

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 HS2 EUSTON ACTION 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 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.

Clauses of the Bill

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. Your Petitioners, the HS2 Euston Action Group ("the Action Group"), is an unincorporated association which was established at a Public Meeting chaired by Frank Dobson MP on 11 February 2014. The Objectives of the Action Group are to: (i) coordinate the lobbying and petitioning by community groups and individuals who live or work in the Euston Area and who are specially and directly affected by HS2; (ii) empower all members of the diverse communities in the Euston area who are specially and directly affected by the HS2 scheme to lobby and petition against the Bill; and (iii) share information and ideas with all those specially and directly affected by HS2 whether in the Euston area, Camden or elsewhere up the line.

8. Membership of the Action Group is open to any community group or individuals who are specially or directly affected by HS2 in the Euston Area. The area covered by the Action Group is the same as that covered by the HS2 Euston Community Forum (the "Community Forum"), namely "CFA1". The membership of the Action Group currently consists of 28 community groups and 270 individuals. The Action Group has cross-party support, the four political parties represented on Camden Council being members, namely the Holborn & St Pancras Labour Party, and the Camden Liberal Democrat, Conservative and Green Parties. Many of our members will be petitioning separately.

9. The following community groups are member of the Action Group: Amptill Square TRA; Camden Cutting; Camden Civic Society; Camden Peoples Theatre, Camden Town DMC; Christ Church & St Mary Magdelene; Churchway TRA; Cumberland Market TRA; Delancey Street Residents Association; Drummond Street Mosque; Drummond Street Traders Association; Drummond Street TRA; New Horizon Youth Centre; Netley Primary Governing Body; Ossulston TRA; Oakshot Court TRA; Park Village and Environs Residents Association; Park Village East Heritage Group; Regents Park TRA; Regents Park CAAVC; Royal Asiatic Society; St Pancras Church PPC; Silsoe House Residents Association; Somers Town Community Association; Stalbridge House TRA; Third Age Project; West Euston Partnership and West Euston Time Bank.

10. The Action Group is a successor to the Community Forum which had been established by HS2 Ltd on 8 November 2012. The Objectives of the Forum were to (i) inform the local

community about HS2 Ltd's proposals and consultations; (ii) highlight local priorities for the route design; (iii) provide information from HS2 Ltd or DfT in a timely and transparent manner to enable members to make an informed response to the issues raised; (iv) provide for public participation in all aspects of the project which impact upon Euston; (v) identify and discuss local preferences for avoiding, managing or mitigating the impacts of the project during construction and operation; and (vi) identify local community benefits and activities which could be linked to the project. 16 December 2013, the Community Forum had its last meeting. The members of the Forum found the consultation process to be extremely frustrating. They were unable to identify any effective outcomes.

11. The Community Forum responded to the following consultations: "Property and Compensation" and "Safeguarding" (31.1.13); "Draft Environmental Statement" (11.7.13); "Design Refinement" (11.7.13); "Property Compensation" (4.12.13); and Environmental Statement (27.2.14). Your Petitioners hope that these will be available to the Committee. There were numerous inaccuracies in the Environmental Statement which were identified by Camden LBC and by members of the Community Forum in their responses. Further, the photomontages bear no resemblance of what is being proposed. We are told that HS2 intend to raise the level of Hampstead Bridge by 6 metres. However LV-01-005 show the raised road at the same height against the existing trees on the east of the road as at present!

12. On 17 September 2013, HS2 Ltd issued a press release stating that they were abandoning CFAs to be replaced by a different type of engagement "more suited to the needs of petitioners". No further announcement has been made. The Forum wrote on 11 February 2014 asking HS2's Director of Hybrid Bill about HS2's plans for the next phase of community engagement. No substantive response has been received.

Introduction

13. Your Petitioners support a modern integrated transport system in which rail plays an increasingly significant role. That transport system must withstand the challenge of Climate Change. Your Petitioners question whether high speed travel, with its greater carbon footprint, is consistent with this objective.

14. The scheme proposed by the Promoters of the Bill does not currently meet the objective of an integrated transport system:

(i) On 17 March 2014, the Promoters abandoned their plans for a link between HS2 and HS1 along the North London line. In the view of Your Petitioners, this decision was inevitable. Sir David Higgins has described the link as "an imperfect compromise". The Community Forum always saw this proposal as nonsensical. It is one which had been rejected some 25 years earlier when HS1 was being planned.

(ii) On 12 January 2012, the Promoters deferred their plans for a link to Heathrow Airport.

(iii) When Phase 2 of HS2 is brought into Euston, the Station will not be able to cope with the additional footfall without Crossrail 2 which will cost a further £15-£20bn. There has been a conspiracy of silence about this fact. The Promoters of the Bill are unwilling to acknowledge that the true cost of HS2 is £80bn.

(iv) Euston is unable to cope with any increase in the number of taxis, buses and cars delivering customers to and from the new Station. Emissions of NO₂ in Euston Road are already three times the EU standard. No increase in pollution levels is acceptable. The Promoters assess that there will be “substantial” increases in NO₂ during the construction period. The long term effects have not yet been assessed.

15. Your Honourable House should not write a blank cheque for Crossrail 2. This will be the practical consequence should Euston be approved as the major London terminus. Those promoting the scheme, propose a single Crossrail 2 station serving Euston, St Pancras and King’s Cross with below surface connections to all three. The construction of such a station will cause immense additional damage to those living in Somers Town and St Pancras. Further, the combination of HS2 and Crossrail 2 will attract more jobs to Central London and shoppers to Oxford Street and the West End. It is difficult to reconcile this with the objective of this Bill’s Promoters to promote economic regeneration in the North.

16. In November 2013, the London Mayor announced plans for a Mayoral Development Corporation at Old Oak Common, a 195 acre site. A transport super hub is proposed serving 250,000 passengers, the equivalent to Waterloo. Two years earlier, Hammersmith and Fulham LBC published “A Vision for Park Royal City International” which described how HS2 could link up not only with Cross Rail 1, but also the London Underground Services and the North London Line. Access could be obtained to 90% of stations in London, with just one change. This would provide much greater connectivity than at Euston. Old Oak Common could also provide links with:

(i) Heathrow Airport, the Heathrow Express already running through Old Oak Common; and

(ii) HS1 via a twin-tracked tunnel to Stratford International. Your Petitioners are not satisfied that there is an economic case for such a link. However, if there is to be one, sufficient funds must be invested to ensure that it stands the test of time.

