

To the House of Lords  
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

## **High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill**

### **THE PETITION OF the Camden Civic Society**

Declares that:

The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.

*Your petitioners* are the Camden Civic Society.

#### **Introduction**

1. Your Petitioners, the Camden Civic Society, lodged a Petition against the Bill (number 1837) and an additional Petition against AP3. Our first petition describes the Camden Civic Society and its membership and sets out the reasons why we are directly and specially affected by the Bill. In many respects AP3 exacerbates rather than mitigates the effects of the original Bill. We continue to rely on the matters set out in our previous petitions.

2. The Camden Civic Society has always campaigned for improved public transport. We recognise the need for increased rail capacity of all kinds and in principle are in favour of a new high speed line as long as this is well planned, causing minimum disruption and damage, and does not operate at excessive and wasteful speeds. We see the sense in bringing this line into Euston, a station which is relatively underused in comparison with other London termini. But we have very grave reservations about HS2 AP3 proposal as it affects Camden and strong objections to it.

#### **Our experience so far as petitioners and our current position**

3. Nothing in HS2 Ltd's Promoters Response Document sent to us on 30<sup>th</sup> October last year suggests that any of our requests has been unfounded. Yet we have received no Assurances from HS2 Ltd.

4. As is the experience of perhaps every other independent Camden petitioner, we also find that almost none of the requests in our original and our AP3 petitions has received a response in any of the reports of the House of Commons Select Committee on HS2.

5. We are therefore obliged to repeat most of them again here.

6. In the House of Commons Select Committee (HCSC) Final Report, the only statements which answer a request from us are on the subject of Euston Station. In our AP3 Commons

petition, at paragraph 68, we asked for *'a coherent design for the redevelopment of the whole station'*. The HCSC Final Report includes the following: at paragraph 255, *'A coherent plan for Euston station is needed'* and at paragraph 243, *'We share the view that Euston's ultimate design needs an holistic approach. The Committee agrees with Camden [Council] that the opportunity for such a redevelopment should not be wasted and that the final appearance of the station should be a coherent whole.'*

7. There has been no engagement on the part of HS2 Ltd with us or any other group within Camden since September 2015 and we have heard nothing directly from them about a revised station design. The impression gained from Camden Council is that HS2 Ltd will not be seeking a new Additional Provision to authorise any revised plans for Euston and that any new design will go through the normal planning procedures in Camden.

8. If it is true that any revised plans will be submitted to Camden Council for planning consent, we look forward to being involved ourselves in this local democratic process. On the condition that this takes place we withdraw our detailed requests in relation to station design. Outlined in our paragraph 68 of our last petitions, these cover station architecture, development around and on top of Euston station, the Seifert buildings, the reinstatement of Euston Square, and arrangements for above-ground local transport (buses and taxis).

#### **Lack of clarity as to what the Commons Select Committee's recommendation covers**

9. We wish to record that at this point we remain uncertain as to what is covered by the HCSC's statement that *'the final appearance of the station should be a coherent whole'*. On present evidence do not believe that it equates to our own broad request for *'a coherent design for the redevelopment of the whole station'*. We take up this issue again below, at paragraphs 15-21.

10. We are in general uncertain about Parliament's intentions for a new station design and how the SC's advice accords with the Bill itself. We note that the Assurances obtained by Camden Council include provision for a new *Euston Station Strategic Redevelopment Board*, of which Camden will be a member, and that a competition has been announced for a new 'architect-led' design for Euston station (reported for example in *bdonline.co.uk* on 6<sup>th</sup> April). But we also note that these potentially positive steps have not been absorbed formally into the Bill and that on the occasion of the Commons Third Reading on 23<sup>rd</sup> March this year the Labour Amendment on Euston Station, NC22, was voted down by the Government. The first clause of this amendment read:

- 1) *The Secretary of State will require the nominated undertaker to take reasonable steps to develop integrated and comprehensive design and construction plans for Euston Station that include integration with other Euston Schemes.*

(We ourselves were not in favour of this amendment since in detail it was based on 'The enlarged Euston Station' and the *Euston Area Plan*, both of which we have objected to.)

