

To the House of Lords
Session 2015–16

PETITION against the

High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Bill

THE PETITION OF REGENTS PARK ESTATE RESIDENTS

Declares that:

1. The petitioners are specially and directly adversely affected by the whole bill.
2. *Your petitioners* are the residents of the Regents Park Estate area and supporters from the Camden Civic Society.

2.1 In the 2011 census there were 2,709 households and 7,228 usual residents on the estate, which is bounded by the Euston Road in the south, Hampstead Road in the East, Albany Street in the west, and the Peabody estate (previously Crown estate) and Regents Park Barracks to the north, leading up to the listed buildings in Park Village East and then to Parkway.

2.2 The Estate was built mainly after the second world war, and is a pleasing balance of high rise blocks, lower build, and surviving Georgian and Victorian houses interspersed with green spaces, mature trees outlining the historic streets and squares, allotments and playgrounds. On the estate are also two primary schools (Netley and Christchurch), one further education college centre (Westminster Kingsway), a youth club (Samuel Lithgow) and tenant halls (Dick Collins, Silverdale) and community facilities (H-pod), several active churches (Mary Magdalen and the Antiochian church) and parades of shops.

2.3 The Estate is an area of high deprivation primarily due to overcrowding in the social housing, and the community merits particular support. The original white British community, many of whom are now elderly, have been joined over the decades by waves of immigrants and refugees from Bangladesh, Somalia and the former Yugoslavia. Many former council tenants have exercised their right to buy resulting in a higher number of leaseholders, some of whom have sub-let, particularly to groups of students or sold on, often to young professionals, but the estate still has a majority of council tenants.

2.4 The group on the Estate submitting this petition came together at meetings in 2015 convened by the Camden Civic Society and Netley Primary School Governing Body, and submitted an HS2 petition to the House of Commons as well as an unsuccessful deputation to Camden Council Development control Committee against HS2 replacement housing being built on public green spaces on the Estate. The group is

now over 500 strong and is submitting this petition to the House of Lords again under the auspices of the Camden Civic Society, which they have joined.

2.5 The Regents Park Estate residents do not feel in need so-called regeneration (developers profit) demolition of homes or further homes crowded into the estate reducing the green spaces. It is a wonderful community, currently vulnerable and needing the protection of Parliament because of the serious threat from decades of grievous disruption by the construction of High Speed 2.

3. Your petitioners' concerns are

3.1 That the assurances given to Camden Council do not alter the issues your petitioners have with the HS2 proposals. Improving the processes for implementing the mitigations already on offer does not address the fact that the mitigations leave your petitioners to suffer twenty years of remaining severe adverse impacts in-combination. Nor has this been addressed by the House of Commons Select Committee.

A. Spoil removed by rail not lorries

3.2 There is apparently a working party but nothing, not even in draft has been communicated to community groups. Spoil should be taken out by rail, not by hundreds of HGV lorries on residential streets. Deliveries should also be by rail, with penalties for transgressions. An architecturally pleasing bridge must be designed for the Hampstead Road replacement, if the case for greater height and size is made.

3.3 There will be over 20% more excavated spoil to remove due to the proposals in the AP3 amendments for increased station basement and the reinstatement of line X. So an additional 1 million tonnes in addition to the 2.5 million tonnes previously estimated will need to be shipped out. This will mean over 20% more heavy good vehicles on your petitioners' residential streets, rising to as many as 800 journeys a day during some years, with all the traffic disruption and pollution that will entail.

3.4 Having the HGVs comply with European emission legislation only reduces the amount by which pollution will INCREASE and is not enough to mitigate the impact on your petitioners' estate. The proposals to use the Zoo carpark will impact on the few remaining hedgehogs, as well as visits by schoolchildren coming by coach; and will mean the HGVs travel through your Petitioners' residential estate every day for decades to reach their main compound. This is both dangerous in terms of accidents to pedestrians and cyclists, and injurious to your petitioners' health, development and life expectancy in terms of pollution. It is further proposed to take away our parking which will impact on disabled people, deliveries and visits by tradespeople.

3.5 There will be impact on emergency services not being able to reach your petitioners through the congestion, and the danger of death directly resulting to your Petitioners.