17. Your Petitioners aver that the Promoters of the Bill have failed to have adequate regard to these developments. In particular, they have failed to assess whether Old Oak Common should be the major London terminus for HS2, whilst Euston would continue to be the major London terminus for classic West Coast mainline services.

The New Station at Euston

18. Your Petitioners understand that the Hybrid Bill is premised on “Option 8” known locally as the “Cheapskate Station”. Your Petitioners find this proposal unacceptable. It only emerged because HS2 Ltd had underestimated the cost of their Baseline Scheme (Option 1) by £800m (£2bn as opposed to their original estimate of £1.2bn). Option 8 causes the

maximum damage to the Euston community, whilst offering least in terms of economic regeneration and community benefit. The proposal to demolish Hampstead Road bridge and raise it by 6 metres would cause havoc to the local road network. The effect on neighbouring residential properties has yet to be assessed. Neither does Option 8 cater for the needs of existing rail passengers. Your Petitioners understand that Option 8 is opposed not only by the local community, but also by Rt. Hon. Frank Dobson MP, Camden Council, the London Mayor and Transport for London. The Community Forum opposed it in their response to the "Design Refinement Consultation" (11.7.13).

19. Your Petitioners understand that Option 8 is not now the station that the Promoters of this Bill now intend to build and that this is to be abandoned in favour of a "level deck option" as proposed by Sir David Higgins in "HS2 Plus" (17.3.14). Although Mr Secretary McLoughlin informed Your Honourable House on 17 March 2014 that he had asked "HS2 Ltd and Network Rail to develop more comprehensive proposals for the redevelopment of Euston working with the rail industry and the local community", there has been no such engagement to date. Until Your Petitioners have a better idea of the alternative proposals, it is difficult for Your Petitioners to discern exactly against what they are petitioning.

20. If the Promoters of the Bill insist on Euston as the main London terminus for HS2, Your Petitioners ask this Honourable House to direct the Promoters to design a station that fits within the curtilage of the existing station. HS2 Ltd has failed to properly appraise such alternatives, including the double-deck down design put forward by local professionals.

21. A tunnelled approach from Parkway to Euston station should be considered. The proposed HS2 track layout in the Camden Cutting should be modified to eliminate the need for a high speed dive under, and the demolition of both the Park Village East retaining wall and the central retaining wall at the proposed Parkway portal. This retaining wall was constructed by Sir George Stephenson and is an important heritage asset which is listed. These changes would have a modest reduction on the speed at which trains could enter the Camden Cutting. They would significantly reduce the impact of the works on those living in the Camden Cutting area.

22. The bulk of the space above the station should be devoted to local housing which local people can afford and to low-cost units to encourage local enterprise. The existing traders within Drummond Street should be fully integrated into the new station. Cobourg Street should not be used as a taxi collection point as currently proposed by the Promoters. Taxi-drop-off and collection points should be incorporated within the existing station, preferably underground. Drummond Street must retain its existing character. Local traffic should be able to circulate within the area, including via Cobourg Street.

23. To date, HS2 Ltd have grossly underestimated the cost and practical difficulties of bring HS2 into a densely populated high value area such as Euston. Neither Kings Cross nor Stratford, both of which were brown field sites, are precedents. We are now told that HS2 Ltd's plans for a level deck option will not be completed until 2034. Given this highly unsatisfactory state of affairs, Your Petitioners urge this Honourable House to direct the Promoters to use Old Oak Common as the London terminus whether on a temporary or a permanent basis until properly costed and acceptable plans for an alternative London

terminus have been devised. Such plans must also address the ability of the London terminus to provide for the onward journeys of those arriving at the Station.

A Preliminary Issue

24. Your Petitioners, together with other community groups and individuals in the Euston area who have petitioned Your Honourable House, have faced considerable difficulties in drafting their petitions because of the uncertainty over the station which the Promoters of the Bill intend to build at Euston and the impact on the local community. We are told that "HS2 Plus" is not a report by HS2 Ltd, but rather one by Sir David Higgins, in his individual capacity. The status of "HS2 Plus" is something that Your Honourable House should determine without delay. The stance adopted by the Promoters is putting Your Petitioners and other petitioners in the Euston area to unnecessary expense in petitioning against a station which it seems that the Promoters have no intention of implementing. Such costs will increase as petitioners prepare the evidence that they will seek to put before Your Honourable House. If unnecessary costs continue to be incurred as a result of the unreasonable conduct of the Promoters, we ask Your Honourable House to consider whether they should be liable for the costs thrown away.

25. We therefore ask Your Honourable House to hold a session at the earliest opportunity to ascertain the Promoters' current intentions.

26. If Option 8 is no longer the promoters' preferred option, Your Petitioners seek the following undertaking from the Promoters of the Bill:

(i) HS2 Ltd will investigate all alternative options for the station at Euston, including those which will enable the new station to be built within the curtilage of the existing station;

(ii) In so far as Crossrail 2 will be required to cope with the increased footfall at the new station, these options will incorporate Network Rail's proposals for the Crossrail 2 station at Euston together with the best estimate of the cost of Crossrail 2;

(iii) Any proposals for above station development will be consistent with the Euston Area Plan which is being prepared by Camden Council as the relevant local planning authority;

(iv) HS2 Ltd will revisit the options of using Old Oak Common as either the temporary or permanent London terminus for HS2.

(v) The local community will be fully engaged in developing the "more comprehensive proposals" for the new station at Euston.

The Impact of HS2 on the Euston Area

27. The impact of HS2 on the Euston communities is probably unique. It is far greater than anywhere else on the route of HS2. Many of the difficulties arise from the decision of the

Promoters to bring HS2 into Euston, a densely populated, diverse area with high land values. Your Petitioners identify the following factors:

(i) The Environmental Statement was premised on works being executed between 2015 to 2026. HS2 Ltd now suggests that with HS2 Plus, this is more likely to be 2016 to 2034, with the implication of 18 years of severe disruption.

