

Hybrid Bill Petition

House of Commons

Session 2017-19

High Speed Rail (West Midlands – Crewe) Bill

Do not include any images or graphics in your petition. There will be an opportunity to present these later if you give evidence to the committee.

Your bill petition does not need to be signed.

Expand the size of the text boxes as you need.

1. Petitioner information

In the box below, give the name and address of each individual, business or organisation(s) submitting the petition.

Jeremy Lefroy MP
Unit 15,
Pearl House,
Anson Court,
Staffordshire Technology Park,
Beaconside,
Stafford,
ST18 0GB

In the box below, give a description of the petitioners. For example, “we are the owners/tenants of the addresses above”; “my company has offices at the address above”; “our organisation represents the interests of...”; “we are the parish council of...”.

I am the member of Parliament for the Stafford constituency. The proposed HS2a route cuts through my constituency, severely affecting Moreton, Great Haywood, Ingestre, Staffordshire Showground, Hopton, Marston and Yarlet in the Stafford constituency. On its route it will damage miles of beautiful countryside and has already seriously impacted hundreds of lives.

2. Objections to the Bill

In the box below, write your objections to the Bill and why your property or other interests are specially and directly affected. Please number each paragraph.

Only objections outlined in this petition can be presented when giving evidence to the committee. You will not be entitled to be heard on new matters.

1.0 The announcement of the proposed route for HS2, Phase 2, on 28th January 2013, sent a shockwave across a considerable part of my constituency. We learned that it was proposed to build an ultra-high speed railway through long-established and peaceful villages, farms, homes and businesses. The impact on the lives of several

thousand of my constituents is very great and will last for a considerable time. The impact will vary over time, from the current substantial reductions in house prices, leaving home owners unable to sell their properties without incurring a large financial loss, to the huge disruption of the construction phase, to the final operation of the route. The impact is and will continue to be considerable.

While I am opposed to the HS2 project, I am not opposed to the need to improve our national infrastructure. I have advocated both the development of new transport infrastructure and improving what already exists. I supported the proposal by the previous Government to build a 'Stafford bypass' on the West Coast Mainline through my constituency as well the substantial rail development at Norton Bridge. However I do not consider that HS2 will deliver the connectivity which the country needs, in addition to capacity.

There is currently a parliamentary majority currently in favour of the HS2 project. It is therefore vital, as a local Member of Parliament, that I do what I can to ensure that our community is properly served through mitigation of, and compensation for, the effects of HS2. It is in that spirit, therefore, that I am petitioning the select committee and will be making general points and specific points on behalf of constituents.

2.0 Issue. Your petitioner has currently had no assurances that the Armitage-Handsacre link will be maintained after HS2a has been completed. The proposed stops using Classic Compatible trains at Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent stations are essential for Stafford, Stoke-on-Trent and the North Midlands as a whole. Stafford constituency and much of Staffordshire is experiencing serious inconvenience as a result of HS2. A silver lining to the cloud has always been the fact that Stafford **will always** have a stop in Stafford, thus bringing the benefits of HS2, as well as the difficulties.

In the initial documentation from HS2, Stafford was shown as having an HS2 Classic Compatible Service from London to Liverpool using the Armitage-Handsacre link. In subsequent documentation, this has been downgraded to a link via Stoke-on-Trent terminating at Macclesfield.

There is now speculation that the Armitage-Handsacre link will be downgraded after the completion of HS2 Phase 2b so that trains will no longer use it other than in exceptional circumstances and not for timetabled services.

Request 1: That the Bill be amended to state that the HS2 Classic Compatible services will always service both Stafford and Stoke-on-Trent with a (minimum) hourly service.

Request 2: That the original proposal for an HS2 Classic Compatible service to one of the major cities of the NW (Liverpool or Manchester) be restored.

3.0 Issue: Your petitioner is very concerned that the viability of the existing West Coast Mainline will be put into question by the opening of HS2. The West Coast Mainline will remain the major provider of local, regional and many long-distance services as well as freight even when HS2 is in operation. Hence it is essential that it is properly maintained. To date, your petitioner has not seen a fully costed case which shows that the operation of HS2 will not be to the detriment of the continued operation of the West Coast Mainline.

Request: That HS2 provide the National Audit Office with a fully costed plan for the maintenance of the West Coast Mainline after it loses the lucrative high-speed passenger traffic.

4.0 Issue: 4.1 Your petitioner is very concerned at the lack of a detailed transport plan for the construction of the HS2a line. Within the Stafford constituency alone, the M6, A34, A518, A51 as well as B and C roads will all be impacted and closed during some periods of construction. Although plans for these individual roads exist, your petitioner is yet to see or hear of an integrated traffic plan. The M6 and A34 provide a vital north to south national, regional and local link. Any problem with both these roads at the same time will not just provide a problem for the residents of Stafford, or north Staffordshire, but will cause major disruption to the national and regional economy.

4.2 Stafford is also earmarked as a place of significant development. There are several developments planned or outline permissions granted for thousands of homes near to the proposed HS2 routes with construction planned for the same period as the HS2a proposed construction. This development will involve traffic management and possibly road closures. There appear to be no joined up plans for traffic management with HS2 Ltd. despite the fact that these traffic restrictions will be on the roads that would reasonably be expected to be the diversions for any HS2 work.

4.3 The M6 is also scheduled to undergo significant disruption over the next few years as the Highways Agency completes works to turn the stretch between Junctions 13 and 15 into Smart Motorway. This will involve significant lane closures and over-night full road closures, using the A34 as the route to divert traffic. Despite my encouragement, your petitioner is very concerned that there is no traffic management plan to deal with any clash between the HS2 and M6 projects.

4.4 Your petitioner is also concerned that the current plans for the M6 Smart Motorway show the project being completed between junctions 13 and 15 following the completion of junction 16 onwards. This leaves only the stretch between junctions 15 and 16 without the Smart Motorway upgrade. With extra capacity required for any proposed closure of the A34 etc., it is vital that the Smart Motorway project does not miss this section, thus creating a bottle neck.

4.5 Your petitioner is also aware of plans to construct a major railfreight interchange on greenbelt at Gailey on the Birmingham-Stafford line south of Penkridge. Your petitioner is opposing this development. However, if it were to go ahead, it would have significant impacts on both the Midlands railway network, the M6, A449 and A5 roads – all major regional and national links. The proposed development would coincide with the construction of HS2 Phase 2a.

4.6 Your petitioner is also aware of the proposals for a new link road between the M54 and M6. While final decisions have not been made, it is likely that these very substantial roadworks (if the project goes ahead) would also coincide with the construction of HS2 Phase 2a. This would add further strain on the already congested regional and national network.

4.7 The petition by Staffordshire County Council provides detail of specific concerns regarding the impact on individual roads within my constituency.

Request 1: That a detailed transport plan be developed as a matter of urgency for the region affected by HS2 Phase 2a. This should take into account all existing, permitted or proposed developments. This plan should be drawn up in full cooperation with Staffordshire County Council, District and Borough Councils and Highways England. It should take fully into account all matters raised by the Councils in their petitions in addition to those made by your petitioner above.