#### **Our concerns are as follows:**

### **‘Temporary effects’ of HS2 up to the completion of the high speed lines and platforms.**

11. As before, the Camden Civic Society is not attempting in our petition to cover the so-called ‘temporary effects’ of HS2 though our position remains that, within Camden, these are far too great to be acceptable. We also cannot agree that effects which are due to continue over such a very long construction period can be considered, for mitigation and compensation purposes, as ‘temporary’. It is also our position that to divide residents and businesses for compensation purposed into ‘urban’ and ‘rural’ on no factual basis is grossly unfair; we note the opinion of local MP, the Right Hon Sir Keir Starmer MP QC, that it does not accord with European Convention on Human Rights (House of Commons petition of the HS2 Euston Action Group, 1686, paragraph 65).

12. We support the agreed community aims as listed, for example, in the petition of the Regent’s Park Estate residents. ‘Asks’ on matters not covered in the body of this petition include: fair urban compensation and the appointment of an independent adjudicator; mitigation for twenty years construction work, agreed and adequately monitored and enforced; minimal disruption and duration of every aspects of HS2 construction; enforcement and fines for breaches of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP); Local Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) actively enforced by officers on the ground; no demolition until there is a formally agreed integrated plan for Euston station authorised by Camden council; no worsening of air quality from HS2 pollution; timely information from HS2 enabling genuine engagement.

13. In more detail, on the subject of mitigation we support the requests in the House of Lords (HL) petition of the Camden Cutting Group. On the very important issue of compensation we support the HL petition of HS2 Euston Action Group. On air pollution we follow the HL petition of Netley School, and on green spaces and trees the HL petition of the Vicar of St Pancras.

### **Proposals which affect Camden between Parkway and Kilburn High Road.**

14. Although the London Borough of Camden extends as far as Kilburn High Road, we are not attempting here to cover HS2 issues between Kilburn and Parkway. HS2 will have substantial effects west of Parkway, but in these are less interconnected than those between Parkway and Euston Road and are ably covered by local groups, including the Gloucester Avenue Association, Belsize Residents Association, and Dinerman Court Limited.

### **Proposal for a new ‘coherent’ design for Euston station: timescale.**

15. We trust that the proposal for a new ‘coherent plan for Euston station’ is not just a device for putting off important decisions about our area. We would like to record that the residents and businesses in the parts of Camden directly affected by the HS2 scheme have by now been in a state of uncertainty for six years, since the announcement of the HS2 in March 2010. This prolonged uncertainty has already led to their experiencing very considerable stress.

16. Our request is that a final proposal for Euston station is put forward as soon as possible and that residents and businesses are not condemned to a further long period of personal and financial uncertainty.

**Proposal for a new 'coherent' design for Euston station: we do not believe that a phased construction programme is compatible with a coherent design.**

17. The Euston proposal published with first Environmental Statement in November 2013, Option 8, while it divided the platforms into three sections, did envisage a single elevation right across the front of the station as well as that reconstruction of the whole station should be a single undertaking. The phased approach introduced with AP3 lost any coherence that might have been inherent to Option 8, and left the rump of the classic platforms, B2, the eastern side of the station, without a design or timetable. This was never going to lead to building which looked good and worked well, and we have serious doubts as to whether the eastern side would or could have been rebuilt under this scheme. (See below, paragraphs 25-29). We are not clear whether the current proposal for a coherent design extends to platforms and tracks, but we believe, for a good design to be achieved, and one that can be carried out within a reasonable time, the phasing envisaged in AP3 needs to be abandoned for all aspects of the station redevelopment.

18. Our request here is that the station is redeveloped as a single undertaking which is carefully planned and organised to take as short a time as possible.

**Proposal for a new 'coherent' plan for Euston station': what is covered by it outside the station itself?**

19. As explained paragraphs 9 and 10 above, we are not clear how far the recommendation of the House of Commons Select Committee (at their paragraph 255), for 'a *coherent plan for Euston station*', extends geographically. As just mentioned, we are also not whether it covers the platforms and tracks.