(ii) HS2 Ltd have failed to assess the cumulative impact of the construction works on our communities, namely the noise, dust, vibration, ventilation, air pollution, loss of safe access routes, loss of amenity and daylight, rodent infestation, anti-social behaviour, construction traffic, bridge closures, and congestion.

(iii) An aggravating factor is the quantity of works which will be executed outside core working hours, premised on the principle that the disruption to existing rail passengers will be kept to a minimum regardless of both (i) the impact on our local community; and (ii) the period of time over which works will be executed.

(iv) The Environmental Statement is riddled with inaccuracies. These were identified by Camden Council and by community groups in their response to the Consultation. Neither does it provide the information reasonably required to assess the environmental impact of the works on the Euston area. The Community Forum addressed this in their response to the Environmental Statement (27.2.14).

28. The Action Group embraces a number of communities with their distinct identities:

(i) **The Drummond Street area** – the triangle surrounded by Hampstead Road, Eversholt Street and Euston Road. Some 20 business premises and 31 dwellings are to be demolished. St James Garden, where 35,000 people (some of historical importance) are buried, is to be lost. The Maria Fidelis School will be forced to move. The Action group is concerned about the impact on the **Drummond Street traders and residents**. Throughout the construction period, residents in Cobourg Street will look directly out onto a “Berlin wall” which will be constructed down the centre of their street. This will cut off the Drummond Street traders from passengers in Euston station, a major source of their custom.

(ii) **The Regents Park Estate** – to the west of Hampstead Road. Some 158 dwellings at Eskdale, Silverdale and Ainsdale and Stalbridge House are to be demolished. Other blocks are at risk. A further 270 dwellings may be rendered virtually uninhabitable during the construction period and/or when the new station is constructed. HS2 Ltd have yet to agree to methodology with Camden Council to assess which additional homes will be rendered “unreasonable to continue to occupy”. It is most unlikely that HS2 will have secured the suitable alternative accommodation by 2017 when the demolition works are due to commence. Two play grounds are to be lost together with a number of open spaces.

(iii) **The Ampthill Square Estate** – The Ampthill Square Estate lies to the north of Euston Station. Gillfoot tower block looks directly down onto the station. The plans used by HS2 Ltd in the Environmental Statement are 10 years out of date. Five years

ago, the estate was modernised at a cost of some £20m. A secure area was developed which has successfully addressed the past problems of drug abuse and anti-social behaviour, a fact not reflected in the Environmental Statement. The tenants' hall is to be demolished. A range of utility works is to be executed within the estate between 2016 and 2022. A construction compound is proposed in the Estate car park which will involve the stopping up of Barnaby Street. Hampstead Road Bridge is to be raised by 6 metres with unknown consequences on the residential properties. Gillfoot and some other properties may be rendered uninhabitable.

(iv) **The Somers Town area** to the east of the existing station. This area will be subjected to significant disruption whilst the new station is constructed. The disruption will be much greater if the Promoters proceed with the "level deck option". Utility works are to be executed in Cedar Way and Chalton Street. The later will have an adverse effect on the Chalton Street Market. Ossulston Street is to be a route for huge construction lorries. HS2 Ltd propose to garage their lorries in the communal area in the Churchway Estate. The community play area in Lancing Street is to be seized for use of a construction compound.

(v) **Camden Cutting** – The area to the east and west of the existing line with Granby Terrace to the south and Parkway to the north. Mornington Terrace, Clarkson Row Mornington Crescent and Park Village East directly abut the railway line as it comes out of Euston station until it goes underground at the Parkway Portal. The 15 metre cutting in the Euston throat will be dropped by a further 35 metres. The retaining wall in Park Village East will be demolished and rebuilt, depriving residents of vehicle access to their homes from 2016-2022. Park Village East will be closed during this period. Night time work will affect all the properties in Park Village East, Mornington Terrace, Parkway and many other local streets. The impact on Silsoe House and Cubbitt Court will also be severe. The demolition and rebuilding of Hampstead Road bridge will have a major impact on the residential properties in Mornington Crescent.

(vi) **Cumberland Market Estate** – This estate which is now owned by Peabody, is to the north of Cumberland Market. The construction works will have a significant impact on blocks at Tintern House, Richmond House and Goldsmith House at the south end of Park Village East.

29. The whole of the Euston area will be affected by the following:

- 24-hour working, particularly at weekends, in respect of utility diversions, the railway track, the demolition and rebuilding of bridges; demolition and rebuilding of the retaining walls; work to the new station. This will be permitted to minimise disruption to rail services and to avoid daytime traffic disruption.
- Almost all the streets in the Euston area are earmarked for utility work;
- Two tunnel boring machines will operate from south of the Parkway portal.
- The removal of waste material by road, rather than rail

- The demolition and rebuilding of the retaining wall in Park Village East;
- The demolition and rebuilding of Hampstead Road Bridge some 6 metres higher than at present and doubling its length to 220 metres. Many properties will be left on the edge of a slope.
- The demolition and rebuilding of bridges in Mornington Street and Granby Terrace and the construction (and subsequent demolition) of a temporary bridge to link Mornington Terrace and Parkway in front of Nos. 9-12 Mornington Terrace.;
- Two main construction compounds and eleven satellite compounds (see "CT-05-001). They will be sited in valuable open spaces, play areas and in residential streets.
- HS2 Ltd believe that they have first call on any open spaces in the area. These are essential community amenities in an urban area. HS2 Ltd is proposing to seize these without offering any compensation to the local community in return.
- Heavy construction vehicles will clog up and pollute the area.
- Some residents will have restricted access to their homes.
- Traffic will be diverted through quiet residential streets.
- No proposals have been made for replacing the parking facilities currently enjoyed by local residents and businesses.

Mitigation – Homes

30. In "Decision Document – Impact on Social Rented Housing" (Nov 2013), the Promoters state "There was a strong sense that it is the Government's duty to 'pay' for the full impacts of HS2". Your Petitioners hope that this is a position that Your Honourable House will endorse. The Promoters also assert that they are committed to working closely "with key stakeholders, more particularly tenants".