Request 2: That no construction work on HS2 Phase 2a which will have any impact on the M6 should commence until all major developments currently proposed affecting the M6 between J11 and J15 are complete.

Request 3: That a new link road between the A34 South of Stafford and the M6 J13 be developed to provide additional connectivity for both regular traffic flows and the additional construction traffic during Phase 2a. This link was originally proposed as part of the Stafford Eastern Distributor Road.

Request 4: That the viaduct (notwithstanding Request 2) carrying HS2 Phase 2a over the M6 be put in place during the work on the M6 J13-J15 Smart Motorway so as to minimise disruption. Precedent for this is the construction of the Lichfield Canal aquaduct over the M6 (Toll) during the motorway works in anticipation of the opening of a canal.

5.0 Issue: *Proposed Stone Railhead/IMB-R* 5.1 Although the proposed Railhead/IMB-R will be in the neighbouring constituency of Stone, it will have considerable implications for the Stafford constituency.

5.2 The impact of traffic for the A34 and neighbouring routes will be very serious. I am not aware of any plans for managing traffic during its construction. The impact assessments I have seen of traffic at the Junction of the A34 and Beaconside at Redhill show much greater congestion occurring at peak times than already exists (even without taking into account the development noted in 5.3).

5.3 The planned and consented housebuilding in the area to the North of Beaconside, and the proposed duelling of the road, will already cause additional congestion.

5.4 The Beaconside-A34 route is a vital link between County Hospital, Stafford, and the Royal Stoke University Hospital, Stoke – and between the town of Stafford and the Royal Stoke University Hospital. Further congestion on this link is likely to increase the time taken by emergency ambulances to travel both between the two hospitals and between the Stafford area and its major acute hospital in Stoke. I am also aware that J15 of the M6 is likely to be gridlocked during peak hours on a daily basis and this will mean considerably more northbound traffic is likely to leave the M6 at J14 and use the A34 to reach Stoke-on-Trent.

5.5 The Stone Railhead/IMB-R is also likely to have a severe negative impact on the promised HS2 classic compatible rail services between Stafford, Stoke-on-Trent and Macclesfield. This is the result of it connecting directly onto the mainline between Norton Bridge and Stone which is currently used by six passenger trains/hour and serves this important future route.

Request: That the Stone Railhead/IMB-R not be proceeded with and that an alternative location be sought with less impact on people and existing infrastructure. *(One possibility is the Aldersey's Rough site near Keele Services which could use the disused former Newcastle-under-Lyme to Market Drayton line as far as the Madeley Chord junction on the West Coast Mainline, with the potential of reconnecting Newcastle-under-Lyme, Keele University Science Park and the Newcastle Western Urban Villages to the railway network. This would only be possible if the proposed longer and deeper tunnel in the Bar Hill/Madeley area was found to be impractical).*

6.0 Issue: Tunnelling

6.1 I do not believe that the option of tunnelling part of the line through my constituency has been adequately investigated. The argument against tunnelling has always been based on a comparison of the notional cost per km. related to that of cuttings and embankments.

6.2 There is currently no tunnelling proposed in Stafford constituency despite the suitability of part of the route and the reduction in impact on people, environment and infrastructure that it would bring.

6.3 A calculation of earthworks reveals that the current design of cuttings and embankments would require the movement of 827,000 cubic metres of material compared with only 342,000 cubic metres from tunnelling. Similarly the loss of land on the surface for the current design would be at least 22 Hectares (not including land for mitigation measures and planting) greater than that required for tunnelling. However the greatest cost savings from tunnelling would be from those construction works which would no longer be required:-

- 6.3.1 Major new road construction on the A518 next to the County Showground.
- 6.3.2 Land take and loss of earnings at the County Showground.
- 6.3.3 Disruption and loss of earnings for Park Farm and Chase View properties.
- 6.3.4 Diversion/reconstruction of the Berryhill culvert.
- 6.3.5 Major earthworks of the south Hopton cutting.
- 6.3.6 Diversion and construction of an overbridge for footpath 24.
- 6.3.7 Construction of large balance pool near Hopton south cutting.
- 6.3.8 Extensive embankment earthworks and retaining wall at Hopton culvert, with additional large mitigation embankment, both having extensive mitigation tree planting, balance pools, sound reduction measures and diversion of footpath 6.
- 6.3.9 Disruption and loss of earnings of Lower House Farm and four barn conversion dwellings.
- 6.3.10 Very major earthworks of the north Hopton cutting, sound mitigation measures, mitigation tree planting, balance pool at Mount Edge and construction of access road from Hopton Lane.
- 6.3.11 Demolition and disruption of a number of properties at Mount Farm, Lower Bridge Farm and Mount Edge.
- 6.3.12 Major new road construction on the B5066 Sandon Road at the junction with Hopton Lane including a 10 metre high embankment, an overbridge and extensive mitigation tree planting.
- 6.3.13 Construction of a new road extending Mount Edge to meet the revised Sandon Road.
- 6.3.14 Construction of a new road to replace the lower half of Hopton Lane.
- 6.3.15 A footpath overbridge from Mount Edge to the revised Hopton Lane.
- 6.3.16 Diversion/reconstruction of the Sandon Road culvert.

6.4 Additional considerations are also very relevant to this case, not only from the cost saving aspect but more importantly to relieve the great burden of stress which has been experienced by Hopton residents over the past five years, and to alleviate as much as possible future stress from construction and operation activities:-

- 6.4.1 Nine properties in Hopton are to be demolished and currently more than 20 additional properties have either been purchased by HS2 or are in the process of negotiation. The community impact assessment record sheets show that at least 60 properties (of the 122 total) will 'experience

significant adverse effects' during construction while a staggering 99 properties will 'experience significant increases in noise level' during the operational phase.

6.4.2 Residents in the Mount Edge area of the village are very concerned as they have received notification of possible compulsory purchase of part of the land associated with their properties for 'construction'. Further enquiry seems to indicate that this involves the movement of electrical utilities. The parcels of land indicated contain a number of mature trees and hedges providing some screening from the proposed route, so removal would be disastrous. Furthermore it appears that if the path of the utility was adjusted by a few metres into the adjacent field the costly purchase of residential land and associated hardship would be averted.

6.4.3 The sound and vibration levels predicted for Hopton are based on mathematical modelling using speed extrapolation of rail level only figures, as data for the actual 400kph rolling stock is not yet available. In any case the highest potential noise levels are expected from the pantograph which will be above the top of the mitigation fencing currently proposed and actual noise levels generated by a passing train at the proposed line speed may be in excess of 100dB.

6.5 For the purposes of these statistics, I have considered the case for replacing the cuttings and embankments with a bored tunnel between Upper Hanyards (chain. 208.8) and the Sandon Road B5066 (chain. 212.2), a distance of 3.4km. It is assumed that a twin bore tunnel of 8 metre diameter would be an appropriate design specification.

6.6 I also believe that there is also a strong argument for tunnelling under the A34 at Yarlet rather than the deep cutting proposed. This would avoid the need to divert the A34 and to remove ancient woodland. It would also reduce the impact on Yarlet School.

Request: That the case for tunnelling in whole or in part between Upper Hanyards and the Sandon Road, and under the A34 at Yarlet Bank be properly evaluated in the light of the reduced impact on people, environment and infrastructure.