20. We note indications that Camden Council understand the area as extending as far as Parkway; for example, residents of Park Village East (PVE) concerned about the proposed intervention building opposite 30 PVE, have been told that this is considered to be part of 'Euston' and will be covered by the new design.

21. Taking the largest possible interpretation therefore of 'Euston' and 'Euston station' our requests relevant to a new coherent design continue as follows, starting with shared community 'asks': that an integrated plan for Euston be developed which fits within the present station and railway footprint; that in this new design, provision for local transport, including a station for the new Crossrail 2 line, is fully integrated; that demolitions on the east side of the station are avoided by integrating the western end of the Crossrail 2 station into the Euston station design; that no additional rail services are brought into Euston station until local transport has the capacity to take the additional passengers. Our own requests continue: that the new coherent design extends as far as Parkway and includes platforms, tracks, track alignment and tunnel portals; that the new coherent design covers Hampstead Road Bridge, Granby Terrace bridge, Mornington Street bridge, any boundary

structures, ancillary structures including the headhouse opposite 6 PVE, the slab over the tracks alongside the Park Village carriage sheds, and the two 'intervention' buildings, one opposite 30 PVE at the corner of PVE and Mornington Street and the other at the corner of PVE and Granby Terrace.

**Railway questions: many details of HS2's scheme remain uncertain and we do not have evidence that they have been resolved, or that all of them can be resolved.**

22. Everyone directly affected by HS2 within Camden have experienced a failure on the part of HS2 to engage and properly communicate to us what their scheme means in detail. In this way we have become aware that many aspects of the AP3 scheme remain unresolved.

This is particularly well demonstrated by the experience of the residents of Park Village East (the Park Village East Heritage Group – PVEHG), in trying to obtain details of the concrete box structure or 'birdcage' to be built partly under their street, what the construction process will entail and how close it will come to their houses. They have found that over time HS2 has become gradually less open, a change reflected in the dwindling number of documents that HS2 were prepared to share: in 2013 they were given a Powerpoint file by HS2 with images showing construction sequence; in early 2014 they were given full-size measured plan and section drawings of the proposals for the cutting; in the September 2015 Environmental Statement (ES), the design for the 'birdcage' is only referred to in a footnote in very small script where it is described as a 'conceptual design' (SES2 & AP3 ES, Vol.2, p.71, n.41); in October 2014, they were given a revised set of drawings, but not full scale and not showing the buildings surrounding the cutting; at the PVEHG's HCSC appearance on 2<sup>nd</sup> December last year the 'PVE Pack', P.11849, included at slide 13 a single section drawing from what was evidently a further modification of the birdcage structure, but without scale or number and with very poor resolution; in an e-mail of 4<sup>th</sup> February this year Damian Cox, Area Petition Advisor- Euston, wrote to the PVEHG - "I am unable to provide further drawings as the detailed design is still progressing"; in an e-mail of March 21<sup>st</sup> March this year Damian Cox wrote to the PVEHG - "the actual method of construction would be determined at a later date by the contractor undertaking the work". (A summary of the experience of the PVEHG in trying to get information from HS2 is contained in their submission to Commons Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee and has been published together with the PACAC report on HS2.)

23. It is now over a year since the Option 8 proposal was withdrawn and more than six months since the AP3 scheme was published: we ask ourselves, if the scheme is workable how is it that there is still no detailed design which can be shared with residents directly affected?

24. We request in relation to the above that: the House of Lords Select Committee does its best to establish, in open session, and with reference to independent technical advice, whether HS2 as it comes through Camden into Euston has a design which is workable in concept and in detail; that the Select Committee ensures that updated detailed drawings of HS2's proposals together with construction sequences are available to all participants in the petitioning process.