31. Many tenants and other residents complain that they have not been adequately involved in decisions about their future. This criticism is largely directed at HS2 Ltd, rather than Camden Council. The criticism is that HS2 Ltd is doing too little itself and is rather placing the onus on the local housing authority to identify sites for alternative accommodation. The search is restricted to council owned land, including a number of valuable open spaces, rather than land held by other private or public bodies.

32. The following is typical of the approach adopted by HS2 Ltd. On 14 May 2014, HS2 Ltd called on residents at Cartmel, a block which may be rendered uninhabitable as a result of the construction works. A tenant complained that a member of her household suffered from severe asthma which would be aggravated by the dust and pollution. The resident was told that she would need to get the council to rehouse her.

Mitigation – Homes to be Demolished

33. A minimum of 214 homes will be demolished. An unspecified number of additional homes may be rendered uninhabitable. On the basis of the limited information that HS2 Ltd has made available to the local community, it seems unlikely that HS2 will have secured the suitable alternative accommodation by 2017 when the demolition works are due to commence.

34. Your Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoters:

(i) There will be no overall loss of low cost homes in the Euston area as a result of HS2. This includes both social housing to rent and low cost ownership. There is a chronic shortage of affordable housing in the area.

(ii) HS2 will fund the replacement of all lost homes, currently a minimum of 214 dwellings. Your Petitioners understand that the Promoters are only willing to replace the 136 flats occupied by secure tenants. There will therefore be a loss of a minimum of 78 units of affordable housing. This is unacceptable.

(iii) If HS2 is not to replace the low cost homes occupied by lessees, it must fund Camden LBC to enable it to secure such homes. Your Petitioners understand that the Promoters accept no responsibility to secure suitable alternative accommodation for lessees. The compensation offered will force them to move out of the area. This includes tenants who exercised their Right to Buy.

(iv) All tenants, leaseholders and owner-occupiers will be offered genuine, suitable alternative accommodation.

(v) All such homes should be in the neighbourhood, if that is what residents desire.

(vi) All Council tenants should be entitled to remain tenants of Camden Council, if that is what they want.

(vii) Camden Council will remain the landlord of existing leaseholders, if that is what they want.

(viii) Alternative homes will be provided straight away and no resident should have to move to temporary accommodation.

(ix) Nothing should affect the security of tenure enjoyed by any resident.

(x) Rents will not be higher than if residents had not been forced out of their homes. The Promoters' current position is that "rents will need to be in line with rent policy set by Government". Government define "affordable rents" as being 80% of market rents. In the Euston area, 80% of market rents are unaffordable.

(xi) Neither will service charges will be higher than if residents had not been forced out of their homes.

(xii) Provision will be made for private tenants who are to be made homeless, whether through the provision of alternative accommodation or through compensation. Whilst most private tenants in the Euston occupy their homes under assured shorthold tenancies, some have occupied their homes for many years.

(xiii) There will be access to free legal advice for all residents to enable them to make an informed decision on the options available to them. This is no longer available under the legal aid scheme.

Mitigation – Homes which may not be “reasonable to continue to occupy”

35. Your Petitioners are concerned that the Promoters have yet to agree a methodology with Camden Council to assess what additional homes (if any) will be rendered “unreasonable to continue to occupy” as a result of the construction works. Residents have been excluded from any such discussions.

36. The issue is apparently the refusal of the Promoters to accept that the cumulative impact of the construction works will be much greater on residents and businesses, than the sum of the individual components. Your Petitioners suggest that a cumulative assessment should be made of the following factors: namely the noise, dust, vibration, ventilation, air pollution, loss of safe access routes, loss of amenity and daylight, rodent infestation, anti-social behavior, construction traffic, bridge closures, and congestion.

37. The Housing, Health and Safety Rating System introduced by the Housing Act 2004 provides a scoring system upon which a methodology to assess “habitability” could be based. Agreement must be reached on a scoring system to assess “habitability”. Baseline surveys must be carried out in advance of any construction works. The local community should be involved in devising the methodology and in the baseline surveys. None of this work has been done to date.

38. Your Petitioners understand that residents of the following properties may require rehousing on a temporary or permanent basis as a result of such surveys: Cobourg Street, Augustus House, Cartmel, Coniston, Langdale, The Tarns and Waterhead, Tintern House, properties on either side of Camden Cutting, and Gillfoot.

39. Your Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoters:

(i) A scoring system to assess “habitability” will be agreed with Camden Council and the local community to assess the cumulative impacts of the construction works.

(ii) Before any construction works commence, baseline surveys will be carried out of all properties upon which the construction works will have any detrimental impact. Affected residents will be fully involved in these surveys.

(iii) Before any construction works commence, all residents and businesses who will be adversely affected will be notified of the outcome of the assessments together with the mitigation measures which HS2 Ltd will offer.

(iv) In so far as it is found that any properties are deemed to be “not habitable” (or “not reasonable to continue to occupy”) on either a temporary or permanent basis, residents will be notified of HS2 Ltd’s proposals for securing alternative accommodation.

(v) Where temporary accommodation is required, residents will be offered a cash alternative so that they can make their own arrangements. Residents do not want to be put in a position whereby they face a choice of moving to temporary accommodation which they consider to be unsuitable or remaining in their homes which have been classed as uninhabitable.

(vi) Where alternative accommodation is not required, but mitigation measures are deemed necessary, these will be put in place before construction works commence. Again, residents should be offered a cash alternative to empower them to take the measures which they consider to be appropriate. There has been a precedent for this in the area when the West Coast mainline was upgraded.

Mitigation – Traders

40. Over the past 50 years, Drummond Street has become a very special neighbourhood in Camden with its strong British Bangladeshi identity and its range of restaurants, shops and businesses. The erection of a “Berlin Wall” down Cobourg Street (2016 to at least 2026) will cut them off from a large number of their customers from Euston Station. It is not realistic for traders to relocate as their businesses thrive on the reputation that Drummond Street has acquired. Their businesses thrive on their proximity to each other. We are advised that the public sector equality duties imposed on the Promoters of the Bill by section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 impose specific duties to foster good community relations and to promote equality of opportunity. The Promoters deny that they are under any such duty and suggest that market forces should be permitted to take their course.

41. Your Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoters in respect of the construction works:

(i) HS2 will adopt an evidence based mitigation strategy which will enable the traders to survive the years of disruption to their businesses. The traders are members of the Action Group. We endorse the demands which they have made in their petition.

