by traffic, already has a significant impact on the lives of Camden residents, particularly those who live in the south of the borough and near main arterial roads such as

Hampstead Road / Camden High Street (the A400). Delancey Street (A503) and Parkway (A4201) are also directly affected. Pollution maps from the London Air Quality Network show that the Camden Cutting area sits at the edge of the inner London zone of raised pollution levels.

74. Despite the fact that some local roads are noted in the ES as having raised levels both during and following construction (for example some houses on Arlington Road have moderate adverse impacts throughout as do most properties on Delancey Street), no mitigation has been proposed. The cumulative impacts of raised levels have not been taken into account and the fact that levels of Nitrogen Dioxide already exceed WHO guidelines by a large amount (by three times the legal safe limit on Euston road) has not been factored in.
75. We request that air quality is monitored continuously during construction and that work is stopped if pollution levels exceed those recommended by the World Health Organisation.

#### ***Acoustic and Visual Screening***

76. The ES states that 'taller screening ... has been assumed ... along the edge of the majority of construction site boundaries'. The design or purpose of this screening is not described.
77. We request that screens are built as close as possible to the works within the Cutting in order to limit breakout of noise.
78. From past experience with screening during construction works (Rail Track erected screens during works in 1999) we know that it has only a minimal effect but none the less is better than nothing. We request that the screening is designed by acousticians and built by HS2 specifically and appropriately for the Camden Cutting.
79. We request that planting on Park Village East adjacent to the Cutting is maintained or replaced with equivalent planting in a suitable depth of soil.
80. We request that the existing trees and wall along Mornington Terrace adjacent to the Cutting are maintained.

#### ***Satellite Construction Compounds***

81. There are three satellite compounds proposed at street level in the Cutting neighbourhood (Mornington Terrace, Hampstead Road near Mornington Crescent, and Park Village East) which will significantly increase the impact on the local environment. The use of these areas also extends either side of the working hours described in the ES, further increasing disruption to local residents.

82. We believe that these local satellites are not necessary in the Cutting and request that they are not allowed. The main compound at the Temperance Hospital site is only 10 minutes walk away, and deliveries of plant and materials should only be allowed via the main construction compound or at Euston Station, not via the satellite compounds.
83. If compounds are required, they should be situated within the railway cutting itself, not at street level immediately adjacent to local residences.

### ***Construction Traffic***

84. Construction lorry routes are proposed by HS2 on residential streets in the Camden Cutting area. This will cause air pollution and noise & vibration to adjacent properties (especially on streets with speed bumps) and increased danger to pedestrians and cyclists.
85. We request that HS2 makes a clear commitment to maximise the use of rail for construction traffic and minimise the use of roads.
86. We request that any use of roads instead of rail is justified to our proposed tripartite LEMP and must be approved by it.
87. We request that HS2 trains all lorry drivers working in the area in safe driving techniques and requires them to drive at very low speeds (maximum 5 mph) on residential streets. This applies to both full and empty lorries. This is for safety and to reduce noise and vibration.
88. We request that there is no transport of materials or waste at night.
89. We request that there is no removal of excavated material or other waste by road.
90. We request that where lorries must be used there is a commitment by HS2 to use zero emission vehicles.
91. We request that fines be levied and that vehicles be stopped immediately if they break the above conditions.
92. We request that traffic management should ensure that no residential streets, including Delancey Street, should suffer any increase in traffic as a result of the work.
93. We request that physical barriers, or road signs with camera enforcement, are used to ensure that other traffic is not able to use residential streets as rat-runs to avoid congestion from construction traffic / utilities works / diversions on main roads.
94. We request that HS2 report three months before construction begins on the measures they have taken to implement these commitments.