**Railway questions: the phasing of the construction of the new railway and of the reconstruction of Euston station.**

25. Our view is the phased proposal inherent to AP3 has never been properly thought through in practical terms. We believe that the main reason for the phasing is probably financial (finance is given as one reason for it in Professor McNaughton's evidence to the Commons Select Committee on the afternoon of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2015, at paragraphs 32-33). The stated advantages to the classic services and train operating companies are very much doubted by us (*ibid.*, paragraphs 34-39; the opening speech of Lord Ahmed at the Lords Second Reading 14<sup>th</sup> April 2016 - *We will deliver the new HS2 station at Euston in a phased approach to reduce disruption to the existing railway and help better manage impacts on the wider area.* – we trust the noble lord was unaware how very dubious this statement is, there is absolutely no doubt that the impact on the wider area would be significantly increased under AP3's phased programme; see also SES2 & AP3 Vol 2 CFA1, 1.1.5). Our belief is that the phasing might result in minimised disruption of the 'classic' services' during the construction of HS2 phases A and B1 but would result in very much increased disruption of them in the B2 phase.

26. In particular we are unclear how the platforms in the rump of the station, B2, and tracks leading to them, can be reconfigured according to a 'coherent' station design if phases A and B1 have already been constructed.

27. At the end of Phase B1 of the AP3 scheme, the undeveloped part of the station (B2) would be left with eleven platforms. Several train service plans for the post-construction period have been published over time: taken with Network Rail's 'Rules of the Route' and its most recent passenger forecasts, it seems likely that at peak hours in the early to mid-2030s (the earliest that Phase B2 could be redeveloped) most, if not all, of these platforms would be needed.

28. The situation will be worsened if Camden Council's request for a 'level deck' station is accepted; this would involve integrating the HS2 and Network Rail parts of the station together with a section of the proposed Crossrail 2 station and would require the lowering of the remaining 'classic' platforms to the below-ground level of the HS2 platforms. Consequently the classic tracks approaching the station from the north would additionally have to be lowered.

29. Here our request is that Network Rail be required to produce a scheme that demonstrates that phase B2 is in fact buildable before work starts on the HS2 station.

**Railway questions: track layout in the throat and Camden Cutting and the necessity for concrete box or 'birdcage' structure below Park Village East.**

30. As set out in paragraphs 22-24 above, the incomplete information provided by HS2 on **track** layout in the throat and Camden Cutting and the need for a concrete box or 'birdcage' structure, suggests to us that this part of the railway design has also not been fully thought through.

31. Meanwhile, on one of the drawings provided by HS2 Ltd on 15<sup>th</sup> October last year (C220-ARP-CV-DSK-01A-432055), the PVEHG discovered text with misgivings about the effect during the operation of the railway on the Grade II\* listed PVE villas: *“Greater flexibility of propping arrangement may mean increased movement of barrette retaining walls (which may mean increased effects on PVE properties)”*. This ‘movement’ would be on top of ‘settlement’ caused to the houses by the rebuilding closer to the houses of the Camden Cutting’s western retaining wall as well as by and the insertion of ground anchors into the ground beneath the houses (the purpose of the permanent anchors being to pin the birdcage against the retaining wall and the ground behind); this settlement itself might extend many years beyond the completion of the construction of the new railway.

32. Residents are concerned that, because of lack of space within the cutting, the birdcage on its western side is propped against the retaining wall itself, rather than being contained on each side within its own structure; they also understand that the arrangement of the high speed tracks within the birdcage is comparatively complex, and that this also adds to the stresses on the structure; finally, they have been told that the potential for movement has increased since the reinstatement of Line X which, for a short stretch, sits on top of the birdcage.

33. The Camden Civic Society in turn questions the comparatively high speed HS2 has given as the purpose for undercutting Park Village East. Speed is also given as the reason for the distance required to accommodate at this point, within the birdcage and well away from the station, the ‘grade separation’ which is required to allow the high speed trains to make use all of the platforms dedicated to them. We have been led to understand that the given speed is connected with the ‘refresh rate’ for the High Speed platforms, something we may wish to go further into when we address the House of Lords Select Committee.