(ii) In so far as they suffer any damage to their businesses as a consequence of the construction works, HS2 Ltd will compensate them for their loss.

(iii) The Promoters will establish a community benefit fund to compensate those who live and work in the Drummond Street area for the detrimental impact that the

construction works will have on their quality of life and to enable them to fund a range of community initiatives.

42. Your Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoters in respect of the new station:

(i) The existing traders in Drummond Street will be fully integrated into the new station.

(ii) Cobourg Street will not be used as a taxi collection point. Taxi drop-off and collection points should be incorporated within the existing station, preferably underground.

(iii) Drummond Street will retain its existing character. Local traffic will be able to circulate within the area, including via Cobourg Street.

43. The Chalton Street Market is an important asset in the Somers Town community. There is a regular market in Chalton Street on Fridays with 36 pitches. The ward councillors and local Neighbourhood Forum have been planning to expand the market by extending opening times, encouraging a more diverse range of stalls and promoting it. The street is also used for the annual Somers Town festival. Utility works are scheduled to close the market for the period 2016-2017.

44. Your Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoters:

(i) The Promoters will find an alternative location for the market whilst Chalton Street is closed.

(ii) Traders will be compensated by the Promoters for any loss in their businesses.

Mitigation – Local Employment Opportunities

45. Your Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoters to ensure that local people can benefit from the employment opportunities that HS2 will create:

(i) The Promoters will work with the local community to develop and implement a comprehensive employment, skill and training strategy, including a local procurement strategy.

(ii) Training programmes and apprenticeship scheme will be put in place in advance, to ensure that local people are able to make maximum benefit of any such employment opportunities.

Mitigation – Open Spaces, Community Facilities and Heritage

46. Your Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoter:

(i) There will be no loss of open spaces – both in the short term and after the new station has been constructed.

(ii) Where play areas or open spaces are being used as construction sites, alternative provision will be made before works commence.

(iii) In exceptional circumstances, when no alternative provision can be provided, HS2 Ltd will contribute to a community benefit fund to compensate residents for their loss of amenity.

(iv) Where there is any loss of open space for residents in Ampthill Square, the Regents Park Estate or the Drummond Street area, this will be replaced when the new station is built. St James Garden is an important local amenity for the Drummond Street area and will be replaced. All trees will also be replaced.

(v) That replacement open space must be for the benefit of the residents of these estates, as opposed to those who will live or work within the new above station development. Areas of the new line should be decked over and made into parkland to restore lost open space. Restoration must be made to all these communities for the loss of a large number of mature trees which are important receptors of CO2 emissions.

(vi) The Silverdale and the Ampthill Square Tenants Halls at Silverdale Tenants Hall will be replaced before construction works commence. Refuges are required for residents seeking to escape from the nuisance created by the construction works.

(vii) If the Park Village East Retaining Wall is to be demolished and rebuilt, the opportunity should be taken to move the wall to the east, providing the opportunity to enhance the local environment, including restoring and broadening the shrub border that runs alongside the wall to provide more green open space and additional trees to provide partial reparation for the large number of mature trees which are to be destroyed. This will also cushion any noise from the new railway.

(viii) HS2 will deck over and grass the new line between Granby Terrace and Parkway. A cycle route will be considered. This would compensate the communities in the Euston area for the loss of green space and would ensure that the local light and airiness in the Camden Cutting is maintained.

Mitigation – The Impact on our Environment

47. The Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoters:

(i) No pollution caused either as a result of the construction or the operation of the new station will be permitted to exceed either domestic or binding EU limits.

(ii) Noise insulation will be provided, or temporary rehousing where required, well in advance of construction. This will extend to all properties adjacent to and immediately facing the proposed line.

(iii) All properties adjacent to the new line and station will be surveyed and assessed for vulnerability to damage from vibration at the earliest opportunity.

(iv) All properties adjacent to routes used for construction traffic will be similarly surveyed and assessed.

Mitigation – The Draft Code of Construction Practice

48. The Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoters:

(i) Noise and vibration limits will be set at a lower level to reflect the cumulative impacts on those who live and work in the Euston area over many years as a result of the construction works and the above station development.

(ii) Camden Council will be the final arbiter under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 for all consents to measures for the control of noise and vibration in connection with the construction works.

(iii) HS2 will justify, on a case by case basis, all work undertaken outside core working hours.

(iv) Where works are necessary outside core working hours, HS2 will offer both compensation and a range of mitigating measures.

(v) Particular measures will be devised for vulnerable residents, such as those who are elderly, have families or are disabled.

(vi) Roads will only be used for construction traffic when it is not possible to use rail. The same will apply to all excavated material, spoil and waste.

(vii) Where it is not practical to use rail, HS2 will offer both compensation and a range of mitigation measures to residents and businesses who will be adversely affected. The Euston area cannot cope with 250-375 construction vehicles per day.

(viii) Where in exceptional circumstances, it is necessary to use road, low emission vehicles will be used. No construction materials or waste will be transported by road at night.

(ix) There will be a community benefit fund for local communities with the Euston area to compensate them for the disruption to their daily lives. This will reflect fair compensation in all circumstances where additional burdens are imposed on the local community in order to minimise the adverse impact on National Rail.

Compensation - Introduction

49. Your Petitioners submit that it is axiomatic that the compensation that falls to be assessed and paid as a result of the HS2 scheme must be fair and proportionate and arrived at by a process which gives proper weight to the interests of all those affected by the scheme.

50. Your Petitioners recognise that Select Committees are normally reluctant to interfere to recommend compensation outside the National Compensation Code because of the precedent that this would set for other major infrastructure projects. Your Petitioners submit that there are five reasons why your Honourable House should subject the Promoters' proposals to anxious scrutiny:

(i) As Secretary Mr Hammond reported to Your Honourable House on 20 December 2010, according to "developing European jurisprudence", compensation awards have become more generous in recent years and the approach adopted in the past is no longer acceptable.

(ii) The Promoters have significantly underestimated the cost of bringing HS2 into a vibrant, diverse, densely populated and high property value such as Euston. We are comforted that the Treasury insisted on P95 budgeting, as a result of which we understand that there is a contingency of £5.7bn in respect of Phase 1. The government's suggestion that HS2 is no different from similar infrastructure projects such as King's Cross, Crossrail 1 or Stratford is risible. The former were largely brown field sites; Crossrail 1 was largely constructed underground; and the timescales were shorter.