7.0 Jean and Trevor Tabernor, Moreton House Farm

Issue: Their family home is within 10m of the proposed embankment. There will certainly be a detrimental impact on their quality of life, both during construction with noise, dust, lighting and fumes emanating from the works. There will be constant worry of very young children and animals straying into the construction area and onto the railway once operational. They are unable to move away due to their farming business – they have to remain on the farm. They are looking to build a replacement farmhouse away from the railway. This is dependent on HS2 Ltd demolishing the existing dwelling and thus so far they have been given no comfort that this will occur. They feel trapped by the plans.

Request: That the Tabernor's farmhouse be moved to a location away from the line as they have proposed to HS2.

8.0 Proposed compound at A51/Hoo Mill Lane

Issue: One house will be almost entirely surrounded by the compound. It is lived in by an elderly couple. HS2 Ltd.'s solution is to shield the house with boarding. As the garden is not large, it will feel as if they are 'living in a box'.

Request: That the home be immediately purchased.

9.0 Canal Farm Shop, Cafe & Marina, Great Haywood

Issue: The proposed railway will cause significant disruption to their operations. This is a very successful local business employing over 40 people. The farm shop and restaurant has a turnover in excess of £1.9 million. They are planning significant expansion in the next few years, which again would create local employment and build on the family's already significant investment in the local economy.

They also own the freehold to Great Haywood Mania, which is operated by Lakeland Leisure. They have a number of private moorings alongside the Trent and Mersey Canal and have further plans to establish a touring caravan site on the premises.

The initial Economic Impact Assessment produced in September 2016 showed a straightforward approach to building the line past the premises. It hinted at temporary bridge crossings over the railway line, the River Trent and the Trent & Mersey Canal. There was no indication that access would be required through their premises.

However, the latest plans submitted to Parliament show an access track running through the main entrance to the site, past the front door of the farm shop and near the Café. This new plan, appearing without any consultation and as a complete surprise to the owners, would severely damage this business and potentially close it.

There is also concern regarding the construction methods to be used when building the viaduct which will cross over the Macclesfield to Colwich railway line, the River Trent and the Trent and Mersey Canal. The construction site runs alongside the Marina basin at the northern boundary. There is concern that any pile driving, ground works and excavations may cause damage to the marina basin.

Request 1: A better solution for access, with less impact on the business, should be found and agreed.

Request 2: That HS2 be required to demonstrate that the construction methods used to build the viaduct will not damage the marina basin.

10.0 Steve & Karen Ingles, Conifers, Toldish Lane, Great Haywood, Stafford, ST18 0RA

Issue: Your petitioner is concerned about the situation of his constituents, Mr & Mrs Ingles. Their property is effectively one unit, although HS2 have proposed buying only part of it.

Request: That HS2 purchase the entire property.

11.0 Collier's Farms, Ingestre Manor, Ingestre.

Issue: Mr Collier is one of a number of your petitioner's constituents who have a significant amount of land impacted by the HS2 proposals. Mr Collier has raised with me the fact that he is being expected to commit considerable time to prepare for and attend meetings with HS2 or their representatives, which detracts from the running of his business.

Request: (General - for all affected constituents) That HS2 be required to pay reasonable compensation for time taken and out of pocket expenses incurred in dealing with the impact on HS2 on my constituents' property and businesses.

12.0 The Madders Family, Upper Hanyards Farm, Lower Hanyards Farm and Deer Park Farm

The property extends to approx. 730 acres of land within a ring fence comprising Upper Hanyards Farm, Lower Hanyards Farm and Deer Park Farm. They also rent approx. 150 acres of land adjoining and in the vicinity.

Issue 1: The Bill authorises compulsory acquisition of interests in my constituents' land. The limits of deviation and of the land to be acquired and used are drawn very widely. If the promoter of the Bill fails to provide a satisfactory explanation for the extent of acquisition, then your petitioners would like the Bill to be amended:

Request 1a): to reduce the geographical extent of compulsory purchase of your petitioners' land;

Request 1b): to ensure that land of lower grade is used for the purposes for which it is required by the Promoter especially in relation to land required for wildlife habitat, tree planting, etc.

Issue 2: The Bill allows the promoter to acquire my constituents' land permanently (under clause 4) or take possession of it temporarily (under Schedules 15 and 16). Your petitioners understand that in implementing Phase One of HS2 under the High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Act 2017, the nominated undertaker is exercising the equivalent powers of temporary possession over large areas of land, including land required for the permanent railway, during the very long construction period, and will follow up later by using powers of compulsory acquisition over the land that is required for the permanent works.

The temporary possession provisions of the Bill allow the Nominated Undertaker to remain in possession of land for as long as is required for the construction of the works, and then for a further maintenance period of up to one year after the works are completed. In total, this could amount to a considerable number of years.

This presents a number of problems.

The first relates to the timing of compensation payments for the capital value of the land. Paragraph 4 of Schedule 15 requires the Nominated Undertaker to pay compensation to the owners and occupiers of land of which possession is taken for any loss which they may suffer.

But, unlike the case where land is acquired compulsorily, there is no procedure in place for advanced payments of compensation for the capital value. This means that if my constituents' land is occupied using the temporary powers, even though it is clear that it will eventually be acquired permanently, my constituents may not obtain any compensation for many years. This could present my constituents with

serious cash flow issues. This problem is compounded by the lack of certainty about when the land will be returned or permanently acquired.

Request 2a: that where my constituents require it and it is clear that the land will be required on a permanent basis for the railway tracks and associated earthworks and cuttings, then the Nominated Undertaker must be required to exercise compulsory purchase powers at the outset rather than temporary powers.

Request 2b: The Nominated Undertaker should be required to provide interim payments in respect of losses suffered as a result of the exercise of the temporary possession powers.

Issue 3: In addition to the problem of delayed compensation for capital value, there is the uncertainty of what will happen to the land in the long term.

As mentioned above, it appears likely that the Nominated Undertaker will use temporary possession powers at the outset even when it is clear that the land is to be needed permanently.

Where land is required permanently for ecological mitigation, for example tree planting, the nominated undertaker is likely, eventually, to offer the landowner the choice as to whether to keep the land and manage it in accordance with arrangements prescribed by the Nominated Undertaker, or to require the Nominated Undertaker to acquire the land permanently so it can make other arrangements for its stewardship.

The landowner should be given the opportunity to make that choice as soon as the Nominated Undertaker gives notice of its intention to take possession of the land. My constituents will also petition themselves in respect of these and more detailed matters.

Request 3: That the Bill include provisions which enable your petitioners to serve a counter-notice on the Nominated Undertaker in cases where the Nominated Undertaker has served a notice under paragraph 4(1) of Schedule 15 of its intention to enter and take possession of my constituents' land, in cases where the Bill or the environmental statement indicates that the land is required permanently for purposes of ecological mitigation, or the Nominated Undertaker has given that indication in some other manner.

The counter-notice would have the effect of requiring the Nominated Undertaker to acquire the land compulsorily at an early stage, hence providing certainty and enabling compensation for capital value to be obtained, and an advanced payment requested.