34. Our asks are here that: that HS2’s current design for the birdcage and its relationship to the new retaining wall and the listed villas be assessed and evaluated by an independent expert; that a new design is developed which would allow the birdcage to be supported independently of the retaining wall; that any research carried out for HS2 Ltd into the need for particular speeds to be achieved in the Cutting are made publicly available.

**‘Heritage Assets’: poor consideration given to the short and long term effects of the construction work and of the operational railway.**

35. As we demonstrated in our presentation to HCSC, in the original Environmental Statement (ES) and in the AP3 ES ‘Heritage Assets’ are poorly represented. Individually listed buildings are not marked separately on the maps supplied, and Conservation Areas (CAs) are not shown at all. But Camden as a whole is rich in Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings, and the area through which HS2’s new railway would pass is typical in this respect. The impression given by the maps and the ES text is that little consideration has been given to these assets. This is an opinion that Camden Council evidently shares: in its detailed comments on the original ES, at 6.3.2. *‘Camden Council points out that the Cultural Heritage section fails to provide a sufficiently detailed assessment of the temporary and permanent*

*impacts on these important heritage assets which are likely to occur during the construction of the Proposed Scheme.'*

36. Once again the example of Park Village East is particularly telling, and Camden's summary number EUS003 on p.452 of its response to the original ES, sets this out: *'Camden Council wishes to stress that the construction impacts on the 17 grade II\* listed houses in Park Village East and on the Regent's Park Conservation Area is likely to be severe. The residential properties and the street itself will suffer access issues for a period of seven years, which is likely to put these nationally significant Nash properties at risk and in danger of serious decay. The impacts from structural works to the railway cutting retaining wall and from potential settlement and vibration have not been assessed. The scale of impact of 'medium' underestimates the potential impacts, which should be 'high'. Camden Council supports the 'major adverse' effect rating.'*

37. Camden's position was supported by English Heritage in its letter of 24<sup>th</sup> February 2014 in response to the original ES: *'There are risks associated with the widening of Euston Cutting, above which sit the Grade II\* listed paired villas of Park Village East. These properties may be vulnerable to ground movement caused by construction of the expanded cutting.'*

38. The issue of decay has become more acute since the introduction of the longer AP3 scheme. In PVE, from the AP3 documents and from informal conversation with HS2 Ltd employees, residents have been able to deduce that much of the construction work needed for the 'birdcage' will take place from the PVE carriageway. During the six years during which PVE will be closed and this construction work will take place, the houses are likely to be left empty for extended periods (HS2 Ltd has issued an Assurance to PVE to cover rehousing for a period up to a year, but residents believe that the time away from PVE is likely to be much longer).

39. At meetings and in conversation with HS2 Ltd employees, the impression given is that any damage can be repaired after the event, and the building 'reinstated'. But in good Conservation practice, reinstatement and replacement have long since become a poor second best to maintenance and preservation.

40. Our requests here are: that the avoidance of direct damage and damage by neglect is given urgent consideration by HS2 Ltd; that HS2 guarantees vehicle access at short notice to Listed Buildings and other heritage assets, throughout the period of the railway's construction, for the purposes of maintenance and repair.

**'Heritage Assets': poor understanding shown by HS2 Ltd of the concept of the 'setting' of Listed Buildings and of Conservation Areas.**

41. In the original ES and the AP3 ES, insufficient consideration is given by HS2 Ltd the question of the 'setting' of Listed Buildings and of Conservation Areas. We note that, in the AP3 ES, in Chapter 12, on *Landscape and Visual Assessment*, better and more detailed consideration is given to setting than in Chapter 9, on *Cultural Heritage*. Once again, PVE provides a useful example, in the words of Camden's response to the original ES p.198,



under the heading 'Verifiable Photomontages': *'The setting of the villas and the conservation area will be affected by the large bulk and mass of the portal/headhouse structure in the cutting.'*

42. In the AP3 scheme, two additional railway buildings are proposed for Park Village East, in addition the headhouse just mentioned. These will be two intervention buildings, also rising 8 m above ground level, one situated in front of 30 PVE, at the corner of PVE and Mornington Street, and the other at the southern end of PVE, at the corner with Granby Terrace (the Conservation Area boundary extends as far as this). In the views up Mornington Street over the bridge to PVE, the first of these two intervention buildings will hide the Nash villa behind it, 30 PVE. To say, as Camden have written to residents, that the detailed and exterior treatment of this building has yet to be decided, gives us little reassurance given the proposed building's height and width.