### ***Personal Mitigation Budgets***

95. The ES and the CoCP only provide vague references to the mitigation options that will be provided when the works breach the statutory limits described in the documents. These include secondary glazing or temporary accommodation for affected periods, but leave details unclear and suggest that these matters would only be agreed at the time. We do not believe these options are sufficient, given the prolonged and extraordinary cumulative impacts on the Cutting area. Will people really be expected to live in a hotel for extended periods? Is secondary glazing really expected to reduce such prolonged and cumulative impacts from noise, vibration and pollution in the area? Note that secondary glazing is not suitable for many of the buildings that face the Camden Cutting, most of which are listed by English Heritage.
96. We request that a Personal Mitigation Budget should be introduced for every household impacted by the construction period (including those on delivery routes, not only those immediate to the railway). This would have to be sufficient to allow households to choose how they responded to the significant impacts on their lives and environment, while not limiting them to a prescribed set of options that may not suit their personal needs.
97. We request that rehousing is agreed two years in advance of construction, and provided for in realistic personal mitigation budgets. If individuals are prepared to put up with the noise for a month, then go on holiday for a month one year, or move to alternative accommodation another year, that should be their choice according to the needs of their household. A child may be studying for exams, a elderly or disabled family member may be too ill to withstand a stifling summer with closed windows.
98. We request that Personal Mitigation Budgets are available to all residents whether or not they own their property; council tenants and tenants of private landlords have equal right to the enjoyment of their homes as do owner occupiers.
99. In 1999 Railtrack made cash payments to residents of the Camden Cutting of between £150 and £300 (depending on location) as compensation for one weekend of noisy work on the tracks. Whether or not this sets a legal precedent, it is an example of a Personal Mitigation Budget being used.

### ***Management of Local issues by HS2***

100. We request a mechanism to ensure that mitigation effects happen as quickly as possible, with minimal red-tape and effective support being available and actively offered to all our community. HS2 should establish an independent local office to facilitate this. It would monitor the unblighted sale and rental values of the complete range of properties in the area, and have the ability to facilitate the residents getting compensation. It would help them make speedy repairs to

properties showing signs of damage from lorry/building vibrations or installation of secondary glazing, or rehousing, help with planning permissions etc. It would be aware of the specific requirements for the rehousing of some categories of residents and the restrictions for the many listed buildings which would require specialist secondary glazing etc.

101. We request that all environmental commitments are enforced by a clearly identified independent authority so that HS2 will have a strong incentive to minimise environmental impact in all senses and not just pay compensation for individuals with an ability to pursue them.

***Alternative Principal Terminus Station: Old Oak Common***

102. It is already proposed that there be a station on the HS2 line at Old Oak Common (OOC). We request that Old Oak Common is developed as the principal London terminus for the high speed section of the line. This has the obvious merit of very substantially reducing the overall cost of HS2, including reducing costs for mitigation and compensation.
103. An onward connection to Euston could be provided using the existing conventional line if necessary and feasible.
104. A principal terminus at Old Oak Common is an effective way to prevent ten years or more of serious disruption to Camden.
105. We believe that the saving would amount to billions of pounds. We request that HS2 provide a detailed breakdown of all costs for developing the line (and Euston station) beyond Old Oak Common, so that a public and independent assessment of the cost-benefit can be undertaken.
106. We are aware of papers presented by other groups in the debate on HS2 that examined the relative interconnectivity of OOC vs. Euston. For most passengers this concluded that OOC was the better choice. Is the cost of the line beyond OOC really worth it for the few who would have better onward connections from Euston?
107. Some of the money saved by not bringing the line into Euston could be used to reduce the fares on HS2. All HS2 passengers would benefit from that, and in all probability the few whose journey times would increase would regard the reduced fare as sufficient compensation. Having the terminus at Old Oak Common rather than at Euston would benefit the local community, the taxpayer and HS2 passengers alike.
108. OOC is a true brownfield site and a real opportunity for regeneration, whereas Euston and the Cutting have a thriving existing community that does not want to be 'regenerated'. Any economic development of an area should be truly additive and not at the cost of the existing local community.

109. HS2 operations should start with the terminus at OOC. If it turned out that capacity was a problem, the first option for dealing with it would be to increase the frequency of the Crossrail service. Next would be to exploit the many opportunities that exist at OOC to connect with other Underground and Overground services. It is important that the station at OOC should be built in such a way that these connections could be provided later in the event that they proved necessary.

**Conclusion**

110. For the foregoing and connected reasons your Petitioners respectfully submit that, unless the Bill is amended as proposed above, so far affecting your Petitioners, should not be allowed to pass into law.

111. There are other clauses and provisions of the Bill which, if passed into law as they now stand will prejudicially affect your Petitioners and their rights, interests and property and for which no adequate provision is made to protect your Petitioners.

112. 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 Petitioner in the premises as your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND your Petitioner will ever pray, &c

Signed



STEPHEN MARTIN

Officer of the Camden Cutting Group

On behalf of the

**CAMDEN CUTTING GROUP**

IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2013-14

**HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL**

**PETITION OF THE  
CAMDEN CUTTING GROUP**

Against the Bill - On Merits – By Counsel &c

STEPHEN MARTIN



on behalf of the  
CAMDEN CUTTING GROUP