Where your petitioners may wish to keep this land, the Nominated Undertaker must at the time of serving notice of temporary occupation, provide the terms for the future management of that land to enable your petitioners to decide.

Issue 4: The way the Bill is drafted means there is a possibility of land being acquired permanently even though it is only needed for a temporary purpose. It is inappropriate for the Bill to contain compulsory purchase powers in respect of land when it is required temporarily, for construction purposes. For example, in relation to compounds, site accesses, storage areas and the suchlike.

Request 4: Your petitioner would like the Bill to be amended so that any part of your petitioners' land which is needed only for construction works may be occupied on a temporary basis only (subject to the points your petitioners make in this petition about the use of the temporary possession powers in the Bill).

Issue 5: As mentioned above, Schedule 15 to the Bill makes provision about temporary possession. Under paragraph 4(1) of Schedule 15, the nominated undertaker is required to give only 28 days' notice to the landowner before entering the land and taking possession. This contrasts with the period of 3 months that is required to be given for permanent acquisition.

Were the powers of temporary possession to be limited to small periods of time and small areas of land, then the shorter notice period might be easier to justify.

But my constituents understand that the nominated undertaker is likely to exercise the powers of temporary possession over large areas of land for long periods.. If that is correct, then the period of 28 days' notice is inadequate, particularly given the need for farmers to be able to make plans for the use of their land a long time in advance.

Request 5: That Paragraph 4(1) of Schedule 15 be amended to provide for a notice period of at least 3 months before the powers of temporary possession are exercised on my constituents' land.

Issue 6: The compensation regime set out in the Bill is inadequate. Any payment of compensation that is due to your petitioners must be made as early as possible and must carry interest at a rate higher than is proposed under the Bill.

Request 6: that the Bill be amended so as to ensure that payment of compensation is made promptly and that the interest rate on outstanding compensation payments should be increased to an appropriate market level.

Issue 7: The proposals under the Bill will have a serious impact on access for my constituents to their business.

Request 7: that the promoter to be required to give an undertaking to ensure that suitable access is provided.

Issue 8: Land on my constituents' farm will be severed as a result of the construction of the proposed railway. Accommodation works in general and crossing points in particular are matters of significant importance for your petitioners. Well-designed accommodation works which meet your petitioners' needs are likely to reduce substantially a claim for compensation.

Request 8: That HS2 Ltd should be required to undertake that it will, prior to notice of entry and at a very early stage, seek to agree with my constituents a suitable specification for accommodation works where they are required as a result of the construction of the Authorised Works. For crossing points, such a specification might include the width, height, weight limit and final surface. The specification, once agreed, must be binding on the Nominated Undertaker.

Issue 9: Under the Bill, it is proposed that trees, grass and/or other vegetation will be planted on my constituents' land or land will be put to other uses in order to provide ecological compensation, visual screening, reduce visual impacts or integrate the railway into the surrounding area.

My constituents have raised requests with HS2 to explain and justify the rationale behind the huge area of tree planting, grassland mitigation habitat and wetland creation that has been designed into the scheme with the subsequent loss of prime agricultural land. The response to date is that the ecologists have used their professional judgement or subjective opinion in deciding the size and location of ecology measures.

Request 9: My constituents request that mitigation measures are carried out on a farm by farm basis so no one landowner has to suffer more land loss than necessary on their farm.

Issue 10: On my constituents' property it is proposed that there will be lengths of earthworks, made-up ground and ground reprofiling alongside the proposed railway, much of it on good quality agricultural land as detailed below.

Request 10: That the Bill should be amended or the promoter required to give an undertaking so as to require the Nominated Undertaker, unless the landowner agrees otherwise, to remain responsible for the safety and maintenance of land which is altered as described above and to be responsible for liability for any losses associated with the failure of such operations, such as settlement or slippage.

The Bill should also be amended to alter the proposed earthworks to minimise the impact on agricultural land.

Issue 11: The construction of the Authorised Works will necessitate the demolition of a dwelling and farm buildings on my constituents' land. My constituents wish to replace those buildings and the dwelling associated with them. In most cases this will require a full planning application. While the cost of dealing with planning can be factored into the compensation payable by the promoter, the uncertainty over whether an application will be approved (particularly in the case of dwellings within green belt and other types of designated land) and the time delays that can arise if a case goes to appeal can all be very difficult for a business to manage.

The development of some agricultural buildings is already permitted development, subject to conditions, including limits on size.

Clause 46 of the Bill would enable the Nominated Undertaker to carry out reinstatement works within the Act limits. In theory, that clause could be utilised so as to meet my constituents' concerns but there is no certainty in that regard, for a number of reasons, most notably that it only applies within the Bill limits.

Request 11: That the Bill be amended so as to ensure that the process for relocating farm buildings and dwellings that are lost are capable of being reinstated more easily. This could be achieved by clause 46 being amended so as to ensure that it will apply in any case where land is available for reinstatement works (not just within the Bill limits), and to remove other uncertainties.

Alternatively, the Bill should make provision for an amendment to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 so that the replacement of any building used for business purposes and any associated dwelling which is acquired under the provisions of the Bill will be permitted development subject only to the prior notification procedure. The permitted development should allow for modern building materials and, if appropriate, modern design and layout, but the size of the replacement building will be restricted to the

size of the original. A local planning authority would then be able to consider siting and access under the prior notification process, as for other permitted development.

Issue 12: The severance of agricultural land by a long linear scheme will result in some of my constituents' fields being left in awkward shapes. A common element of a claim for severance is the cost of removing hedges and fences in order to re-shape fields into a sensible layout. Since the introduction of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997, the removal of any hedge which is more than 20 metres long requires the consent of the local planning authority. This will add time, cost and uncertainty for farmers who are affected.

Request 12a: That the Bill should be amended to provide that the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 do not apply to hedges which have to be removed to allow the reasonable re-organisation of field boundaries where land has been acquired by HS2.

Request 12b: In the event of severance, my constituents request suitable conduits for the passage of services be installed beneath the railway eg mains water, electric and telecoms services which the farm may require.

Issue 13: My constituents are farmers running an efficient dairy herd and arable enterprise. There are three farmsteads in a ring fence which are fundamental to this business. At Lower Hanyards Farm the infrastructure and equipment for the feeding, milking and accommodation of dairy cows is located. The unit has been designed for the efficient movement of cows, machinery, feed and slurry and ease of access for milk tankers, feed lorries and other farm vehicles, machinery and equipment.

Further along Hanyards Lane is located Upper Hanyards Farm. This farmstead provides a dwelling for Mr James Madders, a principal within the business, together with a range of farm buildings that are vital to the farm business, providing housing for calving cows, dry cows, feed, silage, calf pens, machinery storage and two water boreholes providing water to the farm. This vital farmstead will be demolished in its entirety by HS2. These buildings are as follows:

Two silage clamps each of 2,500-3,000 tonne capacity for storing ensiled forage for cattle feed.

Machinery lean-to of steel frame construction adjoining larger building.

Corn/straights shed of around 500 tonne capacity for storing feed, wheat and barley together with straights and concentrates, of concrete portal frame construction.

Six bay straw shed with concrete floor and profile sheet roof.

Dutch barn of around 75ft x 25ft with concrete floor and profile roof.

