

IN PARLIAMENT
HOUSE OF COMMONS
SESSION 2015–16

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON – WEST MIDLANDS) BILL (ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS)

Against – on Merits – [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 RT HON JEREMY WRIGHT QC MP

SHEWETH as follows:-

1. A Bill (hereinafter referred to as “the Bill”) has been introduced and is now pending in your honourable House intituled “A bill to make provision for a railway between Euston in London and a junction with the West Coast Main Line at Handsacre in Staffordshire, with a spur from Old Oak Common in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham to a junction with the Channel Tunnel Rail Link at York Way in the London Borough of Islington and a spur from Water Orton in Warwickshire to Curzon Street in Birmingham; and for connected purposes” .
2. The Bill is presented by Mr Secretary McLoughlin.
3. A paper of amendment of provisions (“AP4”) was published in October 2015 making provision, amongst other matters, for the acquisition of additional land in your Petitioners’ area and the alteration of and addition to the works proposed under the Bill. AP4 was accompanied by a Supplementary Environmental Statement (“the SES”). By AP4 it is proposed that clause 63 of the Bill be amended to include a reference to the SES.

INTRODUCTION

4. Your Petitioner is the Member of Parliament for Kenilworth and Southam (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Petitioner’) and has a constituency office located within the area that will be affected by

the Bill. Your Petitioner holds regular surgeries which draw individuals from across Kenilworth and Southam to access the assistance and intervention of their elected Member of Parliament. Your Petitioner is injuriously affected by the scheduled works as the traffic congestion and road closures during the construction of the proposed train line in Kenilworth and Southam will hinder your Petitioner in meeting his commitments when he travels around his constituency; access will be difficult when crossing the constituency with delays as a result of diversions and closures. Your Petitioner also represents the views of the residents and businesses that are affected by the Bill and in particular those residents who are not able to petition themselves. Your Petitioner respectfully requests that he be heard by the Select Committee of your Honourable House which considers the Bill, both as a private citizen and as a Member of Parliament representing the views of his constituents.

5. Your Petitioner welcomes many of the changes to the scheme that arose out of AP4 but remains concerned that some of the issues originally highlighted by your Petitioner have not been properly addressed and that new concerns are raised by AP4.
6. As your Petitioner has set out on previous occasions, in writing and orally before the Select Committee of your Honourable House, HS2 will seriously affect residents living close to the line and reduce their ability to enjoy their home and the lifestyle they have chosen. The Select Committee of your Honourable House has recognised some special cases but much more needs to be done to compensate those affected by the proposed line. Further consideration also needs to be given to protecting the rural landscape and safeguarding communities along the route during both the construction phase and operation of the line.
7. Where additional land is required for construction of mitigation or earthworks such as CFA18AP4-018-001, your Petitioner expects reasonable consideration is given to farming operations to minimise any loss of productive agricultural land. To date, your Petitioner believes such consideration has been inadequate.

TRAFFIC – CONSTRUCTION AND CONGESTION

8. Many of the roads in the local area are already under pressure at peak times and high usage can lead to gridlock very quickly. This is particularly true of the A46, which provides a strategic transport corridor between the M6 and M40 if the primary motorway network of the M42 and M1 become congested or disrupted.

9. Provision of temporary passing places along Windmill Lane near Ladbroke for construction access (CFA16 AP4-016-003)

Your Petitioner would expect to see these passing places developed in conjunction with the local community to ensure the free flow of traffic in the local area. Where the hedgerow is removed until the construction works are complete, your Petitioner would expect to see an assurance that replanting will be carried out.

10. Revision of the temporary A425 Leamington Road diversion at the Dallas Burston Polo Club (CFA16 AP4-016-004)

Your Petitioner would expect to see sensitive treatment of the road network during the period of temporary diversion in conjunction with the Highways Authority to ensure road safety standards are maintained for pedestrians and motorists. As before, where the temporary road realignment affects biodiversity, for example an important hedgerow, your Petitioner welcomes the assurance that the hedgerow will be reinstated once the construction works are complete.