(iii) The Promoters have failed to have adequate regard to the scale and extent of the proposed works on the Euston area. Your Petitioners understand that the construction works will impact upon Euston for a minimum of 10 years, and possibly as long as 18. Whilst the Promoters have sought to address the individual impacts, it has failed to assess the cumulative impact of the noise, dust, vibration, ventilation, air pollution, loss of safe access routes, loss of amenity and daylight, construction traffic, bridge closures, and congestion.

(iv) A particular factor in the Euston area is the extent of works which will be executed outside core working hours, premised on the principle that the disruption to existing rail passengers will be kept to a minimum regardless of the impact on local residents and businesses. The stated approach adopted by HS2 to mitigations has been "a hierarchy, whereby priority has been given to avoiding or preventing effects; and then (if this was not possible), to reducing or abating them; and then, if necessary, to offsetting them through repair (restoration or reinstatement) or compensation". Where other mitigation measures are impossible, or have been rejected in favour of protecting existing Rail Operators, there is a particular duty on the State to bring forward compensation measures which are fair and proportionate. The basic principle is that "the polluter should pay".

(v) It is not possible to justify the disparate treatment between the compensation offered to those in rural areas, namely the Chilterns, rather than in urban areas. Your Petitioners suggest that the additional provision made available in the Chilterns is motivated by improper political considerations, rather than any rational assessment of what compensation would be fair and proportionate.

51. Your Petitioners accept that those choosing to live in urban areas sometimes endure higher noise levels than in rural areas. However those to the west of the existing station around Drummond Street, live in a quiet residential area. The Camden Cutting area is also tranquil with little through-traffic, benefiting from the space, light and air that the railway creates whilst accepting the limited noise that trains produce. It includes two conservation areas. These communities will not only be subject to exceptional levels of disruption as a result of the construction works, their character will be destroyed for ever if the wholesale redevelopment envisaged in "HS2 Plus" occurs.

Compensation – Supplementing the National Compensation Code

52. On 28 February 2011, Mrs Secretary Greening consulted on the principles for non-statutory compensation to supplement the National Compensation Code. She sought views on three options: (a) a property bond; (b) a hardship scheme; (c) a compensation bond. Despite overwhelming support for a property bond, on 12 January 2012, Mrs Secretary Greening, announced that she intended to proceed with the hardship scheme. On 15 March 2013, this consultation was declared unlawful by Mr Justice Ouseley in *R (Buckingham CC and others) v Secretary of State for Transport* [213] EWHC 481 (Admin). The Judge found that "the consultation process in respect of blight and compensation was all in all so unfair as to be unlawful". Ouseley J was scathing as to how the Secretary of State had handled the 2010 Consultation. The Judge described how she had acted "bizarrely". He found that she had failed to conscientiously take into account a number of consultation responses (at [835]). He described a "sorry saga" (at [733]) as a result of which DfT had lost a number of consultation responses. Thereafter, the HS2AA's proposal for a Property Bond Scheme had been "just brushed aside" (at [841]). Ouseley J stated that the Secretary of State's reasoning was "in part very odd" (at [839]) and the consequence of "muddled thinking" ([840]).

53. On 25 October, 2012, the Mr Secretary McLoughlin launched a further consultation on compensation which proposed four schemes: (i) Advanced Purchase; (ii) Voluntary Purchase; (iii) Sale and Rent Back; and (iv) Long Term Hardship. The first three largely applied to those living in rural areas. The rules for the fourth were so restrictive that it would provide limited assistance to those living in the Euston area. On 31 January 2013, the Community Forum responded to this Consultation. We provided ten Case Studies to illustrate the failure of the proposals to afford fair compensation to those with homes or businesses in the Euston area. Our approach was endorsed by Frank Dobson MP. On 29 January and 14 February 2013, he wrote to the Secretary of State calling for a tailor made scheme to meet the particular needs of those with homes or businesses in the Euston Area. Mr Secretary McLoughlin responded on 18 March 2013, noting that the responses to the consultation were still under consideration. Mr Dobson also put down a question as to the cost of extending the purchase and compensation schemes to those within the M25 corridor. On 31 January 2013,

the Minister, Mr Simon Burns, replied that this information would not be provided as this "would risk undermining local property markets and creating unnecessary property blight".

54. On 12 September 2013, Mr Secretary McLoughlin consulted on further compensation proposals. Your Petitioners can see no evidence that the Promoters of the Bill had regard to the representations made either by the Community Forum or the other respondents from the Euston area. This consultation included further consideration of the property bond scheme which was necessitated by the adverse finding of Ouseley J. The Secretary of State suggested six criteria for compensation, with which Your Petitioners largely agree: (i) Fairness; (ii) Value for Money; (iii) Community Cohesion; (iv) Feasibility, Efficiency and Comprehensibility; (v) Functioning of the Housing Market; (vi) The Best Balance between these Criteria. Somewhat surprisingly, the Secretary of State did not refer to the developing European jurisprudence. The Community Forum responded to this consultation. On 4 December 2013, the Community Forum responded to this consultation.

55. On 25 November 2013, the Promoters deposited the Hybrid Bill in this Honourable House. The Environmental Statement was premised on the National Compensation Scheme with no additional measures. Despite the previous view of Mr Secretary Hammond that developing European jurisprudence required "more generous compensation", Mr Secretary McLoughlin felt able to sign a statement certifying that the Hybrid Bill is compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998 as required by section 19(1)(a) of that Act.

56. On 9 April 2014, Mr Secretary McLoughlin announced a number of schemes to supplement the National Compensation Code. Your Petitioners can see no evidence that the Promoters of the Bill had regard to the representations made either by the Community Forum or the other respondents from the Euston area. The measures announced offer little to those who live in the Euston area:

(i) Express Purchase Scheme – This has been launched for owner-occupiers within 60 metres of the new line. However, properties must be within the "surface safeguarded area". This has been drawn in the Euston Area in such a way as to deny most of those who live within 60m from the proposed line from such compensation.