43. Our requests in relation to the setting of Listed Building and of Conservation Areas are as follows: heritage assets and their care must not be an afterthought and must be considered from the conception of any new proposal; assessments should involve properly trained staff and not left to HS2 employees or consultants without qualifications in this area; the relevant statutory consultees – the Georgian Group, the Victorian Society and the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Society – should be brought in at an early point to any discussion of new impacts on Listed Buildings which would occur as part of the new Euston design.

**Our proposal for the establishment of a Starcross Conservation Area in a triangle to west of Euston station.**

44. Much of Camden – apparently over 50% - is already covered by CA status. But both listings and the designation of CAs has been a long-drawn-out process and there remain some significant gaps. One such is the triangle of land bounded on the south by Euston Street, on the west by North Gower Street/Hampstead Road and the east by Melton Street/Cardington Street, which particularly around Drummond Street and North Gower Street retains much of its very early 19<sup>th</sup> century character and scale, as well as a high proportion of original buildings.

45. Since the inception of the CAs in the late 1960s, many of Camden's CAs have been designated at the instigation of the Camden Civic Society, and we have notified Camden Council officers of our intentions in relation to this 'Starcross' area.

46. The purpose of the Starcross CA, if Camden Council and Historic England agree to its designation, would not be to put a stop to development, but to ensure that proposals which would affect the new CA and its setting, are considered with a good deal more thought and expertise than has been apparent in HS2's attitudes to heritage assets so far.

**Euston Arch.**

47. At our presentation to the HCSC we stated that we are strongly opposed to the reconstruction of the Euston Arch within Euston Square, particularly in the position proposed by the so-called Euston Arch Trust, squeezed between the much smaller and also historically and architecturally important surviving mid-19<sup>th</sup> century lodges facing onto Euston Road.

48. If a position for the Euston Arch could be found within the structure of new station, as envisaged by the DDD scheme, this might be something which we would agree to.

**We repeat our request to HS2 that they establish a platform from which to view the Primrose Hill portals.**

49. Our request to HS2 that they establish a platform to view the Primrose Hill was included in our AP3 petition, at paragraphs 51-51. As stated there: *The creation of a viewing platform will soon be become possible because an electricity substation, used for the cooling of railway power cables, is about to come out of commission..... If this small building was demolished, a very fine view of the portals would be opened up.* The failure of HS2 Ltd so far to engage with us on this question - the only information offered by HS2, that the site of the electricity substation belongs to Network Rail, hardly presents a major obstacle – forms part of our PACAC submission of February this year.

**Clause 48 (previously Clause 47).**

50. The information provided on Clause 48 (previously Clause 47) in the Promoters Response Document of October last year, rather than reassuring us, has made us even more concerned. In particular, the following sentence (p.39) reinforces the impression that this clause is completely unsuited to the Euston area: *When pursuing regeneration and development opportunities in relation to infrastructure projects, amongst other factors, local authorities will need to ensure there is appropriate provision of land in the surrounding vicinity of stations and depots and that it is appropriately packaged to achieve the wider ambitions of the area.*

51. This envisages a situation where a station is bordered by Railway Lands, as at King's Cross and St Pancras. Exceptionally, at Euston there are no Railway Lands adjacent: from the time the station was first established, in the 1830s, the associated Railway Lands have been over a mile away to the north, between the Regent's Canal and Chalk Farm. We made this point forcefully at the HCSC and we are sorry it has been reflected in their report.