Concrete storage shed for storage of general purpose machinery and equipment.

Main cattle shed housing 70-80 cattle. Steel portal frame construction with concrete floor, water and feed facilities and profile roof. Also with cattle handling system and race.

Steel frame cubicle shed with around 50 cubicles, slatted concrete floor and rubber cow beds to cubicles.

Seven bay portal frame shed for housing weaned calves and for calving cows.

Brick built 1950 style cowshed with space frame roof, again for housing weaned calves and dry cows.

Further steel frame cattle shed with profile roof and concrete floor.

Various stables, kennels and silage storage facilities for further cattle feed during winter months.

Unless these facilities are replaced the business will not be able to continue in its current form and without significant losses.

Request 13: That the buildings and facilities be replaced in full by HS2.

Issue 14: The farm drive known as Hanyards Lane (a private drive owned and maintained by the Madders family) is noted on HS2's plan CT-05-214 and CT-05-214L1 as a construction traffic route. Access along this route is resisted most strongly because it is the only way to gain access to the farm without upgrading other tracks at considerable expense.

HS2 has been asked for an indication of the type and number of vehicles they propose to use along Hanyards Lane and no specific response has been received other than to note it is to obtain access to the satellite compounds for the main site works. There will simply be too much conflict between construction traffic and farm machinery and equipment. The cows walk along the lane daily to be fed and milked and that cannot be interrupted. An alternative solution needs to be found. The Community Area Report Vol. 2 notes that around 80-90 lorries per day may use the route. That equates to potentially 180 lorry movements which equates to around 22.5 movements per hour or one lorry movement every 2-3 minutes. This simply will not work. My constituents have sought to work with HS2 to find a solution although no response has yet been forthcoming.

Request 14: My constituents request HS2 find another solution for access.

Issue 15: My constituents note significant areas of tree planting and grassland habitat creation and other ecology measures. We stress there has been no consultation with my constituents in this regard and despite no significant areas of trees being lost on the farm due to HS2, the ecologists have used their own subjective opinion to designate areas for tree planting. My constituents believe these to be wholly unnecessary and in fact are extremely disruptive not only to the farm but also the commercial shoot running on it. My constituents request HS2 be compelled to seek a second opinion on these wildlife mitigation measures.

Request 15: My constituents wish to discuss with HS2 the Hanyards Drop Culvert because of the difficulties that it can create.

Issue 16: My constituents are pleased to note a farm accommodation overbridge is due to be constructed but no details of the type and specification for this have been forthcoming. It is concerning that it is noted as a 'bridleway' accommodation bridge as it needs to carry farm machinery of 50-60 tonnes in weight and also to have a

conduit running across it to encase water pipes and other services. Similarly, conduits are requested elsewhere along the route of the line.

Request 16: My constituents wish to agree with HS2 the construction and load-carrying capacity of the overbridge and the issue of the conduits required.

Issue 17: During the construction works there are extremely significant areas of landtake for temporary material storage stockpiles and the suchlike. These are located in difficult positions taking up some of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Request 17: My constituents request that they be minimised and placed on land which is otherwise going to be severed and difficult to access from a farming point of view. (There has been no consultation with my constituents in this regard)

Issue 18: My constituents would like to draw your attention to some of the comments made in the Community Area Report for this location. For example it states that certain measures that 'have been incorporated to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on agriculture, forestry or soils'. Whilst an accommodation bridge has been factored into the equation, very little else has been done to mitigate the impact on agriculture or soils. Indeed, many acres of land will be taken out of agricultural production for tree planting and 'grassland habitat creation'.

The report also refers to the severance effect on the farm as being 'low'. Where the farm currently has field to field access across its entire length of around 1.5 km it will be reduced to just one crossing point. Further access tracks will need to be built on the farm to mitigate the impact of this.

Request 18: That HS2 discuss impact mitigation with my constituents and agree where the necessary additional access tracks will be built.

Issue 19: My constituents respectfully point out there are two wind turbines operating on the farm generating a significant amount of energy into the National Grid system. These points have been mentioned to HS2 in the past but as yet they have failed to comment how the electricity supply from them to the grid may be maintained or if indeed it will be disrupted.

Request 19: That HS2 resolve with my constituents how disruption of the operation of the turbines will be avoided or minimised and agree a method of compensation for any disruption.

Issue 20: Engagement with HS2 has been inadequate. My constituents and their agents have done all they could to see to mitigate these losses and since the draft EIA was produced in September 2016, there has only been one visit to the farm by HS2.

Request 20: My constituents request that HS2 fund those reasonable costs for preparing the petition and appearing at the hearing. My constituents further request that agents' fees are reimbursed in a timely manner as it is not uncommon to wait over twelve months for payment.

13.0 A G Parrott Farming, co/ Acton Hill Farm, Acton Hill, Stafford ST17 0RZ, regarding Tithe Barn Farm

Tithe Barn Farm comprises a parcel of approx. 387 acres of land all within a ring fence and with a dwelling house and range of character appropriate and suitable farm buildings at its geographical centre. It is a productive and efficient unit being severed by HS2. Tithe Barn Farm forms part of a larger farming enterprise which takes in Acton Hill Farm near to Acton Trussell, Stafford.

Issues 1 to 12 inclusive and Requests 1a to 12b inclusive: As Issues 1 to 12 inclusive and Requests 1a to 12b inclusive in Paragraph 12.0 above.

Issue 13: The railway severs the land in two, more or less along its east/west axis and does so in a catastrophic way. In doing so, it demolishes the farm house and the vital range of farm buildings serving this part of the farm business. The railway line will demolish:

brick and tile Staffordshire farmhouse of comfortable proportions, with paddock and garaging
steel framed grain store with concrete thrust walls, fibre cement cladding, underfloor drying with roller shutter doors and three phase electric drying fan
100ft x 80ft cattle shed with concrete floor, gates, troughs, steelworks, with water and power connected
90ft x 75ft building used for young stock storage, silage storage and together with adjoining lean-to storage of machinery, equipment and straw
brick and tile stable block comprising range of loose boxes
Ancillary buildings and trackways etc

The route of the railway line in this location will destroy what is effectively 387 acre working farm in a ring fence and leave what is effectively two separate and almost severed parcels of land.

It is vital for the farm business that these farm buildings and the dwelling house be replaced. My constituent has sought advice on Rule 5 of Section 5 of the Land Compensation Act 1961 into the principle of 'Equivalent Reinstatement'. Case law dictates that where there is no general market for that type of property being compulsorily acquired then the rules of equivalence apply to put the claimant back, insofar as money can do it, into the position they would have been had the scheme not gone ahead.

In this location HS2 is acquiring a farmhouse and a set of farm buildings which are commensurate with the size of landholding that they serve. It is difficult to conceive a situation where those buildings would be sold off separately given their location more or less in the middle of a 387 acre farm. One could only wonder who would wish to sell them away from the farm and more so, as a set of stand-alone buildings, who would wish to buy them if they were not able to buy the land serving them. Their use is as agricultural buildings and nothing else.