(ii) "Rent-Back" Option – this is now available to those who want to sell their properties, but carry on living in their homes for the time being.

(iii) The "Exceptional Hardship Scheme" continues to be available. However, the rules are so restrictive as to exclude almost everyone adversely affected by HS2 in the Euston area. The Promoters of the Bill intend to introduce a new "Need to Sell" scheme by the end of the year which will apply to both rural and urban areas without a defined boundary. The government will consider applications to buy properties at full unblighted market value from owner-occupiers who have a compelling need to sell, such as job relocation or ill health, but who are unable to do so because of plans to build HS2. This is likely to be the one scheme that could benefit homeowners in Euston. However, the terms are still likely to be highly restrictive.

(iv) The government is proposing two schemes for home owners in rural areas. The "Voluntary Purchase Scheme" will be introduced by the end of the year and apply to those who live outside the safeguarded zone and up to 120 metres from the line. The government is to consult on a new "Homeowner Payment" scheme which will entitle owner-occupiers to a cash payment if they live between 120 and 300 metres from the line. The payments could be from £7,500 to £22,500, depending on how close the route is to the property. Both schemes discriminate against (i) those who do not own their homes and (ii) those who live in urban areas, adding a further gloss to the apparent prejudices of this government. In a rural area, you are compensated if you live up to 300 metres from the line. In Euston, home owners are denied compensation even where their properties are adjacent to the new line.

Compensation – The Developing European Jurisprudence

57. All those affected by the HS2 scheme have legal interests which fall to be protected. Compensation is one element of that protection and it must be fairly addressed according to the principles derived from the European Convention on Human Rights, which were given effect in domestic law by the Human Rights Act.

58. Whether these issues of compensation are considered under Article 6 of the European Convention of Human Rights ("ECHR") (the right to a fair determination of civil rights and obligations), Article 8 (the right to respect for private life, family and home), Article 1 of Protocol 1 (the right not to be deprived of property save in certain prescribed circumstances) or Article 14 (the prohibition of discrimination), two fundamental principles apply: first, that any compensation must be fair and proportionate; second (and linked), that the procedure for determining what compensation is fair and proportionate must itself be fair and must afford a proper opportunity to those affected to influence the final determination.

59. There are a number of features of the impact of the HS2 scheme which put the Euston area into a special category, requiring the most rigorous approach to the assessment of compensation. As identified above, they include:

- (i) The unique nature of the impact. The area in question is densely populated with high value land.
- (ii) The disruption is likely to continue over a prolonged period of up to 18 years.
- (iii) The cumulative impact is extreme and greater than in any other area affected by HS2.
- (iv) The interests that fall to be protected are diverse and the individual impact is difficult to assess properly.

60. Assessing the fair and proportionate compensation that falls to be paid in such circumstances requires a detailed, careful and painstaking analysis of all relevant facts and matters, which takes properly into account the interests actually at stake in Euston, the

particular impact of HS2 on the locality (both in the long term and the short term) and the actual damage likely to be inflicted.

61. Although the relevant authorities obviously have a degree of discretion in their choice of the approach and procedure to be adopted in determining compensation in any given circumstances, and while recognising that the discretion is fairly wide when it comes to the implementation of schemes such as urban planning schemes, the discretion narrows where key interests of individuals are at stake, particularly where their right to a settled and secure place in the community is in issue (see *Connors v UK*, 27 May 2004; affirmed in *Yordanova v Bulgaria*, 5 June 2012). Since loss of a home is the most extreme form of interference with key interests under Article 8 ECHR, anyone at risk of such loss is entitled to a particularly high standard of procedural fairness (*Kay v UK*, 12 September 2010; affirmed in *Yordana v Bulgaria*, 5 June 2012).

62. Against that background, Your Petitioners aver that a detailed and robust impact assessment is needed before fair and proportionate proposals for compensation can properly be arrived at. Moreover, any such assessment must be based on assumptions and starting points that have been consulted upon and are fair. It is fundamental that any such compensation proposals must be capable of leading to a proper and informed assessment of the interference with the many and varied rights and interests engaged in the Euston area. No such impact assessment has taken place nor is one proposed.

63. Your Petitioners also submits that the difference in approach to the assessment of compensation between those living and/or working in urban and rural areas has not been, and cannot be, justified. Once rights under the European Convention on Human Rights are engaged (as they clearly are by the HS2 scheme – for example the right to family life under Article 8 and the right not to be deprived of property under Article 1 of Protocol 1), the principles of non-discrimination under Article 14 ECHR apply. Your Petitioners accept that Article 14 does not prohibit any difference of treatment between different groups, but submits that ECHR case law is clear in requiring any difference in treatment to be reasonably and objectively justified.

64. The reasons advanced for the difference in approach to the assessment of compensation between those living and/or working in urban and rural areas cannot be reasonably and objectively justified. The mere fact that, as a general rule, there may be more noise in an urban area does not justify a blanket approach to lesser compensation without any assessment of the actual difference in each case or set of cases. As noted above, many of those in the Euston area affected by the HS2 Scheme do not live in areas where there is necessarily more noise than in rural areas. The impact will differ between each community and falls to be properly addressed, without resort to inflexible general rules.

65. Against this background, Sir Keir Starmer QC has advised your Petitioners that the proposals set out above are inconsistent with the two fundamental principles set out above. In particular, they do not provide a procedure for determining what compensation is fair and proportionate and they do not afford a proper opportunity to those affected to influence the final determination. The result is that the proposals set out in the consultation document

are not compatible with the ECHR. That is a fundamental issue, cutting through the proposals.

Compensation – Relief sought by Your Petitioner

66. Your Petitioners are anxious to avoid further litigation. Further, Your Honourable House must satisfy yourselves that the Hybrid Bill is compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998. Your Petitioners invite the Select Committee to ask the Joint Committee on Human Rights to advise on whether the Hybrid Bill, including the Environmental Statement, complies with the State's obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights.

67. Your Petitioners seek the following undertakings from the Promoters:

(i) The "Express Purchase" scheme will be extended to the Euston area in respect of all home-owners within 60 metres of the new line. This will benefit home-owners in the Cobourg Street, on the Regents Park and Ampthill Square Estate and Park Village East. Such a decision would not necessarily be a costly one, given the long-term value of the assets that the government might acquire.