11. Relocation of the secondary construction access route to follow Ridgeway Lane near Ufton (CFA16 AP4-016-006)

Your Petitioner seeks assurance that the secondary construction access route will only be used occasionally for exceptional loads and further details on in what circumstances it will be used. Your Petitioner is concerned the access route could be used during other periods, in heavily congested periods for example, affecting properties in the immediate vicinity. Your Petitioner also expects access to be maintained for rural businesses throughout the construction period.

12. Provision of a temporary roundabout at the junction of Fosse Way and Long Itchington Road (CFA19 AP4-017-001)

Your Petitioner welcomes this provision, as requested by fellow constituent Petitioners and envisages road safety advantages to it remaining permanently. Of course the decision should be taken following consultation with the local Highways Authority but the retention of the roundabout would potentially avoid further cost and disruption to road users, of reinstating the existing T Junction. The retention of the roundabout would also be considered by some constituents to be a lasting benefit and legacy to the area.

13. Provision for the widening of the overbridge over the B4453, Rugby Road

Your Petitioner requests that the Rugby Road B4453 road bridge be widened to accommodate a cycleway, footpath and wildlife corridor. The road is popular with walkers joining from pathway W130b onto Rugby Road to visit the 12th Century St. Michael's Church and the woods beyond Princethorpe. The route is also used by many cycling clubs with large groups travelling through the villages. Presently Weston under Wetherley and Cubbington Parish Council are discussing the possibility of a footpath and cycleway between the villages to encourage villagers to leave their cars at home when visiting the local area. Widening of this bridge would be of significant benefit to the community.

A46/STONELEIGH ROAD JUNCTION & ASHOW ROAD

14. Since the submission of the HS2 Hybrid Bill, further analysis of traffic data has been carried out and plans for the movement of excavated materials within CFA 18 have changed. There are changes to the volume of excavated material that need to be transported from the roadhead near the A46 Kenilworth Bypass and the roadhead near Kenilworth Road. To minimise traffic effects associated with these changes, there are proposals for the signalisation of the A46/Stoneleigh Road junction, construction of a temporary slip road from the Kenilworth Bypass roadhead to the southbound carriageway of the A46 and an additional construction traffic route along the B4115 Ashow Road.

Use of Ashow Road for Construction Traffic

15. According to the SES, over 400 HGVs per day are predicted to pass along Ashow Road, going to and from the Kenilworth compound roadhead. The safety of other road users is of great concern to your Petitioner. The B4115 is a designated cycle route taking cycles off the A46 and is used by equestrians also. In addition it is the only pedestrian route from Ashow to bus services on the A452 Leamington Road at the Chesford Grange Junction. The A452 at the Chesford Junction is a busy and fast moving main road between Kenilworth and Leamington and the route used by residents accessing essential services in those towns. The junction is not sufficiently large to accommodate HGVs turning and is entirely inappropriate as an HGV route as set out by the Promoter. Furthermore your Petitioner is also concerned about the effect of the use of the road on the tranquillity of the area through which it passes.

16. Your Petitioner considers the proposed use of Ashow Road for HS2 HGV movements is unacceptable. The provision of an upgraded A46/Stoneleigh Road junction as mentioned above, would remove any need for Ashow Road to be used. If that upgrading is not taken forward in the Bill, your Petitioner submits that the Promoters should be required to consider, and where possible, implement alternatives to the use of Ashow Road.

Junction Capacity

17. Your Petitioner believes the mitigation proposals in AP4 and the SES may worsen network resilience at the A46/Stoneleigh Road junction, may jeopardise proposals for an upgrading of the junction and, as mentioned above, do not account properly for the safety of road users.

18. Your Petitioner is aware that Warwickshire County and Coventry City Councils have been working on proposals to upgrade the A46/Stoneleigh Road junction, which is owned and maintained by Highways England.