My constituent, as claimant, is under a duty to mitigate his losses. As an acquiring authority, HS2 has a duty to act in a fair, reasonable and impartial manner to ensure claimants are dealt with fairly, reasonably and impartially. The case law on this matter is largely dealt with in the case of Harrison and Hetherington Ltd v Cumbria County Council. The case relates to the reconstruction of a cattle market acquired to build a highways scheme. The owner of the site contended that they were simply not able to 'buy another one' as it did not exist. If it did exist, it was not in the vicinity or the location where they would need it.

Similarly here, there is no other range of farm buildings that exist adjoining the farm which my constituent could buy. Therefore to keep their business going as it is they will need to build another range of buildings and they have, at their own expense, engaged planning consultants to start that process. In short, they cannot sit and watch their business be closed down by HS2. My constituent must then take action to mitigate their losses and remedy the situation by constructing new replacement buildings.

Request 13: My constituent therefore requests the select committee to direct HS2 to fund the construction of these buildings to provide similar accommodation and resources to those that it is demolishing on the farm.

Issue 14: Referring to the Colwich Bridleway 35 Accommodation Overbridge my constituent is pleased to see this in place to give some connectivity to the landholding. However, it is in the most inappropriate position for the farmstead.

Request 14a: My constituent requests it be located to tie in to the existing farm drive which also serves as Footpath 26. This is to maintain efficiency and proper connectivity for the farmstead. The current location may suit a horse rider on the bridleway (of which there are few, if any) but it is not the best location for the farm.

Request 14b: My constituent requires a specification for the Colwich Bridleway 35 Accommodation Overbridge. Farm machinery is getting heavier and machinery now weighing 50-60 tonnes is not uncommon. The accommodation overbridge therefore needs to be of a suitable capacity.

Issue 15: There is again a plethora of 'grassland habitat creation' on the farm. This is predominantly an arable and livestock finishing unit and hence the railway does not take any grassland habitat from this farm of any significance.

Request 15: My constituents wish this removed so they can continue to farm it.

Issue 16: There is also a significant area of woodland habitat creation. Again, there is very little if any woodland being taken from the farm so your petitioners fail to see why significant areas of land should be planted to trees when none of significance are being taken.

Request 16: My constituents wish the area of woodland created to be reduced to a reasonable area so that more farmland remains.

Issue 17: My constituent is pleased to note the Colwich Bridleway 58 Accommodation Underbridge. However, priority seems to be given to the fact it is a bridleway underbridge rather than a vital access to enable the farm to continue to function.

Request 17: My constituent requires a specification for this underbridge and request that it be made 6 metres wide by 6 metres high to allow the passage of modern agricultural machinery.

Issue 18: There are a number of footpath diversions connected with Bridleway 58 underbridge and these are located in difficult positions which sever fields unnecessarily. There are other areas likewise where footpaths have been diverted without consultation or discussion with my constituent as to where the most appropriate place may be.

Request 18a: My constituent wishes to determine with HS2 more appropriate places for the footpaths.

Request 18b: My constituent would also like to raise the issue of conduits which will be required to cross from one side of the railway line to the other. They would not like to have the additional problem of being unable to pass services (electricity, water etc) from one side of the railway to the other in the future without ransom.

Request 18c: The farm will need additional access tracks to help connect the land. Its entire length of 1.85 km has been reduced from continuous field to field access to two crossing points, the specification of which my constituent does not yet know.

Issue 19: Engagement with HS2 has been inadequate. My constituent and his agents have done all they could to see to mitigate these losses and since the draft EIA was produced in September 2016, there has only been one visit to the farm by HS2.

Request 19: My constituent requests that HS2 fund those reasonable costs for preparing the petition and appearing at the hearing. My constituent further requests that agents' fees are reimbursed in a timely manner as it is no uncommon to wait over twelve months for payment which is unacceptable.

14.0 The Williams Family, Park Farm, Stafford

Issue 1: The current height of the under bridge is 3.1 metres high which is inadequate for the needs of the farm. My constituents require a height of at least 4.6 metres which will enable services such as refuse collection, and larger agricultural machinery, to access the farm.

Request 1: That HS2 be required to raise the height of the under bridge to at least 4.6 metres.

Issue 2: The proposed balancing pond needs to be better sited on the farm. My constituents have concerns about flooding if it is sited in the location currently proposed.

Request 2: That HS2 be required to move the balancing pond site to a better site in consultation with my constituents.

Issue 3: The extent of the land taken for conservation measures is concerning. In addition, my constituents have no assurance as to who will own the areas and be responsible for their maintenance.

Request 3: That HS2 be required to justify the extent of the land taken for conversation measures (and hence no longer available to farm) and that it be specified who will be responsible for owning and maintaining such land

15.0 Staffordshire County Showground

Issue 1: The route of HS2 cuts through an important area of car parking for Staffordshire County Showground. The Showground puts on at least 160 events of regional, national and international importance and attracts nearly 500,000 visits

annually. It is also a significant local employer. It is essential for the economy that the Showground is able to continue to operate without hindrance.

Request 1a: That the line be put through a tunnel as it passes through Staffordshire Showground. This would minimise disruption and the need for additional car parking spaces. If the request in 6.0 above is granted, then this tunnel would be fulfilled automatically. Otherwise, my request is for a cut-and-cover tunnel.

Request 1b: That HS2 be required to secure sufficient suitable replacement land for car parking in negotiation with the Showground.

Request 1c: That, if two areas of car parking for the Showground are severed by the railway line, HS2 be required to connect them by a bridge suitable for the needs of the Showground and its customers.

16.0 Mr & Mrs Pink, Mount Edge, Hopton, Stafford

Issue: Your petitioner is very concerned about his constituents, Mr & Mrs Pink. Mr Pink is in poor health and they have been waiting a significant amount of time for the purchase of their house to be finalised.

Request: It is vital that this matter is concluded as soon as possible and the purchase finalised. Mr & Mrs Pink have made plans elsewhere and any further delay could place these in jeopardy.

17.0 Mr John James, Hopton, Stafford

Issue: Your petitioner is also concerned about the case of Mr James, also of Hopton. Agreement was reached for Mr James' house to be purchased by HS2 in 2016. However, as yet, the matter is to be finalised.

Request: Mr James' life is now on hold and I would ask that this matter is concluded as soon as possible.

18.0 Mr and Mrs Wise, The Old Vicarage, Yarlet, ST18 9SD

Issue: Mrs and Mrs Wise bought their property in 2000 so that Mr Wise's 75-year old widowed father could live with the family. The family was appropriate to the family's then needs. They spent considerable sums, including pension savings, converting a dilapidated building into a self-contained annex for Mr Wise's father. They planned to downsize when their children had left home, which is now the case. Sadly, Mr Wise's father died in September 2017.

They have tried to sell the property since Spring 2017 but have been unable to at a fair market price due to the impending construction of HS2.

Both they and I believe that they had a clear-cut case under the HS2 Need-to-Sell Scheme. They applied and met the first four criteria. However they were rejected on the fifth criterion: "The decision maker was not satisfied that there is a compelling reason to sell at this time or that the applicants would suffer an

unreasonable burden if they were unable to sell the property within the next three years.”

The rejection did not mention:

- The bereavement;
- The stage in life of Mr and Mrs Wise where they are starting to prepare for retirement;
- The fact that the property is now too large for the 2 people living there (as opposed to 5 when they purchased it).