(ii) The "Voluntary Purchase" and "Homeowner Payment" schemes will be extended to the Euston area. Your Petitioners can see no rational justification for excluding those who live in urban areas from the "Voluntary Purchase" and the "Homeowner Payment" scheme. The injury to homeowners in the Euston area is the greater because of the more restrictive manner in which the safeguarding zone has been drawn. It has been suggested that the reason is the assumption that those living in urban areas are accustomed (and apparently expected) to put up with the adverse effects of construction and traffic noise. This is not based on any objective assessment having regard to the factors outlined in paragraph 59 above. Take for example the resident in Cobourg Street, a quiet residential street in the Drummond Street area. On the east side of the street, all properties are to be demolished and a "Berlin Wall" will be erected whilst the new station is constructed. After ten or more years, this will be removed and the residents will look out onto the main taxi drop-off point for the new station. To add insult to injury, taxis will traverse south down this new thoroughfare and then be routed by a roundabout back past their front doors again. Take also the example of the resident in Camden Cutting, a quiet residential area in a conservation area with a range of listed Victorian properties and more modern social housing. They have now been told that works will start in 2016, but will finish in 2034, rather than 2026 because of the Higgins "HS2 Plus" proposal for a major above deck development to fund the new Station. The only scheme that is available to either resident is the discretionary, and highly restrictive, exceptional hardship scheme which is to be replaced by the "Need to Sell" Scheme.

(iii) If the "Homeowner Payment" scheme is to be extended to the Euston area, we can see no rational justification for restricting it to home owners. Many social tenants see their properties as homes for life and have family, friends and community support networks in the area. Some assured shorthold tenants, the only private tenancy currently granted in the area, have occupied their homes for many

years. The desired objective of Your Petitioners is to bind our diverse and vibrant community together through 10-18 years of unique disruption. We do not want residents to be forced to move away from the area which would fracture the social cohesion of our vibrant and diverse communities. To date, the Promoters of the Bill have been deaf to our pleas for a compensation scheme that will achieve this.

(iv) The compensation under the Land Compensation Act 1973 offered to lessees whose homes are to be demolished will be insufficient to enable them to secure suitable alternative accommodation in the area and within their existing communities. The 216 dwellings are currently listed for demolition in the Euston area. The final number may be significantly higher if it is found that the construction works will render further properties uninhabitable. The majority of the listed properties are units of social housing at Eskdale, Silverdale and Ainsdale. Many social tenants exercised their statutory right to buy. Stalbridge House is an ex-railway block. The value of their flats are relatively low. Under the statutory scheme, these lessees will be offered the market value of their flats + 10%. The problem for them is that there is not the equivalent alternative accommodation at that price in the area. In the response of the Community Forum to the Compensation Consultation (31.1.13), we suggested that the unblighted value of a two bedroom flat in one of these council blocks is some £240k. Alternative equivalent accommodation in the area is likely to cost £400-£450k. The maximum compensation to which the tenant would be entitled under the advance purchase scheme would be £264k (£240k + 10%). This would not be sufficient to secure suitable accommodation in the area. The reason for this is the shortage of affordable housing in the area. In the past 18 months, property prices have continued to rise in the area; therefore the gap between the compensation that is offered and the cost of suitable alternative accommodation has become wider. We note that the Heathrow Airport Authority have recently proposed compensation of 25% on top of the market value. This would be one solution. However, these lessees are not looking for a financial windfall. They would rather seek to transfer the existing equity which they hold in their current property to suitable alternative accommodation in the area.

(v) Compensation for Businesses in Drummond Street: The priority should be on mitigating the impact of the construction works on businesses. To the extent that this is not possible, fair and proportionate compensation will compensate them for any loss.

(vi) Personal Mitigation Budgets. The Promoters acknowledge that the nuisance caused by the works is going to be such as to require HS2 Ltd to offer residents a range of mitigation measures, including secondary/tertiary glazing or temporary rehousing. Many residents will not find additional glazing to be an acceptable solution whether because it is not practical (Georgian and Victorian listed properties with internal shutters) or because they are unwilling to live in hermetically sealed environments. Residents want to exercise control over their lives and will not accept offers of temporary accommodation in a hotel in some remote part of London. Many of Your Petitioners will be urging that the promoters make available personal

budgets which will enable residents to make their own informed choices as to how they would wish to mitigate the impact of HS2 on their lives.

(vii) Local Community Benefit Funds. Many different communities will face loss of amenity, whether it is to be open spaces which are to be used as construction compounds, the loss of tenants' halls, parking, traffic deadlock and higher levels of pollution. Your Petitioners propose that the Promoters should support a range of community benefit funds which will enable different groups, whether schools, tenants, residents groups or the Drummond Street traders to offer a range of initiatives to bind their communities together in the face of 10-18 years of unprecedented disruption to their lives.

(viii) The Promoters will establish procedures for determining claims for compensation which comply with Article 6 of European Convention. Applications for compensation must be determined and payments made promptly. Strict time limits must be imposed. Applications should be determined by an independent and impartial body. A panel including a member of HS2 Ltd is not acceptable. Such an independent and impartial decision-making body already exists, namely the First-Tier Tribunal (Property Chamber).

68. Your Petitioners hope that your Committee will hear evidence in Camden. We invite you to visit the Euston area and will introduce you to our different neighbourhoods. We hope to persuade you that we have diverse and vibrant communities in the Euston area which the Promoters of the Bill must be required to preserve. The primary objective of the Action Group is to maintain these communities through the unique challenges created by the 10-18 years of construction work associated with HS2.

69. 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.

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 themselves, their counsel, agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against so much of the Bill as affects the property, rights and interests of Your Petitioners and in support of such other clauses and provisions as may be necessary or expedient for their protection, or that such other relief may be given to Your Petitioners in the premises as Your Honourable House shall deem meet.

AND Your Petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Signed:



Robert Latham on behalf of the HS2 Euston Community Action Group

House of Commons

Session 2013-4

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON-WEST MIDLANDS)

PETITION

Of

HS2 EUSTON ACTION GROUP

AGAINST

BY COUNSEL. &C.

Robert latham