19. Delivery of the junction upgrade would provide essential resilience over the core 5 year construction period of HS2 and would avoid the need to use Ashow Road as an HS2 construction route.

20. Your Petitioner is of the strong view the proposed junction upgrade should be completed before the main HS2 construction works commence in 2017. The best way for this to be achieved would be for the Bill to make provision for the works, by way of a further Additional Provision. Your Petitioner therefore requests that instead of the works proposed in AP4 and the SES, the Bill should include the powers necessary for the upgrading of the A46/Stoneleigh Road junction to a grade separated junction ahead of the main HS2 construction period in this area. This would provide benefits to businesses and residents in the area, and to the Nominated Undertaker when carrying out the works.

21. If your Honourable House is not convinced of that solution then at the very least the Promoters of the Bill must be required to ensure that the carrying out of the junction upgrading works is not delayed by the works proposed by the Bill as proposed by AP4, which could continue in this area until 2026. The Bill should be amended or undertakings given by the Promoters so that the carrying out of the proposed junction upgrading works will not be prejudiced or delayed by the carrying out of the HS2 works and that where appropriate, passive provision should be made to

ensure that goal is achieved.

CFA 18 – STONELEIGH PARK

22. The Parish of Stoneleigh is of historic importance, housing a number of scheduled monuments and listed buildings. The Leigh family's Stoneleigh Estate dates back to 1561 and Stoneleigh Abbey, a Grade I listed building, to 1154. The Abbey landscape is included on the English Heritage register of parks and gardens of special historic interest. The Parish also includes historic parkland and ancient woodland and hosts Stoneleigh Park, a scientific agricultural business and research park, which is an important local employer of national significance.
23. In view of the historic and economic importance of the locality your Petitioner believes it is deserving of better mitigation than set out in AP4 to counter the effect of HS2 on the area.
24. Your Petitioner has previously raised concerns that the impact of noise from HS2 is unknown. Your Petitioner maintains that noise modelling is inadequate and the use of average noise level maps are not sufficient to understand the noise impact on the rural community and its businesses. Your Petitioner requests that peak noise levels be made available to local residents and the operators of Stoneleigh Park as a matter of urgency. Your Petitioner also requests that cross sections of line be made available at the same time to properly assess the impact of the scheme on this area.
25. In terms of the specific mitigation detailed in AP4 your Petitioner believes the cutting and embankments will cause significant damage to the historic parkland and the proposed bunding to the landscape of the historic estate.
26. With regard to Stoneleigh Park, as an identified Major Development Site with plans for regeneration as a focused science park, your Petitioner is concerned the open cutting within the Park will compromise the efficient operation of the site and its strategic importance to the regional and national economies. Under AP4 additional landscape mitigation works will require approximately 2.7 ha of land on a permanent basis outside the Bill limits.
27. Your Petitioner therefore requests that, in order to protect Stoneleigh's historic parkland, safeguard the future expansion and operability of Stoneleigh Park and shield Stoneleigh village

and residents from the noise and visual impacts of the line, the Select Committee of your Honourable House instructs HS2 Ltd to review decisions made on a long cut and cover tunnel, from a point approximately 250 metres south of the B4113 to a point approximately 100 metres north of the A46.

28. Should the Select Committee of your Honourable House decide not to instruct this, your Petitioner requests that they instruct HS2 Ltd to provide improved mitigation measures, within the Bill limits, along the line of the open cutting, to include aesthetically suitable acoustic barriers.

YOUR PETITIONER therefore humbly prays your Honourable House that the Bill may not be allowed to pass into law as it now stands and that he may be heard by his Counsel, Agents and witnesses in support of the allegations of this Petition against so much of the Bill as affects the property, rights and interests of your Petitioner and his constituents 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:

BACKSHEET:

IN PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS SESSION

2015-16

HIGH SPEED RAIL (LONDON - WEST MIDLANDS) BILL (ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS)

PETITION OF THE RT HON JEREMY WRIGHT QC MP

Against the Bill –On Merits –By Counsel &c