The rejection also dismissed medical evidence in respect of a cardiac problem supplied to HS2 which stated that “The triggering of these events is commonly associated with significant mental stress which can be caused by a variety of psychological and emotional factors. Certainly very considerable stress at home may well be associated with the triggering, but not the genesis, of the arrhythmia.”

Request: That HS2 purchase Mr and Mrs Wise’s property at fair market value given that it is unsaleable by virtue of the proposed line and that it seems clear to me that they meet all the criteria for purchase by HS2.

19.0 Mr and Mrs Stevenson, Hopton

Issue: Mr and Mrs Stevenson are being offered by HS2 much less than the fair value of their property. This seems to be based on the fact that some neighbours of the Stevenson’s have sold their properties to HS2 at less than the market value in order to be able to move away from the stress caused by HS2 and “get on with their lives”.

If this is the reasoning, then it is wrong. My constituents should be able to sell their home to HS2 based on a fair value and not one which is any way affected by the blight brought by HS2. My constituents should be able to move to a similar property and not be put in a position where they are disadvantaged by the decision to construct HS2.

Request: That HS2 be required to purchase Mr and Mrs Stevenson’s property at the fair unblighted value; and that this principle be firmly established for all my constituents in this position.

20.0 Yarlet School, Stafford ST18 9SU

Yarlet is an excellent independent preparatory school for boys and girls aged 2 to 13. It is set in beautiful countryside and is located beside the A34 between Stafford and Stone.

Yarlet offers a first class, all-round education and the school is renowned for traditional values, small class sizes, high academic standards, excellent facilities and excellence in art, sport and music, which it readily shares with local schools and other groups in the community.

Sadly, the school is currently coming to terms with the impact that the HS2, phase 2a railway will have upon them. They are in a unique position in that they take boarders and will feel the impact 24/7 rather than just in normal school hours. The school’s leadership and governors have made it clear that they wish to stay in their buildings, which date back to 1873 and seek to mitigate the impact of the line upon

them as much as possible.

The school have been very proactive in their approach to HS2, which I applaud, but their investigations and many communications with HS2 have failed to get significant progress on several issues which now need to be resolved. These issues and requests are set out in more detail in the petition of the Yarlet Trust, owners of Yarlet School. I am petitioning on the main issues and requests of my constituents given their importance.

Issue 1: Continued good access to the School is vital during and after construction of the line. Without it, the School will be affected both through a decline in applications and in its operations.

Request 1a: That HS2 be required to ensure that the proposed Option 3 access route put forward by HS2 is taken forward at the cost of HS2 (together with a commuted sum for maintenance).

Request 1b: That HS2 be required to show how access from the A34 to the School will be maintained when the temporary diversion of the A34 is in place.

Issue 2: My constituent is very concerned about the impact of noise and vibration on the School both from the construction works and the operation of the line thereafter. My constituent also has grave concerns about the quality of some of the methods used in calculating and assessing noise and vibration at educational facilities within the School's campus.

Request 2a: That HS2 be required to respond to the architect's report and cost estimates (commissioned by the School at HS2's request) in relation to a replacement swimming pool, replacement boarding accommodation and replacement classrooms, all of which lie very close to the line and would be affected by its construction and operation.

Request 2b: That HS2 be required to review the methodology adopted to assess the impact of construction an operational noise and vibration levels and come forward with a revised assessment of their impact on the School.

Issue 3: My constituents I very concerned at the quality of some of the methods used and the absence of key data relied upon by HS2 in assessing the air quality impact of construction.

Request 3: That HS2 be required to review the methodology adopted to assess the impact on air quality and to adopt the same dust thresholds as recommended in current and any future best-practice guidance or undertake long-term baseline monitoring to establish suitable thresholds.

Issue 4: The construction of the proposed Yarlet South cutting would result in the extensive destruction of the ancient woodland known as the Grove which stands over and protects the School. It would also require the removal of a veteran oak tree (Tree 113476 on the Ancient Tree Inventory) located in a field to the West of the Grove.

Request 4a: That HS2 be required to consider tunnelling under The Grove and hence the A34 (hence potentially avoiding the need to divert the A34 as well as

preserving the Grove). This is in accordance with the Request in 6.0 above.

Request 4b: That HS2 also be required to examine realignment of the route so as to avoid the destruction of The Grove and the veteran oak tree.

Issue 5: The powers in the Bill are widely drafted so that HS2 has the ability to carry out and maintain a wide range of works on land within the Bill limits.

Request 5: That HS2 be required to provide a written commitment that the land within the Bill limits in which the School has interests will only be used for specified utility works and for reasonable access of light vehicles in order to carry out the utilities works.

Issue 6: That disruption to the School and its pupils will be greater if works are carried out during school term time and weekdays, and during teaching hours.

Request 6: That HS2 be required to give a commitment that it and its contractors engage with the School so as to manage work so as far as possible the impact on the operation of the School is kept to a minimum.

Issue 7: That the School needs to continue to attract pupils before, during and after construction. In order to do so, the Schools needs to show current and prospective parents that it is taking steps to 'face away' from the HS2 works and to provide all its facilities which are sensitive to noise and dust as far away as possible from the construction works.

Request 7: That HS2 be required to provide the School with sufficient compensation to relocate its activities within its site, away from the construction works and operational line, taking into account any of the mitigation measures described above being adopted.

Issue 8: That the School, in common with many other constituents, has incurred substantial costs in responding to problems arising from the development of HS2.

Request 8: That all reasonable costs incurred by my constituents in responding to the development of HS2 be reimbursed by HS2, such costs – where disputed – to be the subject of independent arbitration.

21.0 Ingestre Salt Marsh

Issue: At Ingestre, the proposed route will be constructed on the site of an historic salt marsh which is still fed by active brine springs. Substantial surface and underground workings exist in this area which have been created over a period of at least 250 years in an attempt to make previously unproductive marshland suitable for agricultural use.

Natural salt dissolution under this area is not only producing an up-welling of saturated brine but also a volumetric loss of underlying ground amounting to many cubic metres per annum.

In many cases, not just at Ingestre, but along the line, it is not only land take which is involved but the usability of the land which remains (whether untouched by construction or used temporarily and the restored).

While severance is addressed, there is no mention of, for example, the effects on ground moisture conditions arising from permanent alteration of the water table

and/or surface drainage characteristics arising from the principal engineering works. In particular, the creation of deep cuttings through sandstone aquifers, as in the vicinity of Upper Hanyards, has the potential to lower the water table to the detriment of the adjoining farmland and woodland.

The petition of Ingestre with Tixall Parish Council provides greater detail on this subject. I fully support all the requests made by the Council in its petition.

Request 1: That HS2 be required – prior to any commencement of construction - to commission detailed independent reports on the consequences both of and on the construction of HS2 on the almost unique geology of Ingestre and Hanyards, (and Hopton and Marston by extension).

Request 2: That HS2 be required to justify to the Committee and by report to the Public Accounts Committee the selection of a longer route which impinges on Ingestre Salt Marsh as opposed to a shorter route impinging upon Pasturefields Salt Marsh; and that HS2 be required to quantify the additional cost involved.