3.6 There have not yet been communicated any new proposals for the Hampstead Road Bridge from HS2 Ltd. The proposals in AP3 for the bridge were much worse: it is now to be 4.6 metres higher than previously with the road correspondingly higher, and even larger and uglier. Insultingly your petitioners are told this is in response to the community not liking the previous proposals – which is no excuse for making them worse.

3.7 The bridge is currently slabs on trestles, it was to have been trusses, but now will be a deck and beam construction with a 220 metre span. However, the changes are clearly to do with accessing the expanded basement on the west side of Euston station.

3.8 The bridge should instead be in keeping with the local context, and not outrage the streetscape, creating severance and disruption for your Petitioners. There will be increased night works, with demolition and pile driving which will increase the distress of your Petitioners. Further works will take place on the Estate, including the barrette walls from Granby Terrace all the way south to the station.

B. Fair urban compensation and independent adjudicator

We support the proposals in the Camden Cutting Petition.

C. Mitigation for 20 years construction, agreed and adequately monitored

We support the proposals in the Camden Cutting Petition.

D. Minimal disruption & duration of every aspect of HS2 construction

3.9 The duration of construction for the west part of the proposed Euston station and approaches was increased by AP3 by six years to 2033. This means that for the first eighteen years of a child's life, if they are born at the start of the project, they will know nothing but pollution and dust and construction traffic and disruption, with previous playgrounds commandeered as construction compounds and not returned. A retired person will live out their final years in misery instead of the quiet enjoyment they had anticipated. The health impacts will be of long duration and have consequences for life expectancy.

E. Enforcement and fines for breaches of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)

F. Local Environment Management Plan (LEMP) actively enforced by officers on the ground

G. No demolition until we have the agreed integrated plan for Euston station

H. An integrated plan for HS2, classic Euston, Crossrail 2 and local transport

3.10 Work on this whole massive infrastructure project should not begin until a coherent and integrated plan is developed for Euston station and approaches. It cannot be designed in bits and hope they will fit together, this will not result in a world-class station. Euston station could be rebuilt in the same footprint – see proposals for Euston Express, High Speed UK and Double Deck Down, and also needs to be co-ordinated with a national railway network strategy as well as Crossrail Two and the London Underground and local transport. Your petitioners urge you to use Old Oak Common (to the west of Euston) as a temporary terminus at least to give time to develop a clear plan for the development of Euston station and approaches.

I. No temporary or permanent loss of public green/open spaces and trees

3.11 There must be urgent discussions now for adequate provision of green and open spaces and playgrounds, both during construction, and after completion. These must be agreed in advance and be at least equivalent to the present areas and shapes and numbers of mature trees which will need replacing at a ratio of 60 for one if their current air pollution reduction function is to be maintained. The current proposals entail a net loss of green space west of the station, with many households left with no public open green space near enough.

3.12 Loss of open spaces will be for two decades now, and more space will be permanently lost. Green lungs are essential to the health of your petitioners. And it is not acceptable to reduce this amenity. The felling of mature trees in the area must be avoided at all costs. Losing trees would not only impact on the streetscape, but also impact negatively on the health of your Petitioners.

3.13 It is to be avoided not only in the green spaces on the Estate, but also along the streets where the trees are to be felled to facilitate utility works. In the connection of replacement green spaces, and green spaces being restored to the community, it is to be noted that your Petitioners do not want the Euston Arch put back, as it would take far too much precious green space. It would have no architectural merit as it would be reconstructed and fake, and would compensate your Petitioners for nothing.

J. No worsening of air quality from HS2 pollution – monitor and improve current levels now

3.14 We ask that resident groups be accorded a formal interface with

HS2 Ltd in addition to Camden Council's over the location of air quality (AQ) monitoring stations which should include residential locations where there is both a predicted significant residual impact on AQ and other locations where there is not - to address the possibility that the AQ modeling undertaken is not accurate.

3.15 Also, an obligation for the AQ monitoring output data to be accessible to the public in real time. Further, given any serious exceedances, empowerment for demolition or construction work to be stopped until acceptable remedial measures have been put in place.