52. One site which the AP3 ES appears to identify for Clause 48 exploitation is the rump of St James's Gardens left after the majority has been absorbed into the station. It is not acceptable that land which has been public open space for more than two centuries should be sold off for commercial use in this way.

53. We are almost as worried about a site on Melton Street, also identified in the AP3 ES as suitable for commercial development. This is to the south of the above-ground parts of the AP3 station, though possibly on top above some underground areas of the new construction. It is not acceptable that a plot which has been in local authority ownership, forming part of a long-established network of rights of way, should be exploited in this manner. In any case, to construct a large building here would restrict flexibility of access to the new station.

54. Our request, following the petitions of the HS2 Euston Action Group and of our GLA member, Andrew Dismore, is that clause 48 is removed altogether from the bill.

### **Railway alternatives: overview**

55. An important part of our two earlier petitions dealt with alternative railway schemes and the great improvements we believe these are able to offer over HS2 Ltd's scheme, particularly in its impacts on its Camden

Since submitting our AP3 petition we have worked closely with the authors of three alternative schemes and one phasing variant and would like to recommend all of these to the Select Committee: they are *Euston Express (EE)*, *Double Deck Down 3\* (DDD)*, *High Speed UK (HSUK)* and *Old Oak Common as a Temporary Terminus (OOCTT)*. DDD, EE and HSUK, are all able to accommodate the platforms and tracks for the high speed trains within the station's existing footprint, thus avoiding the need to expand to the station and the railway to the west.

56. To some extent these alternatives are complementary: a Double Deck design for Euston Station could be used in conjunction with Euston Express or High Speed UK as well as with HS2 AP3; High Speed UK offers a neat link to HS1 at St Pancras via the Midland Main Line and Euston Express could also link to HS1 by making use of the WCML tracks and then the North London Line as far as the junction with HS1 at Camley Street. (As already stated in our evidence to the Commons Select Committee, in a scheme such as HS2 Ltd's, where all the high speed trains come on into central London from Old Oak Common there is no easy way of forming a link with HS1, a situation recognised in the Government's report on the HS2-HS1 link published in November last year.)

57. While the DDD scheme accommodates all the platforms envisaged in HS2's AP3 proposal, a theme common to EE, HSUK and OOCTT alternatives is the necessity of diverting some classic trains away from Euston. A reduction of commuter services coming into Euston would be achieved most simply by extending Crossrail 1 on from Old Oak Common north-west onto the West Coast Main Line and replacing most of the commuter services currently coming in to Euston from stations between Tring, Hemel Hempstead, Watford and Wealdstone. This scheme has its origins in Network Rail's Route Utilisation Strategy Report for London & the South East (July 2011) and has been subject to various modifications since. It would involve construction of a short length of new line from a point on the Willesden Relief Lines of the WCML to the "New North Line" which runs into Old Oak Common above the line of the tunnelled HS2 route from Ruislip. Passive provision for such a link has been included in AP2.

58. Diversion of some services away from Euston, at least in the short term, is in our opinion essential. This is because, as set out in paragraphs 25-29 above, we doubt it is possible to comprehensively rebuild Euston without such diversions. The OOCTT proposal would allow high speed trains coming into London via OOC (i.e. as in HS2's own Phase 1 trains) to terminate temporarily at OOC in the platforms and station box structure forming part of the

Hybrid Bill scheme, thereby freeing up more space at Euston and perhaps facilitating the movement of materials and spoil by rail. (It is assumed that this scheme would use the tunnelled link from Old Oak to Euston which forms part of the Hybrid Bill scheme: it is likely that these tunnels would have to be completed before the station at OOC could be brought into operation, one or both tunnels could be used for the delivery of materials and removal of spoil to and from Euston).