22.0 Ingestre Golf Club

1. **Issue:** The Ingestre Golf Club has in excess of 650 members and several employees. The impact of the proposed HS2 route will be severe as it is due to go through the middle of the course and make it financially unviable. The management of the club has tried to hold discussions with HS2. However HS2 has not entered into a dialogue after being presented with the Club's Business Case seeking Equivalent Reinstatement. The construction of the proposed railway would result in the following –
 - a) the bisecting of the golf course;
 - b) the complete removal of the 5th, 7th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 14th and 18th holes, certain greens and fairways;
 - c) the loss of 39 acres of land which is required for mitigation planting;
 - d) the demolition of the club house; and
 - e) the loss of access to the greenkeeper's compound.

Put simply, the Bill's proposals will render the golf course unplayable and this would have a disastrous impact on the Club.

The cumulative effect will be significant damage to a valuable community facility for around 760 members and the thousands of others who play the course as guests or visitors.

In addition, the Club employs some 15 people who would find it difficult to obtain alternative employment in the event of closure, and there is a separate golf shop business located next to the club house which would also be lost. The owner of the shop fully supports the Club in its proposals as set out in this petition.

Any remedy to these problems will need to achieve two goals, and failure to achieve either would result in closure of the Club. The goals are –

- first, to maintain at all times, both during and after construction, 18 holes of golf in play of sufficient standard to permit players to maintain active competition handicaps; and

- secondly, to maintain a fully functioning club house at all times in order to maintain revenue streams from bar, catering and visitors.

Request: The Club hopes that an agreement for complete relocation can be reached with the Promoter; however, if that is not possible, the Club request that the Select Committee require the Promoter to relocate the Club. This option would require early agreement in order to meet the required construction timetable for the new golf course. In any event, the Club and the owner of the golf shop business should be properly compensated for any losses incurred because of the works being carried out.

23.0 St Leonard's Church, Marston

My constituents, the incumbent and church wardens of St Leonard's Church, Marston, (whose history goes back to at least 1288) are greatly concerned at the impact of the construction and operation of the railway line on the life of this ancient church. They point out that several key members of the church community have already left as a result of HS2's proposals.

Issue 1: The church is used on a daily basis, either for events or by visitors. The construction works will bring about greater separation between the church and the community which it serves. As my constituents state in their petition, the construction phase 'will undermine the work of the church and put at risk its future viability.'

Request 1a: That HS2 take responsibility for the maintenance and insurance of the church during the construction phase due to the reduced congregation and hence ability to pay for these running costs during construction. The church, in return, is prepared to lease to HS2 (subject to a faculty) part of its space for refreshment and meeting facilities. HS2 would need to supply toilet facilities and refreshment facilities which could then remain after construction as a legacy for the community.

Request 1b: That HS2 provide drop-off facilities and safe walking routes to the church.

Request 1c: That HS2 provide indemnity from all damage to the church caused by vibration from the construction or operation of the line; and that HS2 undertake preventative work on the windows and roof.

24.0 Design of Great Haywood Viaduct

Issue: Serious consideration should be given to the design of the Viaducts and the line as a whole. Reference has been made throughout the process to the builders of the first railways. Many of them put great store by excellent design and HS2 must be no different.

The proposed Great Haywood Viaduct, in your petitioner's constituency, is currently proposed to be constructed of plain concrete, a standard 'off the peg' design. This would not be at in keeping with local architecture and materials. It would damage permanently one of the most beautiful points in the upper Trent Valley.

Staffordshire County Council has also petitioned to reduce the height of the viaduct so as to alleviate its impact on what is what one of the most beautiful parts of the Trent Valley.

Request 1: Great Haywood Viaduct and other significant constructions should see extensive use of local design and construction materials (e.g. Staffordshire blue bricks). Local design competitions or consultations should take place, so that those communities affected by the line will at least have the opportunity to choose what it will look like. Along the full length of the line, landscaping should be in keeping with the local area. The A50 cuttings through Stoke-on-Trent are a good example of where effective use of local brick has ameliorated what would otherwise have been a soulless outlook.

Request 2: That HS2 consider carefully the reduction of the height of the viaduct proposed by Staffordshire County Council.

25.0 Compensation

Issue: The whole situation regarding the compensating of home and landowners has been an issue of great controversy since the proposals for HS2 were first announced.

In the view of your petitioner, many of his constituents have been unfairly treated by HS2 when it comes to compensation. Some HS2 staff often will go the extra mile to help people but that is not always the case.

One of your petitioner's constituents, confused by the compensation rules, sold their home for a knock down price and is now not entitled to any compensation from HS2, simply because they were confused. There should be some way to assist them to receive the compensation which they are due.

Many constituents have told your petitioner that they feel that they "are an inconvenience" when trying to get the compensation that they so rightly deserve.

Landowners have rightly raised with your petitioner, the complaint that the line could be going straight through a field or farm, but the landowner will only be receiving the land price plus ten percent for the land actually taken, even though a large amount of land may then be cut off from the main farm. Landowners should also be compensated for this permanent inconvenience.

Request: Your petitioner requests that his constituents who were not aware of or confused over the rules regarding compensation for the loss in value of their property due to HS2 have their cases revisited.

Your petitioner also requests that – where landholdings are wholly or substantially severed, resulting in damage to the viability of the whole unit as business – compensation is paid which reflects not just the unit value of the land but its value as part of the existing business.

26.0 Support for local health services

Issue: Many constituents have been put under mental and emotional pressure by the proposals from HS2 which have had (for more than 5 years) a very significant impact on their lives. On several occasions, I have requested that local health services be provided by HS2 with additional resources so as to help my constituents. To date, this has not been forthcoming.

Request: That HS2 provide adequate additional resources to local health services (in particular general practices) so that they provide specific counselling and mental

health support for constituents (in whichever constituency) who are affected by the proposals for and construction of HS2.

27.0 Support for Parish, Town, Borough and County Councils.

Issue: Councils at all levels in my constituency have been greatly affected by the proposals for HS2. They have been required to devote very significant amounts of time to analysing and responding to the proposals for HS2, consulting with their residents, speaking and negotiating with HS2. These councils are already under significant financial strain. In addition, Parish and Town Councils have very small budgets which are inadequate to deal with this level of work. Given that this is a project of national significance, it is unreasonable to expect local councils on the route to bear the full weight of the cost of consultation, analysis and negotiation.

Request: That HS2 – or if that is inappropriate, the Secretary of State for Transport - provides financial support for Councils at all levels so that they are properly able to carry out their duties of protecting the interests of their residents during the preparation for, construction and operation of HS2.

3. What do you want to be done in response?

In the box below, tell us what you think should be done in response to your objections. You do not have to complete this box if you do not want to.

The committee cannot reject the Bill outright or propose amendments which conflict with the principle of the Bill. But it can require changes to the Government's plans in response to petitioners' concerns, which can take the form of amendments to the Bill or commitments by HS2 Ltd.

You can include this information in your response to section two 'Objections to the Bill' if you prefer. Please number each paragraph.

Requests have been included in Section Two.

Next steps

Once you have completed your petition template please save it and go to our website to submit it during the petitioning period.