K. Independent costings & technical assessment of HS2 & alternative railway schemes

L. Old Oak Common costings to be calculated as per Lords Economic Committee request

3.16 Your petitioners understand that an important reason for the extended timetable for the reconstruction of Euston is the need to avoid disruption to railway services. If this is so, then the diversion of services away from Euston, whether on a temporary or permanent basis, is key to reducing the term of the disruption to Camden.

3.17 In the absence of existing stations that could handle diverted services comfortably, Old Oak Common must play an important rôle as a temporary terminus and proper consideration must be given to extending Crossrail One to Watford Junction and Tring. Many middle and longer distance services into Euston could then be withdrawn as they will have been replaced by Crossrail trains which industry studies have indicated would be more convenient to the great majority of passengers and provide substantially greater commuter capacity compared with the gains that HS2 is claiming as a side-effect of its own scheme. Your petitioners note that the majority of trains planned to operate on HS2 during Phase One are in reality services that will migrate from the classic lines into Euston. Taken together these measures would greatly reduce pressure at Euston, both in respect of the demands on railway infrastructure (platforms, train paths) and on interchange facilities.

3.18 Your petitioners suggest that the promoter has ignored the implications of AP2 for capacity on Crossrail One and may not have undertaken sufficient work to support its claims that Old Oak Common as a temporary terminus would impose unacceptable time penalties on passengers during Phase One.

3.19 Your petitioners urge that an adequate investigation of the use of Old Oak Common as a temporary high speed terminus for the whole or part of the duration of Phase One of the construction of HS2 be carried out and the findings made public."

M. Timely information from HS2 enabling genuine engagement – HS2 has continued to fail to engage.

3.20 There is apparently a working party but nothing, not even in draft has been communicated to community groups. Information reasonably required by your petitioners must be provided in time for presentations to select committee.

3.21 The environmental statements are flawed with many inaccuracies of detail and methodology and omissions of information and assessments. There is insufficient accurate information to inform your petitioners' petition. Neither have your petitioners received responses from HS2 to our reasonable questions at the so-called community engagement meetings. In particular, the residual significant impacts are considered in isolation rather than in combination over many years.

3.22 Long periods of time are described as temporary, and they are laid end to end creating decades of construction work. There need to be clear criteria for habitability and arrangements for compensation. Carrying out a project of this size and complexity in a densely populated area requires exceptional planning, and there is little evidence of the people who live here being taken into account. Your Petitioners feel ignored, with their interests subsumed to those of developers and commuters, and ask the Select Committee to take them into consideration. There is no gain for local people.

3.23 Therefore the residents of the Regents Park Estate ask for the following changes and mitigations. If these are not possible, then they ask that Old Oak Common is made the London terminus, at least until there is a coherent plan for the development of Euston Station. Many of the detailed points made in the Camden Cutting Petition are supported by your petitioners on the Regents Park Estate, as these relate to the immediate north of the estate and have similar impact. Therefore we have not repeated them all in this petition, relying on the thorough work of our neighbours.

N. Euston Station including HS2 and Crossrail 2 to be rebuilt in same footprint, no demolition until we have a plan

3.24 There is still no clear plan for the development of Euston station and approaches, integration with Crossrail 2 and the subsequent over site development, though a board with no community representation has been set up to look at this. It is the station that needs rebuilding, all the impact on the estate looks to your Petitioners like a developers land-grab to make profit. Therefore there will be many more years of construction while the station itself is rebuilt subsequent to 2033, and made fit for purpose.

3.25 Under the additional provisions the cost of Euston station to your petitioners and all taxpayers has increased from £2Billion to

£2.25Billion, and that is just for additional platforms and does not include the cost of developing the existing station so your petitioners see "half a station for double the money" when compared to the original estimates for HS2, the value for money status of which is in any case called into question by the House of Lords report.

O. No additional railway scheme into Euston until local transport has capacity to cope with the additional passengers.

4. The prayer

The petitioner(s) therefore ask(s) the House of Lords that (s)he/they, or someone representing her/him/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 petitioner(s) remain(s), etc.

Name:..... Signature.....