59. Our first request in relation to these schemes is that the House of Lords Select Committee agree to hear presentations of these alternatives; our second is that, as in Lord Berkeley's withdrawn second Motion on the occasion of the Bill's Second Reading in the House of Lords on 14<sup>th</sup> April, that an independent technical advisor is appointed to attend the Lords Select Committee – this would avoid the risk of the overdependence of committee members on HS2's Ltd own experts for the explanation of technical matters; our third request is that the Select Committee request that the Government commission a detailed technical, economic and social analysis of HS2 Ltd's current proposals for the route into Euston alongside equivalent studies of the alternatives, and that this be done as soon as possible; our fourth is that, if HS2 Ltd and the Government have considered the various alternative solutions in any depth, that all relevant research, analysis and correspondence by and between HS2 Ltd, the DfT and the Treasury is made public.

#### **The High Speed UK scheme: relevant background.**

60. The Camden Civic Society would like ourselves to present the High Speed UK scheme to the House of Lords Select Committee. We were very grateful for the opportunity to do so to the HCSC.

61. There is no mention of HSUK in the HCSC report. HS2 Ltd themselves have also not engaged with us on this subject: HSUK was not mentioned in the Promoters Response Document and no evidence on HSUK was included by HS2 Ltd in their evidence pack submitted to the HCSC. (We have outlined this lack of engagement in our submission to PACAC.)

62. The reason given by HS2 Ltd for this non-engagement is that HSUK is considered by them to be non-compliant with the principle of the bill; this is technically correct in so far that HSUK, up to now, had no services passing through OOC. To remedy this lack, the authors of High Speed UK, Quentin Macdonald and Colin Elliff, have added a 'Parliamentary Loop' to the scheme, taking some trains to Old Oak Common *en route* to Euston, making possible a direct connection at that point with Crossrail 1 (and so allowing travel by Crossrail 1 to Heathrow) and with the Great Western Railway.

63. Members of the Lords Select Committee will be aware that HSUK made a presentation of their scheme to the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee during its Inquiry into The Economic Case for HS2; we would like to think that what they learnt then at about HSUK may have influenced the conclusion of that Committee that *'it is not at all clear that HS2 represents the best, most cost-effective solution to the problems it is intended to solve.'* (Report Summary, p.5.) At the Second Reading debate at the House of Lords on 14<sup>th</sup> April

this year, HSUK's alternative scheme was referred to by four members, Lord Rowe-Beddoe, Lord Framlingham, Lord Turnbull and Viscount Simon.

**The High Speed UK scheme: further details.**

64. High Speed UK is a national scheme intended to provide a fully integrated national network with a core spine of four tracks between London and South Yorkshire, closely following the M1 from London to Leicester. Taking advantage of the opportunities to divert commuter services away from Euston, HSUK would not require Euston station to be expanded and a far shorter construction programme is envisaged. Direct connections over existing lines are provided to St Pancras (for HS1) and to Heathrow.

65. The main approach to Euston would be by four single-track tunnels of 'Continental' size between West Hampstead and south of Parkway. With no complicated crossover movements to accommodate, the tunnel entry structure would be much simpler and more robust, thus greatly limiting the potential for ground movement. This would remove the need for the HS2 'birdcage' construction in Camden Cutting. The tunnel alignment would pass under Belsize Park and a vent shaft might be sited at Juniper Crescent.

66. With train flows into Euston reduced during reconstruction works, the West Coast Main Line from Euston to Willesden Junction and beyond could be used to transport materials and spoil. It might also prove possible to use a completed tunnel for spoil removal directly to the Midland Main Line at West Hampstead.

67. The 'Parliamentary Loop', which we have introduced in order to comply with the principle of the HS2 Hybrid Bill, would turn take some trains from Brent Cross to Old Oak Common. Travelling on from OOC to Euston, these trains would first use tunnels up to the West Coast Main Line (as in the Euston Express scheme) and would then follow the WCML tracks to the Euston approach. Finally these trains would join the HSUK 'high speed' tracks (arriving at Euston directly from West Hampstead) in the throat of Euston Station.

**The prayer**

The petitioners therefore ask the House of Lords that they, or someone representing them in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition to the Select Committee which considers this Bill.

AND the petitioners remain, etc.

Name:..... Signature: 

Hero Granger-Taylor,  
Committee member, Camden Civic Society

